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Study

- cRCT testing norms & experience of IPV
- 3 districts, 36 communities
- Repeated cross sectional surveys (N=1440)
- Quantitative cohort of 360 female LDG participants
- Qualitative cohort of
  - 18 couples
  - 120 family members
  - 30 leaders
- Radio listener feedback
- Process evaluation
Measuring Norms

- Literature review
  - Domains
  - Item structure

- Formative research
  - Focus group discussions
  - Key informant interviews
  - Pilot testing
Baseline Qualitative Findings

- Acceptability of violence/use of force
- Family honor & women’s expected role in maintaining that through silence
- Family roles and dynamics
- Gender related role expectations
- Dowry
- Sexuality and sexual entitlement
- Family privacy
Reference Groups & Sanctions

- **Reference Group:** Mostly family, although this issue is difficult to discern exactly from broad FGD questions.

- **Sanctioner:**
  - Elders: mother in laws, and other older family and community members

- **Sensitivity to Sanctions:** varied widely based on individual and particular role or topic
  - R: He washes the clothes, takes them to the terrace to dry them, and cooks food. He also washes the dishes despite what the community says.
  - I: Exactly, why should he listen to what the community says for that?
  - R: There are some people in this community who call him names for that, and accuse him of doing women’s work.
  - I: How do you feel when people talk like that?
  - R: I feel like there is nothing wrong in that, it’s between two husband and wife. We should be working together. It does not matter what anybody else says.
## Partner Violence Norms Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>None %</th>
<th>Some %</th>
<th>Most/All %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A husband who helps his wife with the household chores will not be respected by his family</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man who makes important decisions jointly with his wife will be considered a weak man by his family</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man’s family will think he is a disloyal son if he takes his wife’s opinion over his mother’s opinion</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A woman who openly expresses her sexual desires to her husband is perceived to be vulgar</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands may use force to reprimand their wives because men should be in control of their families</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A woman who complains about her husband’s violent behavior is considered a disloyal wife by her in-laws</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A woman who does not tolerate violence from her husband is dishonoring her family and should not be welcomed home</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who intervenes when a woman is being beaten by her husband would be considered to be interfering or meddling in the couple’s private affairs</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scale Psychometrics

- **Dimensionality**
  - EFA
    - 1 factor
      - RMSEA 0.13 (0.12, 0.14)
      - CFI = 0.96
    - 2 factors
      - RMSEA 0.06 (0.05, 0.07)
      - CFI = 0.99

- **7-item measure**
  - RMSEA = 0.074 (0.063, 0.084)
  - CFI = 0.99
  - TLI = 0.98

- **Reliability**
  - Coefficient alpha = 0.88

Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Factor</th>
<th>2 Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chores</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td><strong>0.75</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td><strong>0.93</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complain</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerate</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norms and IPV

Community
- Financial Stress
- Injunctive Norms

Individual
- Caste
- Education
- Financial Stress
- Communication
- Quarreling
- Alcohol
- Witnessing IPV
- Normative expectations
Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion of sanction / reference group in item could be wrong for some</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norms reference groups differ and may be more expansive for men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t have strong data on sensitive to the norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t have strong data on conditional preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a ton of data to speak to norms, but have to mine it from less intentional approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have data on women’s attitudes not men’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

• Complete Endline March 2018

• More intensively examine:
  • Social norms reference groups and their relevance for intervention development
  • Diffusion processes at the LDG and community levels
• Theoretical underpinnings?

• What label to put on the norms measures at the individual and community levels?

• Should caste/ethnicity also be included as norms underpinning women’s risk of IPV?

• Omitted or erroneous norms constructs underpinning women’s risk of IPV in Nepal?

• Other questions???????
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