

Men's Perpetration of Intimate Partner Violence in Vietnam: Gendered Social Learning and the
Challenges of Masculinity

Kathryn M. Yount^{a,b}, Eilidh Higgins^a, Kristin E. VanderEnde^c, Hoang Tu Anh^{d,e}, Tran Hung
Minh^d, Sidney Ruth Schuler^f

^a Hubert Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, 1518
Clifton Road NE, Atlanta, GA 30322

^b Department of Sociology, Emory University, 201 Dowman Drive, Atlanta, GA 30322

^c Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, 1518 Clifton Rd. NE, Atlanta, GA 30322

^d Center for Creative Initiatives in Health and Population (CCIHP), No. 48, Lane 251/8 To 39
Khang Nguyen, Cau Giay District, Ha Noi, Vietnam

^e Institute for Social Sciences Research University of Amsterdam

^f FHI 360, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20009

Acknowledgments: *Correspondence concerning this manuscript should be addressed to Kathryn
M. Yount, Hubert Department of Global Health, Emory University, 1518 Clifton Road NE,
Atlanta, GA 30322. Email: kyount@emory.edu. Tel: 404-727-8511. This work was supported
by the National Institutes of Health [5R21HD067834-01/02 (PIs Yount and Schuler)] and the
Hubert Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University. We
thank the Center for Creative Initiatives in Health and Population (CCIHP) and the local health
authority of My Hao district for their outstanding partnerships; CCIHP collaborators Dr. Vu
Song Ha and Ms. Quach Trang, and all of the study participants for their time, effort, and
dedication to this project.

Abstract

Using the survey responses of 522 married men 18-51 years in Vietnam, we explored how gendered social learning in boyhood and challenges to men's expected status in marriage may increase the risk that men perpetrate intimate partner violence (IPV) against their wives. Over one third (36.6%) of participants reported having ever perpetrated psychological, physical, or sexual IPV against their current wife. In multivariate analyses, witnessing IPV as a boy (aOR=1.92), being physically maltreated as a boy (aOR=2.73), and being the same age or younger than one's wife (aOR=1.74) were associated with higher adjusted odds of perpetrating any IPV. Men with 13-18 completed grades of schooling had lower adjusted odds (aOR=0.56) of ever perpetrating any IPV than men with 12 or fewer completed grades. Programs to prevent men's perpetration of IPV should address the parenting practices of boys that legitimize men's aggression and gendered status expectations in marriage, which when challenged, may lead husbands to respond with violence. Engaging men to endorse non-violent masculinities is an important consideration for future intervention.

Keywords: Intimate partner violence, masculinity, men's perpetration, social learning, status conflict, Vietnam

Research Highlights

- Men's perpetration of intimate partner violence (IPV) is understudied in Vietnam.
- In 522 married men 18-51 years in My Hao District, 36.6% reported IPV perpetration.
- Witnessing IPV and being hit or beaten as a boy predicted men's IPV perpetration.
- Status-conflict in spousal age and earnings predicted men's IPV perpetration.
- Promoting non-violent masculinities may prevent men's IPV perpetration in Vietnam.

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is “behavior within an intimate relationship that causes physical, sexual or psychological harm, including acts of physical aggression, sexual coercion, psychological abuse and controlling behaviors” (World Health Organization [WHO] & London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, 2010, p. 11). IPV is among the most common forms of violence experienced by women globally (WHO, 2002), with between 10% and 69% reporting physical IPV and between 6% and 59% reporting sexual IPV in their lifetimes (Garcia-Moreno, Jansen, Ellsberg, Heise, & Watts, 2005; WHO, 2002). IPV can have substantial short- and long-term physical and mental health effects on women and their children (Author, et al., 2011). Women experiencing IPV have long-term poor health status and place higher demands on health and social services (Boy & Salihu, 2004; Campbell, 2002; Ellsberg, Jansen, Heise, Watts, & Garcia-Moreno, 2008).

Research on IPV in lower-income countries has focused on women's exposure, not on men's perpetration, despite the importance of men's attitudes for prevention (Garcia-Moreno, Jansen, Ellsberg, Heise, & Watts, 2006; Jewkes, 2002; Author et al., 2014a). Most research on men's perpetration of IPV against women has been undertaken in wealthier countries, mainly among college-aged men, men in the military, men in drug-treatment programs, or recent immigrants (Gupta, Acevedo-Garcia, Hemenway, Decker, Raj, & Silverman, 2009; Leonard & Blane, 1992; Murphy, Meyer, & O'Leary, 1993; Neidig, Friedman, & Collins, 1986). More recent studies have examined men's perpetration of IPV in South Africa (Abrahams, Jewkes, Hoffman, & Laubscher, 2004; Abrahams, Jewkes, Laubscher, & Hoffman, 2006; Gass, 2011), Uganda (Speizer, 2010), India (Go et al., 2010; Koenig, Stephenson, Ahmed, Jejeebhoy, & Campbell, 2006; Martin, Tsui, Maitra, & Marinshaw, 1999), Bangladesh (Sambisa, Angeles, Lance, Naved, & Curtis, 2010), and Thailand (Hoffman, Demo, & Edwards, 1994).

Here, we explore the factors associated with men's perpetration of IPV against women among 522 married men 18-51 years in My Hao District, Hung Yen Province, Vietnam. In the first national study on IPV in Vietnam, conducted in 2010, one third (32%) of ever-married women 18–60 years reported ever experiencing physical IPV in their lifetime, and 6% reported physical IPV in the last 12 months (General Statistics Office of Vietnam, 2010). These results corroborate those from a 2002 study among 883 women 17-60 years in rural Bavi District, Ha Tay Province, in which 30.9% reported lifetime exposure to physical IPV, and 8.3% reported physical IPV in the prior 12 months (Vung, Ostergren, & Krantz, 2008).

