



Intimate Partner Violence Among Female Traders in Markets in Imo State: Prevalence, Pattern and Determinants

¹Olua Kingsley Nnamdi, ¹Ozims S. J., ¹Chinedu Eleonu P. O and ²Olua Ezinneamaka Ozichi

¹Department Of Public Health Faculty of Health Sciences, Imo State University, Owerri.

²Federal Teaching Hospital Owerri, Imo State.

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.1799458](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1799458)

Submission Date: 25 Oct. 2025 | Published Date: 20 Dec. 2025

*Corresponding author: [Olua Kingsley Nnamdi](#)

Department Of Public Health Faculty of Health Sciences, Imo State University, Owerri.

Abstract

This study investigated Intimate Partner Violence among Traders in Markets in Imo State: Prevalence, Patterns, and Determinants. The study was directed by four research enquiries. The study utilised a descriptive survey design. The sample consisted of 600 respondents chosen from the entire population by simple random sampling. We employed a structured questionnaire to get the data. The instrument's reliability coefficient was 0.7, determined by the test-retest procedure. The research issues were addressed by frequency counts and percentages. The main results are that most participants (90.7%) were aware of intimate partner relationships, that IPV leads to physical harm and injury (78.7%), and that IPV mostly happens in marriage (82.3%). The prevalence of IPV is 66.2%, and the most common types of IPV are verbal abuse (69.0%) and physical abuse (62.5%). Some of the characteristics that affect IPV are the age of the couple when they got married, their religion, their tribe, their spouse's job, and the woman's level of education, among others. Based on the data, conclusions were made and a recommendation for policy was made to make sure that all cases of IPV are.

Keywords: *intimate partner, violence, female traders, markets, prevalence, imo state.*

INTRODUCTION

Intimate partner violence (IPV) against women is acknowledged as a significant global public health issue due to its severe detrimental impacts on the physical, psychological, social, and economic health of women [1]. IPV impacts women of all ages, socio-economic statuses, and cultural origins, occurring in both heterosexual and homosexual relationships. It is a significant cause of illness and has been recorded as the third highest cause of mortality among women of reproductive age [2].

The rising incidence of IPV has led to heightened lobbying for regular screening in healthcare environments, thereby imposing increasing accountability on health professionals for the rapid identification, documentation, and management of IPV cases. However, a significant obstacle to effective detection is the exceedingly low rate of disclosure among women, especially in sub-Saharan Africa. Research repeatedly indicates that women infrequently report intimate partner violence (IPV) to authorities, including law enforcement, healthcare professionals, or civil society organisations [3]. People don't tell anyone about abuse for a number of reasons, including as not trusting the authorities, being afraid of getting hurt, respecting their husbands or family rules, being financially dependent on abusive partners, and worrying about the safety and health of their children. To create effective interventions that can improve identification, support, and prevention, it is important to know what causes IPV disclosure and how abuse happens.

The United Nations says that violence against women is "any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in physical, sexual or mental harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts of coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private." The World Health Organisation (WHO) defines IPV as actions by a current or former partner that cause physical, sexual, or psychological harm. This includes physical

aggression, sexual coercion, psychological abuse, and controlling behaviours. [4] The United States Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) also defines IPV as physical, sexual, or psychological injury inflicted by a current or former partner, happening in both heterosexual and same-sex couples, and not necessarily necessitating sexual interaction. The CDC further defines IPV as a spectrum that includes both one-time acts of violence and long-term, severe abuse. [5] The Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service (CAFCASS, USA) defines intimate partner violence (IPV) as a pattern of behaviours in which one spouse misuses power and control over the other in an intimate relationship. IPV can happen in relationships between people of different genders or the same gender, and it can have serious effects on people, kids, families, and even communities. Physical, emotional, sexual, and psychic violence are all types of IPV. Psychological abuse can include threats, property damage, intimidation, harassment, and financial abuse. The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary says that "intimate" means having a close relationship. This means that intimate partners are people who are in a close personal relationship.

In Nigeria, violence against women in the home is often seen as a private matter, which protects the people who do it from being judged by society. Cultural standards often perpetuate shame on victims instead of denouncing offenders [7]. As a result, IPV is still common and not reported enough.

In underdeveloped nations, the rates of prevalence are usually greater (lifetime prevalence 11–52%; yearly prevalence 4–29%) than in industrialised countries, where the rates are lower (lifetime prevalence 11%–16%) [8]. Worldwide, the prevalence varies from 10% to 69%, with at least one in three women thought to have experienced physical violence, sexual coercion, or other forms of abuse throughout their lives [9]. In a multi-country study by the WHO, 6% to 69% of women said they had been sexually abused by a partner at some point in their lives. Most countries reported numbers between 10% and 50%. In Africa, the prevalence of physical intimate partner violence (IPV) varies from 13% in Zimbabwe to 45% in Ethiopia, substantially influenced by cultural norms that allow wife-beating [10]. In Nigeria, domestic violence is still very common. The CLEEN Foundation revealed that one in three Nigerians said they had been victims of domestic violence [11]. The 2018 Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS) found that 60.8% of the 2,501 women surveyed in South-East Nigeria said they had been physically abused, while 11.8% said they had been sexually abused. In Imo State, 54.1% reported physical intimate partner violence (IPV), and 15.3% reported sexual IPV [12]. This study aims to enhance policy formulation to address IPV at community, state, and national levels. It also wants to teach people in the community about IPV tendencies and make them more aware of them. The study specifically evaluates the awareness, knowledge, and attitudes of women regarding intimate partner violence (IPV); ascertains the frequency and patterns of IPV among female traders in designated markets in Imo State; and finds characteristics correlated with IPV among the participants.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design

This study employed a cross-sectional descriptive design to assess IPV among female traders in intimate relationships in selected markets in Imo State.

Area of Study

The study was conducted in markets across the three geopolitical zones of Imo State—Owerri, Orlu and Okigwe. Selected markets included Imo International Modern Market (Naze-Nekede, Owerri), Orlu International Market and Eke Okigwe International Market.

Imo State, located in southeastern Nigeria, was created in 1976 from the former East-Central State. It is bounded by Abia State to the west, Anambra State to the north, Rivers State to the south and Enugu State to the east. The State lies between latitudes 4°45'N and 7°15'N and longitudes 6°50'E and 7°25'E, covering approximately 5,100 km². Major towns include Owerri (the capital), Orlu, Okigwe, Isu, Oguta, Akokwa, Mbaise and Ngor-Okpala. The population is estimated at 4.8 million, with a density ranging from 230 to 1,400 people per square kilometer.

