

**Full Title:**

Effect of justification of wife-beating on experiences of intimate-partner violence among men and women in Uganda: A propensity matched scores approach

**Short Title:**

Justification of wife-beating on experiences of intimate-partner violence

**Damazo. T. Kadengye<sup>†</sup>, Jonathan Izudi, Elizabeth Kemigisha, Sylvia Kiwuwa-Muyingo**

African Population and Health Research Center (APHRC), Nairobi, Kenya.

<sup>†</sup> Corresponding author

Email: [dkadengye@aphrc.org](mailto:dkadengye@aphrc.org); [dkadengye@gmail.com](mailto:dkadengye@gmail.com) (DTK)

## Abstract

In some communities, rationalization of men's controlling attitudes are associated with justification of gender norms such as wife-beating as a method of correcting spouse behaviour. In this quasi-experimental study, we investigate the causal effects of acceptability of gender norms justifying wife-beating on experiences of sexual, emotional and physical intimate partner violence (IPV) among Ugandan men and women. We analysed the 2016 Uganda Demographic and Health Survey data using propensity-score matching. The exposure variable is acceptability of gender norms justifying wife-beating measured on binary scale and the outcomes are respondent's life-time experiences of sexual, physical, and emotional IPV. We matched respondents who accepted gender norms justifying wife-beating with those that do not using 1:1 nearest neighbor matching with a caliper to achieve comparability on selected covariates. We then estimated the causal effects of acceptability of gender norms justifying wife-beating on the study outcomes using a logistic regression model. Results showed that of the 4,821 (46.5%) out of 10,394 respondents who reported that a husband is justified in beating his wife for specific reasons, the majority (3,774; 78.3%) were women compared to men (1,047; 21.7%). We found that at population level, men and women who accept gender norms justifying wife-beating are about 1.5 times more likely to experience each of the three forms of IPV. In the sub-group analysis, men who justify wife-beating were more likely to experience emotional and physical IPV but not sexual IPV. However, women who justify wife-beating were more likely to report experiences all of the three forms of IPV. In conclusion, acceptability of gender norms justifying wife-beating has a positive effect on experiences of different forms of IPV by men and women in Uganda. Government should tackle the drivers of acceptability of gender norms justifying wife-beating at the societal level.

**Keywords:** Intimate partner violence; gender norms; wife-beating, physical violence; sexual violence; emotional violence.

# 1 Introduction

2 Intimate partner violence (IPV) which harms the victim's physical, sexual or psychological  
3 health, is an issue of grand proportion that reflects the unequal power dynamics created within  
4 the binary gender system and is often perpetrated by those with more physical, cultural, or social  
5 power and inflicted upon those without [1–3]. The 2018 global estimates based on data from  
6 2000–2018 indicate that, the lifetime prevalence of physical and/or sexual IPV among ever-  
7 married/partnered women aged 15–49 years was highest among the least developed countries  
8 with Oceania at 37%, Southern Asia, 35% and Sub-Saharan Africa at 33% [4]. Although estimates  
9 for men are rarely reported in the literature, a recent analysis of data from six East African  
10 countries shows that the prevalence of physical, sexual, emotional IPV against men is about half  
11 that of women [5].

12 Strong evidence exists that social norms about the roles and behavior of men and women  
13 contribute to an increased level of IPV in various low- and middle-income countries [3,6–8]. Given  
14 the importance of social norms such as male masculinity and female subordination in shaping  
15 acceptable behavior within communities, several programmes aimed at shifting norms and  
16 behavior around IPV have been implemented across Africa. In Uganda, the SASA! Project, a  
17 community mobilization project was designed and trialed between 2007 and 2012, to transform  
18 gender relations, power dynamics and reduced social acceptability of IPV [9,10]. This is in addition  
19 to a favorable policy environment including the introduction of the Domestic Violence Act of 2010,  
20 which aims to protect both men and women against gender-based violence.

21 Yet, the 2016 Uganda Demographic Health Survey (UDHS) shows that IPV prevalence  
22 remains very high, with 56% of ever-married women and 44% of ever-married men reporting to  
23 have ever experienced physical, sexual, or emotional violence by their current or most recent  
24 spouse/partner. Furthermore, about four in 10 women and men (both 39%) experienced IPV in

25 the 12 months preceding the survey [11]. In general, prevalence of the different forms of IPV  
26 (physical, sexual, or emotional) has generally remained high in Uganda over the last decade.  
27 Notably, there has been a stable and an unacceptably high prevalence of lifetime sexual IPV  
28 among ever-married Ugandan women, with estimates of 24.8% in 2006, 28% in 2011 and 22%  
29 in 2016 [11–13]. This could be a consequence of women’s perceived low status in many societies  
30 and men’s dominance over women which is enforced through sexual and physical violence [14].  
31 The close association of violence with masculinity has created a dangerous and unjust power  
32 dynamic that manifests in forms of violent physical, emotional, or psychological aggression and  
33 affects an alarming proportion of the population [2]. In some communities rationalization of men’s  
34 controlling attitudes are associated with justification of gender norms such as wife-beating [15],  
35 which may increase the risk of experiencing IPV [16,17].

36 In this paper, we investigate the causal effects of acceptability of gender norms justifying  
37 wife-beating on the experiences of sexual, emotional, or physical violence among Ugandan men  
38 and women using a quasi-experimental design with propensity-score matched (PSM) analysis.  
39 We use data from the 2016 Uganda Demographic and Health Survey (UDHS) data.

