



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
Center for Global Health Practice and Impact

Couple's report men's perpetration and women's experience of IPV: an analysis of discordant reporting in Rwanda and Senegal

SVRI 2024

Georgetown University:

Plan International US:

Plan International Rwanda:

Plan International Senegal:

Anjalee Kohli, Bryan Shaw, Jiaqin Wu

Christina Yantis, Erin Degraw

Lameck Habumugisha, Jean Lambert Sebarezze

Fatou Yate Gueye, Mor Lo, M.Badiene

Partnerships **PLUS**



Background

Few studies have examined agreement (i.e., concordance) on the occurrence of male-to-female IPV in intimate relationships

Among studies of concordance:

- Discordant reporting of IPV occurrence is common
- Women report greater experience of IPV than men report perpetrating
- Men report their IPV perpetration more often in relationships where women report IPV occurring with less frequency
- Some studies show men report sexual coercion or physical IPV more than women

Research Objectives

- Explore the patterns of concordance and discordance in couples' reports of male-to-female psychological, physical, and sexual IPV in the past three months
- Explore whether sociodemographic factors were associated with couples' concordant reporting of IPV vs. discordant reporting of IPV

Research Methods

- **Survey:** Baseline data from REAL Fathers evaluation as part of the Gender Transformative Programming for Advancing Care for Children in Adversity
- **Location & Population:**
 - (1) 330 couple dyads in Southeastern Senegal;
 - (2) 315 couple dyads in Southern and Eastern Rwanda
- **Eligibility criteria (men)**
 - 18-30 years (Rwanda); 18-35 years (Senegal)
 - Married or living with a female partner of 18+ years
 - At least one child aged 5 or less
 - Commitment to participating in the REAL Fathers Program
 - Resident of the selected village

Research Methods

- **Community Advisory Board** to review protocol and procedures
- **Local Advisory Committee** composed of respected women & focused on planning and risk mitigation
- **IRB Approvals:** Georgetown University (USA), Rwanda National Ethics Committee (Rwanda), National Ethics Committee for Health Research (Senegal)

Measures

- **Psychological, physical, and sexual IPV** (WHO measures)
 - Any IPV: 3-month recall
 - Frequency: 1-month recall
- **Acceptability** of IPV (DHS measure, 6 items)
- **Descriptive IPV norms** (2 items)
- **Injunctive IPV norms** (2 items)
- **Other variables:** relationship quality, quarreling frequency, male engagement in household chores, age, education, marital status, number of children, household food security, men's alcohol consumption

Data Analysis

- **Concordance Definitions**
 - Discordance: Female partner only reports IPV*
 - Concordance: Both men and women report IPV*
 - Discordance: Male partner only reports IPV
 - Concordance: No IPV
- **Bivariate and multivariate logistic regression** to look at the relationship between men's socio-demographic factors and discordance (female partner only reports IPV)
- **Chi Square test** to compare proportions between concordant and discordant couples

Results: Patterns of concordance and discordance

	ANY IPV	Physical IPV	Sexual IPV	Psych. IPV
Rwanda (N=315)				
Concordance: IPV	18%	10%	3%	9%
Discordance: female partner only reports IPV	28%	21%	18%	19%
Discordance: male partner only reports IPV	8%	5%	6%	10%
Concordance: No IPV	46%	64%	73%	63%
Senegal (N=330)				
Concordance: IPV	16%	5%	1%	11%
Discordance: female partner only reports IPV	32%	25%	23%	28%
Discordance: male partner only reports IPV	9%	6%	6%	6%
Concordance: No IPV	43%	64%	71%	55%

Results: Patterns of concordance and discordance

	ANY IPV	Physical IPV	Sexual IPV	Psych. IPV
Rwanda (N=315)				
Concordance: IPV	18%	10%	3%	9%
Discordance: female partner only reports IPV	28%	21%	18%	19%
Discordance: male partner only reports IPV	8%	5%	6%	10%
Concordance: No IPV	46%	64%	73%	63%
Senegal (N=330)				
Concordance: IPV	16%	5%	1%	11%
Discordance: female partner only reports IPV	32%	25%	23%	28%
Discordance: male partner only reports IPV	9%	6%	6%	6%
Concordance: No IPV	43%	64%	71%	55%

