

Does domestic violence legislation reduce permissive attitudes about intimate partner violence? Longitudinal evidence from men and women from 61 countries.

Robin A Richardson,¹ Alexandria R Hadd,^{1,2} Nuria Rodriguez-Planas,³ Katjana Wiederkehr,⁴ Farheen Jamshed,⁴ Tarik Benmarhnia,⁵ Cari Jo Clark²

¹Department of Epidemiology, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University

²Hubert Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University

³City University of New York (CUNY), Queens College

⁴Department of Epidemiology, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University

⁵Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California San Diego

Keywords: domestic violence legislation; attitudes about intimate partner violence; gender-based violence; difference-in-differences; policy evaluation; Demographic and Health Surveys; Women, Business, and the Law database

ABSTRACT

Background: Intimate partner violence (IPV) is highly prevalent and has substantial implications for women's health. Changing IPV attitudes is one pathway to reduce IPV. While evidence suggests that interventions targeting individuals may change IPV attitudes, the effect of wider-scale interventions, such as legislation, remain unknown.

Methods: We used individual-level IPV attitudes information collected between 1997 and 2020 by the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) and the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS), which we linked with national-level domestic violence (DV) legislation information. We evaluated the effect of adoption of DV legislation on changes in IPV attitudes using a difference-in-differences study design that controlled for time-varying country-level confounding and accounted for staggered timing of legislation adoption.

Findings: Our sample included 2,184,047 women from 60 countries and 390,877 men from 40 countries. After controlling for country-level confounders, adoption of DV legislation reduced IPV acceptability among women (average treatment effect among treated (ATT) = -0.07, 95% CI: -0.16, 0.06) and men (ATT = -0.11, 95% CI: -0.22, 0.03) although estimates were imprecise and included the null.

Interpretation: DV legislation may reduce permissive IPV attitudes, especially among men, although conclusions should be interpreted cautiously due to imprecise estimates.

Funding: Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (5R00HD104896).

PUTTING RESEARCH INTO CONTEXT

Evidence before this study

Ecological models identify attitudes about intimate partner violence (IPV) as an important driver of IPV. Almost all empirical research has focused on individual-level determinants of permissive IPV attitudes, and the effect of large-scale factors, including domestic violence (DV) legislation, is not well known. We performed a search in Google Scholar, PubMed, SCOPUS, PsycINFO, and Web of Science, without language restrictions, using search terms relevant to DV legislation (e.g., DV law, IPV legislation, etc.) and IPV attitudes (e.g., intimate partner violence beliefs, attitudes on wife beating, perception about acceptability of violence, etc.). The terminal date of this search was May 23, 2023. We also searched reference lists of relevant studies to widen our search. We found two papers that estimated the association between DV legislation and IPV attitudes, both of which investigated multiple individual and contextual risk factors simultaneously using cross-sectional data from a large selection of low- and middle-income countries (i.e., 41 and 49 countries). Both studies found no association between DV legislation and IPV attitudes among women (first study) or among men and women (second study).

Added value of this study

The present study is the first longitudinal assessment of DV legislation on changing IPV attitudes. Prior research was cross-sectional and investigated many determinants simultaneously, which may obscure specific relationships (e.g., by over-controlling for factors that are consequences of changes in IPV attitudes, such as women's household decision-making) and cannot establish temporal ordering (e.g., if countries with less permissive attitudes about IPV enacted legislation vs. if legislation reduced permissive IPV attitudes). Using comprehensive longitudinal data from men and women from 61 countries, coupled with a difference-in-differences study design that accounts for inherent differences across countries, the present study provides the most rigorous evidence to-date of this relationship.

Implications for all available evidence

We found that DV legislation resulted in modest reductions in permissive IPV attitudes among women and slightly more pronounced reduction in permissive IPV attitudes among men, although estimates were imprecise. Given that the majority of IPV is perpetrated by men, coupled with the fact that IPV attitudes is a strong predictor of IPV perpetration, our results suggest that DV legislation may be one strategy to reduce IPV. However, estimates were imprecise, and more research is needed to confirm this relationship. Future research could replicate findings in additional countries and could clarify this relationship among men by exploring specific aspects of DV legislation that may be most relevant for changing IPV attitudes (e.g., criminal sanctions) or evaluate if DV legislation is only effective in the presence of other contextual factors (e.g., equitable gender norms, government institutions with high levels of democracy).