## 40 **Methods and Materials**

### 41 **Data source and study population**

42 We analyzed data from a nationally representative population-based household survey,  
43 the 2016 UDHS [11]. Data collection took place from 20 June to 16 December 2016. Inner City  
44 Fund provided technical assistance through the DHS Program, which is funded by the United  
45 States Agency for International Development (USAID) and offers financial support and technical  
46 assistance for population and health surveys in different countries worldwide.

47 The survey sample was stratified and selected in two stages. The first stage consisted of  
48 the selection of 697 enumeration areas: 162 urban and 535 rural. Due to land disputes, one cluster  
49 from the Acholi sub-region was excluded to ensure safety of enumerators. The second stage  
50 involved sampling of households within the clusters. This was achieved through a listing of all  
51 households within each of the 696 accessible selected enumeration areas between April and  
52 October 2016, with some listings overlapping with fieldwork. The survey drew maps for each of  
53 the sampled clusters and then listed all the households but institutional living arrangements,  
54 namely army barracks, hospitals, police camps, and boarding schools were all excluded.

55 To minimize the task of household listing, each large enumeration area yielding more than  
56 300 households selected for the survey was segmented, and one segment was selected for the  
57 survey with probability proportional to segment size, and the household listing was conducted  
58 within the segment. The implication is that a cluster suggests an enumeration area or a segment  
59 of an enumeration area. Overall, a representative sample that consisted of 20,880 households  
60 corresponding to 30 per enumeration area or a segment of enumeration area was randomly  
61 selected for the survey. All women aged 15-49 who were either permanent residents of the  
62 selected households or visitors who stayed in the household the night before the survey were  
63 eligible to be interviewed. In one-third of the sampled households, all men aged 15-54, including

64 both usual residents and visitors who stayed in the household the night before the interview, were  
65 eligible for individual interviews. Data were collected using four questionnaires: the household,  
66 women, men, and the biomarker questionnaires. Detailed procedures on sampling and  
67 methodology are available in the 2016 UDHS report [11].

68 The 2016 UDHS included a domestic violence module in all sampled households.  
69 Following the World Health Organization's (WHO) guidelines on the ethical collection of  
70 information on domestic violence, only one eligible person per household was randomly selected  
71 for the module which was implemented in privacy. In two-thirds of households, one woman aged  
72 15-49 was randomly selected to receive the domestic violence module as part of her interview. In  
73 the remaining one-third of the households, one man aged 15-54 was randomly selected to receive  
74 the domestic violence module as part of his interview. In total, 9,232 women aged 15-49 and  
75 4,011 men aged 15-54 (3,758 men aged 15-49) responded to the domestic violence questions.  
76 One percent of eligible women and men could not be successfully interviewed with the module  
77 because of lack of privacy or other reasons.

## 78 **Study design**

79 We employed a quasi-experimental design with propensity score matched (PSM) analysis  
80 using data from all respondents in the 2016 UDHS who responded to the domestic violence  
81 module. The rationale behind the use of PSM analysis is to achieve balance in participant  
82 characteristics between two groups [18], a group that reported gender norms justifying wife-  
83 beating is acceptable (exposed) versus a group that reported it as not acceptable (non-exposed  
84 group). Balancing of participant characteristics controls for selection bias and the confounding of  
85 the association between the exposure and the outcome [19], thus mimicking a randomized  
86 controlled trial (RCT) [20].

## 87 **Variables and measurements**

### 88 **Exposure**

89           The exposure of interest was acceptance of gender norms justifying wife-beating, with the  
90 exposed group being respondents reporting that is acceptable and the non-exposed group  
91 reporting that it is not acceptable. During the 2016 UDHS, both women and men were asked to  
92 report whether or not beating one's wife was justified under the following five circumstances: 1)  
93 Wife goes out without telling husband; 2) Wife neglects the children; 3) Wife argues with husband;  
94 4) Wife refuses to have sex with husband; and, 5) Wife burns the food. The justification of wife-  
95 beating was computed as the percentage of all women and men aged 15-49 who agree that a  
96 husband is justified in beating his wife under the above five circumstances.

### 97 **Outcomes**

98           The study outcomes included life-time experiences of sexual, physical, and emotional  
99 violence with the most recent intimate partner. Respondents who answered 'yes' to any of the  
100 provided questions were considered to have experienced IPV. More specifically, violence  
101 committed by the current spouse/partner (for currently married women and men) and by the most  
102 recent spouse/partner (for formerly married women and men) was measured by asking all ever-  
103 married women and men if their spouse/partner ever did the following to them:

- 104           • Physical IPV: Push you, shake you, or throw something at you; slap you; twist your arm  
105           or pull your hair; punch you with his/her fist or with something that could hurt you; kick you,  
106           drag you, or beat you up; try to choke you or burn you on purpose; or threaten or attack  
107           you with a knife, gun, or any other weapon.
- 108           • Sexual IPV: Physically force you to have sexual intercourse with him/her even when you  
109           did not want to, physically force you to perform any other sexual acts you did not want to,

110 or force you with threats or in any other way to perform sexual acts you did not want to.

- 111 • Emotional IPV: Say or do something to humiliate you in front of others or threaten to hurt  
112 you.

## 113 **Covariates**

114 We extracted background characteristics of each respondent to be included in the  
115 statistical analyses as covariates, namely sex (male or female), age group (15-19, 20-24, 25-29,  
116 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, and 50-54), level of education (none/no education, primary,  
117 secondary, and higher), marital status (never in union, currently in union, and formerly in union),  
118 number of living children, wealth index (poorest, poorer, middle, richer, and richest), religion (no  
119 religion, Anglican, Catholic, Muslim, Seventh Day Adventist, Pentecostal, and others), and the 15  
120 regions in Uganda (Kampala, Central 1, Central 2, Busoga, Bukedi, Bugishu, Teso, Karamoja,  
121 Lango, Acholi, West Nile, Bunyoro, Tooro, Ankole, and Kigezi). These covariates are known to  
122 either influence the outcome or the exposure of interest and were selected as potential  
123 confounders as appropriate for the assumptions of strong ignorability of treatment assignment or  
124 unconfoundedness [21].

