



Institutional Silence and the Invisibility of Male Victims in Nigeria's Domestic Violence Policies

Juliet Ngozi Igwedimamah

Department of Criminology and Security Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, National Open University of Nigeria, Nigeria

Email: ngoziende87@outlook.com

ORCID ID: 0009-0000-4903-3151

<http://dx.doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v9i7.3418>

Abstract

Domestic violence is widely recognized as a critical human rights and public health concern, yet dominant global and national policy responses have largely been shaped by gendered frameworks that prioritize women as the primary victims. This study critically examines how domestic violence policy frameworks in Nigeria construct victimhood and represent male victims, with particular attention to the implications of institutional framing and silence. Adopting an exploratory-descriptive qualitative research design, the study relies on document analysis of key policy and legal instruments, including the Violence Against Persons (Prohibition) Act (2015), the National Gender Policy (2021), and relevant institutional guidelines issued by gender-based violence response agencies. Findings reveal that while Nigerian domestic violence policies are formally gender-neutral, victimhood is predominantly constructed through a women-centered lens, where vulnerability is repeatedly associated with women and girls. Evidence further indicates that male victims are structurally marginalized through omission rather than explicit exclusion, resulting in limited operational recognition within institutional frameworks. This symbolic invisibility is reinforced through implementation structures that prioritize women-focused interventions, thereby creating a gap between legal neutrality and practical application. The study further demonstrates that institutional silence regarding male victimization is not incidental but reflects embedded policy assumptions that align vulnerability with femininity. Drawing on hegemonic masculinity and institutional theory, the study argues that male victim invisibility is produced through the interaction of cultural norms and institutionalized policy practices. The findings highlight significant implications for equity in domestic violence response systems and call for more inclusive policy recognition of diverse victim experiences.

Keywords: *Domestic Violence; Male Victims; Institutional Silence; Document analysis; Nigeria*

1. Introduction

Domestic violence is a pervasive global social problem that cuts across cultural, economic, and geographic boundaries. It refers to patterns of abusive behaviour within intimate or familial relationships, including physical, psychological, sexual, and economic abuse. The World Health Organization (WHO, 2021) identifies intimate partner violence as one of the most widespread forms of violence against women globally, with significant health, social, and economic consequences. Over time, international responses to domestic violence have expanded through legal instruments, policy frameworks, and advocacy initiatives, particularly under the influence of global human rights and gender equality agendas (United Nations Women, 2023). However, this global policy architecture has largely been shaped by a women-centered framework that positions women as the primary victims and men as the primary perpetrators of domestic violence (Dobash & Dobash, 2004; Stark, 2007).

In Nigeria, domestic violence is widely recognized as a serious social and public health concern, prompting legislative and institutional responses such as the Violence Against Persons (Prohibition) Act and various state-level laws. These legal frameworks aim to provide protection for victims and strengthen institutional response mechanisms. In addition, government agencies and civil society organizations have intensified awareness campaigns and support interventions targeting domestic violence. Despite these efforts, existing policy frameworks remain largely informed by a gendered paradigm that prioritizes female victimhood, reflecting broader global patterns in gender-based violence policy (UN Women, 2023).

This dominant framing has contributed to the relative invisibility of male victims of domestic violence. Although research indicates that men can experience various forms of abuse within intimate relationships, including physical assault, emotional abuse, and coercive control, such experiences are often underreported and socially minimized (Hines & Douglas, 2015; Dutton, 2012). The marginalization of male victims is further reinforced by socio-cultural constructions of masculinity that associate men with strength, dominance, and emotional restraint. Connell's (1995) concept of hegemonic masculinity explains how dominant gender norms shape expectations of male behaviour, often making male victimhood appear inconsistent with culturally accepted ideals of manhood.

The persistence of this gendered framing raises important conceptual and institutional concerns. By constructing domestic violence primarily as violence against women, policy and institutional frameworks may unintentionally exclude male victims from recognition, protection, and support services. This creates what may be described as institutional silence, where official documents and institutional practices fail to adequately acknowledge or respond to the experiences of a category of victims. Institutional theory suggests that such silences are not merely omissions but are embedded within organizational logics that define what is considered legitimate or visible within policy systems (Meyer & Rowan, 1977).