Bivariate Regression: Odds of Discordant Reporting

*Discordant (Women report IPV & men don't report IPV) vs. Concordant (men & women report IPV occurs)

	Higher odds of discordant reporting		Lower odds of discordant reporting	
	Rwanda	Senegal	Rwanda	Senegal
Having 3+ children (vs. 1 child)				X
Attitudes that IPV is sometimes acceptable			X	X
Men drink alcohol more often			X	X
Male considers relationship to be very good	X	X		
Descriptive norms that IPV is common			X	X
Injunctive norms that it is acceptable for men to use IPV				X
Uses coercive behaviors	X			

Rwanda: Odds of Discordant vs. Concordant Reporting

	aOR	95% CI	p-value
Perceived relationship quality			
Bad or not good	-	-	-
Fairly good	4.92	[0.45, 53.78]	0.192
Very good	22.99	[1.78, 295.24]	0.016
IPV Attitudes			
IPV always unacceptable	-	-	-
IPV sometimes acceptable	0.21	[0.06, 0.67]	0.008
Descriptive Norms – Men beat their wives in this community			
No one does this	--	--	--
Some people do this	0.47	[0.14, 1.57]	0.218
Most people do this	0.09	[0.01, 0.56]	0.010

Other factors: age, marital status, education, number of children, food insecurity, alcohol consumption, male engagement: household chores, coercive behaviors, injunctive norms

Senegal: Odds of Discordant vs. Concordant Reporting

	aOR	95% CI	p-value
Coercive Behaviors			
None	-	-	-
Any coercive behaviors	0.36	[0.14, 0.96]	0.042
IPV Attitudes			
IPV always unacceptable	-	-	-
IPV sometimes acceptable	0.28	[0.08, 0.95]	0.041
Food Insecurity in Past Month			
Never	--	--	--
Once or twice	0.25	[0.06, 0.96]	0.044
Three or more times	0.66	[0.17, 2.48]	0.535

Other factors: age, marital status, education, number of children, alcohol consumption, perceived relationship quality, male engagement: household chores, descriptive and injunctive norms

Is there a relationship between concordance of IPV reports & IPV frequency (as reported by women)?

Mean frequency of IPV (women's report) vs. men's concordance and discordance

	Women's report of mean IPV frequency					
	Rwanda			Senegal		
	Concordance	Discordance	p-val.	Concordance	Discordance	p-val.
Any IPV	0.39	0.41	0.726	0.16	0.25	0.307
Physical IPV	0.25	0.29	0.659	0.17	0.26	0.291
Sexual IPV	0.32	0.31	0.854	0.17	0.23	0.617
Emotional IPV	0.64	0.67	0.792	0.16	0.24	0.331

Key Findings

- Concordance is most common when men and women report no IPV occurrence
- Discordant IPV reporting (only women report) is greater than concordant reporting of IPV occurrence
- Discordant IPV reporting is common for all types of IPV
- Men who consider IPV acceptable have greater odds of concordant IPV reports (both men and women report IPV)

Limitations

- **Measures**

- This analysis used a short recall period (>3 months). IPV occurrence likely higher with a longer recall
- Given the short recall period (<3 months), the IPV measures do not capture IPV frequency well

- **Participants**

- Men who have agreed to participate in a fatherhood program – risk of social desirability bias
- Women's reports may be affected by men's participation in fatherhood program, i.e., they may be concerned whether men will know their reports

Conclusions

- Discordant reporting shows some IPV underreporting (especially with men)
- Future research: why do men and women report male-to-female IPV differently?
 - Do IPV norms affect IPV reporting in surveys?
 - Does relationship quality or social desirability affect how men and women recall violence in their relationships?
 - What motivates or causes men to underreport IPV perpetration?
- Programming:
 - Entry points to working with men: positive programming, gender & power vs. violence
 - For violence prevention, how important is it that report their past violence to prevent future violence?

Thank you

This presentation was made possible through the generous support of the American people through the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) under Partnerships Plus cooperative agreement number 7200AA18CA00032, funded September 28, 2018, and implemented by JSI Research and Training Institute, Inc. in partnership with Plan International and Georgetown University. The information provided is not official U.S. Government information and does not represent the views or positions of the U.S. Agency for International Development or the U.S. Government.