Imo State experiences heavy seasonal rainfall from March to October, with peak humidity of about 90%. Temperatures are highest between January and March. The State contains natural resources such as crude oil, natural gas, zinc, lead and commercially important forest products including iroko, mahogany, bamboo, rubber and oil palm. However, population pressure and over-farming have contributed to deforestation and severe soil erosion.

Study Population

The study population consisted of female traders in selected markets across the three geopolitical zones of Imo State.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion: Female traders in selected markets who were currently in intimate relationships.

Exclusion: Male traders, visitors, and buyers were excluded regardless of occupation.

Sample Size Determination

Sample size was calculated using the Cochrane formula for populations greater than 10,000:

$$n = Z^2 P(1-P) / d^2$$

Where:

$$Z = 1.96$$

$$P = 0.566$$

$$Q = 1 - P = 0.434$$

$$d = 0.05$$

$$n = (1.96)^2 \times 0.566 \times 0.434 / 0.05^2 = 377$$

Assuming a 59.2% attrition rate:

$$0.592 \times 377 = 223$$

Total sample size:

$$377 + 223 = 600$$

Sampling Technique

A multistage sampling technique was used:

Stage 1: Markets were stratified by zone (Owerri, Orlu, Okigwe).

Stage 2: Two markets per zone were selected using simple random sampling by balloting.

Stage 3: Market sections/lines were selected using simple random sampling.

Validity of the Instrument

Face and content validity were ensured through expert review by the research supervisor, who assessed the questionnaire for relevance, clarity and adequacy before finalization.

Reliability of the Instrument

Reliability was established using the test-retest method. Fifteen pupils from Community Primary School, Orlu LGA, were randomly selected and administered the questionnaire twice within a 10-day interval. A reliability coefficient of 0.7 was obtained, indicating good internal consistency.

Data Collection

An advocacy visit was conducted to market leaders to obtain permission. Data were collected using semi-structured, interviewer-administered questionnaires. The instrument was pretested before use. The questionnaire comprised:

Section A: Socio-demographic/household characteristics

Section B: Awareness and knowledge of IPV

Section C: Prevalence and experiences of IPV

Statistical Analysis

Data were cleaned manually, validated and analyzed using Microsoft Excel. Results were summarized using frequencies, tables and descriptive statistics.

RESULTS

A total of 600 questionnaires were distributed in markets in Imo State and analyzed giving a response rate of 100%.

TABLE 4.1: SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

Variables	Owerri (%) n=200	Orlu (%) n=200	Okigwe (%) n=200	Total (%) n=600
AGE GROUP (YRS)	28(14.0)		23(11.5)	
<20	89(44.5)		86(43.0)	76(12.7)
20-29	49(24.5)	25(12.5) 70(35.0) 75(37.5)	20(10.0)	64/32.0
30-39	20(10.0)	10(5.0) 200(100)		21(10.5)
40-49	14(7.0)			6(3.0)
	200(100)			200(100)

> 50				
<i>Total</i>				
<i>Mean age =</i>				
28±2				
RELIGION				
Catholic	75 (37.5)	80(40.0)	101(50.5)	256(42.7)
Pentecostal	73(36.5)	10(20.0)	60(30.0)	173(28.8)
Orthodox	41(20.5)	67(33.5) 13(6.5)	32(16.0)	140(23.3)
Traditional	8(4)	0(0)	4(2.0)	25(4.2)
Muslim	3(1.5)	200 (100)	3(1.5)	6(1.0)
<i>Total</i>	200(100)		200	600(100)
		(100)	...	

TRIBE	192(96.0)	200(100)	200(100)	592(98.7)
Igbo	8(4.0)	0(0)	0(0)	8(1.3)
Hausa	200(100)	200(100)	200(100)	600(100)
<i>Total</i>				
OCCUPATION OF SPOUSE				
Trader	88(44.0)	70(35.0)	55(27.5)	213(35.5)
Artisan	10(5.0)	74(37.0)	55(27.5)	139(23.2)
Professional	30(13.0)	20(10.0)	15(17.5)	85(14.2)
Student	16(8.0)	4(2.0)	44(22)	64(10.7)
Civil servant	21(10.5)	10(5.0)	25(12.5)	56(9.3)
Unemployed	26(13.0)	2(1.0)	21(10.5)	49(8.2)
Farmer	9(4.5)	20(10.0)	12(6.0)	41(6.8)
<i>Total</i>	200(100)	200(100)	200(100)	600(100)
MARITAL STATUS				
Married	120(60.0)	87(43.5)	94(47.0)	301(50.2)
Single	49(24.5)	66(33.0)	85(42.5)	200(33.3)
Separated	14(7.0)	25(12.5)	8(4.0)	47(7.8)
Divorced	4(2.0)	15(7.5)	5(2.5)	24(4.0)
Widowed	6(3.0)	5(2.5)	4(2.0)	15(2.5)
Cohabiting	7(3.5)	2(1.0)	4(2.0)	13(2.2)
<i>Total</i>	200(100)	200(100)	200(100)	600(100)

AGE IN RELATIONSHIP (YRS)				
<1				
1-5	17(8.5)	15(7.5)	32(16.0)	64(10.7)
0-10	95(47.5)	115(57.5)	106(53)	87(14.5)
>10	58(29.0)	56(28.0)	34(17.0)	58(9.7)
<i>Total</i>	30(15.0)	14(7.0)	28(14.0)	34(9.5)
	200(100)	200(100)	200(100)	600(100)

TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP				
Monogamous	141(70.5)	100(50.0)	91(45.5)	332(55.3)
Single partner Relationship	53(26.5)	75(37.5)	85(42.5)	213(35.5)
Polygamous	5(2.5)	25(12.5)	20(10.0)	50(8.3)
Multiple partner Relationship	1(0.5)	0(0)	4(2.0)	5(0.8)
Total	200(100)	200(100)	200(100)	600(100)
HOW MUCH EARNED PER MONTH (₦)				
<10.000	71(35.5)	37(18.5)	55(27.5)	163(27.2)
10,000-19,000	40(20.0)	70(35.0)	36(18.0)	146(24.3)
20,000-29,000	21(10.5)	35(17.5)	33(10.5)	89(14.8)
30,000-39,000	45(22.5)	18(9.0)	24(12.0)	87(14.5)
40,000-49,000	12(6.0)	20(10.0)	26(13.0)	58(9.7)
>50,000	11(5.5)	20(10.0)	26(13.0)	34(9.5)
Total	200(100)	200(100)	200(100)	600(100)

EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION OF WOMAN

Secondary education	89(44.5)	125(62.5)	68(34.0)	282(47.0)
Tertiary education	60(30.0)	56(38.0)	101(50.5)	217(36.1)
primary education	0(16.5)	18(9.0)	19(9.5)	70(11.7)
None	18(9.0)	1(0.5)	12(6.0)	31(5.2)
total	200(100)	200(100)	200(100)	600(100)

EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION OF SPOUSE

Tertiary education	06(33.0)	100(49.0)	98(49.0)	204(44.0)
Secondary education	>9(39.5)	60(30.0)	40(20.0)	179(29.8)
None) 0(15.0)	20(10.0)	39(19.5)	89(14.8)
Primary education	25(12.5)	20(10.0)	23(11.5)	68(11.3)
Total	200(100)	200(100)	200(100)	600(100)

TYPE OF ACCOMMODATION

Flat	49(24.5)	80(40.0)	58(29.0)	187(31.2)
Two rooms apartment	74(37.0)	60(30.0)	38(19.0)	172(28.7)
One room anpartment	46(23.0)	18(9.0)	45(22.0)	109(18.2)
Bungalow	16(8.0)	10(5.0)	24(12.0)	50(8.3)
Share flats	8(4.0)	15(7.5)	20(10.0)	43(7.2)
Batcher	7(5.5)	17(8.5)	14(7.0)	38(6.3)
Others	0(0)	1(0)	1(0.5)	1(0.1)
Total	200(100)	200(100)	200(100)	600(100)

Table 4.1 shows the sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents. The mean age of the respondents in the study was found to be 28 ± 2 (Owerri 28 ± 2 , Orlu 28 ± 2 , Okigwe 28 ± 3) with majority of the respondents in all markets found within 20-29 years age group, 40.8% (Owerri 44.5%, Orlu 35%, Okigwe 43%). Generally, there were more Catholics, 42.7%, followed by Pentecostals, 28.8%. Majority of the respondents in all markets were Ibos, 98.7% (Owerri 96%, Orlu 100%, Okigwe 100%). Major occupation of the spouse of most of our respondents is trading, 35.5%, followed by artisans 23.1%. Among our respondents, 50.2% were married, 33.3% single, 7.8% were separated. Majority of the respondents have been in a relationship for 1-5 years, 52.6% (Owerri 47.5%, Orlu 57.5%, Okigwe 53%). Majority were in a monogamous relationship, 55.2% (Owerri 70.4%, Orlu 50%, Okigwe 45.5%). Most of the respondents earned less than N10,000, 27.2% (Owerri 35.5%, Orlu 18.5%, Okigwe 27.5%) with highest educational attainment of secondary

education 47% (Owerri 44.5%, Orlu 62.5%, Okigwe 34%). For their spouse, highest educational attainment is tertiary education, 44%, followed by secondary education, 29.8%. Most of the respondents live in a flat, 31.2%, followed by two rooms apartment, 28.7%, and one room apartment, 18.2%.

TABLE 4.2: AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE ABOUT 1PV AMONG RESPONDENTS

VARIABLES	OWERR1(%) (n = 600)	ORLU(%) (n = 600)	OK 1 G W E (%) (n = 600)	T O T A L (%) (n = 600)
HAVE YOU HEARD OF IPV				
Yes	168(84)	181(90.5)	195(97.5)	544(90.7)
No	32(16)	91(45.5)	5(2.5)	56(9.3)
Total	200(100)	200(100)	200(100)	600(100)
SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT IPV(n = 544)				
Friends/Relatives//Neighbors	(n = 168)	(n = 181)	(n = 195)	(n = 544)
Radio	135(80.4)	126(69.6)	85(43.6)	346(32.3)
Market	137(81.5)	135(71.6)	68(34.9)	140(61.2)
Television	95(56.5)	145(80.1)	26(13.3)	266(47.9)
August meeting	92(54.8)	85(46.9)	68(34.9)	245(44.1)
News letter/Magazine	69(41.1)	50(27.6)	35(17.9)	154(27.7)
Internet/social media	64(38.1)	47(25.9)	39(20.0)	150(27.0)
Books	61(36.3)	25(13.8)	48(24.6)	134(24.1)
Posters and Billboards	44(26.2)	31(17.1)	43(22.1)	118(21.2)
Seminar /Workshop	40(23.4)	25(13.8)	20(10.3)	85(15.3)
Health Personnel /Gov. Agencies	42(05.0)	5(2.8)	22(11.3)	69(12.4)
/Gov.	17(10.1)	11(6.1)	5(2.6)	33(5.9)
AaA Agencies1 Icrilth Pcfgouncil/Gov Agencies	13(7.7)	15(8.3)	4(2.1)	32(5.8)
NGO				
TYPE OF IPV KNOWN				
Physical abuse	164(98.4)		117(59.7)	431(77.6)
Sexual abuse	160(96.0)	150(82.5)	111(56.6)	351(63.2)
Verbal abuse	112(67.2)	80(44.0) 85(46.8)	69(35.2)	266(47.6)
Emotional abuse	114(68.4)	75(14.3) 47(25.9)	67(4.1)	256(46.1)
Financial abuse	104(62.4)	10(5.5)	8(29.6)	209(37.6)
Psychological abuse	47(28.2)	20(11.0)	41(20.9)	98(17.6)
Spiritual abuse	46(27.6)		19(9.7)	85(15.3)
CONSEQUENCES OF IPV KNOWN				
(n =544)	(N = 168)	(n = 181)	(n = 195)	(n =544)
Injury and physical harm	160(96.0)	150(82.5)	127(64.8)	437(78.7)
Spontaneous abortion	122(73.2)	85(46.8)	63(32.1)	270(48.6)
Sexual reproductive confliction	95(57.0)	90(49.5)	69(35.2)	254(45.7)
Mental Problem and Suicide	94(56.4)	85(46.8)	66(33.7)	245(44.1)
Unwarned Pregnancy	126(75.6)	50(27.5)	67(34.2)	243(43.7)
Homicide and other Mortality	100(60.0)	90(49.5)	32(16.3)	222(40.0)
Risk of Sexually transmitted disease	61(36.6)	75(41.3)	60(30.61)	196(35.21)

Table 4.2 shows the awareness and knowledge of respondents about IPV 90.7% of the respondents have heard of IPV with majority of the source being from friends/relatives/neighbors 62.3%, followed by radio 61.2%, followed by market 47.9% and television 44.1%. About 78.7% of the respondents believe that physical harm and injury are consequences of IPV, while 48.6% believe that spontaneous abortion is a consequence of IPV. 62.6% of the respondents believe that low level of education can cause IPV, 59.2% attributes IPV to alcohol abuse while 59.4% attributes it to young age.

Majority of the respondents 82.3% believe that IPV occurs most in marital relationship, 70.6% believe it occurs in boyfriend/girlfriend relationship. 67.7% believe it occurs in couples living together without marriage.