Explanations for Men's Perpetration of IPV

We consider three theoretical perspectives, adapted to the context of Vietnam, to explain men's perpetration of IPV against their wives: gendered social learning theory, resource theory, and status-conflict theory.

Gendered social learning: corporal punishment to teach sons about hierarchy and masculinity

Social learning theorists argue that behaviors are learned by observing those of others, and are reinforced by observing the associated rewards or consequences (Bandura, 1971; Sellers, Cochran, & Branch, 2005). Accordingly, boys who witness IPV between their parents or who experience maltreatment as a child may come to view perpetrating IPV as normal. Studies from lower-income settings have shown an association between men's perpetration of IPV in adulthood and having witnessed their father hitting their mother or having experienced child maltreatment (Gass, 2011; Speizer, 2010).

In Vietnam, Rydstrøm (2006b) characterizes “violent intergenerational practices” between grandfathers, fathers, and grandsons or sons as “tangible manifestations of a masculine discourse...composed of a tradition of patrilineal ancestor worship, ideas about honor,” and

assumptions about hot/superior/masculine bodies and cool/inferior/feminine bodies (p. 329–330). Namely, Confucianism stresses a set of moral obligations in human relationships that are seen as hierarchical, such as father with child, older brother with younger brother, and husband with wife. According to these obligations, the superior should educate the inferior, who should return obedience, gratitude, and filial piety (Tran Dinh Huou, 1991; Werner, 2004). The male head of household has the right to raise, educate, and discipline junior male (and female) kin (Rydstrøm, 2002, 2003a, 2003b), for example, by instilling fear and using physical punishment (Nguyen Thuy Ngan, 2000). Such methods teach children “their subordinate role in the learning process” and the nature of social relations more generally (Morton, 1996, p. 212). A mother or grandmother would rarely beat a son because doing so would challenge the male household head’s authority as a fair educator who can assess when a son or grandson should be corporally disciplined (Rydstrøm, 2006b). Finally, violent intergenerational interactions between male kin reflect local oppositional ideas about “cool” inferior femininity and “hot” superior masculinity. When a father or grandfather corporally punishes a son or grandson, the father/grandfather elevates his own masculinity and demotes that of the boy to an inferior (feminine) position (Rydstrøm, 2006b). Interestingly, boys may even describe such violence as “justified” if they perceive themselves to be at fault, or willfully disobedient (Rydstrøm, 2006b).

Resource theory

Resource theorists assert that adults who lack resources have less prestige and power, and thus have fewer means to achieve their goals (Felson & Messner, 2000; Goode, 1971). When resources such as money or schooling are lacking, force is a “resource” to which men may resort to sustain or regain control of their intimate partners. In Asia, researchers have found associations between men’s lower socioeconomic status and their perpetration of IPV. For

example, in India, men who worked for pay less than 12 months annually had higher odds of perpetrating forced sex than their continuously employed counterparts (Go et al., 2010). In India and urban Bangladesh, men's poverty and lower schooling attainment have been associated with a higher risk of perpetrating IPV (Martin et al., 1999; Sambisa et al., 2010). Likewise, in Thailand, Hoffman and colleagues (1994) found a positive association between men's lower socioeconomic status and perpetrating physical IPV.

Status conflict in marriage, masculinity threat, and violence to assert male dominance

Status conflict theorists argue that men's lower resources alone cannot explain their perpetration of IPV; perhaps more important is the atypical distribution of resources in the relationship, such as women being older, having more schooling, or earning more than their partner (Macmillan & Gartner, 1999). Evidence for this theory in Southeast Asia is mixed. In Cambodia, women who were older and who had more or substantially less schooling than their husband had higher odds of reporting psychological IPV (Author et al., 2006). Yet, in Thailand, Hoffman and colleagues (1994) found no association between differences in occupational prestige or schooling attainment and men's perpetration of physical IPV.

In Vietnam, gendered privilege is embedded in the patrilineal organization of social life, in which descent is traced through fathers (Rydstrøm 2002, 2003a). A senior man customarily has been the head of household, and symbolically, the 'pillar of the house' (Rydstrøm 2006a, 2006b; Vu Hong Phong 2008). Because ancestors have reflected the pinnacle in a patrilineage, older persons are respected for their greater proximity to deceased ancestors; yet, the respect that is granted on the basis of seniority is gender-imbalanced, in that men are viewed as superior to women in the vertical patrilineal kinship structure (Horton & Rydstrøm, 2011). While in theory, a woman—regardless of her seniority—cannot acquire equal status to a man in this system, in

practice, new household organizations and “gendered power balances” are challenging customary patrilineal hierarchies (Tai, 2001; Phinney, 2003; Rydstrøm, 2003a; Werner, 2008). Since the 1990s, trends in schooling have shown increasing gender parity (Nguyen, 2004). Although women’s work outside the home has been longstanding (Korinek 2004), some women’s labor migration has spurred their husbands to assume unpaid family work (Hoang & Yeoh, 2011); yet, most women still do this work (Hy, 2003; Cong Bui et al., 2012) and sustain high rates of market work (81.1% in 1990; 78.1% in 2010) (World Bank, 2013). Occupations remain gender-segregated (Hoang & Yeoh, 2011; Cong Bui et al., 2012), with women more often doing unskilled activities (42.9% vs. 36.2% in men) (World Bank, 2011). Thus, departures from customary status expectations regarding age, educational, and earnings differences between spouses could threaten customary “entitlements” of senior men, spurring partner violence as a way to assert dominance.