INTRODUCTION

Intimate partner violence (IPV), highly prevalent in all regions of the world,¹ is widely acknowledged as a major threat to women's health and well-being. The ecological model of IPV posits that causes operate on many different levels, ranging from the individual to societal,² and development schemes have accordingly proposed prevention efforts that confront factors on multiple levels.^{2,3} For example, a newly proposed framework to prevent violence against women put forth by the United Nations and the World Health Organization (RESPECT) suggests a suite of comprehensive interventions targeting individuals (e.g., changing attitudes about violence against women), relationships (e.g., improving conflict management), communities (e.g., creating safe work environments), and structures (e.g., availability of legal and social services for survivors of violence).³

Despite the conceptual and development focus on confronting causes of IPV on many levels, empirical research has primarily focused on evaluating factors experienced at the individual or relational level, with few studies focused on larger-scale factors. A 2018 systematic review of longitudinal studies investigating determinants of IPV found 60 studies that evaluated 71 risk and protective factors, but only 7 of these factors were at the community level and none were at the structural level.⁴ Lack of evidence on these broader levels is a critical research gap that limits evidence-informed decision-making about which structural interventions may work, and which may not, to prevent IPV.

Domestic violence (DV) legislation, adopted in over 100 countries since the year 2000,⁵ may transform ideas about IPV attitudes by signaling the unacceptability of violence on a societal level. IPV attitudes are sensitive to various community and structural interventions,⁶⁻¹⁰ offering promising evidence that DV legislation may also affect IPV attitudes. Such changes in IPV attitudes may have substantial implications for IPV: permissive attitudes about IPV is a major risk factor for both IPV perpetration¹¹⁻¹⁶ and victimization^{11, 16-22} and has been identified as a risk factor for IPV in the ecological model.² However, to-date only two exploratory studies have investigated the effect of DV legislation on IPV attitudes. These two studies used population-based data from low- and middle-income countries to estimate the cross-sectional association between multiple individual and contextual risk factors simultaneously, finding no overall association between DV legislation and IPV attitudes among men²³ or women.^{23, 24} However, the lack of observed associations in these studies could be a result of investigating many determinants simultaneously, which may obscure relationships (e.g., by over-controlling for factors that are consequences of changes in IPV attitudes, such as women's household decision-making), and cannot establish temporal ordering (e.g., if countries with less permissive attitudes about IPV enacted legislation vs. if legislation reduced permissive IPV attitudes). Longitudinal evidence isolating the effect of distinct determinants would provide stronger evidence for (or against) this relationship.

In this study, we help clarify this relationship. Using national-level policy data from the World Bank, linked with individual-level information from the Demographic and Health Surveys and the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys, we evaluate the longitudinal association between adoption of DV legislation and changes in attitudes about the acceptability of IPV among men and women. This work uses data over a 23-year period from 2.6 million adults from 61 countries and assesses the differential impact of the policy among specific demographic groups, providing a comprehensive assessment of the impact of DV legislation.

METHODS

Study Population

Our study used individual-level IPV attitudes data from the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) and the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS). The DHS is a repeated cross-sectional survey, typically administered every 5 years, that collects information from reproductive age women and men in over 100 low- and middle-income countries. Similarly, the MICS is a repeated cross-sectional survey that has been administered in over 100 countries since the mid-1990s to reproductive age women and men. The MICS and DHS survey designers collaborate closely to produce comparable, harmonized information, which can be combined to produce global datasets.²⁵ Standardized questions about IPV attitudes were first introduced in the DHS around 1997 and in the MICS around 2005, although administration of the DHS and the MICS, including the selection of specific questions and study participants, was at each countries' discretion. Therefore, IPV attitudes information was not collected each survey round in all countries, and additionally some countries chose to collect information from only men or women, whereas other countries collected information from both. Therefore, we restricted our sample to countries that collected information about IPV attitudes from men or women in at least two survey rounds and had not adopted DV legislation before the study period (i.e., before 1997). Our final sample included repeated cross-sectional information from 60 countries for the women's sample and from 40 countries for the men's sample. We further restricted our sample to participants who were currently or formerly married because some countries did not administer surveys to individuals who had never been married. Both the DHS and the MICS are population-based surveys that select men and women through a multistage sampling procedure, and we applied the weights supplied by the MICS and DHS to derive a longitudinal panel of nationally representative estimates of currently or formerly married men and women.

Study Measures

Domestic violence (DV) legislation

Yearly country-level DV legislation information came from the World Bank's Women, Business and the Law (WBL) database.⁵ This database was created by WBL staff by surveying professionals with knowledge of local laws (e.g., judges, lawyers, academics, and non-governmental organizations providing gender-related services) about the presence of DV legislation and any amendments to existing law. WBL staff reviewed texts of relevant laws and regulations in each country to verify existence of two aspects of DV legislation: 1) protective orders for victims of domestic violence, and 2) criminal sanctions against domestic violence perpetrators, and they then classified countries fulfilling either criteria as having DV legislation and countries that offered neither as not having legislation.⁵ Major strengths of this database include confirmation of presence of legislation through review of source documents, and the application of the same criteria across time and countries. To our knowledge, this is the only DV legislation database that provides consistent information across time and country.