TABLE 4.3: PREVALENCE, PATTERN AND EXPERIENCE OF INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

HAVE YOU SUFFERED AN ABUSE IN YOUR CURRENT RELATIONSHIP				
Yes	87(43.5)	155(77.5)	155(77.5)	397(66.1)
No	113(56.2)	45(22.5)	45(22.5)	203(33.8)
Total	(100)	200(100)	200(100)	600(100)
IF YES, WHAT TYPE OF ABUSE HAVE YOU SUFFERED (n= 397)				
	(n = 87)	(n = 155)	(n = 155)	(n = 397)
Emotional/Psychological abuse	18(20.7)	5(3.4)	23(15.0)	46(11.5)
Verbal abuse	61(70.2)	115(74.8)	100(65.0)	276(69.0)
Sexual abuse	15(17.3)	40(26.0)	93(60.5)	148(37.0)
Physical abuse	55(63.3)	105(68.3)	90(85.5)	250(62.5)
Financial abuse	29(33.4)	10(6.5)	29(7.3)	68(17.0)
Spiritual abuse	2(2.3)	0(0)	1(0.65)	3(0.75)
WHAT KIND OF RELATIONSHIP ARE YOU ON				
Marital union	40(46.0)	100(60.1)	52(31.2)	192(48.0)
Boy friend/Girl friend	25(28.7)	40(24.0)	67(40.2)	132(33.0)
Girl friend only (Lesbianism)	4(4.6)	8(4.8)	16(9.6)	28(7.0)
Engaged	7(8.1)	3(1.8)	18(10.8)	28(7.0)
Man friend	11(12.7)	4(2.4)	2(1.2)	17(4.3)
Total	87(100)	155(100)	155(100)	397(100)

IF YOU HAVE SUFFERED VERBAL ABUSE, WHAT TYPES (n= 276)				
Insults	50(80.0)	107(93.1)	65(65.0)	222(80.0)
Name calling	55(88.0)	90(78.3)	32(32.0)	177(63.7)
Blaming	35(56.0)	65(56.6)	14(34.0)	134(48.2)
False accusation	28(44.8)	20(17.4)	27(27.0)	75(27.0)
Raising causes	32(51.2)	25(21.8)	15(15.0)	72(25.9)
Shouts at me	8(12.8)	33(28.7)	11(11.0)	52(18.7)
Grumbles always	44(78.4)	75(65.3)	45(45.0)	169(60.8)
IF YOU HAVE SUFFERED PHYSICAL ABUSE. WHAT SORT HAVE YOU EXPERIENCED				
	(n = 88)	(n = 105)	(n = 90)	(n = 250)
Pushing or shoving causing no injury	23(45.5)	90(85.5)	38(48.2)	153(61.2)
Slapping or pushing causing no injury	42(76.4)	40(30.0)	46(31.1)	128(51.2)

Hitting	32(58.2)	70(66.5)	34(37.7)	127(50.8)
Pulling your hair	18(32.8)	55(53.3)	20(22.2)	93(37.2)
Attempted strangulation	7(12.7)	28(26.6)	12(13.3)	79(31.6)
Pushing or shaking causing Injury	20(36.4)	40(38.0)	19(21.1)	66(26.4)
Hitting your head	2(3.6)	35(33.3)	13(14.4)	50(20.0)
Kicking	14(25.5)	37(35.2)	15(16.7)	47(18.8)
Burning you	2(3.6)	10(9.5)	3(3.3)	15(16.0)

WHAT PART OF YOUR BODY WAS TARGETED (n = 250)				
Head	(n = 55)	(n = 105)	(n = 90)	(n = 250)
Trunk	16(65.5)	95(90.3)	52(57.7)	183(71.2)
Arms and Hand	16(29.1)	71(67.5)	13(14.4)	100(40.0)
Legs and feet	32(58.2)	25(23.8)	37(41.1)	94(37.6)
Genitalia	20(36.4)	10(9.5)	19(21.1)	49(19.6)
	1(1.8)	22(20.9)	13(3.3)	36(14.4)
WHAT SORTS OF INJURY (n = 250)				
No injury	(n = 55)	(n = 105)	(n = 90)	(n = 250)
Bruising or Scratching requiring no medical intention	12(21.8)	65(36.0)	33(36.6)	110(44.0)
Cuts or gashes not requiring medical attention	15(27.3)	40(16.0)	16(17.8)	71(28.4)
Cuts or gusto not requiring no Medical attention	7(12.7)	7(2.8)	6(6.7)	20(8.0)
Broken Bone	1(1.8)	0(0)	11(12.2)	12(4.8)
Bum or scald	2(3.6)	1(0.4)	8(8.9)	11(4.4)
Injuries to genital areas	0(0)	0(0)	1(1.1)	1(0.4)
HOW SOON AFTER STARTING RELATIONSHIP DID THE FIRST PHYSICAL ASSAULT TAKE PLACE				
Alter a year	(n = 55)	(n = 105)	(n = 90)	(n = 200)
After u month	45(81.9)	40(38.0)	30(33.3)	115(46.0)
After a week	13(23.7)	32(30.4)	31(34.4)	76(30.4)
After a day	4(7.2)	26(24.7)	24(26.6)	54(21.6)
Total	55(100)	105(100)	90(100)	200(100)

HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU BEEN PHYSICALLY ASSAULTED				
Many times	(n = 55)	(n = 105)	(n = 90)	(n = 250)
Twice	21(38.2)	50(47.5)	42(46.4)	113(45.3)
Thrice	21(38.2)	20(19.0)	29(32.2)	70(28.0)
Once	1(8)	23(21.9)	7(7.8)	31(12.2)
Total	12(21.8)	12(11.4)	120(3.3)	36(14.4)
HAVE THE PHYSICAL ASSAULTS INCREASED, STAYED THE SAME OR DECREASED DURING YOUR RELATIONSHIP				
Decreased	(n = 55)	(n = 105)	(n = 90)	(n = 250)
Stayed the same	9(16.4)	7(6.7)	11(12.2)	27(10.8)
	4(7.3)	41(39.0)	12(11.1)	57(22.0)

Only been assaulted once	21(38.2)	25(23.8)	25(27.8)	71(28.0)
Increased	15(27.3)	20(19.0)	38(42.2)	73(29.2)
Not sure	6(10.9)	12(11.4)	4(4.4)	22(8.8)
Total	55(100)	105(100)	90(100)	250(100)
HOW DID THE PHYSICAL ABUSE START				
(n= 250)	(n = 55)	(n = 105)	(n=90)	(n=250)
When we moved in together	21(38.2)	,10(2K.5)	48(53.3)	90(39.6)
None of the above	21(38.2)	34(32.3)	27(30.0)	82(32.8)
When I said I was leaving	12(21.8)	35(33.3)	120(33)	59(23.6)
After a yarn	1(1.8)	6(5.7)	3(3.3)	10(4.0)
Total	55(100)	105(100)	90(100)	250(100)