Hypotheses

The above discussion motivates three hypotheses about the influence of gendered social learning in boyhood, resources, and status conflict in marriage on men’s perpetration of IPV in Vietnam. First, boys who experience corporal punishment or witness IPV against their mothers will have higher adjusted odds of perpetrating IPV. Second, men who lack valued resources, such as schooling, will have higher adjusted odds of perpetrating IPV. Finally, men with wives who are older, have more schooling, or have higher incomes will have higher adjusted odds of perpetrating IPV.

Methods

Study Site

My Hao district in Hung Yen Province is a peri-urban area located 30 km from Hanoi, the capital

and second largest city in Vietnam. Almost 100,000 people live in My Hao, and almost all residents are of Kinh ethnicity (Author et al., 2013). Being a patrilocal society, men live more often than do women in their commune of birth (95% vs. 58%) and in the same commune as their birth family (94% vs. 60%) (Author et al., 2013). Joint household residence is common (40%) (Author et al., 2013). Most residents (93%) live in households that are above the official poverty line for rural areas (VND400,000 per capita per month) (Author et al., 2013). Women and men have high average schooling attainments (9.5 grades), and almost all women (97%) and men (98%) work for money (Author et al., 2013). Residents engage in various economic activities that reflect rapid economic growth, including farming (64%), work in small factories (30%) and self-employment (23%) (Author et al., 2013, Author et al., 2014a).

Sample

The survey sample was drawn from a household census of 75 villages across the 12 communes and one district town of My Hao. Married men and women 18-50 years were eligible for inclusion. To preserve confidentiality and to enhance participants' safety, the men's and women's samples were drawn from separate villages. In total, 40 villages were sampled, and within each village, 27 households were selected, and one eligible individual was randomly selected within each household, for a possible sample size of 540 men and 540 women.

Response rates were high (92.6%-100% across villages), and a total 533 women and 522 men were interviewed. This analysis was based on 522 male survey respondents 18–51 years (one respondent who reported an age of 51 years was retained for analysis).

Data Collection

Experienced, Vietnamese speaking interviewers were gender-matched with respondents and conducted in-person interviews between July and August 2012. The questionnaire was adapted

from the one used in the National Study on Domestic Violence against Women in Vietnam (General Statistics Office of Vietnam, 2010) and revised based on formative qualitative research (Author et al., 2013; Author et al., 2014b). The questionnaire included questions on participants' demographic and socioeconomic background, attitudes about IPV against women and their recourse after IPV, women's exposure to and men's perpetration of IPV, and experiences of violence in childhood (Author et al., 2013, Author et al., 2014a). The study adhered to international guidelines for research on IPV against women (WHO, 2001). The Institutional Review Boards of Emory University and the Center for Creative Initiatives in Health and Population approved the study.

Variables

The three theoretical perspectives, above, and existing research guided the selection of variables for this analysis. The outcome—perpetration of IPV—was captured with a binary variable denoting whether or not a male participant reported having ever perpetrated physical, psychological, or sexual IPV against his current wife. Reported physical IPV against his wife included any slapping, throwing an object, pushing, shoving or pulling hair; hitting with a fist or other object that could cause harm; kicking, dragging or beating up; choking or burning; and threatening to or using a gun knife or other weapon. Reported psychological IPV included belittling or humiliating his wife in front of others; insulting, scaring or intimidating his wife; threatening to cause harm to his wife or her loved ones; and threatening or actually throwing his wife out of the house.

Reported sexual IPV included physically forcing his wife to have sexual intercourse.

Based on theory, we grouped explanatory variables into three categories. Measures of *gendered social learning* included whether or not a man as a child witnessed his mother being hit and whether or not as a child he was physically hit or beaten by a parent or adult relative (8 “don't

knows” for witnessing IPV coded “No”; 3 “don’t knows” for physically hit or beaten coded “No”). Measures of *resources* included an index for household wealth (divided into tertiles) and participant’s completed grades of schooling (0-7, 8-12, 13-18; 2 missing values coded 8-12, the modal value). The household wealth index was derived from a principal components analysis of 14 household assets and amenities (e.g., water source, flush toilet, concrete roof, computer, washing machine, car, tractor/milling machine) (Rutstein & Johnson, 2004). Measures of *status-conflict* in marriage included spousal age differences (man the same age or younger, reference: man older), spousal schooling differences (man has less schooling, reference: man has the same or more schooling; 2 missing values coded 9, the modal value), and spousal income differences (man earns less, reference: man earns same or more; 12 missing values coded “don’t know”). *Control variables* included participant’s age (in years), number of children ever born, whether or not the man lives with his extended family (natal or in-laws), and whether or not he lives in his hometown (whole life or since before age 12; 3 missing values coded 1, the modal value).

Analysis

Univariate analysis was performed to assess the completeness and distributions of all variables. Bivariate associations were estimated between men’s perpetration of IPV and all covariates, assessing significant differences using Chi-squared statistics for categorical variables and the student’s t-test for continuous variables. Four multivariate logistic regression models were estimated to assess the associations of the outcome with variables for (1) gendered social-learning in boyhood, (2) resources, and (3) status-conflict in marriage, each set adjusted only for the control variables, and then a full model (4) with all variables. All analyses were conducted using SAS 9.3 and SUDAAN, using the without replacement (WOR) sample design option in SUDAAN to account for the complex survey design.

