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30% of women globally have experienced physical &/or sexual violence by an intimate partner.
Identifying upstream factors: Key to prevention

Attitudes justifying IPV are widely evidenced as one of the strongest predictors of:

- Perpetration of intimate partner violence
- Disclosure and help-seeking by women experiencing intimate partner violence
- Response of professionals to survivors (and perpetrators) of intimate partner violence

Most studies to date have focused on individual and/or household level attitudes to IPV

**Individual:**
Factors in an individual's biological and personal history that increase the possibility of becoming a victim or perpetrator of violence.

*Example:* attitudes or beliefs that support sexual violence, impulsive and anti-social behaviors, history of abuse or witnessing abuse, alcohol or drug use.

**Relationship:**
Factors within the individual's closest relationships such as social peers, intimate partners, and family members that may increase their risk.

*Example:* association with sexually aggressive peers, emotionally unsupportive, physically violent or strongly patriarchal family environment.

**Community:**
Factors on the community level such as relationships with schools, workplaces, and neighborhoods that may increase the individual's risk.

*Example:* general tolerance of sexual assault, lack of support from police or judicial system, poverty, weak community sanctions against perpetrators.

**Societal:**
Societal or cultural norms that create an environment that accepts or condones violence or inequality.

*Example:* Inequality due to an individual's gender, religion, culture, sexual orientation, or race, inequality due to economic and social policies.
1. What is the prevalence and distribution of attitudes among women and men justifying domestic violence across LMICs?

2. Do economic, social and political empowerment factors explain variations in women’s and men’s attitudes to IPV by countries?

3. To what extent are variations in women’s and men’s attitudes explained by country- and individual-level factors?
Gender differences in the pattern and distribution of attitudes justifying IPV across countries and geographic regions

Systemic economic, social and political empowerment predictors of societal attitudes to IPV alongside individual-level risk factors
Sample Description

Countries with **Demographic and Health Survey (DHS)** data on both women’s and men’s attitudes included on study

- **Level 2 (Country) N= 49**
  - Regions N=533
  - Clusters N=29, 240

- **Level 1 (Individuals) N = 1, 174, 894**
  - Women= 775, 024
  - Men= 399,084

Sample representative of 2.5 billion of world population
Measurement of IPV Attitudes

“Sometimes a husband/partner is annoyed or angered by things that his wife/partner does. In your opinion, is a husband/partner justified in hitting or beating his wife/partner in the following situations:

- If she goes out without telling him
- If she neglects the children
- If she argues with him
- If she refuses to have sex with him
- If she burns the food”

**Outcome variables:** Acceptance of IPV in any one situation
Attitudes to IPV scale ($\alpha=.89$)
IPV Acceptance across the 49 Low- and Middle-Income Countries (weighted)
At a glance: Prevalence and Acceptance of IPV
Country-level IPV Acceptance by Gender

Justification of domestic violence in at least one situation by gender (%), weighted

[Graph showing a scatter plot with countries labeled on the axes and a line of best fit.]
Larger proportion of women justified IPV in most countries
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Prevalence of IPV acceptance: Key Points

- IPV acceptance more widespread in Sub-Saharan Africa and South and South-East Asia compared with Central Europe and LAC

- Gender differences in IPV acceptance in at least one scenario was statistically significant in 45 of the 49 countries

- In 36 of the 49 countries a larger proportion of women had violence accepting attitudes compared to men

- Gender differences were statistically significant across geographical regions with a larger proportion of women justifying violence in South (East) Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa and the LAC.
Meta-database: Sources and construction

**ECONOMIC FACTORS**
- Multi-dimensional Poverty Index (Bristol Measure)
- UNDP
- IMF World Economic Database
- ILO Key Indicators of the Labour Market (KILM) 7th Edition
- Cingranelli-Richards Human Rights Database (CIRI)
- DHS

