

Violence Against Women and Girls

Project 2 — Data Analysis Report

Tool: MySQL Workbench · Dataset: Kaggle · Coverage: 70 Countries, 2000–2017 · 16 Queries across 5 Sections

Dataset Overview

About the Dataset

This dataset documents attitudes toward violence against women and girls across 70 countries, collected between 2000 and 2017. It captures survey responses on whether people justify domestic violence under specific circumstances, broken down by demographic factors such as age, education, employment, marital status, and residence type.

Dataset Columns

- **Record ID:** Unique identifier per row. Some IDs are shared, possibly indicating responses recorded on the same date, in the same location, or under the same conditions.
- **Country:** The country from which the respondent's data was collected.
- **Gender:** Male or Female.
- **Demographics Question:** The social/demographic category being assessed (e.g. age, education, employment, marital status, residence).
- **Demographics Response:** The respondent's answer to the demographics question (e.g. age group, education level).
- **Question:** The specific justification scenario presented to the respondent (e.g. 'If she burns the food').
- **Survey Year:** The year the data was collected for that country.
- **Value:** The percentage of respondents agreeing that the given scenario justifies violence.

Notable Observations Before Analysis

- **Gender inclusion:** Although the dataset is titled 'Violence Against Women and Girls,' male respondents are also included. This appears to capture male attitudes toward justifying violence, not male victims — an important framing distinction.
- **Geographic skew:** Western and European countries are largely absent. The dataset is predominantly African (55.7%), suggesting either a targeted research focus, limited data availability in wealthier nations, or refusal to participate by those countries.
- **Survey year per country:** Each country's data was collected in a single year — not continuously. This means the dataset reflects a snapshot in time per country, not a longitudinal study per country.

SECTION 1: Data Verification & Geographic Scope

Query 1: Total Records Count

Objective: Verify all records in the dataset to ensure completeness before proceeding with professional analysis.

Findings

- **Total records:** 25,477
- **Total rows of data:** 12,600

Key Takeaway: The dataset is sizeable and complete enough to support meaningful analysis. Verifying the record count upfront ensures all subsequent queries are working with the full picture.

Query 2: Countries Covered in the Dataset

Objective: Identify all countries represented, understand their data volume, and map the geographic distribution of the dataset.

Geographic Coverage

- **Total countries:** 70
- **Total continents:** 5 (Africa, Asia, Europe, North America, South America)

Continental Breakdown

- **Africa:** 39/70 countries (55.7%) — 14,040 total responses
- **Asia:** 19/70 countries (27.1%) — 6,948 total responses
- **North America:** 5/70 countries (7.14%) — 1,800 total responses
- **South America:** 4/70 countries (5.71%) — 1,440 total responses
- **Europe:** 3/70 countries (4.29%) — 1,249 total responses

Key Patterns

- 68 of 70 countries have exactly 360 total responses each, suggesting a standardized survey design.
- **Exceptions:** Albania (529 responses, Europe) and Afghanistan (468 responses, Asia) both exceeded the standard count.
- Each country's data was collected in a single year, not across multiple years. The dataset spans 2000–2017 because different countries were surveyed in different years.
- Western and high-income nations are largely absent — this likely reflects the research focus on developing nations where violence data is more difficult to gather and attitudes may differ significantly.

Key Takeaway: Over half the dataset comes from Africa, making this analysis particularly relevant to African contexts. The absence of Western countries is a meaningful limitation when interpreting global conclusions.

SECTION 2: Attitudes & Justification Patterns

Query 3: Survey Questions Overview — Justification Reasons Ranked

Objective: Understand what specific scenarios respondents were asked to evaluate, and rank them by average acceptance rate.

The 6 Justification Scenarios (Ranked by Acceptance)

- **1st — At least one specific reason:** 29.91% average agreement
- **2nd — If she neglects the children:** 21.07% average agreement
- **3rd — If she goes out without telling him:** 18.14% average agreement
- **4th — If she argues with him:** 16.57% average agreement
- **5th — If she refuses to have sex with him:** 11.7% average agreement
- **6th — If she burns the food:** 7.97% average agreement

Key Patterns

- Each question was asked between 4,230 and 4,251 times, indicating consistent sampling across the dataset.
- The broadest justification ('at least one specific reason') has the highest acceptance rate at nearly 30% — meaning almost 1 in 3 respondents globally accept violence under some circumstance.
- Even the lowest-ranked reason (burning food) still carries a 7.97% acceptance rate — nearly 1 in 12 respondents.
- Neglecting children and going out without permission rank high, suggesting violence is most 'socially justified' when it involves perceived failures of domestic duty or challenges to male authority over movement.

Key Takeaway: No justification scenario has a 0% acceptance rate, which means violence against women is normalized to some degree across all surveyed populations. The framing of justifications reveals that patriarchal control — over children, movement, and sex — underpins acceptance of violence.

Query 4: Male vs Female Attitudes Comparison

Objective: Compare how men and women justify violence to identify gender differences in attitudes.