Results

Prevalence of IPV Perpetration

In our sample, 36.6% of men reported perpetrating any physical, psychological, or sexual IPV against their current wife (Table 1). Most often, men reported perpetrating physical IPV (28.0%), including slapping or throwing an object at their wife (23.5%), and pushing or shoving their wife or pulling her hair (7.8%). Just over one fifth of men (21.2%) reported perpetrating psychological IPV against their wife, including threatening to harm her or her loved ones (11.4%) and threatening to or actually throwing her out of the home (6.7%). Only 0.2% of men reported to have perpetrated sexual IPV.

[Table 1]

Characteristics of the Sample

Overall, 27.4% of men reported witnessing as a child physical IPV against their mother, and 72.3% reported being hit or beaten as a child by a parent or adult relative (Table 2). Men were evenly distributed across tertiles of household wealth (32.8% 1st tertile, 35.4% 2nd tertile, 31.9% 3rd tertile). Nearly half (47.1%) had completed 8-12 grades of schooling. Overall, a minority of men were in status inconsistent marriages: 27.1% were the same age or younger than their wife, 24.4% had less schooling than their wife, and 10.2% reported earning less than their wife. On average, participants were 35.9 years old and had 1.9 children. Over one third (37.0%) of men were living with their extended family, and most (95.9%) lived in their hometown.

[Table 2]

Attributes of Men who Ever and Never Perpetrated any IPV in Current Marriage

Compared to men who had not perpetrated IPV against their current wife, those who had perpetrated IPV more often had witnessed in childhood IPV against their mother (36.7% versus

22.1%, $p=0.000$) and had been hit or beaten as a child (84.2% versus 65.4%, $p=0.000$) (Table 2). The distributions of household wealth and schooling attainment did not differ between men who had and had not perpetrated any IPV. Compared to their counterparts, men who had perpetrated IPV more often were the same age or younger than their wives (32.1% vs. 24.3%, $p=0.01$); however, the distributions of spousal schooling differences and spousal income differences were similar across men who had and had not perpetrated IPV.

Multivariate Analysis of Potential Risk Factors for Men's Perpetration of IPV

Table 3 presents the multivariate results. In Model 1, adjusted for control variables, men who as children had witnessed IPV against their mothers had 1.83 times higher adjusted odds of perpetrating IPV ($p<0.001$) than men who had not witnessed IPV. Likewise, men who were hit or beaten as a child had 2.64 times higher adjusted odds of perpetrating IPV ($p<0.001$) than men who were not treated this way. In Model 2, adjusting for control variables, men who had completed 13 to 18 grades had lower adjusted odds of perpetrating IPV (aOR = 0.64, $p<0.001$) than men who had completed 8-12 grades.

[Table 3]

In Model 3, adjusting for control variables, men who were the same age or younger than their wives had higher adjusted odds of perpetrating IPV than men who were older than their wives (aOR=1.52, $p<0.01$). The results for the full Model 4, with all variables included, were similar to prior models. Men who witnessed as a child IPV against their mother had 1.92 times higher adjusted odds of perpetrating IPV ($p<0.001$) than their counterparts, and men who were hit or beaten as a child had 2.73 times higher adjusted odds of perpetrating IPV ($p<0.001$) than their counterparts. Men who had completed 13 to 18 grades had lower adjusted odds of perpetrating IPV (aOR=0.56, $p<0.01$) than men with 8-12 completed grades. Of the status-conflict indicators,

men who were the same age as their wife or younger had 1.74 times higher adjusted odds of perpetrating IPV than men who were older than their wives ($p < 0.001$), and men who earned less than their wife had marginally higher adjusted odds of perpetrating IPV than men who earned the same or more (aOR=1.40, $p < 0.10$).

Discussion

According to our findings, men's perpetration of IPV in marriage is highly prevalent in Vietnam, with more than one third reporting any physical, psychological, or sexual IPV against their current wife. This prevalence corroborates those reported from the recent *UN Multi-country Cross-sectional Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific* (Fulu et al., 2013).

Our findings also corroborate theories of social learning in boyhood (hypothesis 1). Namely, high percentages of men reported to have witnessed IPV against their mother (27.4%) and especially to have been hit or beaten as a child (72.3%). Men exposed in childhood to these forms of violence had nearly twice and three times the adjusted odds, respectively, of perpetrating IPV in marriage. These findings corroborate those from men in South Africa (Gass, 2011), Uganda (Speizer, 2010), and several countries in Asia and the Pacific (Fulu et al., 2013). Unpublished analyses of our data have confirmed that corporal punishment by parents or adult relatives was reported more often by men participants than women participants (50.3%). Also in this sample, men's exposure to violence in childhood has been positively associated with reporting more good reasons to hit a wife (Author et al., 2014a). Thus, in Vietnam, the corporal punishment of boys is an accepted means to instill ideas about dominant (aggressive) masculinity and about age-gender hierarchies in the family and marriage (Rydstrøm, 2006b). Thus, programs to reduce men's perpetration of IPV might address the practices of fathers toward sons that legitimize violence as an aspect of senior masculinity and should promote non-violent models of

masculinity within the family, more generally (Hoang, Quoach, & Tran, 2013).

Our analysis provided partial support for resource theories of men's perpetration of IPV (hypothesis 2). For instance, household wealth was not associated with men's perpetration of IPV, contradicting some research in Southeast Asia (Author et al., 2006) and a recent systematic review (Fulu et al., 2013); however, recent analyses suggest that poverty may be associated with men's perpetration of IPV only in the lowest-income settings (Fulu et al., 2013). That said, men with the highest schooling attainment (some university or more) in our sample had almost half the adjusted odds of perpetrating IPV as did men with less schooling. Although this finding corroborates resource theory, recent systematic reviews, and research elsewhere in Asia and the Pacific (Fulu et al., 2013), it suggests that only very high schooling attainments are associated with a lower risk of men perpetrating IPV in Vietnam.