## 125 **Data analysis**

126 All data management and analysis was done in Stata version 15 [22]. To measure the  
127 effect of acceptability of gender norms justifying wife-beating on experiences of sexual, physical,  
128 and emotional violence, we used PSM analysis to create a counterfactual, a comparison group  
129 that was identical to the comparison group [21]. We used a logit model to generate propensity  
130 scores by regressing the exposure on the matching covariates and assessed the initial balance  
131 in propensity scores and covariates between the exposed and non-exposed groups by splitting  
132 the sample into equally spaced intervals [18]. We used the Student's t-test within each interval to  
133 assess statistically significant differences in the average propensity scores between the groups.

134 The intervals were divided further in instances where we observed statistically significant  
135 differences and then re-tested until such differences were removed. The degree of overlap of  
136 propensity scores and balance in covariates was checked using a propensity score graph.

137 We then matched the exposed and non-exposed respondents on similar propensity scores  
138 using several approaches: pair matching with and without replacement, nearest neighbor  
139 matching with and without a caliper, and kernel matching in order to select the most appropriate  
140 approach with balance [23]. In pair matching, we matched respondents in the exposed group with  
141 that in the non-exposed group regardless of the quality of the matches. In nearest neighbor  
142 matching without a caliper, the respondents were matched based on similar propensity scores  
143 regardless of the distance/width within which the matching was implemented. However, in nearest  
144 neighbor matching within a caliper, the respondents were matched within a distance/width known  
145 as a caliper computed as 20% of the standard deviation of the propensity score in a 1:1 ratio to  
146 prevent bias from distant matches [18]. In Kernel matching, the weighted average of all the  
147 respondents in the non-exposed group was used to construct the missing counterfactual outcome  
148 to enable the use of more data and produce fewer differences. Of all these approaches, we  
149 selected the most appropriate one based on the balance of all covariates across the exposed and  
150 non-exposed groups and significant reduction in propensity score pseudo R-square value. We  
151 assessed covariate balance after matching and considered covariates with a standardized mean  
152 difference (SMD) of less than 0.25 as balanced.

153 We saved the matched dataset and used it for outcome analysis, where we fitted a  
154 conditional logistic regression analysis for the outcomes taking into consideration the matched  
155 pairs. We reported the results odds ratios with a 95% confidence interval.

156 We checked the robustness of the results to unmeasured confounders and the analytic  
157 approach using the Mantel-Haenszel (MH) bounds approach proposed by Rosenbaum, with

158 distant gamma values to achieve statistical significance or insignificance considered indicative of  
159 robust findings [24], using the Stata command “*mhbound*”.

## 160 **Ethics statement**

161 We conducted secondary data analysis using the 2016 Uganda Demographic Health  
162 Survey de-identified data that is publicly available and requires no ethical approvals. However,  
163 permission to use these data was obtained from the Demographic and Health Surveys division at  
164 ICF International through completion of an online request form that is available on the DHS  
165 website (<http://www.dhsprogram.com>) from where the data was downloaded. As such, no ethical  
166 reviews and approvals were required before or during the preparation of the present manuscript.  
167 Further, informed consent was not required during preparation of this paper because there was  
168 no interaction with human subjects during preparation of this manuscript. The 2016 UDHS was  
169 implemented by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics [11].

## 170 **Results**

### 171 **Distribution of participant characteristics**

172 Table 1 shows the distribution of covariates across the exposure of interest namely, a  
173 husband is justified in beating his wife for specific reasons. Of the 10,394 respondents, 46.5 %  
174 (4, 821) reported that a husband is justified in beating his wife for specific reasons. The majority  
175 of those who justified wife-beating were females (78.3%), those aged 20-24 years (20.9%), those  
176 with a primary level of education (65.8%), and those who were currently in union or living with a  
177 partner (86.4%). Further, there were statistically significant differences in sex, age, level of  
178 education, wealth index, religion, and controlling behaviour.