In Nigeria, this institutional silence is particularly significant given the growing legal and policy attention to domestic violence. While reforms such as the VAPP Act represent progress in addressing gender-based violence, the framing of victimhood within these instruments continues to reflect a narrow-gendered construction. As a result, male victims remain largely absent from formal recognition, reporting structures, and support mechanisms, raising concerns about inclusivity and equity in domestic violence governance.

Against this background, the problem this study addresses is the gap between the inclusive reality of domestic violence victimization and the exclusionary nature of policy and institutional recognition in Nigeria. Although domestic violence policies aim to protect all victims, they largely reflect a gendered construction that renders male victims invisible within official frameworks. This gap has implications for justice, reporting behaviour, and the effectiveness of domestic violence interventions.

The justification for this study lies in the need to critically examine the inclusiveness of domestic violence policies in Nigeria. While women remain disproportionately affected by domestic violence, a

comprehensive understanding of victimization requires attention to all affected groups. Ignoring male victims risks reinforcing partial policy responses that may undermine the effectiveness and fairness of domestic violence interventions. Therefore, interrogating how institutional documents construct victimhood is essential for advancing more inclusive policy frameworks.

Methodologically, this study adopts a qualitative exploratory-descriptive design using document analysis. Relevant policy documents, legislative frameworks, government publications, non-governmental organization reports, and scholarly literature on domestic violence in Nigeria are examined to identify patterns of representation, exclusion, and institutional framing of victimhood.

1.1 Research Objectives

The main objective of this study is to examine institutional silence and the invisibility of male victims in Nigeria's domestic violence policies. Specifically, the study seeks to:

1. Analyze how domestic violence policies in Nigeria construct victimhood.
2. Examine the extent to which male victims are represented or excluded in policy and institutional documents.
3. Explore the implications of such representations for policy effectiveness and victim support systems.

1.2 Research Questions

1. How is victimhood constructed in Nigeria's domestic violence policies?
2. To what extent are male victims represented or excluded in these policies?
3. What are the implications of institutional silence on male victimization for domestic violence response mechanisms in Nigeria?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Domestic Violence as a Gendered Global Discourse

Evidence suggests that domestic violence is widely recognized as a pervasive violation of human rights and a major global public health concern. The World Health Organization (2021) conceptualizes intimate partner violence as behaviour within intimate relationships that results in physical, sexual, or psychological harm. While this definition is gender-neutral in principle, global policy responses have largely been shaped by gender-focused frameworks that prioritize violence against women, largely due to the disproportionate severity and prevalence of abuse experienced by women across many settings.

Literature indicates that international advocacy, particularly feminist-informed scholarship, has played a central role in elevating domestic violence as a global policy issue. However, evidence also suggests that this dominant framing has contributed to the construction of domestic violence as primarily a women-centered phenomenon (Stark, 2007). As a result, institutional attention, funding priorities, and academic discourse have largely concentrated on female victimization, often limiting visibility of other victim groups.

At the same time, evidence from multiple jurisdictions suggests that intimate partner violence is not strictly unidirectional. Studies indicate that men also experience forms of domestic abuse, although these experiences are less visible within dominant policy and research frameworks (Dutton, 2012; Hines & Douglas, 2015). This creates a conceptual imbalance between empirical diversity and institutional recognition, where lived realities are broader than what is reflected in dominant discourse.

2.2 Empirical Evidence of Male Victimization

Evidence increasingly suggests that men experience multiple forms of domestic violence within intimate relationships, including physical assault, emotional abuse, coercive control, and psychological manipulation, often with significant emotional and mental health implications (Hines & Douglas, 2015). However, the visibility of such experiences remains limited within both academic and institutional datasets.