Finally, our results provided some support for status conflict theory (hypothesis 3). Namely, men who were the same age or younger than their wives had higher adjusted odds of perpetrating IPV than did men who were older than their wives. According to the 2009 census in Vietnam, the mean age at marriage is three and a half years younger for women (22.8) than men (26.2) (General Statistics Office of Vietnam, 2011). Thus, marriages in which the husband is the same age or younger than his wife may challenge local expectations about the status between husbands and wives. This finding corroborates status conflict theory, suggesting that men in marriages in which spousal age gaps threaten the status quo may perpetrate IPV to reassert their dominance. That said, spousal schooling differences were not associated with men's perpetration of IPV. The non-significance of this variable may be the result of sustained efforts to reduce gender gaps in schooling in Vietnam. Indeed, the gender gap in schooling fell from 10.0% in 1989 to 4.4% in 2009 (UNFPA, 2011). The promotion of universally high schooling may have

broadened expectations about acceptable marriage matches along this dimension, reducing the threat of a wife's greater schooling attainment and a husband's risk of reasserting dominance through violence. That said, spousal differences in earnings were marginally associated with men's perpetration of IPV in marriage. Specifically, men who earned less than their spouse had marginally higher adjusted odds of perpetrating IPV. Given the small percentage of men in this sample who earned less than their spouse (10.2%), this status difference clearly defied the norm of men earning the same or more than their wife. Thus, women's longstanding presence in the paid workforce in Vietnam has not resulted in broader expectations about the primary earner and domestic laborer in marriage (Knodel et al., 2004). More effort is needed to understand persistent ideas about gendered labor in public and private life in Vietnam, the transformation of which may help to reduce men's perpetration of IPV.

Study Limitations

Some limitations of this study are notable. First, this study was conducted in one district in Vietnam, and so the broader generalizability of the findings should be verified. Second, the age range of 18 – 51 years for the sample does not capture all adults. Still, this age range was selected to (a) be comparable with the WHO Multi-Country Study on Violence against Women and the 2010 national study on Violence against Women in Vietnam, (b) accommodate the practicalities of fieldwork in Vietnam, where interviewing men and women 18–50 years at the commune and village levels has a long history arising from the national family planning and reproductive health program, and (c) leverage resources of the local health authority in My Hao to cross-check data from the household registration with data at the commune health station. Third, because this study was cross-sectional, the results should be interpreted as associational and not causal. Fourth, two risk factors for the perpetration of IPV—alcohol and drug use—were

not included in the survey, as its focus was on attitudes about IPV and not the full array of behavioral risks in marriage. Still, such risk factors are not clear, causal predictors of IPV perpetration and have been variably associated with it in recent studies (Fulu et al., 2013).

Finally, IPV is illegal in Vietnam, and so men's under-reporting of perpetration is a concern. Interestingly, the percentage of men reporting perpetration of physical IPV (28.0%) was similar to the percentage of women reporting exposure to physical IPV in the parent study (29.1%) (Author et al., 2013) and in a 2010 national study of violence against women (32%) (General Statistics Office of Vietnam, 2010). Despite such evidence of reliability in reporting, the percentage of men reporting perpetration of psychological IPV (21%) was slightly lower than that of women reporting exposure to psychological IPV (27%), and the percentage of men reporting perpetration of sexual IPV (0.2%) was markedly lower than the percentage of women reporting any exposure (12%). Given poor knowledge about the prevalence of psychological and sexual IPV against women in Vietnam, and the small percentage of men who reported perpetrating sexual IPV in this study (0.2%), separate analysis of this outcome was not possible, and researchers should explore in greater depth men's interpretation of these more subjective measures of IPV and men's willingness to disclose these forms of violence.

Conclusion

Social learning in boyhood, including witnessing IPV against one's mother and being hit or beaten as a boy, were strongly associated with men's perpetration of IPV in marriage in My Hao, Vietnam. Some evidence also supports the influence of status conflict in marriage along dimensions that challenge expected age and earnings differences between spouses. The influences of resources such as wealth and schooling were more modest. In light of these findings, longitudinal studies are especially needed to elucidate the relationship between men's

exposure to violence in childhood and their subsequent perpetration of IPV as adults. A nuanced understanding of this relationship is important in contexts like Vietnam, where most men report exposure to violence in childhood.

Programmatically, efforts to prevent men's perpetration of IPV in Vietnam might focus on promoting non-violent masculinities among fathers and male relatives as well as broadened and more diversified expectations about appropriate marriage matches (Rydstrøm, 2006b). Young men and adolescent boys, especially those who have experienced and/or witnessed violence as children, also may be important groups to target for interventions. In Vietnam, gender and generational norms continue to justify family violence, including IPV and violence against children (General Statistics Office of Vietnam, 2010; Rydstrøm, 2006b). Therefore, interventions should involve ideational and behavior-change approaches targeting individuals, families, and communities to address the gendered sociocultural factors underlying men's perpetration of IPV (Author et al., 2010). Finally, the negative association of men's schooling attainment with their perpetration of IPV suggests that the benefits of investing in men's higher education are still to be realized.

References

Author et al. (2006).

Author et al. (2010).

Author et al. (2011).

Author et al. (2013).

Author et al. (2014a).

Author et al. (2014b).