Attitudes about intimate partner violence (IPV)

Attitudes about the acceptability of IPV were captured in the DHS and the MICS by asking men and women if they believe a husband is justified beating his wife in five specific scenarios: 1) if a wife goes out without telling her husband, 2) if a wife neglects the children, 3) if a wife argues with her husband, 4) if a wife refuses to have sex with her husband, or 5) if a wife burns the food. For each question, response options include “agree”, “disagree”, or “don’t know”. We classified a person as having permissive attitudes about IPV if they selected “agree” to at least one of the five scenarios. We aggregated responses to the year and country level using sampling weights provided by the DHS and the MICS, thus providing prevalence estimates representative at the country-level.

County-level control variables

Country-level information that may predict adoption of DV legislation and may also affect IPV attitudes were considered potential confounders. Variables include: female labor force participation rates (% of women aged 15 or older in the labor force, provided by the International Labour Organization²⁶), literacy rates (% of people aged 15 or older who can read and write, provided by the World Bank²⁷), educational attainment gap between men and women (% of men with at least a primary education minus % of women with at least a primary education, calculated from data provided by the World Bank²⁷), and gross domestic product (log) (per capita values for gross domestic product expressed in current international dollars converted by purchasing power parity conversion factor and expressed on the natural logarithm scale, provided by the World Bank²⁷). Within countries, data was missing for some years. In these instances, we used linear interpolation to estimate missing values in models stratified by country.

Analytic Approach

We evaluated the effect of DV legislation on men and women’s attitudes about IPV using a difference-in-differences (DID) approach, a common method to estimate the causal effect of a policy change on health. This approach follows units (e.g., countries) over time, some that experienced a policy change (“treatment group”) and some that never adopted a policy (“control group”). Many countries recently adopted DV legislation,⁵ offering a unique opportunity to use this strong study design to evaluate policy effects.

We used a specialized DID estimation procedure, called the fixed effects counterfactual estimator,²⁸ that is designed for repeated cross-sectional data and staggered adoption of policy adoption. The fixed effects counterfactual estimator uses an estimation procedure that compares each treated country with its predicted untreated counterfactual, takes the difference between the two to estimate the treatment effect, and then averages these estimated differences to derive the average treatment effect on the treated (ATT).

Statistical Analysis

We performed analyses with a panel data setup that modeled changes within countries over time. Models controlled for country fixed effects, included a binary variable indicating presence or absence of national-level

DV legislation (exposure), and controlled for time-varying country-level confounders, including female labor force participation rate, literacy rate, educational attainment gap between men and women, and gross domestic product (log). Because the estimation procedure used in this analysis (fixed effects counterfactual estimator) uses time since treatment adoption to match treated units with their estimated counterfactual, time since treatment adoption was also accounted for. Due to the relatively small number of treatment units, variances were estimated using a bootstrap procedure.

Contextual factors affect men and women's IPV attitudes differently,²³ and therefore we estimated separate effects in sex-stratified models. In addition, we hypothesized that certain demographic groups may be more affected by DV legislation, including younger adults (because they may be more impressionable or more flexible/ready to change their minds), those with higher educational attainment (because they may be more likely to have knowledge of legislation and may have the means to leverage the new law, if needed), and those living in urban areas (because legislation may be more robustly enacted in this setting). Therefore, in additional analyses we estimated effects among specific demographic groups within sex stratum, including by age (15 – 29 years, 30-40 years, and 41 years or older), educational attainment (primary education or less, secondary education or higher), and location (urban, rural). We formally tested heterogeneity among demographic groups with Cochran's Q test.²⁹

Role of the funding source

The funder of the study had no role in the study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or the writing of the report.

RESULTS

Our study included 2,184,047 women from 60 countries and 390,877 men from 40 countries. Table 1 shows the sample size in each country and the percentage of men and women who believed IPV is justified. Prevalence of the acceptability of IPV was high in our sample among both men (28.0%) and women (43.7%), although prevalence ranged considerably across countries and years. Among men, acceptability ranged from 5.0% in Malawi (in 2014) to 85.1% in Timor-Leste (in 2009), and among women, from 2.1% in Serbia (in 2019) to 94.0% in Afghanistan (in 2011).

Many countries adopted DV legislation over the study period. Among the women's sample, 39 of 60 countries adopted legislation (Figure 1), and among the men's sample, 25 of 40 countries adopted legislation (Figure 2). There was a strong correlation between presence of DV legislation and lower prevalence of permissive IPV attitudes among both men ($r = -.28$) and women ($r = -.23$).

