

# Multilevel Analysis of VAW & Patriarchal Attitudes in four Nepal districts

A Presentation for the  
Sexual Violence Research Initiative Forum  
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 18-21 September 2017



Katherine A. Roof, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Cari Jo Clark, PhD<sup>1</sup>,  
Mahesh Puri, PhD<sup>3</sup>, & Kathryn M. Yount, PhD<sup>1,2</sup> (Presenter)

Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

<sup>1</sup>Rollins School of Public Health, Department of Global Health

<sup>2</sup>Department of Sociology

<sup>3</sup>Centre for Research on Environment, Health, & Population Activities (CREHPA), Kathmandu, Nepal



# Acknowledgements

## Funding

- **Department for International Development (DfID)**, PO 7352 linked to PO 7185, “Service Provider for Research on Violence Against Women and Girls in South Asia” to the **Overseas Development Institute (ODI)**

## Data

- Center for Research on Environment, Health, & Population Studies (CREHPA), Kathmandu, Nepal
- Demographic & Health Survey Program (ICF International; USAID)

## Intellectual Contribution

- Ruchira T. Naved (ICDDR, Bangladesh)

## Comments

- Fiona Samuels, Taveeshi Gupta, and Nupur Baurua, (DfID)

# Background on VAWG

- ▶ **VAWG** - any act that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering and includes threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivations of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life (UN GA 48/104 1993)
- ▶ **IPV** disproportionately burdens women and girls, with 1 in 3 ever-partnered women worldwide reporting lifetime exposure
  - ▶ Prevalence especially high in South Asia
- ▶ **Violation of Human Rights**
- ▶ **Public Health Problem**
  - ▶ Acute, long-term, intergenerational health effects
  - ▶ Adverse social and economic effects on schooling, market work, and economic independence
- ▶ **UN Sustainable Development Goals** for 2030
  - ▶ Goal 5: Eliminate violence against women and girls globally, including psychological, physical, and sexual IPV (UN GA A/RES/70/1 2015)



# Objectives of Parent Study

- ▶ **Leverage national or regional data** from surveys in Bangladesh, **Nepal**, & Pakistan
- ▶ **Explore multilevel drivers** of men's attitudes about gender & IPV, control in family decisions, & physical IPV perpetration
- ▶ **Guide policies & programs** to ↓ men's IPV justification, dominance in decisions, & IPV perpetration

**To what extent do community-level norms of masculine dominance and violence influence an individual man's ...**

**...attitudes about IPV?**

**...IPV-related behaviors?**



# Nepal: Conceptual Framing

- ▶ **Feminist, ecological, life-course framing**
  - ▶ Nested systems of power & oppression
  - ▶ Developmental life stages
  - ▶ Dynamic and reflexive influence of precipitating factors across environmental system levels
- ▶ **Incorporated theories**
  - ▶ Social norms (Bandura; Bicchieri & Mercier)
    - ▶ Injunctive and descriptive norms
  - ▶ Gendered self-determination (Deci & Ryan; Hearn)
  - ▶ Masculinity (Connell)

# Expectations

1. A man's exposure to discrimination against a female relative will be associated with ...
  - a. ↑ aOR of perpetrating VAWG
  - b. ↑ aOR of holding patriarchal attitudes about gender & phy. IPV
  
2. Community-wide prevalence of VAWG will be associated with...
  - a. ↑ aOR of perpetrating VAWG
  - b. ↑ aOR of holding patriarchal attitudes about gender & phy. IPV
  
3. Community-wide norms of masculine dominance will be associated with ...
  - a. ↑ aOR of perpetrating VAWG
  - b. ↑ aOR of holding patriarchal attitudes about gender & phy. IPV

# Data Description

	Bangladesh	Nepal	Pakistan
<b>Year</b>	2007	<b>2012-13</b>	2012-13
<b>Source</b>	DHS	<b>CREHPA</b>	DHS
<b>Scale</b>	national	<b>4 districts</b>	national
<b># of communities</b>	307	<b>80</b>	346
<b>L1 sample</b>	774 EMM 18-29 y	<b>1,693<sup>a</sup> EMM 16-64 y</b>	755 EMM 16-29 y
<b>L2 sample</b>	2,398 EMM 30-54 y 3,841 EMW 15-49 y	<b>1,693<sup>a</sup> EMM 16-64 y</b>	1,668 EMM 30-49 y 5,831 EMW 30-49 y

*Note:* L1 – level 1, individual; L2 –Level 2, community.