HAVE YOU EVER TRIED DEFENDING YOURSELF FROM A PHYSICAL ASSAULTS (n = 250)	(n = 55)	(a = 105)	(11= 90)	(n = 250)
Yes	40(72.8)	70(66.5)	75(83.3)	185(34.0)
No	15(27.3)	35(27.3)	15(33.3)	65(26.0)
Total	55(100)	105(100)	90(100)	250(100)
WHAT SORT OF SEXUAL ABUSE HAVE YOU EXPERIENCED (n = 148)				
Forced sex when ill	(n = 15)	(n = 40)	(n * 93)	(n= 148)
Forced sex when ill	11(73.4)	10(25.0)	40(43.2)	61(413)
Rape- Incomplete	7(46.7)	10(25.0)	25(27.0)	42(28.6)
Rape – Complete	6(40.0)	25(62.5)	30(324)	61(41.6)
Calling you sexual derogatory names	11 (73.4)	5(12.5)	25(27.0)	41(27.9)
Excessive sexual jealousy	14(934)	2(5.0)	23(24.8)	39(26.5)
Forced sexual act alter physical assault	9(60.0)	15(37.5)	20(21.6)	44(29.9)
Forced to watch pornographic	4(26.7)	10(25.0)	15(16.2)	29(19.7)
Withholding sex	8(53.4)	0(0)	19(20.5)	27(18.4)
Making sex conditional	7(46.7)	0(0)	18(19.4)	25(17.0)
Forced sexual act excluding penetration	7(46.7)	5(12.5)	10(10.8)	22(14.9)
Having sexual euphuist photos	2(13.3)	5(12.5)	14(15.1)	21(14.3)
Criticizing you sexually	13(86.7)	1(2.5)	6(6.5)	20(13.6)
Forced prostitution	1(6.7)	2(5.0)	16(27.0)	19(12.9)
Rape using an object	0(0)	1(2.5)	10(10.8)	11(73)
Anal rape (buggery)	2(13.3)	0(0)	3(32)	5(3-4)

IF YOU HAVE BEEN RAPED, DID YOUR ABUSER USE;	(n = 13)	(n = 35)	(n=55)	(n =103)
(n = 103)	2(15.4)	20(57.2)	19(34.6)	41(39.8)
Coercion	6(46.1)	8(22.9)	15(273)	29(28.1)
Only enough force	4(30.8)	3(8.6)	15(27.3)	22(21.3)
Violence	1(7.7)	4(11.4)	6(10.9)	11(10.7)
Weapon				
HOW MANY TIMES WERE YOU SEXUALLY ABUSED BEFORE TELLING SOMEONE, (n = 148)	(n = 15)	(n = 40)	(n = 93)	(n = 148)
Once	7(46.7)	15(37.5)	36(38.9)	58(39.4)
Twice	4(26.7)	5(12.5)	28(30.2)	37(25.2)
Thrice	4(26.7)	20(5.0)	29(29.3)	53(39.0)
Total	15(100)	40(100)	93(100)	148(100)

HOW SOON AFTER STARTING HIE RELATIONSHIP DID THE FIRST SEXUAL ABUSE TAKE PLACE				
	(n = 15)	(n = 40)	(n=93)	(n=148)
After a year	5(33.4)	10(25.0)	19(20.5)	34(31.9)
After a month	6(40.0)	10(25.0)	31(33.5)	47(31.9)
After a week	3(20.0)	15(37.5)	28(30.2)	46(31.3)
After a day	01(6.7)	5(12.5)	15(16.2)	21(14.3)
Total	15(100)	40(100)	93(100)	148(100)
HAVE YOU REPORTED THIS SEXUAL ABUSE TO ANY ONE (u =397)				
	(n =15)	(n = 10)	(n=93)	(n =148)
Yes	10(66.7)	25(62.5)	68(73.4)	103(70.0)
No	5(33.4)	15(37.5)	25(27.0)	45(30.6)
Total	15(100)	40(100)	93(100)	148(100)
WHO DID YOU REPORT THIS ABUSE TO				
	(n=10)	(n =25)	(n = 68)	(n = 103)
Friends	3(03)	7(28.0)	22(35.4)	32(31.0)
Parents	4(0.4)	8(32.0)	34(54.7)	46(39)
Siblings	2(0.2)	6(24.0)	15(24.2)	23(22.3)
Law enforcement agent	1(0.1)	2(8.0)	14(22.5)	17(16.5)
Spiritual leader	1(0.1)	2(84.0)	5(8.1)	27(262.2)
WHAT DID THEY DO				
Told me to forgive him	0(0.9)	12(48.0)	8(12.9)	29(28.1)
Arrest him	2(0.2)	3(12.0)	14(163)	19(18.4)
Did nothing	6(0.0)	8(32.0)	6(7.0)	20(19.4)
Insult him & throw objects	210.1)	10(40.0)	7(8.1)	19(18.4)
Beat him up	1(0.1)	7(28.0)	5(5.8)	13(12.6)
HAS THE SEXUAL ABUSE INCREASED STAYED THE SAME OR DECREASED DURING YOUR RELATIONSHIP				
	(n = 15)	(n = 40)	(n=93)	(n = 148)
Decreased	4(26.7)	10(25.0)	44(47.8)	58(38.9)
Stayed the same	5(33.4)	10(25.0)	29(31.3)	44(29.5)
Only been assaulted once	2(2.3)	8(20.0)	4(4.3)	14(9.4)
Increased	3(20.0)	10(25.0)	10(10.8)	23(15.4)
Nut sure	1(6.7)	2(5.0)	6(6.5)	9(6.0)
Total	15(100)	40(100)	93(100)	148(100)

IF YOU HAVE BEEN RAPED, DID YOU RECOGNIZED IT AS RAPE AT THE TIME OF THE INCIDENT (n = 103)				
	Yes	7(53.8)	20(57.1)	35(63.7)
No	6(46.2)	15(42.9)	20(36.4)	41(39.8)
Total	13(100)	35(100)	55(100)	103(100)
DID YOU SUSTAINED ANY INJURY DURING THE SEXUAL ABUSE				
	Yes	13(86.7)	38(95.0)	47(50.5)
No	2(13.3)	2(5.0)	46(49.5)	50(33.8)
Total	15(100)	40(100)	93(100)	148(100)

HAVE YOU SUSTAINED ANY INJURIES/DISEASES/PREGNANCY ETC AS A RESULT OF THE SEXUAL ABUSE (n = 98)	(n- 13)	(n = 38)	(n = 47)	(n = 98)
Sustained physical injury to other part	205 (4)	12(31.6)	12(25.6)	20(26.51)
Sustained physical injury in genital urea	12(92.4)	5(13.2)	15(32.0)	332(32.6)
Oot pregnant	1(7.7)	5(13.2)	9(19.2)	13(15.3)
Hud sexually transmitted disease	1(0.7)	3(2.0)	7(4.7)	11(7.4)
Infection	0(0)	17(44.7)	14(29.8)	31(31.6)
Sustained physical injury to breast	1(7.7)	7(18.4)	27(57.5)	35(335.7)

Table 4.3 shows the prevalence/types of IPV experienced by the respondents in the 3 zones. About 66.2% of the respondents have experienced intimate partner violence, while 33.8% have not experienced IPV.