Figures 3 and 4 show results of the longitudinal analysis evaluating the effect of adoption of DV legislation on changes in IPV attitudes using a DID study design. We found that DV legislation resulted in a 7% reduction in the prevalence of permissive IPV attitudes among women (ATT = -0.07, 95% CI: -0.16, 0.06) and an 11% reduction among men (ATT = -0.11, 95% CI: -0.22, 0.03), after controlling for country-level confounders. However,

estimates were imprecise and included the null value. Unadjusted models showed stronger and more precise effects among women (18% reduction in prevalence) (Figure 3), with adjustment for GDP (log) producing the greatest attenuation on women's effect size. Among men, unadjusted and adjusted estimates had similar effect sizes, although adjusted estimates were more imprecise (Figure 4).

In additional analyses stratified by specific demographic groups hypothesized to be more affected by DV legislation (i.e., urban, younger, or more educated adults) (Figures 3 & 4), we found that effects did not differ among demographic groups in either the men or women's sample, as indicated by Cochran's Q test ($p > 0.5$ for all tests within demographic groups).

DISCUSSION

Development schemes to reduce IPV have strongly emphasized confronting structural determinants, yet empirical evidence on which factors prevent IPV are lacking.⁴ This study helps fill this crucial evidence gap by leveraging longitudinal country-level information, coupled with an innovative, rigorous estimation strategy, to evaluate the effect of one structural factor identified as a major determinate of IPV: men and women's IPV attitudes. This work provides the most comprehensive assessment to-date of the relationship between DV legislation and permissive IPV attitudes. We found that adoption of DV legislation corresponded to a 7% reduction in the prevalence of permissive IPV attitudes among women and an 11% reduction in prevalence among men. While these results suggest legislation may lead to meaningful reductions in IPV attitudes, estimates were imprecise and confidence intervals included the null, precluding firm conclusions.

The imprecision of estimates, despite a fairly large sample size, may suggest substantial effect heterogeneity due to various contextual factors (e.g., IPV norms, status of women) that may amplify or diminish the effect of DV legislation. The 'sticky norms problem' posits that when legislation deviates substantially from norms, judges, police officers, juries, and community members will be less likely to enforce, implement, or support the law, resulting in less effective legislation.³⁰ For example, in the US, mandatory arrest laws for perpetrators of DV were not universally adopted due to the belief among some police departments that DV was a relationship issue and not criminal matter,³¹ and extreme laws addressing other social issues, including polygamy and inheritance rights for women, were found to be less effective than more moderate laws that align more closely with local norms.³² Accordingly, DV legislation may only be effective in environments where legislation aligns with local norms about violence against women. In addition, the presence of multiple structural factors may be necessary to substantially change IPV attitudes, such as structural determinants that may act upon IPV attitudes more broadly by changing perceptions about women's role in society (e.g., policies to promote women's economic empowerment) or promote women's freedom from violence (e.g., perceptions about the acceptability of divorce). While our study design, a modified difference-in-differences approach, allowed us to rigorously isolate the effect of DV legislation, this approach has limited ability to estimate the joint effect of multiple contextual or structural factors because estimating joint effects requires grouping countries by these additional factors (e.g., the effect of adoption of DV legislation among countries with high permissive IPV attitudes). Given the relatively small number of countries in this study, stratified analyses investigating additional country characteristics was not feasible. Future studies that include more countries, or estimate effects within geographic regions within individual countries, could clarify the influence of contextual environments on DV legislation.

Our study has limitations. First, our study used presence or absence of DV legislation, and this broad measure did not capture granular information about the degree of implementation or the comprehensiveness of enacted legislation. Integrating this information into our evaluation could clarify if DV legislation is effective in specific scenarios. We are not aware of longitudinal databases that systematically collect this information across time and countries, and the creation of new datasets that collect aspects of DV legislation (e.g., criminal sanctions, civil penalties) longitudinally would open up new opportunities to rigorously evaluate the effect of specific aspects of DV legislation. Second, changes in IPV attitudes may occur slowly over time, and the relatively short period of follow-up after adoption of legislation in our study (on average, the women's and men's sample included 5.5 years of follow-up) may not allow enough time to detect changes. Thus, future research with more years of follow-up could confirm the relationships observed in this study. Third, the psychometric properties of the IPV attitudes questions used in this study may vary across time or country. These differences may be a potential source of study bias, and a psychometric assessment of these measures could be an additional area of future research. Fourth, our study used data from a selected group of low- and middle-income countries that had information from at least two DHS or MICS surveys, and among these selected countries, our estimation strategy did not use information from countries that always had DV legislation. Thus, the study population was composed of a selected group of countries, and results may not be generalizable to countries beyond this subset.

Despite these limitations, our work provides the most comprehensive assessment to-date on the link between DV legislation and women and men's IPV attitudes. Understanding specific pathways that may result in reductions in violence – at the individual, relational, community, and structural level – is imperative to effectively reduce violence. Our work helps fill this evidence gap by clarifying the role of one structural determinant, DV legislation, on changing IPV attitudes. Future research could investigate structural determinants that act more broadly upon gender equitable attitudes, which may reveal new pathways for reducing permissive IPV attitudes.