Research indicates that male victimization is significantly underreported, largely due to stigma, gender expectations, and fear of social ridicule. According to Hines and Douglas (2015), evidence suggests that male victims often experience abuse patterns comparable to those of female victims but differ significantly in disclosure behaviour. This divergence is strongly shaped by societal expectations that discourage men from acknowledging vulnerability.

In the Nigerian context, evidence suggests that male victimization exists but is frequently concealed. Studies indicate that cultural expectations of masculinity, fear of disbelief, and institutional bias significantly reduce reporting rates among male victims (Aborisade, 2023; Isangha, 2024). Consequently, official data may not accurately reflect the prevalence of male victimization, reinforcing the perception that such cases are rare or socially insignificant.

Further evidence suggests that institutional response systems are not adequately structured to recognize or support male victims. Service provision frameworks, legal mechanisms, and advocacy interventions tend to prioritize women, thereby limiting institutional visibility of male experiences (Fasuyi & Olajide, 2023). This contributes to a cycle of underreporting, under-recognition, and limited institutional response.

2.3 Masculinity and the Social Invisibility of Male Victims

Evidence suggests that the invisibility of male victims is closely linked to dominant socio-cultural constructions of masculinity. Connell's (1995) hegemonic masculinity framework explains that masculinity is socially constructed around ideals of strength, dominance, emotional restraint, and control. Within this framework, vulnerability and victimhood are perceived as incompatible with normative masculine identity.

Literature indicates that such constructions significantly shape help-seeking behaviour among male victims. Evidence suggests that men who experience domestic violence often internalize societal expectations of masculinity, leading to shame, identity conflict, and reluctance to disclose abuse (Hines & Douglas, 2015). In many cases, victimization is interpreted not as abuse but as personal failure to conform to masculine ideals.

In Nigeria, evidence suggests that these dynamics are intensified by strong patriarchal norms that associate masculinity with authority within the household. As a result, male victimization is often socially dismissed, ridiculed, or perceived as implausible (Olatunji et al., 2023). Media representations further reinforce these assumptions, as domestic violence discourse is frequently framed as a women-centered issue, while male victimization is either marginalized or trivialized (Olorunpomi et al., 2025).

Overall, evidence suggests that masculinity functions as both a cultural and psychological mechanism that contributes to the silencing and invisibility of male victims across social contexts.

2.4 Institutional and Policy Exclusion of Male Victims

Beyond socio-cultural norms, evidence suggests that institutional structures play a significant role in shaping the recognition and response to domestic violence. Although many legal frameworks are formally gender-neutral, their implementation often reflects gendered assumptions that prioritize female victimhood in practice.

In Nigeria, evidence suggests that legislative instruments such as the Violence Against Persons (Prohibition) framework are designed to protect all victims; however, institutional implementation tends to prioritize women in terms of service delivery and policy focus (Fasuyi & Olajide, 2023). This creates a gap between formal legal inclusivity and practical exclusion.

Institutional theory provides an explanation for this pattern. Meyer and Rowan (1977) argue that institutions often adopt formal structures that reflect socially legitimized norms rather than empirical complexity. Over time, these structures become institutionalized, producing systemic blind spots in policy and practice. In the context of domestic violence, this results in institutional systems that are more responsive to female victimization while inadvertently marginalizing male victims.

Evidence from Nigeria supports this position, indicating that shelters, counselling services, and advocacy programmes are largely designed for women, leaving male victims with limited access to formal support systems (Isangha, 2024). Additionally, limited institutional awareness and training further contribute to the invisibility of male victims within official response mechanisms.

Overall, evidence suggests that institutional exclusion is not always intentional but is sustained through policy routines, organizational norms, and embedded gender assumptions that shape institutional behaviour over time.

2.5 Synthesis and Research Gap

Evidence across the literature suggests a clear disconnect between the empirical reality of male victimization and its institutional recognition. While studies increasingly acknowledge that men experience domestic violence, institutional frameworks continue to reflect a gendered understanding of victimhood that prioritizes women.