Majority of the respondents (69.5%) have suffered verbal abuse (Orlu 28.9%, 15.4% Owerri and 25.2% in Okigwe), 62.5% have suffered physical abuse, 37.3% suffered sexual abuse, 17.1% have suffered financial abuse, 11.6% emotional abuse and 0.8% have suffered spiritual abuse.

TABLE 4.4: FACTORS INFLUENCING IPV IN RELATIONSHIPS. VARIABLE CURRENT EXPERIENCE OF IPV

	Yes (%)	No (%)	Total (%)
Age			
<20	50(77.0)	17(22.4)	76(100)
20-29	185(75.5)	60(24.5)	245(100)
30-3M	100(53.2)	88(46.8)	188(100)
40-44J	31(40.8)	30(59.1)	61(100)
>50	22(73.3)	8(26.7)	30(100)
Total	397(66.1)	203(33.8)	600(100)
RELIGION			
Catholic	196(76.6)	60(23.4)	256(100)
Pentecostal	101(58.4)	72(41.6)	173(100)
Orthodox	79(56.4)	61(43.6)	140(100)
Traditional	17(12.1)	8(87.9)	25(100)
Muslim	4(66.7)	2(33.3)	6(100)
Total	397(66.1)	203(33.8)	600(100)
TRIBE			
Igbo	391(66.1)	201(34.0)	592(100)
Hausa	6(75.0)	2(25.0)	8(100)
Total	397(66.1)	203(33.8)	600(100)
OCCUPATION OF SPOUSE			
Trader	130(65.3)	74(34.7)	213(100)
Artisan	00(71.9)	39(28.1)	139(100)
Professional	60(70.6)	25(29.4)	85(100)
Student	13(18.8)	52(81.2)	64(100)
Civil servant	30(53.6)	26(46.4)	56(100)
Unemployed	30(61.2)	19(38.8)	49(100)
Farmer	26(63.4)	15(36.6)	41(100)
Total	307(66.1)	203(33.8)	600(100)
MARITAL STATUS			
Married	209(69.4)	92(30.6)	301(100)
Single	150(75.0)	50(25.0)	200(100)
Separated	17(36.2)	30(63.8)	47(100)
Divorced	10(41.7)	14(58.3)	24(100)
Widowed	3(20.0)	12(80.0)	15(100)
Co-habiting	8(61.5)	5(38.5)	13(100)

Total	0)7(66.1)	203(33.8)	600(100)
AGE IN RELATIONSHIP (YRS)			
<1	61(9.4)	3(90.6)	64(100)
1-5	210(66.5)	106(33.6)	316(100)
6-10	89(60.1)	59(39.9)	148(100)
>10	37(51.4)	35(48.6)	72(100)
Total	397(66.1)	203(33.8)	600(100)
TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP			
Monogamous	205(01 71	127(38 3)	332(100)
Single	150(70 4)	63(29.6)	213(100)
Polygamous	40(80.0)	10(20.0)	50(100)
Multiple	2(40.0)	3(60.0)	5(100)
Total	307(66.1)	203(33.8)	600(100)
HOW MUCH EARNED PER MONTH			
<10,000	150(95.7)	7(4.3)	163(100)
10,000-19, U (JU	75(51.4)	7U48.6)	146(100)
20,000-29.000	61(70,11	26(29.9)	87(100)
30,000-39,000	55(61.8)	34(38.2)	89(100)
40,000-49.000	30(62.1)	22(37.9)	58(100)
>50,000	14(41.2)	20(58.8)	34(100)
1 out	397(66.1)	203(33.8)	600(100)
EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN			
Tertiary education	134(50,8)	80(49.2)	264(100)
Secondary education	110(61.5)	9(38.5)	179(100)
Primary education	30(42.9)	40(57.1)	70(100)
None	28(90.3)	3(9,7)	31(100)
Total	397(66 1)	203(33.8)	600(100)
TYPE OF ACCOMMODATION			
Flat	180(96 3)	7(3.71	187(100)
Two room apartments	106(61.6)	60(38 4)	172(100)
One room apartment	40(36.7)	69(63-4)	109(100)
Bungalow	20(40)	30(60)	50(100)
Share Flats	30(69.8)	13(302)	43(100)
Batcher	20(52.6)	18(47.4)	38(100)
Others	1(100,0)	0(0)	1(100)
Total	3NNNN97(66.1)	203(33.8)	600(100)

From the study, it was formed that IPV occurred more in the 20-29 years group (31.5%), was more prevalent in the catholic denomination (32.6%), highest among married couples. (34.8%).

TABLE 4.5: GENERAL QUESTIONS FOR ALL ABUSE TYPE

IS YOUR ABUSER MALE OR FEMALE				
(n=397)	(n =87)	(n= 155)	(n =155)	(n= 397)
Male	83(95)	147(94.8)	139(89.7)	369(92.9)
Female	4(4.6)	8(52)	16(10.3)	28(7.1)
Total	87(100)	153(100)	155(100)	397(100)
ARE YOU STILL LIVING WITH OR IN CLOSE CONTACT WITH YOUR ABUSER				
Yes	43(49.5)	65(41.9)	59(38.9)	167(41.8)
No	25(28.8)	30(19.1)	59(38.9)	114(28.5)
Sometimes	19(21.9)	60(38.7)	37(24.4)	116(29.0)
Total	87(100)	155(100)	155(100)	397(100)
DOES HE ISOLATE YOU FROM				
Friends	19(21.8)	60(38.7)	48(31.2)	127(31.5)
Family/relatives colleagues	9(10.3)	40(25.8)	34(22.1)	83(20.8)
	6(6.9)	35(22.6)	15(9.8)	56(14.0)
DOES HE MAKE YOU FEEL BAD ABOUT YOURSELF (DEPRESSED)				
Yes	28(32.2)	40(25.8)	86(55.9)	154(38.5)
No	35(40.2)	85(54.8)	21(13.7)	141(35.3)
Never	24(27.6)	30(19.4)	48(31.2)	102(25.5)
Total	87(100)	155(100)	153(100)	397(100)