Contributors

RAR conceptualized the study and wrote the first draft of the report.

RAR, NRP, and TB contributed to the study design.

ARH, KW, and RAR constructed harmonized datasets.

ARH and RAR conducted statistical analysis.

ARH, RAR, CJC, and NRP contributed to the interpretation of results.

FJ and RAR conducted the literature review.

FJ and ARH contributed to the writing of the report.

All authors provided critical feedback of manuscript drafts, and reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

Declaration of interests

We declare that we have no competing interests.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (5R00HD104896). We thank Lori Heise for providing comments on an earlier paper draft.

References

1. Devries KM, Mak JYT, García-Moreno C, et al. The global prevalence of intimate partner violence against women. *Science*. June 28, 2013 2013;340(6140):1527-1528. doi:10.1126/science.1240937
2. Heise L. *What Works to Prevent Partner Violence ? An Evidence Overview*. 2011. <http://strive.lshtm.ac.uk/resources/what-works-prevent-partner-violence-evidence-overview>
3. UN Women & Social Development Direct. *Overview: How to Use the RESPECT Framework Implementation Guide*. 2020.
4. Yakubovich AR, Stöckl H, Murray J, et al. Risk and protective factors for intimate partner violence against women: systematic review and meta-analyses of prospective-longitudinal studies. *Am J Public Health*. Jul 2018;108(7):e1-e11. doi:10.2105/ajph.2018.304428
5. World Bank Group. *Women, Business and the Law 2021*. 2021.
6. Omidakhsh N, Heymann J. Improved child marriage laws and its association with changing attitudes and experiences of intimate partner violence: A comparative multi-national study. *Journal of Global Health*. 2020-06-01 2020;10(1)doi:10.7189/jogh.10.010707
7. Pronyk PM, Hargreaves JR, Kim JC, et al. Effect of a structural intervention for the prevention of intimate-partner violence and HIV in rural South Africa: A cluster randomised trial. *The Lancet*. 2006-12-01 2006;368(9551):1973-1983. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(06)69744-4
8. Gupta J, Falb KL, Lehmann H, et al. Gender norms and economic empowerment intervention to reduce intimate partner violence against women in rural Côte d'Ivoire: A randomized controlled pilot study. *BMC Int Health Hum Rights*. Nov 1 2013;13:46. doi:10.1186/1472-698x-13-46
9. Kim JC, Watts CH, Hargreaves JR, et al. Understanding the impact of a microfinance-based intervention on women's empowerment and the reduction of intimate partner violence in South Africa. *Am J Public Health*. Oct 2007;97(10):1794-802. doi:10.2105/ajph.2006.095521
10. Usdin S, Scheepers E, Goldstein S, Japhet G. Achieving social change on gender-based violence: A report on the impact evaluation of Soul City's fourth series. *Soc Sci Med*. Dec 2005;61(11):2434-45. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.04.035
11. Alio AP, Clayton HB, Garba M, Mbah AK, Daley E, Salihu HM. Spousal concordance in attitudes toward violence and reported physical abuse in African couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2011;26(14):2790-2810. doi:10.1177/0886260510390951
12. Stith S, Smith D, Penn C, Ward D, Tritt D. Intimate partner physical abuse perpetration and victimization risk factors: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*. 2006;10(1):65-8.
13. Ali PA, Naylor PB. Intimate partner violence: A narrative review of the feminist, social and ecological explanations for its causation. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*. 2013/11/01/ 2013;18(6):611-619. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2013.07.009>
14. Flood M, Pease B. Factors influencing attitudes to violence against women. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. 2009-04-01 2009;10(2):125-142. doi:10.1177/1524838009334131
15. Guoping H, Yalin Z, Yuping C, Momartin S, Ming W. Relationship between recent life events, social supports, and attitudes to domestic violence: predictive roles in behaviors. *J Interpers Violence*. May 2010;25(5):863-76. doi:10.1177/0886260509336959
16. Khawaja M, Linos N, El-Roueiheb Z. Attitudes of men and women towards wife beating: Findings from Palestinian refugee camps in Jordan. *Journal of Family Violence*. 2008/04/01 2008;23(3):211-218. doi:10.1007/s10896-007-9146-3
17. Alan Dikmen H, Gönenç I. The relationship between domestic violence and the attitudes of women towards honor, gender roles, and wife-beating in Turkey. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*. 07/01 2020;34doi:10.1016/j.apnu.2020.07.012
18. Faramarzi M, Esmailzadeh S, Mosavi S. A comparison of abused and non-abused women's definitions of domestic violence and attitudes to acceptance of male dominance. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*. Oct 1 2005;122(2):225-31. doi:10.1016/j.ejogrb.2004.11.047