Three key gaps emerge from the literature. First, there is limited empirical focus on male victimization within African and Nigerian contexts. Second, there is a persistent gap between gender-neutral legal frameworks and gendered institutional implementation. Third, there is limited attention to how policy documents themselves construct victimhood and contribute to the invisibility of male victims.

Against this background, evidence suggests the need for a critical examination of domestic violence policies in Nigeria, particularly in relation to how victimhood is constructed and how institutional silence contributes to the marginalization of male victims.

3. Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on two complementary theoretical perspectives: Hegemonic Masculinity Theory and Institutional Theory. These theories are combined to explain how male victim invisibility in domestic violence discourse is socially produced and structurally sustained within policy frameworks.

3.1 Hegemonic Masculinity Theory

Hegemonic Masculinity Theory, as advanced by Connell (1995), conceptualizes masculinity as a socially constructed and hierarchically organized set of norms that privilege traits such as strength, authority, emotional restraint, and dominance. Within this framework, masculinity is maintained through cultural expectations that define “real manhood” in opposition to vulnerability and dependence.

In the context of domestic violence, this construction renders male victimization socially difficult to acknowledge. Men who experience abuse may perceive such experiences as inconsistent with normative masculinity, leading to silence, stigma, and underreporting. Empirical studies support this position, showing that male victims often avoid disclosure due to fear of ridicule and perceived loss of masculine identity (Hines & Douglas, 2015; Aborisade, 2023). In the Nigerian context, these norms are

reinforced by patriarchal expectations that associate masculinity with control and authority within the household, further limiting the visibility of male victimization.

3.2 Institutional Theory

Institutional Theory (Meyer & Rowan, 1977) explains how organizational structures and policy systems become shaped by socially legitimized norms and expectations. Institutions often adopt formal rules and practices not solely based on empirical realities but to align with dominant cultural understandings that confer legitimacy and stability.

Applied to domestic violence governance, this theory highlights how policy frameworks and institutional responses may reproduce gendered assumptions about victimhood. Although legal instruments such as domestic violence laws are often formally gender-neutral, their implementation frequently reflects institutional priorities that center on female victimhood. This results in uneven service provision, where shelters, support systems, and advocacy programmes are primarily designed for women, while male victims remain largely unrecognized within institutional practice.

3.3 Theoretical Integration

Together, Hegemonic Masculinity Theory and Institutional Theory provide a multi-level framework for understanding institutional silence regarding male victims of domestic violence. Hegemonic masculinity explains the cultural production of silence, where gender norms discourage recognition and disclosure of male victimization. Institutional theory explains the structural reproduction of that silence, where policy systems and organizational practices embed and normalize gendered assumptions about victimhood. This integrated framework is therefore essential for analyzing how domestic violence policies in Nigeria construct victimhood and how such constructions contribute to the marginalization of male victims within institutional responses.

4. Methodology

This study adopts an exploratory-descriptive qualitative research design and relies on document analysis to examine how domestic violence policy frameworks in Nigeria construct victimhood and represent male victims. This design is appropriate where the aim is not to measure prevalence, but to explore and describe how social issues are framed within institutional texts, particularly in areas where existing scholarship remains limited, such as male victimization in domestic violence discourse.

The study draws on a purposively selected set of key policy and legal documents that shape domestic violence governance in Nigeria. These include the Violence Against Persons (Prohibition) Act (2015), the National Gender Policy (2021), selected guidelines and strategic frameworks issued by the Federal Ministry of Women Affairs, and relevant gender-based violence response documents used by state and institutional actors. These texts were selected because they are authoritative policy instruments that define victim protection frameworks and guide institutional responses to domestic violence in the Nigerian context.

Data were analyzed using thematic content analysis, which allows for the systematic identification of patterns of meaning within textual data. In this study, the documents were read repeatedly to develop familiarity with their content, after which relevant segments were coded according to recurring ideas relating to victim definition, gender representation, and institutional response. These codes were then organized into broader themes that reflect how domestic violence and victimhood are constructed within policy discourse.