DOES HE DEPRIVE YOU OF THE FOLLOWING				
Money	42(48.3)	40(25.8)	43(27.7)	165(41.6)
Transportation	5(7.5)	80(51.6)	30(19.5)	115(28.8)
Food	16(18.4)	47(30.3)	20(12.9)	113(28.3)
Access to health care	0(0)	31(20.0)	15(9.8)	46(11.5)
Community mobilization	6(6.9)	16(4.0)	18(11.7)	40(10.0)

Table 4.5 shows the frequency of incomplete partner violence pattern of abuse in those currently suffering IPV. About 57.4% of those abused are from those living together (long term partner), followed by Boy friend/girl friend with 32.0% and family member/relative ranks the least. Among those abused 91.9% of their abuser are males among while 8.1% of them are females. About 46.9% of the respondents are depressed from abuse, 18.1% of the respondents have never been depressed before, 30.9% are deprived of money, and ranking the highest followed by food 18.3% with community mobilization been the least, 4%.

TABLE 4.6: SUPPORT AVAILABLE AND PERCEPTION OF IPV

Ye	48(55.2)	65(41.9)	83(54.0)	1>6(49.0)
No	39(44.8)	90(58.1)	72(46.0)	201(50.3)
Total	87(100))	155(100)	155(100)	397(100)
IF YES, WHO HAVE YOU TOLD				
	(n = 48)	(n = 65)	(n = 83)	(n = 196)
Family/siblings	20(41.7)	45(692)	45(13.0)	110(563)
Parental	20(41.)	45(64.6)	42(11.4)	107(54.6))
Domestic violence	2(4.3)	5(2.6)	5(2.6)	12(6.2)
Friends	2(4.2)	5(2-6)	5(2.6)	12(63)
Police/law enforcement	2(4.3)	15(7.8)	15(7.8)	22(16.63)

Church leader	6(12.5)	2(1.0)	1(0.5)	9(4.6)
Social services	1(2.1)	0(0)	0(0)	1(0.25)
IE NO, WHY	(n=34)	n = 125)	(n - 28)	(n= 192)
Fear old being blamed	40(51.3)	22(17.6)	2(7.1)	60(32.3)
Fear of being ashamed	10(51.3)	20(16.0)	8(28.6)	60(31.2)
Stigmatization	19(48.6)	10(8.0)	10(35.7)	39(20.3)
For the danger	1(25.6)	12(9.6)	7(25.0)	20(10.4)
for forgiveness sake	5(02.8)	15(12.0)	1(3.6)	11(57)
WHAT WAS THE RESPONSE				
Advised to bear the fortitude	20(10.3)	25(13.0)	21(10.9)	66(34.2)
Blamed you	12(6.2)	13(6.7)	15(7.8)	40(20.7)
Partner encouraged to change his way	12(0.2)	13(6.7)	13(6.7)	38(19.6)
Advised to abandon the relationship	15(7.8)	13(6.7)	10(5.2)	38(19.7)
The case taken to court	2(1.0)	2(1.0)	7(3.6)	11(5.6)
Total	61(253)	46(34.1)	66(343)	193(100)

HOW LONG HAD THE ABUSE BEEN ONGOING BEFORE YOU CONTACTED AN OFFICIAL BODY				
<6 months	13(6.7)	10(5.2)	30(15.5)	43(27.4)
6-12 months	12(6.2)	14(7.3)	23(11.9)	27(25.4)
1 -5 years	17(8.8)	11(5.7)	19(9.8)	27(24.3)
>5 years	11(5.6)	11(5.7)	22(11.3)	14(22.6)
Total	53(27.3)	46(23.9)	94148.5	193(100)
HOW CAN INTEIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE BE PREVENTED IN YOUR OWN VIEWS				
Strengthen women's civil right	51(8.5)	55(9.1)	67(11.1)	173(28.7)
Raising awareness about IPV	43(7.1)	70(11.7)	59(8.9)	172(28.01)
Legislation against IPV	52(8.7)	67(11.2)	28(4.7)	168(24.6)
Engaging of govt, and policy makers	50(8.3)	40(6.7)	18(3.0)	108(18.0)
Total	276(100)	443(100)	200(100)	600(100)
IN YOUR OWN OPINION, IS A PARTNER JUSTIFIED OF HITTING OR BEATING HIS PARTNER FOR ANY REASON,				
Yes	51(8.5)	65(10.8)	56(9.3)	172(28.6)
No	149(24.8)	135(22.5)	144(24.0)	428(71.3)
Tout)	200(33.3)	200(33.3)	200(33.3)	600< 100)

IF YES, WHAT ARE THE SITUATIONS (MRA = 172)				
Unfaithfulness	20(11.6)	50(29.1)	12(7.0)	82(48.6)
Insulsive	3(7)	55(32.0)	12(7.0)	75(44.6)
Disobedience	7(4.1)	35(20.3)	9(5.2)	2
Refusal of sex	5(2.9)	5(2.9)	9(5.2)	2
Addition to alcohol	3(1.7)	24(14.0)	9(5.2)	
Inability to provide food		50(29.1)	6(3.5)	

In the table above, majority of the respondents 51.3% didn't confide in any one while 48.6% of those that confided in people reported to their family and siblings 36.3%, followed by parents 24.7% with the least being the social services, 0.8%.

Reason for not confiding in any one were mainly fear of being ashamed 31.2%, fear of being blamed 32.3%, stigmatization 20.3%, and danger to life 10.4%, for forgiveness sake been the least 5.7%. Response to reported cases were mainly to bear with fortitude 34.2%, followed by advice to abandon the relationship 19.7%, blamed the abused 20.7% and the least been the abuser taken to court 5.6%. Prevalence measures chosen were mainly legislation against IPV 24.6%, raising awareness 28.6%. The respondents believed that it is unjust for a partner to abuse his partner for any reason.

Discussion

This study demonstrated that IPV is prevalent among female traders in Imo State. The prevalence percentage in this study is 66.1%. The global prevalence rates are 30%, 37%, and 23.2% for low-, middle-, and high-income nations, respectively. This is greater than those rates. It is also better than the 13.647.1% reported for South Eastern Nigeria, but it is lower than the 83.4% reported for South-South Nigeria. [13]

This high proportion among female traders may be attributable to their partners' low level of education, young age, and usage of drugs and alcohol. These things could make their partners mistreat them since they are desperate to stay in charge of the relationship [14]. Additionally, they might not have been exposed to the social and religious standards that prevent married women from admitting to abuse, leading to increased revelation of abuse.