179 **Table 1. Distribution of participant characteristics**

Variable	Overall (n=10,363)	Wife-beating is justified		p-value
		No (n=5,542)	Yes (n = 4,821)	
<b>Sex</b>				
Male	2,846 (27.5)	1,799 (32.5)	1,047 (21.7)	<0.001
Female	7,517 (72.5)	3,743 (67.5)	3,774 (78.3)	
<b>Age group</b>				
15-19	557 ( 5.4)	228 ( 4.1)	329 ( 6.8)	<0.001
20-24	1,945 (18.8)	939 (16.9)	1,006 (20.9)	
25-29	2,077 (20.0)	1,126 (20.3)	951 (19.7)	
30-34	2,068 (20.0)	1,155 (20.8)	913 (18.9)	
35-39	1,475 (14.2)	800 (14.4)	675 (14.0)	
40-44	1,161 (11.2)	679 (12.3)	482 (10.0)	
45-49	855 ( 8.3)	469 (8.5)	386 (8.0)	
50-54	225 ( 2.2)	146 (2.6)	79 (1.6)	
Mean (SD)	31.8 (8.7)	32.4 (8.7)	31.1 (8.8)	
<b>Level of education</b>				
No education	1,242 (12.)	547 ( 9.9)	695 (14.4)	<0.001
Primary	6,260 (60.4)	3,086 (55.7)	3,174 (65.8)	
Secondary	2,049 (19.8)	1,270 (22.9)	779 (16.2)	
Higher	812 (7.8)	639 (11.5)	173 ( 3.6)	
<b>Marital status</b>				
Currently in union	8,999 (86.8)	4,833 (87.2)	4,166 (86.4)	0.230
Formerly in union	1,364 (13.2)	709 (12.8)	655 (13.6)	
<b>Number of living children</b>				
≤2	3,800 (36.7)	2,088 (37.7)	1,712 (35.5)	0.074
3-5	4,130 (39.9)	2,176 (39.3)	1,954 (40.5)	
≥6	2,433 (23.5)	1,278 (23.1)	1,155 (24.0)	
Mean (SD)	3.8 (2.7)	3.8 (2.7)	3.8 (2.6)	
<b>Wealth index</b>				
Poorest	2,469 (23.8)	1,075 (19.4)	1,394 (28.9)	<0.001
Poorer	2,214 (21.4)	1,077 (19.4)	1,137 (23.6)	
Middle	2,002 (19.3)	1,054 (19.0)	948 (19.7)	
Richer	1,866 (18.0)	1,108 (20.0)	758 (15.7)	
Richest	1,812 (17.5)	1,228 (22.2)	584 (12.1)	
<b>Religion</b>				
No religion	24 ( 0.2)	14 ( 0.3)	10 ( 0.2)	<0.001
Anglican	3,316 (32.0)	1,854 (33.5)	1,462 (30.3)	
Catholic	4,324 (41.7)	2,139 (38.6)	2,185 (45.3)	
Muslim	1,222 (11.8)	668 (12.1)	554 (11.5)	
Seventh Day Adventist	145 ( 1.4)	104 ( 1.9)	41 ( 0.9)	
Pentecostal	1,200 (11.6)	673 (12.1)	527 (10.9)	

Variable	Overall	Wife-beating is justified		p-value
Others	132 (1.3)	90 ( 1.6)	42 ( 0.9)	
Place of residence				
Urban	2,106 (20.3)	1,326 (23.9)	780 (16.2)	<0.001
Rural	8,257 (79.7)	4,216 (76.1)	4,041 (83.8)	
Partner has a controlling behavior				
No	2,822 (27.2)	1,782 (32.2)	1,040 (21.6)	<0.001
Yes	7,541 (72.8)	3,760 (67.8)	3,781 (78.4)	
Region				
Kampala	527 (5.1)	373 (6.7)	154 ( 3.2)	<0.001
Central1	863 (8.3)	500 (9.0)	363 ( 7.5)	
Central2	850 (8.2)	449 (8.1)	401 ( 8.3)	
Busoga	889 (8.6)	544 (9.8)	345 (7.2)	
Bukedi	662 (6.4)	280 (5.1)	382 (7.9)	
Bugishu	596 (5.8)	300 (5.4)	296 (6.1)	
Teso	668 (6.4)	266 (4.8)	402 ( 8.3)	
Karamoja	427 (4.1)	134 (2.4)	293 ( 6.1)	
Lango	734 (7.1)	333 (6.0)	401 ( 8.3)	
Acholi	654 (6.3)	300 (5.4)	354 ( 7.3)	
West Nile	727 (7.0)	313 (5.6)	414 ( 8.6)	
Bunyoro	675 (6.5)	472 (8.5)	203 (4.2)	
Tooro	722 (7.0)	424 (7.7)	298 (6.2)	
Ankole	802 (7.7)	456 (8.2)	346 (7.2)	
Kigezi	567 (5.5)	398 (7.2)	169 ( 3.5)	

## 180 **Covariate balance before and after PSM**

181 Overall, we matched 8,284 respondents in the ratio of 1:1, and Table 2 shows the  
182 distribution in covariates after PSM. Before matching, systematic differences in the justification of  
183 wife-beating were observed in all the covariates (standardized percentage bias before matching  
184 >5%), except the number of living children, wealth index, and religion. After PSM, all the  
185 covariates demonstrated no systematic difference across justification of wife-beating. Since all  
186 the standardized percentage biases for the covariates were <5%, this signifies a good covariate  
187 balance. We also observed at least a 75% drop in pseudo-R-square value (0.057 to 0.014), which  
188 is a large decline suggesting a good covariate balance was achieved.

## 189 **Distribution of outcomes before and after matching PSM**

190           In Table 3, we summarized the distribution of respondents' experiences of different forms  
191 of IPV (outcomes) by the justification of wife-beating (exposure). Overall, there was a statistically  
192 significant difference in the study outcomes, namely life-time experiences of sexual, physical, and  
193 emotional IPV by the justification of wife-beating. Before PSM, 1,156 (24.0%) respondents who  
194 justified wife-beating had experienced sexual IPV; 2,126 (44.1%) had experienced physical IPV,  
195 and 2,262 (46.9%) had experienced emotional IPV. After PSM, the data show that 978 (23.6)  
196 respondents experienced sexual IPV, 1,767 (42.7) had experienced physical IPV and 1,934 (46.7)  
197 had experienced emotional IPV. This indicates that there are no major differences in the overall  
198 proportions of respondents' experiences of different forms of IPV before and after PSM.