EMM / EMW=ever-married men / women

<sup>a</sup>unweighted



# General Method

- ▶ **Descriptive analyses:** univariate, bivariate
  - ▶ Indexed man removed from calculation of L2 descriptive and injunctive norms exposure variables.
- ▶ **Two 2-level negative binomial logistic regression (FML estimation)**
  - ▶ **DV1** = patriarchal attitudes of gender & phy IPV
  - ▶ **DV2** = phy VAWG
    - ▶ **Model 1:** Unconditional
    - ▶ **Model 2:** L1 & L2 exposures only
    - ▶ **Model 3:** L1 & L2 exposures + L1 & L2 covariates



# Nepal: Analysis Plan

Outcomes	L1 Individual Exposures	L2 Community Exposures	Covariates
<b>1. Patriarchal attitudes: gender &amp; phy IPV justification</b>	1. Gender discrimination against female relative	1. Norms of masculine dominance	1. L1: Age, edu, HH wealth in upper 40%
<b>2. VAWG</b>		2. Gender discrimination against female relative	2. L2: Avg. HH wealth in upper 40%, location in central region

# Men's Tendency to Justify IPV

	Men (N = 1,693wt.)	
Attitudes about IPV justification, proportion agreeing	Mean	SD
husband/family has such right(s) as a husband	.15	.36
the women deserve it	.03	.18
it is necessary to maintain societal harmony	.11	.31
it is necessary to maintain family harmony	.14	.35
it is necessary to maintain family prestige	.16	.37
it is necessary for the husband's social superiority	.13	.34
it is a private/family matter	.15	.35
Agreement with IPV justification (ref: disagrees/dk/ns), ct (0-7)	.88	1.93

# Attitudes about Gender Roles

	Men (N = 1,693wt.)	
Attitudes about gender roles, proportion agreeing	Mean	SD
a woman's obligation is to serve her husband and family in the home	.78	.42
a woman should not get involved in matters outside the home because this is a man's responsibility	.52	.50
a woman shames and angers her husband if she does not produce a son for him/his family	.35	.48
men say/do things to control the activities of their wives because this is their obligation as husbands	.62	.49
wives are blamed by their husbands and in-laws for everything that goes wrong in the family	.39	.49
once a woman gets married, she belongs to her husband's family and should obey her in-laws	.93	.25
Agreement with patriarchal attitudes about gender roles, ct (0-6)	3.60	1.66

# Physical VAWG Perpetration

	Men (N = 1,693wt.)	
<b>Physical VAWG, proportion perpetrating</b>		
threatened to hurt or harm her or someone close to her	.03	.16
punched with fist or with something that could hurt her	.05	.21
kicked, dragged, or beaten her up	.02	.13
physically forced her to have sexual intercourse when she did not want to	.01	.11
perpetration of physical VAWG, ct (0-4)	.10	.41

# Exposure to Discrimination against Female Relative

	Men (N = 1,693wt.)	
Exposure to discrimination against female relative, proportion witnessing	Mean	SD
prevented from attending social gatherings/activities	.06	.24
treated unfairly during menstruation	.13	.34
treated unfairly during post-partum	.21	.41
excluded from religious activities or places of worship	.09	.29
dismissed, suspended, or prevented from attending education institution	.01	.11
denied health services	.00	.07
treated unfairly in family activities	.22	.41
deprived of nutritious food	.02	.14
Exposure to discrimination against female relative, ct (0-8)	.75	1.23

# Composite Norm of Masculine Dominance

	Men (N = 1,693wt.)	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Composite norms of masculine dominance, ct (0-13)	4.47	2.86