This study showed that most of the people who answered (90.7%) knew a lot about IPV. Only roughly 47.9% of the people who answered acquired their information about IPV from the markets. This suggests that the harmful impacts of IPV in the markets are not given much thought. Instead, a large number of the people who answered got their information on IPV from friends, family, or neighbours (62.3%) or the radio (61.2%) [15].

Verbal abuse is the most common type of abuse, with 69.0% of victims reporting it. Physical abuse is next, with 62.5%, and sexual abuse is last, with 37.0%. People who are 20 to 29 years old are more likely to be mistreated than people of other ages, which is consistent to what other research have found. This could be attributed to increased assertiveness among women as they age.

This study indicated that IPV is more common in marital relationships (48.0%), followed by boyfriend/girlfriend relationships (33.0%). This is because society expects women to rely on men. When men and women are in a relationship, males are seen to have the right to do anything they want with women.

49.0% of the people who answered said they have encountered IPV and looked for help. For those who reported, most told their parents or siblings, 56.2% and 54.6%, respectively.

The percentage of police and law enforcement agents was 16.3%. In this society, it seems normal for family members to deal with IPV problems, but in developed countries, law enforcement and social agencies are used [17]. Most of the people who didn't tell anyone said that they were afraid of being ashamed (31.2%), being blamed (32.3%), or being stigmatised (20.3%) were the main reasons they didn't report [18,19].

Conclusion

This study indicates a decline in the prevalence of IPV. Verbal abuse is the most common type of IPV, followed by physical violence, sexual abuse, financial abuse, emotional/psychological abuse, and spiritual abuse. A higher percentage of the respondents are aware of IPV. Many people still don't disclose situations because they are afraid of being embarrassed, accused, or stigmatised, among other things. According to this study, the best method to stop IPV is to make laws and raise awareness about IPV among other things.

REFERENCE

1. Avanigadda, D. B., & Kulasekaran, R. A. (2021). Associations between intimate partner violence and pregnancy complications: A study from India. *Journal of Family & Community Medicine*, 28(1), 17–27. https://doi.org/10.4103/jfcm.JFCM_256_20
2. Stewart, D. E., Cummings, S. R., Tchabo, K., Lofters, A., & Kingston, D. (2023). Maternal and neonatal outcomes associated with intimate partner violence during pregnancy: A retrospective cohort in Australia. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology*, 130(4), 567–575.
3. Walby, S., & Towers, J. (2020). Measuring violence to end violence: Mainstreaming gender in violence research. *Feminist Review*, 124(1), 21–43.
4. Devries, K. M., Mak, J. Y. T., García-Moreno, C., Petzold, M., Child, J. C., Falder, G., & Lim, S. (2020). Global patterns of intimate partner violence: A reanalysis of national prevalence estimates. *The Lancet Global Health*, 8(4), e495–e507.
5. Gebremeskel, G. G., Gebrewahd, G. T., & Tadesse, D. B. (2024). Intimate partner violence during pregnancy and risk of low birth weight and preterm birth in Northern Ethiopia: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 24, Article 123.
6. Guo, M., Wan, X., Wang, H., Wang, C., Tousey-Pfarrer, N., Liu, M., ... Zhang, W. (2023). Associations between intimate partner violence and adverse birth outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLOS Medicine*, 20(5), e1004332.
7. Homer, C. S. E., Doran, E., Foureur, M., & Hill, P. (2021). Intimate partner violence and its health impacts on women: A systematic review of evidence from low- and middle-income countries. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(11), 5790. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18115790>
8. Sabri, Y. (2021). Depression and post-traumatic stress disorder in females exposed to intimate partner violence. *Middle East Current Psychiatry*, 28, Article 85.
9. Iwuagwu, T. E., Kalu, M. O., Ngwoke, S. O. R., Yohanna, W., Umar, I., Iwuagwu, V. M., & Ejimonu, N. C. (2024). Spatio-temporal patterns of intimate partner violence victimization and preventive measures among married persons in Imo State, South East Nigeria. *Journal of Home Economics Research*, 31(2), 1–15.
10. Edwards, K. M., Rodriguez, D., & Benson, K. (2021). The psychological impact of intimate partner violence: Substance use as a coping strategy. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 50(6), 3569–3580. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-021-01957-8>
11. Okorie, C. O., Bassey, P. E., Nwachukwu, N. S., & Ndep, A. O. (2021). Perceived determinants of domestic violence and the strategies for its prevention in Orlu Local Government Area of Imo State, South East Nigeria: A cross-sectional questionnaire-based study. *Emerging Trends in Disease and Health Research*, 1, 112–129.
12. Sardinha, L., Maheu-Giroux, M., Stöckl, H., Meyer, S. R., & García-Moreno, C. (2022). Global, regional, and national prevalence estimates of physical or sexual intimate partner violence against women. *The Lancet*, 399(10327), 803–813. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)02664-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)02664-7)
13. Eze, J., Ogbuabor, C., & Okeke, T. (2020). Awareness and perception of intimate partner violence among female undergraduates in Southeast Nigeria. *African Journal of Reproductive Health*, 24(2), 112–122.
14. Gadd, D., Radcliffe, P., Gilchrist, G., Potts, L., & Johnson, M. (2023). Pathways between substance use and intimate partner abuse: A descriptive model. *Journal of Family Violence*, 38, 855–868.
15. Mbah, G. O., & Njoku, J. I. K. (2021). Factors influencing domestic violence and its mitigation strategies among rural farm households in Imo State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Agricultural Extension & Rural Development Studies*, 8(1), 100–109.
16. Nwankwo, A., & Chukwu, J. (2022). Knowledge and sources of information about intimate partner violence among female tertiary students in Imo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence Studies*, 37(5), 1012–1027.
17. Okafor, P., Eze, U., & Ude, I. (2021). Prevalence and determinants of intimate partner violence among female students in tertiary institutions in Southeast Nigeria. *BMC Women's Health*, 21, 320. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-021-01471-4>
18. Simpson, J. A., & Rholes, W. S. (2020). Attachment theory and close relationships: A lifespan perspective. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 32, 43–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.06.002>
19. Muluneh, M. D., Alemu, T. F., Meazew, G. W., & Alemu, S. M. (2021). Educational inequality and the risk of intimate partner violence among women in sub-Saharan Africa: A multi-country analysis. *BMC Public Health*, 21, 345. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10387-y>

CITATION

Olua, K. N., Ozims, S. J., Eleonu, C. P. O., & Olua, E. O. (2025). Intimate Partner Violence Among Female Traders in Markets in Imo State: Prevalence, Pattern and Determinants. In Global Journal of Research in Medical Sciences (Vol. 5, Number 6, pp. 95–110). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17994586>