Abrahams, N., Jewkes, R., Hoffman, M., & Laubsher, R. (2004). Sexual violence against intimate partners in Cape Town: Prevalence and risk factors reported by men. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 82(5), 330-337.

Abrahams, N., Jewkes, R., Laubscher, R., & Hoffman, M. (2006). Intimate partner violence: Prevalence and risk factors for men in Cape Town, South Africa. *Violence and Victims*, 21(2), 247-264.

Bandura, A. (1971). *Social Learning Theory*: General Learning Corporation.

Boy, A., & Salihu, H. (2004). Intimate partner violence and birth outcomes: A systematic review. *International Journal of Fertility and Women's Medicine*, 49(4), 159-164.

Campbell, J. C. (2002). Health consequences of intimate partner violence. *The Lancet*, 359, 1331-1336.

Cong Bui, T., Markham, C. M., Ross, M. W., Williams, M.L., Beasley, R.P., Tran, L.T., Nguyen, H.T., & Le, T.N. (2012). Dimensions of gender relations and reproductive health inequity perceived by female undergraduate students in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam: a qualitative exploration. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 11,11.

Ellsberg, M., Jansen, H.A., Heise, L., Watts, C.H., & Garcia-Moreno, C. (2008). Intimate partner

violence and women's physical and mental health in the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence: an observational study. *The Lancet*, 371(9619), 1165-1172.

Felson, R. B., & Messner, S. F. (2000). The control motive in intimate partner violence. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63(1), 86-94.

Fulu, E., Jewkes, R., Roselli, T., Garcia-Moreno, C., on behalf of the UN Multi-country Cross-sectional Study of Men and Violence research team. (2013). Prevalence of and factors associated with male perpetration of intimate partner violence: findings from the UN Multi-country Cross-sectional Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific. *Lancet Global Health*, 1, e187–207.

Garcia-Moreno, C., Jansen H.A., Ellsberg, M., Heise L., & Watts, C.H. (2005). *WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence: summary report of initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses*. Geneva: World Health Organization. http://www.who.int/gender/violence/who_multicountry_study/en/

Garcia-Moreno, C., Jansen, H. A., Ellsberg, M., Heise, L., & Watts, C. H. (2006). Prevalence of intimate partner violence: Findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *The Lancet*, 368, 1260-1269.

Gass, J. D. (2011). Gender Differences in Risk for Intimate Partner Violence Among South African Adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(14), 2764-2789.

General Statistics Office of Vietnam. (2010). *“Keeping silent is dying”*: Results from the National Study on Domestic Violence against Women in Vietnam. Hanoi, Vietnam.

General Statistics Office of Vietnam. (2011). *Age-sex structure and marital status of the population of Vietnam: Findings from the 2009 population and housing census*. Hanoi,

Vietnam.

- Go, V.F., Srikrishnan, A.K., Salter, M.L., Mehta, S., Johnson, S.C., Sivaram, S., Davis, W., Solomon, S., & Celentano, D.D. (2010). Factors associated with the perpetration of sexual violence among wine-shop patrons in Chennai, India. *Social Science and Medicine*, *71*, 1277-1284.
- Goode, W.J. (1971). Force and violence in the family. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *33*(4), 624-636.
- Gupta, J., Acevedo-Garcia, D., Hemenway, D., Decker, M., Raj, A., & Silverman, J. G. (2009). Pre-migration exposure to political violence and perpetration of intimate partner violence among immigrant men in Boston. *American Journal of Public Health*, *99*(3), 462-469.
- Hoang, L. A. & Yeoh, B. S. A. (2011). Breadwinning Wives and "left-behind" husbands: Men and Masculinities in the Vietnamese Transnational Family. *Gender & Society*, *25*(6), 717-739.
- Hoang, T. A., Quach, T. T., & Tran, T. T. (2013). 'Because I am a man, I should be gentle to my wife and my children': positive masculinity to stop gender-based violence in a coastal district in Vietnam. *Gender and Development*, *21*(1), 81-96.
- Hoffman, K.L., Demo, D.H., & Edwards, J.N. (1994). Physical wife abuse in a non-Western society: An integrated theoretical approach. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *56*(1), 131-146.
- Horton, P. & Rydstrom, H. (2011). Heterosexual Masculinity in Contemporary Vietnam: Privileges, Pleasures, and Protests. *Men and Masculinities*, *14*(5), 542-564.
- Hy Van Luong. (2003). Gender Relations: Ideologies, Kinship Practices, and Political Economy. In Hy Van Luong (Ed.), *Post-War Vietnam: Dynamics of a Transforming Society* (pp. 201-

- 224). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies; Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Jewkes, R. (2002). Intimate partner violence: Causes and prevention. *The Lancet*, 359(9315), 1423-1429.
- Knodel, J., Loi, V. M., Jayakody, R., & Huy, V. T. (2004). Gender roles in the family: Change and stability in Vietnam. PSC Research Report No. 04-559, Population Studies Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Koenig, M., Stephenson, R., Ahmed, S., Jejeebhoy, S., & Campbell, J. (2006). Individual and contextual determinants of domestic violence in North India. *American Journal of Public Health*, 96(1), 132-138.
- Korinek, K. (2004). Maternal employment during Northern Vietnam's era of market reform. *Social Forces*, 83(2), 791-822.
- Leonard, K.E., & Blane, H.T. (1992). Alcohol and marital aggression in a national sample of young men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 7(1), 19-30.
- Macmillan, R., & Gartner, R. (1999). When she brings home the bacon: Labor-force participation and the risk of spousal violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61(4), 947-958.
- Martin, S.L., Tsui, A. O., Maitra, K., & Marinshaw, R. (1999). Domestic violence in Northern India. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 150(4), 417-426.
- Morton, H. (1996). *Becoming Tongan: An Ethnography of Childhood*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Murphy, C.M., Meyer, S.L., & O'Leary, K.D. (1993). Family of origin violence and MCMI-II psychopathology among partner assaultive men. *Violence and Victims*, 8(2), 165-176.
- Neidig, P.H., Friedman, D.H., & Collins, B.S. (1986). Attitudinal characteristics of males who