199 **Table 2. Covariate balance before and after PSM**

Variable	Mean		SPB*
	Treated	Control	
Sex			
Unmatched	0.78	0.68	24.4
Matched	0.75	0.75	-0.1
Age in 5-year groups			
Unmatched	3.83	4.08	-14.6
Matched	3.94	3.91	2.1
Level of education			
Unmatched	31.13	32.40	-14.6
Matched	31.71	31.53	2.1
Marital status			
Unmatched	1.09	1.36	-36.7
Matched	1.18	1.16	3.5
Number of living children			
Unmatched	1.14	1.13	2.3
Matched	1.14	1.13	0.9
Wealth index			
Unmatched	1.88	1.85	4
Matched	1.88	1.87	1.7
Religious affiliation			
Unmatched	3.81	3.80	0.4
Matched	3.84	3.79	1.9
Place of residence			
Unmatched	2.59	3.06	-34
Matched	2.79	2.74	3.8
Region			
Unmatched	2.31	2.39	-5
Matched	2.37	2.35	1.1
Partner has a controlling behavior			
Unmatched	1.84	1.76	19.4
Matched	1.82	1.83	-1.9

200 **Note:** Standardized percentage bias (SPB) <5% signifies balance in covariate.

201 **Table 3. Number of respondents (%) reporting experiences of IPV before and after matching PSM**

Experiences of IPV	Before PSM				After PSM			
	Overall (n=10,363)	Justify wife-beating		P-value	Overall (n=8,284)	Justify wife-beating		P-value
		No (n=5,542)	Yes (n=4,821)			No (n=4,142)	Yes (n=4,142)	
Sexual IPV								
No	8,422 (81.3)	4,757 (85.8)	3,665 (76.0)	<0.001	6,667 (80.5)	3,501 (84.5)	3,164 (76.4)	<0.001
Yes	1,941 (18.7)	785 (14.2)	1,156 (24.0)		1,617 (19.5)	641 (15.5)	978 (23.6)	
Physical IPV								
No	6,655 (64.2)	3,960 (71.5)	2,695 (55.9)	<0.001	5,222 (63.0)	2,856 (69.0)	2,375 (57.3)	<0.001
Yes	3,708 (35.8)	1,582 (28.5)	2,126 (44.1)		3,062 (37.0)	1,286 (31.0)	1,767 (42.7)	
Emotional IPV								
No	6,182 (59.7)	3,623 (65.4)	2,559 (53.1)	<0.001	4,883 (58.9)	2,687 (64.9)	2,208 (53.3)	<0.001
Yes	4,181 (40.3)	1,919 (34.6)	2,262 (46.9)		3,401 (41.1)	1,455 (35.1)	1,934 (46.7)	

202

## 204 **Effect of justification of wife-beating on experiences of IPV**

205            Logistic regression estimates after PSM in Table 4 show that, justification of wife-beating  
206 is associated with higher chances of experiencing different forms of IPV both for men and women.  
207 Specifically, both men and women respondents combined, are about 1.6 times more likely to  
208 experience sexual IPV (OR, 1.67; 95% CI, 1.49-1.87), emotional IPV (OR, 1.63; 95% CI, 1.49-  
209 1.78), and physical IPV (OR, 1.69; 95% CI, 1.54-1.86) for those who justify wife-beating compared  
210 to those who do not.

211            Findings of sub-group analysis are also presented in Table 4. Men who justified wife-  
212 beating were about twice as more likely to experience emotional (OR, 2.27; 95% CI, 1.69-3.04),  
213 and physical (OR, 1.92; 95% CI, 1.35-2.72) IPV when compared to those who did not justify wife-  
214 beating. Further, men who justify wife-beating are about 1.5 times more likely to experience  
215 sexual IPV (OR, 1.45; 95% CI, 0.92-2.29) compared to those who do not justify wife-beating.  
216 Similarly, women who justify wife-beating were about 1.5 times more likely to experience all the  
217 three forms of IPV: sexual (OR, 1.67; 95% CI, 1.46-1.91), emotional (OR, 1.42; 95% CI, 1.27-  
218 1.60), and physical (OR, 1.65; 95% CI, 1.46-1.85), when compared to those who did not justify  
219 wife-beating.

## 220 **Sensitivity analysis**

221            The Mantel-Haenzel bounds analysis showed that a Gamma value of 1.55 was required  
222 for a shift from a statistically significant value to a statistically non-significant value. Since a large  
223 Gamma value was required to attain statistical non-significance in the Mantel-Haenzel bounds,  
224 the implication is that the findings are robust to unmeasured confounders and analytic  
225 approaches.

226 **Table 4. Odds ratio estimates of the effect of justification of wife-beating on experiences**  
227 **of different forms of IPV**

<b>Experiences of IPV</b>	<b>Odds Ratio (95% CI)</b>
<b>Both men and women combined</b>	
Sexual violence (ref = No)	1.67 (1.49-1.87)** *
Emotional violence (ref = No)	1.63 (1.49-1.78)***
Physical violence (ref = No)	1.69 (1.54-1.86)***
<b>Sub group analysis</b>	
Sexual violence(ref = No)	
Males	1.45 (0.92-2.29)
Females	1.67 (1.46-1.91)***
Emotional violence (ref = No)	
Males	2.27(1.69-3.04)***
Females	1.42(1.27-1.60)***
Physical violence(ref = No)	
Males	1.92(1.35-2.72)***
Females	1.65(1.46-1.85)***

228 **Note:** Statistical significance: \* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001

## 229 **Conclusions and Discussions**

230 Gender-based violence (GBV) of any form perpetrated against a woman or girl, man or  
231 boy harms their physical, sexual or psychological health [4,25]. In this paper, we investigated the  
232 causal effects of acceptability of gender norms justifying wife-beating on the life-time experiences  
233 of sexual, emotional, or physical intimate partner violence (IPV) among Ugandan men and women  
234 using a quasi-experimental design with propensity-score matched (PSM) analysis. We analyzed  
235 data from the 2016 Uganda Demographic and Health Survey (UDHS) data.