19. Lawoko S. Factors associated with attitudes toward intimate partner violence: a study of women in Zambia. *Violence Vict.* Oct 2006;21(5):645-56.
20. Sayem AM, Begum HA, Moneesha SS. Attitudes towards justifying intimate partner violence among married women in Bangladesh. *J Biosoc Sci.* Nov 2012;44(6):641-60. doi:10.1017/s0021932012000223
21. Abramsky T, Watts CH, Garcia-Moreno C, et al. What factors are associated with recent intimate partner violence? Findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *BMC Public Health.* 2011-12-01 2011;11(1):109. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-11-109
22. Shakya HB, Cislighi B, Fleming P, et al. Associations of attitudes and social norms with experiences of intimate partner violence among married adolescents and their husbands in rural Niger: a dyadic cross-sectional study. *BMC Womens Health.* May 18 2022;22(1):180. doi:10.1186/s12905-022-01724-y
23. Sardinha L, Nájera Catalán HE. Attitudes towards domestic violence in 49 low- and middle-income countries: A gendered analysis of prevalence and country-level correlates. *PLOS ONE.* 2018-10-31 2018;13(10):e0206101. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0206101
24. Hayes BE, Boyd KA. Influence of individual- and national-level factors on attitudes toward intimate partner violence. *Sociological Perspectives.* 2017;60(4):685-701. doi:10.1177/0731121416662028
25. Hancioglu A, Arnold F. Measuring coverage in MNCH: tracking progress in health for women and children using DHS and MICS household surveys. *PLoS Med.* 2013;10(5):e1001391. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001391
26. International Labour Organization. Statistics and Databases. Accessed November 14, 2022, <https://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/lang--en/index.htm>
27. The World Bank. World Development Indicators. Accessed November 14, 2022, <https://datatopics.worldbank.org/world-development-indicators/>
28. Liu L, Wang Y, Xu Y. A practical guide to counterfactual estimators for causal inference with time-series cross-sectional data. 2002.
29. Kaufman JS, MacLehose RF. Which of these things is not like the others? *Cancer.* Dec 15 2013;119(24):4216-22. doi:10.1002/cncr.28359
30. Kahan DM. Gentle nudges vs. hard shoves: Solving the sticky norms problem. *The University of Chicago Law Review.* 2000:607-645.
31. Zorza J. Criminal law of misdemeanor domestic violence, 1970-1990. *J Crim L & Criminology.* 1992;83:46.
32. Platteau J-P, Wahhaj Z, Aldashev G. Confronting oppressive custom: reformism versus radicalism. presented at: National Academy of Sciences Sackler Colloquium; 2010;

Table 1. Sample characteristics by country and year

Country	Survey years	Women		Men	
		N	% believe IPV is justified	N	% believe IPV is justified
Afghanistan	2011	14,851	94.0		
	2016	28,632	82.7		
Albania	2005	3,434	35.9		
	2009	5,170	33.4		
	2017	11,923	7.8		
Armenia	2000	4,622	34.3	1,179	41.1
	2005	4,528	24.2	826	27.1
	2010	4,063	10.5	878	16.6
	2015/2016	4,353	10.9	1,570	22.2
Bangladesh	1999			2,554	36.2
	2004			3,131	32.1
	2007	10,986	31.0	3,766	31.9
	2011	17,828	32.6		
	2014	17,851	28.3		
	2017/2018	20,118	20.1		
	2019	53,887	27.7		
Belarus	2012	4,923	4.3	2,282	5.4
	2019	4,864	4.1	2,298	4.1
Benin	2001	4,882	63.5		
	2006	14,261	50.4	3,542	14.7
	2011/2012	12,662	17.2	3,368	14.8
	2014	11,627	39.1	2,423	15.7
	2017/2018	12,017	33.9	4,658	13.8
Burkina Faso	2003	10,011	73.1	2,029	40.5
	2006	5,865	74.5		
	2010	13,957	45.7	4,702	32.1
Cambodia	2000	2,571	40.2		
	2005/2006	2,846	58.8		
	2010/2011	12,764	49.0		
	2014	12,832	53.3		
	2021	14,847	39.4		
Cameroon	2004	8,097	57.1		
	2011	11,100	47.4		
	2014	6,736	38.6	2,620	37.7
	2018/2019	9,739	30.7	3,593	25.5
Chad	2010	12,257	69.6		
	2015	14,721	76.5	3,298	47.6