**SOCIAL FACTORS**
- UNESCO UIS
- UNICEF Global database
- Gender Statistics database
- DHS

**POLITICAL FACTORS**
- Inter-Parliamentary Union
- Women Stats Database
- Women Business and the Law
- Unified Democracy Score
- Centre for Systemic Peace
- Armed Conflict Location and Event Data
- Quality of Governance data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidimensional deprivation score</td>
<td>.202* (.019 .386)</td>
<td>-.072 (-.290 .146)</td>
<td>-.008 (-.113 .098)</td>
<td>-.085 (-.227 .058)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequality Index (Gini)</td>
<td>-.013 (-.029 .003)</td>
<td>-.009 (-.023 .005)</td>
<td>-.008 (-.017 .001)</td>
<td>-.007 (-.016 .002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s economic rights</td>
<td>-.351* (-.657 -.048)</td>
<td>-.335** (-.597 -.074)</td>
<td>-.177* (-.352 -.002)</td>
<td>-.173* (-.344 -.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence and quality of DV law</td>
<td>.042 (.041 .124)</td>
<td>.016 (-.056 .088)</td>
<td>.021 (-.026 -.068)</td>
<td>.013 (-.034 .061)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy Score</td>
<td>-.147 (-.602 .308)</td>
<td>-.275 (-.671 .122)</td>
<td>-.262* (-.523 -.001)</td>
<td>-.298* (-.558 -.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s political rights</td>
<td>-.645 (-1.390 .099)</td>
<td>-.406 (-1.058 .246)</td>
<td>-.169 (-.596 .258)</td>
<td>-.102 (-.529 .325)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seats held by women in national parliament</td>
<td>.028* (.007 .048)</td>
<td>.025** (.009 .194)</td>
<td>.007 (-.005 .018)</td>
<td>.006 (-.006 .018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political conflict</td>
<td>.069 (-.025 .190)</td>
<td>.101** (.008 .043)</td>
<td>.073* (.011 .134)</td>
<td>.078* (.017 .139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female literacy rates</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.760**** (-2.727 -.793)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.495 (-1.129 .139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC used by Stata</td>
<td>99.199 (-2.727 .793)</td>
<td>88.113 (-.2727 .793)</td>
<td>50.277 (-.1129 .139)</td>
<td>50.920 (-.1129 .139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R squared</td>
<td>.456 (-.025 .190)</td>
<td>.600 (-.056 .088)</td>
<td>.385 (-.026 -.068)</td>
<td>.411 (-.034 .061)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The Attitudes to DV scale is the outcome variable; The unstandardised beta coefficients and the 95% CI are presented.