- have engaged in spousal abuse. *Journal of Family Violence*, 1(3), 223-233.
- Nguyen, N. N. (2004). *Trends in the Education Sector*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Nguyen Thuy Ngan. (2000). *The Role of Men and Grandparents in Vietnamese Families*. Hanoi: UNICEF.
- Phinney, H. M. (2003). Asking for the Essential Child: Revolutionary Transformations in Reproductive Space in North Vietnam. Dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- Rutstein, S.O., & Johnson, K. (2004). *The DHS Wealth Index*. DHS Comparative Reports No. 6. Calverton, Maryland: ORC Macro. <http://www.measuredhs.com/pubs/pdf/cr6/cr6.pdf>
- Rydstrøm, H. (2002). Sexed Bodies, Gendered Bodies: Children and the Body in Vietnam. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 25(3), 359–72.
- Rydstrøm, H. (2003a). *Embodying Morality: Growing Up in Rural Northern Vietnam*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Rydstrøm, H. (2003b). Encountering “Hot” Anger: Domestic Violence in Contemporary Vietnam. *Violence Against Women*, 9(6), 676–97.
- Rydstrom, H. (2006a). Sexual Desires and ‘Social Evils’: Young Women in Rural Vietnam. *Journal of Gender, Place, and Culture*, 13, 282–301.
- Rydstrøm, H. (2006b). Masculinity and Punishment: Men's upbringing of boys in rural Vietnam. *Childhood*, 13(3), 329-348.
- Sambisa, W., Angeles, G., Lance, P.M., Naved, R.T., & Curtis, S.L. (2010). Physical and sexual abuse of wives in urban Bangladesh: Husbands' reports. *Studies in Family Planning*, 41(3), 165-178.
- Sellers, C.S., Cochran, J.K., & Branch, K.A. (2005). Social learning theory and partner violence: A research note. *Deviant Behavior*, 26, 379-395.

- Speizer, I.S. (2010). Intimate partner violence attitudes and experience among women and men in Uganda. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 35*(7), 1224-1241.
- Tai, Hue-tam Ho. (2001). Faces of Remembrance and Forgetting. In Hue-Tam Ho Tai (Ed.), *The Country of Memory: Remaking the Past in Late Socialist Vietnam* (pp. 167–96). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Tran Dinh Huou. (1991). Traditional Families in Vietnam and Influence of Confucianism. In Rita Liljeström and Tuong Lai (Eds.), *Sociological Studies on the Vietnamese Family* (pp. 27–55). Hanoi: Social Science Publishing House.
- UNFPA (2011). Factsheet: Education in Vietnam: Evidence from the 2009 census. Hanoi, Vietnam: United Nations Population Fund in Vietnam.
- Vu Hong Phong. (2008). Male Sexual Health Concerns in Muong Khen, Vietnam. *Culture, Health and Sexuality, 10*, 139–50.
- Vung, N. D., Ostergren, P.O., & Krantz, G. (2008). Intimate partner violence against women in rural Vietnam. Different socio-demographic factors are associated with different forms of violence: Need for new intervention guidelines? *BMC Public Health, 8*(55).
- Werner, J. (2004). Managing Womanhoods in the Family: Gendered Subjectivities and the State in the Red River Delta in Vietnam. In Lisa Drummond and Helle Rydstrøm (Eds), *Gender in Practice in Contemporary Vietnam* (pp. 26–47). Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Werner, J. (2008). *Gender, Household, and State in Post-Revolutionary Vietnam*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- World Health Organization (2001). Putting women first: Ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence against women. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- http://www.who.int/entity/gender/documents/violence/who_fch_gwh_01.a/en/index.html

World Health Organization (2002). *World report on violence and health*. Geneva: World Health Organization. http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/world_report/en/.

World Health Organization & London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (2010). *Preventing intimate partner and sexual violence against women: taking action and generating evidence*. Geneva, World Health Organization, 2010.
http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2010/9789241564007_eng.pdf.

World Bank. (2011). *Vietnam- Country gender assessment*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank. (2013). *Gender Statistics*. <http://databank.worldbank.org/data/views/reports/tableview.aspx>.

Table 1: IPV Perpetration by Type against Current Wife, N=522

Married Men, 18-51 years, My Hao District, Vietnam, 2012

| Type of IPV Perpetrated: | % |
|---|------|
| Any psychological IPV | |
| Belittle or humiliate in front of other people | 3.5 |
| Insult or make her feel bad about herself | 2.9 |
| Scared or intimidated | 4.7 |
| Threaten to harm her or loved one | 11.4 |
| Threatened to throw her out/have thrown her out of home | 6.7 |
| <i>Any of the above</i> | 21.2 |
| Any physical IPV | |
| Slapped or thrown object at her | 23.5 |
| Pushed, shoved or pulled hair | 7.8 |
| Hit with fist or other object | 1.1 |
| Kicked, dragged or beat up | 1.5 |
| Choked or burnt her | 0.0 |
| Threatened to use weapon/used weapon against her | 0.5 |
| <i>Any of the above</i> | 28.0 |
| Any sexual IPV | |
| Physically forced her to have sexual intercourse | 0.2 |
| Any psychological, physical, or sexual IPV | 36.6 |