	2019	17,166	79.1	3,614	49.4
Democratic Republic of Congo	2007	7,473	77.3		
	2010	9,678	78.6		
	2013/2014	14,244	75.9	5,568	55.2
	2018	15,652	64.7	3,482	46.3
Republic of Congo	2005	4,961	69.2		
	2011/2012	8,325	60.9	3,295	38.5
	2015	8,518	55.7	3,010	38.0
Côte d'Ivoire	2006	8,133	68.7		
	2012	7,087	49.5	2,894	37.0
	2016	8,322	43.6	2,840	20.6
Egypt	2005	19,389	50.2		
	2008	16,480	39.4		
	2014	21,687	35.8		
Eswatini	2006	2,496	19.7	1,475	19.7
	2010	2,294	23.2	1,701	17.9
	2014	2,351	15.6	597	13.2
Ethiopia	2000	11,356	86.8		
	2005	10,211	84.8	3,566	52.9
	2011	12,074	73.0	8,445	45.1
	2016	11,393	66.2	7,558	27.2
Gambia	2006	7,358	78.0		
	2010	11,175	79.0		
	2013	7,358	61.9	1,718	25.9
	2018	9,939	53.9	1,955	17.6
	2019/2020	8,624	53.8	4,502	27.9
Ghana	2003	4,174	50.4	3,008	28.8
	2006	4,199	48.9		
	2008	3,365	37.6	2,628	19.7
	2011	7,728	45.2	1,914	22.7
	2014	6,348	28.9	2,522	9.7
	2017	9,156	34.2	2,583	14.1
Guinea	2005	6,625	88.0		
	2012	7,134	93.8	2,150	68.7
	2016	7,779	74.4		
	2018	8,215	70.8	2,351	54.3
Guinea-Bissau	2006	5,592	56.7		
	2014	6,555	46.0	1,644	24.6
	2019	7,007	37.9	1,158	51.8
Haiti	2000	6,895	41.2	1,678	17.2
	2005/2006	7,332	30.5		

	2012	9,018	16.2	4,896	12.2
	2016/2017	8,610	16.3	5,187	7.8
Indonesia	2002/2003	29,232	25.0		
	2007	32,584	31.0		
	2012	34,642	33.5		
Iraq	2006	16,749	63.3		
	2011	36,266	54.6		
	2018	20,784	41.7		
Jordan	2002	6,006	65.4		
	2007	10,868	52.6		
	2012	11,342	22.6		
	2017/2018	14,672	14.2		
Kazakhstan	1999	3,541	31.0		
	2006	10,189	12.0		
	2010	10,016	13.8		
	2015	9,893	15.9		
Kenya	2003	5,689	72.2	1,981	61.5
	2008/2009	5,819	54.4	1,962	40.9
	2014	10,668	43.4	7,415	35.7
Lesotho	2004/2005	4,728	48.2	1,388	48.1
	2009/2010	5,066	36.1	1,616	45.5
	2014	4,418	31.3	1,454	33.7
	2018	4,286	23.6	1,293	22.5
Liberia	2006/2007	5,141	65.0	3,595	28.2
	2013	6,830	42.9	2,525	21.5
	2019/2020	5,433	39.5	2,706	18.3
Madagascar	2003/2004	6,021	28.2	1,605	8.1
	2008/2009	14,063	32.2	6,211	27.9
	2018	13,158	41.2	4,799	27.5
	2021	14,136	40.5	6,088	24.0
Malawi	2000	10,918	35.8		
	2004/2005	9,771	28.6	2,215	12.2
	2010	18,469	11.9	4,463	9.5
	2014	19,320	12.5	4,178	5.0
	2015/2016	19,228	15.9	4,546	8.2
	2020	18,733	18.2	3,839	8.8
Maldives	2009	7,096	30.9	1,714	14.0
	2016/2017	6,191	20.6	2,588	13.6
Mali	2001	11,079	90.8	2,194	62.2
	2006	12,677	77.4		
	2010	21,616	89.1		
	2012/2013	8,893	77.8	3,021	51.8