236 Results show that the acceptance of gender norms justifying wife-beating increases the  
237 likelihood of experiencing sexual, emotional, and physical IPV in the general population – both  
238 form men and women. In the sub-group analysis, women who accepted gender norms justifying  
239 wife-beating experienced all the three forms of IPV: sexual, emotional, and physical violence  
240 when compared to those women who did not justify justifying wife-beating. For men, justification  
241 of wife-beating was associated with an increased likelihood of experiencing emotional and  
242 physical violence when compared to those men who did not justify wife-beating. However,  
243 whereas the odds of experiencing sexual IPV was higher among men justifying wife-beating  
244 compared to those who did not justify, the difference was not statistically significant. The finding  
245 of an increased odds of experiencing of sexual, emotional, and physical IPV among people who  
246 accept gender norms justifying wife-beating might be explained by two plausible reasons. First,  
247 gender norms are acquired through socialization during the transition from childhood to adulthood.  
248 Recent studies conducted in Uganda show that tendencies to have inequitable gender attitudes  
249 including justification of wife-beating can be traced in early adolescence [26] and tend to increase  
250 with age [27]. Studies have also report that people who experience violence in childhood find it  
251 normal to accept violence as a disciplinary measure and tend to become either victims or  
252 perpetrators of gender based violence, or both. The effects of childhood experiences of gender-  
253 based violence suffices in adulthood especially in marriage [28,29]. Second, cultural beliefs or

254 societal justification of gender-based violence even exacerbates the problem. For instance,  
255 certain cultures justify dating and marital rape while in other cultural settings, intimate love is  
256 intricately linked to legitimization of IPV [30,31]. In addition, certain women feel loved if they are  
257 either abused or beaten by their spouses as a corrective measure for their faults. In addition,  
258 patriarchal norms that support male dominance and power control may further drive IPV [32].

259 Results further showed that women who justify wife-beating experience all the three forms  
260 of violence compared to those who do not justify wife-beating. Conversely, men who justify wife-  
261 beating experience merely physical and emotional violence but not sexual violence compared to  
262 those who do not justify wife-beating. This finding is in agreement with earlier studies in SSA that  
263 report IPV is more prevalent in women than men for various reasons, namely neglect of family  
264 responsibilities such as childcare, travelling away from home without informing a husband, or  
265 being disrespectful towards the spouse. Another likely explanation could be since sexual violence  
266 is largely perpetrated by men, in instances where it is perpetrated by women through for example  
267 denial of sex or forced sex, the men generally tend to not report for fear of shame and  
268 disempowerment or emasculation [33,34].

269 Generally in most settings, being a man means being tough, brave, aggressive, and  
270 invulnerable, consequently, the need to appear invulnerable reduces men's willingness to seek  
271 help or treatment for physical or mental health problems, and in turn this contributes to lower rates  
272 of safer sex and health-seeking behaviour [1]. Although evidence for the effectiveness of  
273 programs like SASA! to shift gendered norms, attitudes, and beliefs related to IPV is growing  
274 [9,10], their potential to significantly impact the occurrence of IPV in a general population still  
275 requires rigorous evaluation for several reasons. Firstly, findings from these IPV prevention  
276 trials/programs primarily rely on self-reported changes in gendered social beliefs and norms  
277 among members of neighborhoods where the programs are being implemented. This measure  
278 can be strongly influenced by social desirability bias. Second, rates of justifying wife-beating have

279 been used as indicators for the prevalence of IPV at the community level. However, changes in  
280 this measure at a community level do not inform the extent to which it translates to a reduction of  
281 IPV at the population level [3]. Understanding these facets is important to inform future  
282 interventions, national policy, and development partners about whether the investment is  
283 worthwhile or not, and whether such changes can translate to real reductions in IPV.

284 Some limitations in this study include reliance of the analytic technique on observed  
285 covariates and the lack of qualitative data to contextualize the findings. Further, the exposure and  
286 outcomes were assessed by self-reports implying that the possibility of social desirability bias  
287 cannot be excluded. However, a key strength from our study is that we analyzed a large and  
288 nationally representative dataset, implying that the findings are generalizable to the entire country  
289 and other similar settings. Secondly, we applied a robust study design and analytic approach to  
290 measure unbiased cause-effect relationships using observational data, implying that results are  
291 robust to unmeasured confounders and analytic technique.

292 In conclusion, findings from this study show that the risk of experiencing IPV is high among  
293 both women and men who accept gender norms justifying wife-beating than among those who do  
294 not. There is, therefore, a need to tackle the drivers of gender norms justifying wife-beating at the  
295 societal level.

## 296 Funding

297 No specific funding was obtained by the authors for preparation of this manuscript.

## 298 Acknowledgements

299 We wish to acknowledge the Ministry of Health of Uganda and Demographic Health  
300 Survey program, who granted us access to use the DHS data. This manuscript preparation and  
301 statistical data analysis were carried out, during an Impact Evaluation Training Workshop as part  
302 of the "Contextualizing IE Pedagogy in Africa (CIPA) project" a joint initiative between the Centre  
303 for Global Challenges based in Utrecht University (UU) and the Network of Impact Evaluation  
304 Researchers in Africa (NIERA) based at the United States International University (USIU-Africa).