The analysis was guided by an interpretive orientation, with attention given not only to what the documents explicitly state, but also to what they leave unsaid, particularly regarding the visibility or

absence of male victims. This focus on both presence and silence is important in policy discourse analysis, where omissions often reveal underlying institutional assumptions and priorities.

To enhance the credibility of the analysis, interpretations were compared across multiple documents to ensure consistency and reduce the risk of selective reading. Since the study relies entirely on publicly available policy documents, no human participants were involved. Ethical considerations were observed through careful and faithful representation of the original policy texts without distortion or misrepresentation.

5. Presentation and Discussion of Findings

5.1 Construction of Victimhood within Domestic Violence Policy Frameworks in Nigeria

Evidence from the analyzed policy documents suggests that victimhood within Nigeria's domestic violence governance architecture is constructed through a subtle but consistently gendered lens. Although the Violence Against Persons (Prohibition) Act (2015) adopts a formally neutral term "person," its interpretive ecosystem, particularly in implementation guidelines and related institutional frameworks, reveals a strong orientation toward women-centered vulnerability.

A critical reading of the National Gender Policy (2021) further reinforces this pattern. The policy explicitly prioritizes "eliminating all forms of discrimination against women and girls" and advancing "the rights and welfare of women." While these provisions are normatively progressive, they also embed a conceptual hierarchy of vulnerability in which women are positioned as the default category of protection. This framing is further reinforced in operational documents from the Federal Ministry of Women Affairs, where domestic violence interventions are repeatedly situated within the protection of "women and girls as vulnerable groups."

Evidence suggests that across these documents, victimhood is not merely defined legally but socially constructed through repeated policy associations between vulnerability and femininity. This produces what can be described as an institutionalized interpretive bias, where women are foregrounded as the normative victims of domestic violence, while other victim categories remain conceptually peripheral.

From a theoretical standpoint, this reflects the operation of hegemonic masculinity at the discursive level, where masculinity is implicitly associated with strength and invulnerability, making male victimhood difficult to accommodate within dominant policy imaginaries.

5.2 Representation and Structural Exclusion of Male Victims in Policy Discourse

Evidence suggests that male victims are not explicitly excluded from Nigerian domestic violence policy frameworks, but their representation is structurally marginal and largely implicit. Across the Violence Against Persons (Prohibition) Act (2015), the term "person" is used inclusively; however, no operational provisions, service pathways, or targeted intervention mechanisms explicitly address male victimization.

This legal neutrality contrasts sharply with implementation frameworks, where institutional language repeatedly prioritizes women. For example, institutional response structures are consistently framed around the protection of "women and children affected by violence," a formulation that appears across multiple policy and operational documents. While not legally exclusionary, this phrasing produces what can be described as functional exclusion through omission. A key analytical insight emerging from cross-document comparison is that inclusion at the legal level does not translate into inclusion at the operational level. The gap between formal neutrality and practical gendered implementation reveals a structural disjuncture in policy design.

Evidence suggests that this disjuncture results in symbolic invisibility of male victims: they exist within the legal category of “persons” but are absent from targeted institutional programming. This aligns with institutional theory, which explains how organizations maintain legitimacy by adopting socially accepted categories of vulnerability here, femininity as the primary referent for protection.

5.3 Institutional Silence and the Reproduction of Gendered Vulnerability

Evidence suggests that institutional silence regarding male victims is not merely an absence of reference but a patterned form of policy structuring that reproduces gendered assumptions about vulnerability. Across the analyzed documents, institutional responses to domestic violence are consistently framed through protective language such as “support for survivors of violence, particularly women and children.”

This recurring formulation is significant because it simultaneously signals inclusion and exclusion. While the term “survivors” is theoretically inclusive, its repeated qualification through “women and children” effectively narrows the operational meaning of vulnerability. This produces what can be interpreted as selective universality, where inclusivity is stated but not operationalized.

A comparative reading of the National Gender Policy (2021) and the VAPP Act (2015) suggests that while both instruments endorse broad protection principles, neither establishes dedicated mechanisms to recognize or respond to male victimization. This absence becomes particularly significant when considered alongside implementation structures under the Federal Ministry of Women Affairs, where institutional programming is overwhelmingly gender-specific.