Table 2: Descriptive Characteristics by IPV Perpetration in Current Marriage and Overall among N=522 Married Men, 18-51 years, My Hao District, Vietnam, 2012

| | Perpetrated IPV | | p-value | Total (n=522) |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|------------------|
| | Yes (n=185) | No (n=337) | | |
| Social Learning in boyhood | | | | |
| Witnessed IPV against mother, % | 36.7 | 22.1 | 0.000 | 27.4 |
| Hit or beaten as child, % | 84.2 | 65.4 | 0.000 | 72.3 |
| Resources | | | | |
| Tertile of household wealth, % | | | | |
| 1 st | 30.4 | 34.1 | 0.350 | 32.8 |
| 2 nd | 33.8 | 36.3 | | 35.4 |
| 3 rd | 35.8 | 29.6 | | 31.9 |
| Completed grades of schooling, % | | | | |
| 0-7 | 40.0 | 37.7 | 0.120 | 38.6 |
| 8-12 | 47.9 | 46.6 | | 47.1 |
| 13-18 | 12.1 | 15.6 | | 14.3 |
| Status-Conflict in Marriage | | | | |
| Spousal age difference, % | | | | |
| Man older | 67.9 | 75.7 | | 72.9 |
| Man same age or younger | 32.1 | 24.3 | 0.010 | 27.1 |
| Spousal schooling difference, % | | | | |
| Man has same or more | 74.2 | 76.4 | | 75.6 |
| Man has less | 25.9 | 23.4 | 0.370 | 24.4 |
| Spousal income difference, % | | | | |
| Man earns same or more | 78.8 | 82.0 | 0.420 | 80.8 |
| Man earns less | 12.1 | 9.1 | | 10.2 |

| | | | | |
|--|------|------|-------|------|
| Don't know | 9.2 | 9.0 | | 9.0 |
| Control Variables | | | | |
| Age in years, mean | 35.9 | 35.9 | 0.950 | 35.9 |
| Number of children ever born, mean | 1.9 | 2.0 | 0.220 | 1.9 |
| Lives with natal family or in-laws, % | 35.0 | 38.2 | 0.280 | 37.0 |
| Lives in hometown, % | 96.3 | 95.7 | 0.580 | 95.9 |

^a p-value indicates the results of chi-squared comparisons for categorical variables and t-tests for continuous variables.

Table 3: Adjusted Odds of IPV Perpetration in Current Marriage, N=522 Married Men, 18-51 years, My Hao District, Vietnam, 2012

| | Model 1 | | Model 2 | | Model 3 | | Model 4 | |
|--|------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|------------|-----------------|
| | <i>aOR</i> | (95% CI) | <i>aOR</i> | (95% CI) | <i>aOR</i> | (95% CI) | <i>aOR</i> | (95% CI) |
| Social Learning in Boyhood | | | | | | | | |
| Witnessed IPV against mother (ref: no) | 1.83 | (1.41, 2.38)*** | | | | | 1.92 | (1.48, 2.50)*** |
| Hit, beaten by parent, adult relative (ref: no) | 2.64 | (1.83, 3.81)*** | | | | | 2.73 | (1.90, 3.91)*** |
| Resources in Adulthood | | | | | | | | |
| Household wealth tertile (ref: 2 nd) | | | | | | | | |
| 1 st | | | 0.97 | (0.75, 1.27) | | | 1.04 | (0.80, 1.37) |
| 3 rd | | | 1.47 | (0.89, 2.42) | | | 1.51 | (0.94, 2.41) |
| Completed grades of schooling (ref: 8-12) | | | | | | | | |
| 0-7 | | | 1.18 | (0.86, 1.62) | | | 1.08 | (0.76, 1.53) |
| 13-18 | | | 0.64 | (0.47, 0.87)*** | | | 0.56 | (0.38, 0.82)** |
| Status Conflict in marriage | | | | | | | | |
| Spousal age difference (ref: man older) | | | | | | | | |
| Man is same age or younger | | | | | 1.52 | (1.14, 2.02)** | 1.74 | (1.28, 2.36)*** |
| Spousal schooling difference (ref: man same, more) | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|---------------|------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Man has less schooling | | | | 1.15 | (0.87, 1.52) | 1.23 | (0.91, 1.67) | |
| Spousal income difference (ref: man same, more) | | | | | | | | |
| Man earns less income | | | | 1.43 | (0.91, 2.25) | 1.40 | (0.92, 2.11)† | |
| Don't know | | | | 1.08 | (0.77, 1.52) | 1.35 | (0.96, 1.89)† | |
| Control variables | | | | | | | | |
| Age (years) | 1.02 | (1.00, 1.04)† | 1.00 | (0.98, 1.02) | 1.00 | (0.98, 1.03) | 1.01 | (0.99, 1.04) |
| Number of children ever born | 0.88 | (0.70, 1.10) | 0.86 | (0.68, 1.09) | 0.85 | (0.67, 1.09) | 0.86 | (0.69, 1.07) |
| Lives with natal family or in-laws (ref: <i>no</i>) | 0.80 | (0.62, 1.04)† | 0.84 | (0.65, 1.08) | 0.87 | (0.66, 1.14) | 0.81 | (0.62, 1.05) |
| Lives in hometown (ref: no=2) | 1.33 | (0.84, 2.10) | 1.24 | (0.68, 2.29) | 1.19 | (0.71, 2.01) | 1.36 | (0.84, 2.19) |

aOR = adjusted odds ratio; CI = confidence interval; † $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$