## 305 References

- 306 1. Greene ME, Levack A. Synchronizing gender strategies: A cooperative model for improving  
307 reproductive health and transforming gender relations. [Internet]. Washington, DC: Population  
308 Reference Bureau; 2010 [cited 2017 Dec 5]. Available from:  
309 [http://www.prb.org/igwg\\_media/synchronizing-gender-strategies.pdf](http://www.prb.org/igwg_media/synchronizing-gender-strategies.pdf)
- 310 2. Tsapalas D, Parker M, Ferrer L, Bernales M. Gender-Based Violence, Perspectives in Latin America  
311 and the Caribbean. *Hisp Health Care Int* [Internet]. 2021 Mar [cited 2022 May 3];19(1):23–37.  
312 Available from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1540415320924768>
- 313 3. Kadengye DT, Iddi S, Hunter L, McCoy SI. Effectiveness of Potential Interventions to Change  
314 Gendered Social Norms on Prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence in Uganda: a Causal Inference  
315 Approach. *Prev Sci* [Internet]. 2019 Oct [cited 2020 Feb 9];20(7):1043–53. Available from:  
316 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11121-019-01010-8>
- 317 4. World Health Organization [WHO]. Violence against women prevalence estimates, 2018: Global,  
318 regional and national prevalence estimates for intimate partner violence against women and  
319 global and regional prevalence estimates for non-partner sexual violence against women  
320 [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021 [cited 2022 May 4]. Available from:  
321 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/341337>
- 322 5. Kiwuwa-Muyingo S, Kadengye DT. Prevalence and Risk Factors for Women's Reports of Past-Year  
323 Intimate Partner Violence: A Comparative Analysis of Six East African National Surveys. *J Interpers  
324 Violence* [Internet]. 2020 Nov 1 [cited 2022 May 4];088626052096937. Available from:  
325 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0886260520969374>

- 326 6. Devries KM, Mak JYT, Garcia-Moreno C, Petzold M, Child JC, Falder G, et al. The global prevalence  
327 of intimate partner violence against women. *Science* [Internet]. 2013 Jun 28 [cited 2017 Nov  
328 9];340(6140):1527–8. Available from:  
329 <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/doi/10.1126/science.1240937>
- 330 7. Shakya HB, Hughes DA, Stafford D, Christakis NA, Fowler JH, Silverman JG. Intimate partner  
331 violence norms cluster within households: an observational social network study in rural  
332 Honduras. *BMC Public Health* [Internet]. 2016 Dec [cited 2017 Nov 10];16(1). Available from:  
333 <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/16/233>
- 334 8. Tsai AC, Kakuhikire B, Perkins JM, Vořechovská D, McDonough AQ, Ogburn EL, et al. Measuring  
335 personal beliefs and perceived norms about intimate partner violence: Population-based survey  
336 experiment in rural Uganda. Jewkes R, editor. *PLOS Med* [Internet]. 2017 May 23 [cited 2017 Nov  
337 10];14(5):e1002303. Available from: <http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002303>
- 338 9. Abramsky T, Devries KM, Kiss L, Nakuti J, Kyegombe N, Starmann E, et al. Findings from the SASA!  
339 Study: a cluster randomized controlled trial to assess the impact of a community mobilization  
340 intervention to prevent violence against women and reduce HIV risk in Kampala, Uganda. *BMC  
341 Med* [Internet]. 2014 Dec [cited 2017 Nov 10];12(1). Available from:  
342 <http://bmcmmedicine.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12916-014-0122-5>
- 343 10. Kyegombe N, Starmann E, Devries KM, Michau L, Nakuti J, Musuya T, et al. ‘SASA! is the medicine  
344 that treats violence’. Qualitative findings on how a community mobilisation intervention to  
345 prevent violence against women created change in Kampala, Uganda. *Glob Health Action*.  
346 2014;7:25082.
- 347 11. Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS), ICF International. Uganda Demographic and Health Survey  
348 2016 [Internet]. Kampala, Uganda and Rockville, Maryland, USA: UBOS and ICF; 2018 [cited 2018  
349 Mar 20]. Available from: <http://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR333/FR333.pdf>
- 350 12. Uganda Bureau of Statistics [UBOS], ICF International. Uganda Demographic and Health Survey  
351 2011 [Internet]. Kampala, Uganda: UBOS and ICF International; 2012 [cited 2017 Sep 3]. Available  
352 from: <http://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-fr264-dhs-final-reports.cfm>
- 353 13. Uganda Bureau of Statistics [UBOS], Macro International. Uganda Demographic and Health Survey  
354 2006 [Internet]. Calverton, Maryland, USA: UBOS and Macro International; 2007. Available from:  
355 <http://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR194/FR194.pdf>
- 356 14. Greene ME, Barker G. Masculinity and its public health implications for sexual and reproductive  
357 health and HIV prevention. In: *Routledge handbook of global public health*. Routledge; 2010. p.  
358 225–33.
- 359 15. Sunmola AM, Mayungbo OA, Ashefor GA, Morakinyo LA. Does Relation Between Women’s  
360 Justification of Wife Beating and Intimate Partner Violence Differ in Context of Husband’s  
361 Controlling Attitudes in Nigeria? *J Fam Issues* [Internet]. 2020 Feb [cited 2022 Sep 24];41(1):85–  
362 108. Available from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0192513X19868831>
- 363 16. Bukuluki P, Kisaakye P, Wandiembe SP, Musuya T, Letiyo E, Bazira D. An examination of physical  
364 violence against women and its justification in development settings in Uganda. Atiqul Haq SM,