	2015	15,006	75.7	3,826	50.9
	2018	8,693	81.8	3,002	43.9
Mauritania	2011	9,212	40.0		
	2015	10,519	26.9		
Mongolia	2005	5,316	21.7		
	2010	6,683	10.0	2,883	8.7
	2018	8,754	9.6	3,206	5.3
Montenegro	2005	1,576	13.3		
	2013	2,340	3.5		
	2018	1,674	7.8		
Mozambique	2003/2004	10,148	55.3	1,921	37.5
	2008	11,697	37.0		
	2011	10,848	21.9	2,730	18.3
	2015	6,289	14.0	3,470	16.3
Namibia	2000			1,352	39.7
	2006/2007			1,407	33.9
	2013			1,836	15.3
Nepal	2001/2002	8,724	28.8	2,258	34.1
	2006/2007	8,633	23.3	3,186	19.2
	2014	10,999	46.3		
	2016	10,236	28.3	2,722	20.6
	2019	11,859	32.6	3,868	31.6
Nicaragua	1997/1998	8,435	24.4		
	2001	9,781	17.0		
Niger	2006	7,841	71.2		
	2012	9,889	61.2		
Nigeria	2003	5,509	69.0	1,248	39.9
	2008	25,101	47.3	9,025	28.2
	2011	23,386	48.5		
	2013	28,921	37.0	8,811	23.5
	2016	25,384	36.1	7,396	18.6
	2018	31,139	30.2	8,172	18.1
	2021	26,233	31.7	7,609	21.2
North Macedonia	2005	5,314	24.4		
	2011	2,775	16.3		
	2018	2,517	11.5		
Pakistan	2012/2013	13,467	42.5	3,117	32.1
	2017/2018	14,883	41.6	3,686	37.5
Philippines	2003	9,315	25.4		
	2008	9,191	15.0		
	2013	10,639	13.9		
	2017	16,407	11.2		

Rwanda	2000	6,658	65.8	1,436	42.6
	2005	6,986	47.6		
	2010/2011	8,309	57.7	3,423	20.4
	2014/2015	8,290	40.5	3,470	14.3
	2019/2020	8,570	49.9	3,590	14.5
Sao Tome e Principe	2008	2,018	19.3	1,416	20.3
	2014	2,200	19.0	1,341	11.7
	2019	2,026	16.0	758	12.9
Serbia	2005	5,838	7.6		
	2010	4,345	3.8		
	2014	3,735	4.5		
	2019	2,927	2.1		
Sierra Leone	2005	6,499	87.8		
	2008	5,692	70.6	2,138	59.2
	2010	9,995	78.9		
	2013	11,522	68.6	4,373	33.8
	2017	12,315	58.5	3,969	33.9
	2019	10,601	53.5	4,288	28.4
Sudan	2010	12,095	48.8		
	2014	12,882	36.3		
Suriname	2006	3,633	13.7		
	2010	4,458	12.0		
	2018	5,901	4.7		
Tajikistan	2005	5,964	75.1		
	2012	6,718	67.9		
	2017	8,090	70.6		
Tanzania	2004/2005	7,796	60.9	1,500	38.1
	2009/2010	7,400	55.9	1,366	41.1
	2015/2016	9,755	60.0	1,934	35.1
Timor-Leste	2009/2010	8,378	88.9	2,193	85.1
	2016	7,694	78.7	2,489	54.3
Togo	2006	4,769	55.6		
	2010	4,785	44.8	1,082	29.0
	2014	7,020	31.2	2,572	17.0
	2017	5,307	30.7	1,219	18.0
Tunisia	2012	5,011	33.2		
	2018	5,961	16.3		
Turkey	2003/2004	8,061	39.3		
	2008	7,393	20.0		
	2013	7,214	15.0		
	2018	5,475	10.2		
Uganda	2000/2001	5,634	76.9		

	2006/07	6,464	72.0	1,591	55.7
	2011	6,446	58.7	1,422	41.3
	2016	13,766	48.8	3,305	36.0
Ukraine	2005	4,981	5.6		
	2007	5,247	4.0	2,101	11.0
	2012	6,671	3.4	2,726	11.2
Vietnam	2006	6,556	70.6		
	2010	8,691	37.7		
	2014	7,470	30.3		
	2020	8,851	12.1		
Zambia	2001/2002	5,803	88.0	1,358	65.5
	2007	5,187	63.9	3,947	45.7
	2013/2014	11,628	48.7	8,843	27.6
	2018/2019	9,354	47.8	6,978	21.5
Zimbabwe	1999	4,216	51.5		
	2005/2006	6,445	48.9	3,714	29.8
	2009	8,318	50.1		
	2010/2011	6,836	40.3	4,147	26.9
	2014	11,043	36.1	4,629	16.9
	2015	7,289	36.7	4,776	24.7
All countries	1997-2021	2,184,047	43.7	390,877	28.0


Note: Prevalence estimates use sampling weights provided by the Demographic and Health Surveys and the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys.

Figure 3. Effect of adoption of domestic violence legislation on changes in attitudes about IPV among women



Note: Adjusted models controlled for country-level female labor force participation rate, literacy rate, educational gap between men and women, and Gross Domestic Product (log). Models investigating effects in specific demographic groups (location, age, education) are jointly stratified by sex and demographic groups. Bars represent the 95% confidence interval.

Figure 4. Effect of adoption of domestic violence legislation on changes in attitudes about IPV among men



Note: Adjusted models controlled for country-level female labor force participation rate, literacy rate, educational gap between men and women, and Gross Domestic Product (log). Models investigating effects in specific demographic groups (location, age, education) are jointly stratified by sex and demographic groups. Bars represent the 95% confidence interval.