Evidence, therefore, suggests that institutional silence operates as a stabilizing mechanism for gendered policy priorities rather than a neutral omission. It ensures continuity of women-centered service delivery while unintentionally marginalizing male victims.

Theoretically, this pattern reflects institutional theory’s argument that organizations reproduce socially legitimized norms to maintain coherence and legitimacy, even when these norms do not fully reflect empirical complexity.

5.4 Cross-Theme Synthesis: The Production of Invisible Victimhood

A cross-theme analysis of the policy documents suggests a coherent institutional pattern: victimhood is constructed through gendered framing, operationalized through women-centered implementation, and stabilized through institutional silence.

First, victimhood is conceptually framed through repeated association with women and girls as primary vulnerable groups. Second, this framing is operationalized through implementation structures that prioritize women-focused interventions. Third, the absence of explicit provisions for male victims consolidates a system of institutional silence that renders male victimization socially and administratively invisible.

Evidence suggests that these three processes are mutually reinforcing rather than isolated. Together, they produce a policy environment in which male victims are not explicitly excluded but are structurally deprioritized through language, institutional design, and implementation logic.

From a theoretical perspective, hegemonic masculinity explains the cultural difficulty of recognizing male vulnerability, while institutional theory explains how this cultural bias becomes embedded in formal governance systems. The interaction of both theories provides a robust explanation of how male victim invisibility is produced, normalized, and sustained within domestic violence policy frameworks in Nigeria.

6. Conclusion

This study set out to examine how domestic violence policy frameworks in Nigeria construct victimhood and represent male victims, with particular attention to the role of institutional framing and silence. Using an exploratory-descriptive qualitative design and document analysis of key policy instruments, the study reveals a consistent pattern in which domestic violence discourse is formally inclusive but substantively gendered in orientation.

Evidence from the analysis suggests that although legal and policy frameworks such as the VAPP Act (2015) adopt gender-neutral language, the practical construction of victimhood is predominantly centered on women and girls. This framing is reinforced through repeated policy emphasis on female vulnerability and institutional programming that prioritizes women-focused interventions. As a result, victimhood becomes socially and institutionally associated with femininity, while male victimization remains largely unrecognized within operational structures.

A key finding is that male victims are not explicitly excluded from legal frameworks; rather, they are rendered invisible through omission and lack of operational specification. This symbolic exclusion is sustained through institutional practices that privilege women as the default category of protection and service delivery. The study further demonstrates that this pattern reflects deeper socio-cultural and institutional logics, where hegemonic masculinity shapes perceptions of vulnerability, and institutional structures reproduce these assumptions through policy implementation.

Overall, the study concludes that domestic violence policy in Nigeria reflects a paradox of formal inclusion and practical exclusion, where gender-neutral legal language coexists with gendered institutional practice. This disconnect has significant implications for equity, access to support services, and the broader effectiveness of domestic violence response systems.

7. Recommendations

Drawing from the findings, this study proposes the following thematic policy directions to improve inclusivity and responsiveness in domestic violence governance in Nigeria. Practical illustrations accompany each recommendation to demonstrate feasibility.

7.1. Reframing Victimhood within Existing Legal Language

Evidence suggests that domestic violence policy frameworks in Nigeria are formally gender-neutral but operationally gendered in implementation. To address this gap, rather than introducing new legal categories, existing legal language should be more explicitly operationalized in practice.

Practically, implementation guidelines for the Violence Against Persons (Prohibition) Act (2015) should clearly state that protections apply to “all persons experiencing domestic violence, including both male and female victims.” This clarification would not alter the legal structure but would strengthen interpretive consistency across institutions.

Additionally, institutional manuals used by agencies could include explicit recognition of male victimization to reduce ambiguity in service delivery and reporting practices.

7.2. Institutional Redesign and Service Inclusivity

Findings indicate that existing support systems are structurally oriented toward women-centered services. To address this imbalance, domestic violence response systems should be redesigned to reflect inclusive service provision models.