- 365 editor. PLOS ONE [Internet]. 2021 Sep 29 [cited 2022 Sep 24];16(9):e0255281. Available from:  
366 <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255281>
- 367 17. Speizer IS. Intimate Partner Violence Attitudes and Experience Among Women and Men in  
368 Uganda. J Interpers Violence [Internet]. 2010 Jul [cited 2022 Sep 24];25(7):1224–41. Available  
369 from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0886260509340550>
- 370 18. Staffa SJ, Zurakowski D. Five Steps to Successfully Implement and Evaluate Propensity Score  
371 Matching in Clinical Research Studies: Anesth Analg [Internet]. 2018 Oct [cited 2022 May  
372 4];127(4):1066–73. Available from: <http://journals.lww.com/00000539-201810000-00037>
- 373 19. Garrido MM, Kelley AS, Paris J, Roza K, Meier DE, Morrison RS, et al. Methods for Constructing and  
374 Assessing Propensity Scores. Health Serv Res [Internet]. 2014 Oct [cited 2022 May 4];49(5):1701–  
375 20. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1475-6773.12182>
- 376 20. Okoli GN, Sanders RD, Myles P. Demystifying propensity scores. Br J Anaesth [Internet]. 2014 Jan  
377 [cited 2022 May 4];112(1):13–5. Available from:  
378 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0007091217319645>
- 379 21. Harris H, Horst SJ. A Brief Guide to Decisions at Each Step of the Propensity Score Matching  
380 Process. Pract Assess Res Eval [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2022 May 4];21(1):4. Available from:  
381 <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/pare/vol21/iss1/4/>
- 382 22. StataCorp LLC. Stata data analysis and statistical Software: Release 15. [Internet]. College Station,  
383 TX: StataCorp LP; 2017. Available from: <https://www.stata.com>
- 384 23. Liu Y, Zumbo B, Gustafson P, Huang Y, Kroc E, Wu A. Investigating causal DIF via propensity score  
385 methods. Pract Assess Res Eval [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2022 May 4];21(1):13. Available from:  
386 <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/pare/vol21/iss1/13/>
- 387 24. Olmos A, Govindasamy P. A practical guide for using propensity score weighting in R. Pract Assess  
388 Res Eval [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2022 May 4];20(1):13. Available from:  
389 <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/pare/vol20/iss1/13>
- 390 25. Arefaynie M, Bitew G, Amsalu ET, Kefale B, Muche A, Fentaw Z, et al. Determinants of wife-beating  
391 acceptance among reproductive age women in Ethiopia: a multilevel analysis of 2016 Ethiopian  
392 demographic and health survey. BMC Womens Health [Internet]. 2021 Dec [cited 2022 May  
393 3];21(1):342. Available from:  
394 <https://bmcwomenshealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12905-021-01484-1>
- 395 26. Vu L, Pulerwitz J, Burnett-Zieman B, Banura C, Okal J, Yam E. Inequitable Gender Norms From Early  
396 Adolescence to Young Adulthood in Uganda: Tool Validation and Differences Across Age Groups. J  
397 Adolesc Health [Internet]. 2017 Feb [cited 2022 Sep 24];60(2):S15–21. Available from:  
398 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1054139X16303767>
- 399 27. Kemigisha E, Nyakato V, Bruce K, Ndaruhutse Ruzaaza G, Mlahagwa W, Ninsiima A, et al.  
400 Adolescents' Sexual Wellbeing in Southwestern Uganda: A Cross-Sectional Assessment of Body  
401 Image, Self-Esteem and Gender Equitable Norms. Int J Environ Res Public Health [Internet]. 2018  
402 Feb 22 [cited 2022 Sep 24];15(2):372. Available from: <http://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/15/2/372>

- 403 28. Whitfield CL, Anda RF, Dube SR, Felitti VJ. Violent Childhood Experiences and the Risk of Intimate  
404 Partner Violence in Adults: Assessment in a Large Health Maintenance Organization. *J Interpers*  
405 *Violence* [Internet]. 2003 Feb [cited 2022 Sep 24];18(2):166–85. Available from:  
406 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0886260502238733>
- 407 29. Madruga CS, Viana MC, Abdalla RR, Caetano R, Laranjeira R. Pathways from witnessing parental  
408 violence during childhood to involvement in intimate partner violence in adult life: The roles of  
409 depression and substance use: Pathways of witnessing parental violence. *Drug Alcohol Rev*  
410 [Internet]. 2017 Jan [cited 2022 Sep 24];36(1):107–14. Available from:  
411 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/dar.12514>
- 412 30. Sjödin J. “If your husband doesn’t beat you, he doesn’t love you” : A qualitative study about the  
413 work of change regarding Intimate Partner Violence in Nairobi, Kenya. [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2022  
414 Sep 24]. Available from: <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:umu:diva-161975>
- 415 31. Lelaurain S, Fonte D, Giger JC, Guignard S, Lo Monaco G. Legitimizing Intimate Partner Violence:  
416 The Role of Romantic Love and the Mediating Effect of Patriarchal Ideologies. *J Interpers Violence*  
417 [Internet]. 2021 Jul [cited 2022 Sep 24];36(13–14):6351–68. Available from:  
418 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0886260518818427>
- 419 32. Waltermaurer E. Public Justification of Intimate Partner Violence: A Review of the Literature.  
420 *Trauma Violence Abuse* [Internet]. 2012 Jul [cited 2022 Sep 24];13(3):167–75. Available from:  
421 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1524838012447699>
- 422 33. Uthman OA, Lawoko S, Moradi T. Factors associated with attitudes towards intimate partner  
423 violence against women: a comparative analysis of 17 sub-Saharan countries. *BMC Int Health Hum*  
424 *Rights* [Internet]. 2009 Dec [cited 2022 Sep 24];9(1):14. Available from:  
425 <https://bmcinthealthhumrights.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-698X-9-14>
- 426 34. Hlavka HR. Speaking of Stigma and the Silence of Shame: Young Men and Sexual Victimization.  
427 *Men Masculinities* [Internet]. 2017 Oct [cited 2022 Sep 24];20(4):482–505. Available from:  
428 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1097184X16652656>