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Rwanda:
Land of a Thousand Hills

It’s **SMALL**
It’s **DENSELY POPULATED**
It’s **INCREDIBLY WELL ORGANISED**
Organization of Rwanda and Indashyikirwa

7 Districts Included
- In Northern, Eastern, and Western Provinces

Two cells per intervention sector
“ Couples training → activist training”
• 120 couples per sector = 840 per arm
Indashyikirwa Intervention Model

Creation of “ENABLING ENVIRONMENT”:
- Opinion Leader Training
- Women’s Spaces
- Sector & District Level Advocacy

Structured Linkages Across Levels

Activist Training
[Drawing from SASA!]

GBV ACTIVISM

Couples Curriculum

Cells & VSLAs

RWN

CARE Rwanda

RWAMREC
Data collected: Community

- **Targets**
  - 1400 women: 700 from intervention sectors + 700 from control sectors
  - 1400 men: 700 from intervention sectors + 700 from control sectors

- **We have useable data for**
  - 1399 women: 699 intervention and 700 control
  - 1399 women: 700 intervention and 700 control

- **All participants provided complete surveys**
  - All respondents provided useable data on physical/sexual IPV (i.e. answered at least one of the 8 core items)
  - Only 3 women and 11 men skipped at least 1 core IPV questions
Data collected: Couples

- Potential respondent pool was 1,680 men and women in couples
- We have useable data for
  - 1,662 women (98.9%): 827 (98.5%) intervention and 835 (99.4%) control
  - 1,642 men* (97.7%): 807 (96.1%) intervention and 835 (99.5%) control
  - **1,629 complete pairs** (97.0%): 801 (95.4% intervention and 828 (98.7%) control
- 3 women (0.1%) and 22 men (1.3%) provided usable but incomplete surveys
  - **All** respondents provided useable data on physical/sexual IPV (i.e. answered at least one of the 8 core items)
  - Only 1 woman and 16 men skipped 1 or more core IPV questions
Economic risk factors tested for community women

- HH food insecurity
- HH any debt last month
- Women earns more

HH Asset Ownership:

- Low
- Medium
- High

Woman’s Perception of HH wealth compared to neighbours:

- Worse
- Same
- Better
Relationship and alcohol use risk factors tested for community women

Woman’s Alcohol Use
In past 12 months
Past Experience of Violence, Tested for Community Women

Woman’s Experience at First Sex
Multivariable Logistic Regression, Community Women

Adjusted Odds Ratios

- HH food insecurity
- Woman earns more than man
- Perceived wealth same as others
- Perceived wealth better than others
- Partner has other partners
- Partner drinks past 12 m
- Woman drinks last 12 m
- First sex was forced
- Rape by non-partner man

Any IPV vs. 2+ IPV
Relationship and alcohol use risk factors tested for community men

Justifications cited for beating partner
Alcohol, Sex, & Past Experience of Violence, Tested for Community Men

Alcohol use, past 12m

- None: 60%
- Any: 30%
- Problem: 10%
- Suspects infidelity: 10%
- Sex w/sex worker, 12 m: 10%
- Physical abuse as child: 20%
- Saw abuse of mother: 40%
Man is under 30  
Beaten often as child  
Witnessed abuse of mother  
HH had debt last month  
Woman earns more  
Suspects partner infidelity  
Visited sex work in past year  
Drank alcohol in past year  
Had problems with alcohol in past year

Justifications for beating woman

Multivariable Logistic Regression, Community Men
## Multivariable Logistic Regression, Paired Couples Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Any IPV</th>
<th>2+ IPV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HH has cellphone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman earns &gt;20K RWF pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH wealth same/better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man has secondary ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman has seen man drink</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman believes man unfaithful</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child sexual violence (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult rape (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness mother abuse (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Justification for IPV (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ Justifications for IPV (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion, part 1

- Overall similar risk and protective patterns reported by community members and paired couples data
  - Higher household SES is protective
  - Perceived SES also protective – need to pair this data with actual
  - Education only protective for men – need to explore why
  - Unclear the extent to which gender-imbalance in income is a risk, but clear that high earning woman in home can be protective
Discussion, part 2

- Overall similar risk patterns as are observed in comparable settings
  - Household SES and food security are protective

- For women, past victimisation is a risk, but many risk factors are partner related

- For men, witnessing maternal abuse, alcohol use, extra-relational partnering, and beliefs that beating is justified increase perpetration
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