For example, state-level shelter systems and crisis centres under gender-based violence programmes could introduce designated confidential referral pathways for male victims, rather than

requiring them to access women-focused shelters. Similarly, helplines such as national GBV hotlines could incorporate trained operators and protocols specifically addressing male victim disclosure, ensuring that calls from men are not redirected or dismissed.

7.3. Capacity Building and Institutional Sensitization

Evidence suggests that frontline responders often operate within gendered assumptions that affect how domestic violence cases are interpreted. To address this, structured training programmes should be institutionalized for police officers, social workers, and judicial personnel.

Practically, this could include integrating modules on male victim recognition and gender bias reduction into training curricula at the Nigeria Police Force training schools and National Judicial Institute programmes. Scenario-based training could also be introduced, where officers are exposed to simulated cases involving male victims to improve response sensitivity and reduce stereotypes during case handling.

7.4. Data Inclusion and Evidence-Based Policymaking

A significant gap identified in the study is the absence of systematic data collection on male victimization. To address this, national data systems should adopt gender-disaggregated reporting mechanisms.

For instance, the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) and relevant GBV response agencies could revise their domestic violence data tools to include separate categories for male and female. Police incident reporting forms could also be redesigned to ensure that male victimization is explicitly recorded rather than absorbed into general “complainant” categories, thereby improving statistical visibility and policy planning.

7.5. Public Awareness and Normative Reorientation

Evidence suggests that cultural perceptions of masculinity significantly contribute to the underreporting of male victimization. Public awareness interventions are therefore necessary to challenge dominant narratives that associate vulnerability exclusively with women.

Practically, national campaigns led by agencies such as the Federal Ministry of Women Affairs and civil society partners could include targeted messaging such as: “*Domestic violence affects everyone, men can also be victims.*” Media campaigns on television, radio, and social media platforms could also feature survivor stories involving men, helping to normalize help-seeking behaviour and reduce stigma.

References

- Aborisade, R. A. (2023). Male victimization and underreporting of intimate partner violence in Nigeria: Sociocultural and institutional barriers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence Studies*, 18(2), 145–162.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. University of California Press.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (2004). Women’s violence to men in intimate relationships: Working on a puzzle. *British Journal of Criminology*, 44(3), 324–349.
- Dutton, D. G. (2012). Female intimate partner violence and developmental issues. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(4), 342–351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.04.001>
- Fasuyi, A. O., & Olajide, T. O. (2023). Institutional responses to domestic violence in Nigeria: Gender bias and policy implementation gaps. *African Journal of Criminology and Justice Studies*, 15(1), 88–104.

- Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. (2015). Sexual aggression experiences among male victims of intimate partner violence: Prevalence and consequences. *Journal of Family Violence*, 30(4), 435–446.
- Isangha, E. E. (2024). Male victims of domestic violence in Nigeria: Silence, stigma, and institutional neglect. *Nigerian Journal of Social Sciences*, 20(1), 55–73.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–363. <https://doi.org/10.1086/226550>
- Olatunji, O. S., Adeyemi, K. A., & Bello, M. A. (2023). Masculinity norms and help-seeking behaviour among male victims of domestic violence in Nigeria. *Gender & Behaviour*, 21(3), 21045–21060.
- Olorunpomi, J. O., Akinyemi, O., & Eze, C. (2025). Media framing of domestic violence in Nigeria: A gendered discourse analysis. *Communication and Society Review*, 12(1), 1–18.
- Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: How men entrap women in personal life*. Oxford University Press.
- United Nations Women. (2023). *Progress on the sustainable development goals: Gender equality and violence against women*. <https://www.unwomen.org>
- World Health Organization. (2021). *Violence against women prevalence estimates, 2018*. <https://www.who.int>
- Violence Against Persons (Prohibition) Act, 2015 (Nigeria).
- Federal Ministry of Women Affairs. (2021). *National gender policy*. Abuja, Nigeria: Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).