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001

Based on significance and model fit female primary, secondary and tertiary education, and female labour force participation were not included in final model.
### Acceptance of IPV: Multivariate Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Multidimensional Deprivation Score</td>
<td>.202* [.019 .386]</td>
<td>-.072 [-.290 .146]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's economic rights</td>
<td>-.351* [-.657 -.048]</td>
<td>-.335** [-.597 -.074]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of IPV law</td>
<td>.042 [-.041 .124]</td>
<td>.016 [-.056 .088]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy Score</td>
<td>-.147 [-.602 .308]</td>
<td>-.275 [-.671 .122]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary seats(women)</td>
<td>.028* [.007 .048]</td>
<td>.101** [.009 .194]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict area</td>
<td>.069** [.025 .190]</td>
<td>.025** [.008 .043]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Female Literacy rates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1.760*** [-2.727 -.793]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC used by Stata</td>
<td>99.199</td>
<td>88.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Multidimensional Deprivation Score</td>
<td>-.072 [-.113 .098]</td>
<td>-.008 [-.227 .058]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's economic rights</td>
<td>-.335** [-.597 -.074]</td>
<td>-.177* [-.352 -.002]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of IPV law</td>
<td>.016 [-.056 .088]</td>
<td>.021 [-.026 .068]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy Score</td>
<td>-.275 [-.671 .122]</td>
<td>-.262* [-.0523 -.001]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary seats(women)</td>
<td>.101** [.009 .194]</td>
<td>.007 [-.005 .018]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict area</td>
<td>.025** [.008 .043]</td>
<td>.073* [.011 .134]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Female Literacy rates</td>
<td>-1.760*** [-2.727 -.793]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC used by Stata</td>
<td>88.113</td>
<td>50.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Multidimensional Deprivation Score</td>
<td>-.008 [-.113 .098]</td>
<td>-.008 [-.227 .058]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's economic rights</td>
<td>-.177* [-.352 -.002]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of IPV law</td>
<td>.021 [-.026 .068]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy Score</td>
<td>-.262* [-.0523 -.001]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary seats(women)</td>
<td>.007 [-.005 .018]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict area</td>
<td>.073* [.011 .134]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Female Literacy rates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC used by Stata</td>
<td>50.277</td>
<td>50.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Multidimensional Deprivation Score</td>
<td>-.085 [-.227 .058]</td>
<td>-.085 [-.227 .058]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's economic rights</td>
<td>-.173* [-.344 -.001]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of IPV law</td>
<td>.013 [-.034 .061]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy Score</td>
<td>-.298* [-.558 -.038]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary seats(women)</td>
<td>.006 [-.006 .018]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict area</td>
<td>.078* [.017 .139]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Female Literacy rates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1.495 [-1.129 .139]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC used by Stata</td>
<td>50.920</td>
<td>50.920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National-level predictors of IPV acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Multidimensional deprivation (+)</td>
<td>• Country’s democracy levels (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National female literacy rates (+)</td>
<td>• Political Conflict in the past 5 years (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Women’s economic rights (+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seats in national parliament ( - )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Political Conflict in the past 5 years (+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hierarchical models of ever-justifying IPV
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### Individual-level risk factors for IPV acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Multidimensional deprivation</td>
<td>• Multidimensional deprivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No education</td>
<td>• No education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marital Age &lt;18</td>
<td>• Marital Age &lt;18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not involved in household decision-making</td>
<td>• Partner not involved in household decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Media Exposure</td>
<td>• Media Exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural residence</td>
<td>• Rural residence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitudes towards Intimate Partner Violence

**Economic and social factors**
- Multidimensional Poverty Index
- Gini Index
- Labour Force Participation
- Women’s economic rights
- Educational Attainment / Literacy
- Prevalence of early marriage

**Contextual-level Predictors**
- Educational Attainment
- Employment Status
- Deprivation index
- Marital age (<18)
- Household decision-making
- Media Exposure

**Political Factors**
- Women in national parliament
- Women’s political rights
- Regime type (Democracy level)
- **Political Conflict**

**Legislation**
- Existence of IPV specific laws
- Quality of IPV laws
- Inheritance rights

**Controls**
- GDP per capita
- Age
- Marital Status
- Type of residence (rural/urban)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>LIMITATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The largest population-based study across geographical regions</td>
<td>• Cross-sectional data so cannot establish causality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gendered analyses of IPV attitudes</td>
<td>• Constrained by availability and quality of meta-data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drew on diverse metadata on conducting robust quality checks</td>
<td>• Limitations of existing IPV attitudinal data and measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of a harmonised international meta-database</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key messages for prevention research and policy

- Multi-level (socio-ecological) and multi-sectoral approach to IPV primary

- Systemic social, economic and political empowerment indicators do not appear to have a consistent direct influence of the societal acceptance of IPV and discriminatory gender norms

- Political conflict was the strongest population-level predictor for IPV acceptance

- Complex relationship between legislation and IPV acceptance that warrants further research

- Gender norms might have an even stronger influence at the neighbourhood-level and warrants further research
Next Steps...

Do neighbourhoods matter? Country- cluster- and individual effects on attitudes towards intimate partner violence in low- and middle-income countries

❖ Spatial Analyses and mapping of neighbourhoods and regions to identify ‘hotspots’

❖ Cluster-level social, economic and political predictors of IPV acceptance

❖ Pathway analyses of IPV legislation and attitudes to IPV
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