# Nepal: 80 Communities

	Weighted Estimate	Obs. Range	# items
<b>Norms of masculine dominance</b> , avg. count	4.45	1.85 – 7.50	13
<b>Justifies IPV</b> , average count	.87	.00 – 2.77	7
<b>Patriarchal attitudes about gender roles</b> , average count	3.58	1.85 – 5.22	6
<b>VAW perpetration</b> , average count	.10	.00 – .78	4
<b>Exposure to gender discrimination of female relative</b> , average count	.76	.00 – 2.55	8
<b>Grades schooling</b> , mean yrs	4.91	.44 – 9.50	na
<b>HH wealth upper 2 quintiles (ref: lowest 3)</b> , mean %	40	.00 – 1.00	na
<b>District in Central Dvlpmnt Region (ref: other)</b> , mean %	50	.00 – 1.00	na

# Nepal: Multilevel Results

	VAWG	Patriarchal Attitudes: Gender & Phy IPV
L1–Witnessed gender discrimination of female relative	+	ns <sup>a</sup>
L2–Witnessed gender discrimination of female relative	-. <sup>a</sup>	ns
L2–Masculinity Norms	ns	+
L2–VAWG Perpetration	+	ns <sup>b</sup>
L1 ↑ Grades schooling	-	-
L1 ↑ Household wealth	n/a	-
L2 ↑ Grades schooling	+ <sup>a</sup>	+ <sup>a</sup>
L2 ↑ Household wealth	-	ns
L2 ↑ central dvlpmnt region	-	ns

Also controlled for L1 VAWG (ns) & L1 Attitudes (ns) as additional covariates

<sup>a</sup>unexpected result; schooling: VAWG Est.=.04(.02)\*; Attitudes Est= 01(.01)\*\*

<sup>b</sup>marginal significance Est.=05(.03)



# Qualitative Comparisons

Exposure	Place	IPV Justification	Controls Decisions	Patriarchal Attitudes	IPV/VAWG Perpetration
Level 1 Violence in Childhood	BGD:	Moderate	Moderate	n/a	Strong
	<b>NPL:</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>Moderate</b>
	PKN:	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 Norms Masc Dominance	BGD:	Strongest	Strongest	n/a	Strong
	<b>NPL:</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>None</b>
	PKN:	Strongest	Strongest	n/a	n/a
Level 2 IPV/VAWG Perpetration	<b>NPL:</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Strongest</b>

Notes: Comparisons are within-country only (across outcomes and between L1 & L2)

Scale: None, Weak, Moderate, Strong, Strongest

**L2 Exposure: IPV/VAW Perpetration only available for Nepal.**

# Limitations

- ▶ **X-sectional, Non-experimental**
- ▶ **Small sample limited confounders**
- ▶ **Linear relationships assumed**
- ▶ **Generalizability limited**
- ▶ **Under-reporting**
- ▶ **Wife attributes excluded**
- ▶ **Heterogeneity in norms in communities**
- ▶ **Data from 4 of 75 districts**
- ▶ **L2 variables created from same sample as L1 variables**
- ▶ **Perpetration & exposure items not specific to timeframe or relationship to respondent**
- ▶ **Differences across 3 datasets limited comparisons**
  - ▶ Source of data & sampling design
  - ▶ Participant characteristics
  - ▶ Availability, completeness, & wording of key items
  - ▶ Recoding dichotomous or counts



# Key Takeaways (1)

- ▶ **First comparative analysis of men's data across South Asia to assess multilevel influences on men's IPV justification, control in family decisions, and perpetration of IPV or VAW**
- ▶ **Confirms pervasiveness and persistence of:**
  - ▶ physical VAW and/or physical IPV
  - ▶ gender role restrictions, inequalities
  - ▶ masculine dominance/control, female subjugation
  - ▶ son preference



# Key Takeaways (2)

- ▶ **Multilevel ecological framework needed to conceptualize drivers, analyze data, and develop IPV prevention programs for men**
- ▶ Underscores joint influences of individual- and community-level exposures on men's attitudes about and treatment of women in marriage
- ▶ Potential to effect changes beyond the individual man, grapple with broader systemic factors



# Key Takeaways (3)

- ▶ **Effective IPV prevention with men may require a multilevel strategy**
  - ▶ Investment in norm change and recognition that family patriarchy harmful to boys, with cascading adverse effects on their future partners
  - ▶ Intervention early in life course, while attitudes and behaviour potentially more malleable
- ▶ **Older men in communities are key stakeholders for change**, potential role models, thereby altering injunctive and descriptive social norms



Thank you. Questions?