Findings

- **Female respondents:** 12,723 total responses — 22.29% average justification rate
- **Male respondents:** 12,754 total responses — 12.85% average justification rate

Key Patterns

- Despite males providing more total responses, females show a significantly higher justification rate.
- The gap between female (22.29%) and male (12.85%) justification rates is 9.44 percentage points — a 73.45% relative difference.
- Both genders share a minimum justification rate of 0% and a similar maximum rate of 9.9%.
- This finding is one of the most striking in the dataset: women justify violence against themselves at nearly double the rate of men.

Key Takeaway: Women justifying violence against themselves at a far higher rate than men points to deeply internalized social conditioning. This is not a data error — it reflects a pattern seen globally where cultural norms lead women to accept violence as a consequence of their own behavior.

Query 5: Gender Differences by Country

Objective: Identify countries with the largest gap between male and female justification rates.

Top 15 Countries Where Women Justify Violence More Than Men

- **Eritrea:** Women: 46.19%, Men: 0% — Gap: 46.19%
- **Morocco:** Women: 45.21%, Men: 0% — Gap: 45.21%
- **Tajikistan:** Women: 44.3%, Men: 0% — Gap: 44.3%
- **Turkmenistan:** Women: 36.19%, Men: 0% — Gap: 36.19%
- **Mali:** Women: 53.31%, Men: 25.53% — Gap: 27.78%
- **Yemen:** Women: 27.62%, Men: 0% — Gap: 27.62%
- **Niger:** Women: 41.58%, Men: 16.84% — Gap: 24.74%
- **Ethiopia:** Women: 40.69%, Men: 16.09% — Gap: 24.6%
- **Chad:** Women: 53.75%, Men: 31.12% — Gap: 22.62%
- **Sierra Leone:** Women: 40.35%, Men: 18.53% — Gap: 21.82%

Key Patterns

- **Geographic breakdown of top 15:** 11/15 countries from Africa, 4/15 from Asia, 0 from Europe or the Americas.
- In 15/15 of these countries, women justify violence more than men — there are no exceptions.
- 6/15 countries show 0% male justification rate, yet still have significant female justification rates.
- Female average justification across these 15 countries: 40.60%. Male average: 13.04%.
- Africa: female avg 40.51%, male avg 14.40% — gap of 26.11%.
- Asia: female avg 40.84%, male avg 9.29% — gap of 31.55%. Asia shows a wider gender gap despite fewer countries represented.

Key Takeaway: The countries with the largest gender gaps are concentrated in Africa and Asia. The pattern of women justifying their own abuse at far higher rates than men — particularly in countries where male justification is 0% — is a strong signal of internalized misogyny rooted in cultural and social conditioning.

SECTION 3: Demographic Drivers of Justification

Query 6: Education Level Impact on Attitudes

Objective: Assess whether education level influences the likelihood of justifying violence.

Findings by Education Level

- **No Education:** 21.33% average justification — Moderate Concern
- **Primary Education:** 19.74% average justification — Moderate Concern
- **Secondary Education:** 15.68% average justification — Moderate Concern
- **Higher Education:** 7.99% average justification — Lower Concern

Key Patterns

- Each education level had exactly 1,697 total responses, ensuring a balanced comparison.
- Justification decreases consistently as education increases — a clear inverse relationship.
- The difference between no education and higher education is 13.34 percentage points — a near halving of the justification rate.
- Even people with higher education still show a 7.99% justification rate — education alone does not eliminate the problem.

Key Takeaway: Education is a measurable protective factor against violence justification. The more educated people are, the less likely they are to justify violence. However, the continued 7.99% justification rate among highly educated respondents shows that cultural attitudes persist even with education, requiring broader societal interventions.

Query 7: Education Impact by Gender

Objective: Determine whether education reduces violence justification differently for men and women.

Findings by Education Level and Gender

- **Higher Education:** Females 9.22%, Males 6.78%
- **Secondary Education:** Females 19.05%, Males 12.32%
- **Primary Education:** Females 25.85%, Males 13.67%
- **No Education:** Females 28.24%, Males 14.47%

Key Patterns

- Females show higher justification rates than males at every education level without exception.
- Female overall average across all education levels: 20.59%. Male overall average: 11.81%.
- Both genders reduce justification as education increases — the direction is the same, but the magnitude differs.
- **Critical observation:** Females reduce justification more sharply as education increases. They start much higher and drop much faster, while males start lower and decline more gradually.
- This suggests education has a particularly powerful impact on female attitudes, making women's education a high-leverage intervention point.

Key Takeaway: Education reduces violence justification for both genders, but women have more to gain from increased education. Investing in girls' and women's education in high-justification countries is likely to yield the greatest reduction in violence normalization.

Query 8: Age Group Analysis

Objective: Identify how age influences attitudes toward violence justification.

Findings by Age Group

- **Ages 15–24:** 19.00% average justification
- **Ages 25–34:** 17.76% average justification
- **Ages 35–49:** 17.44% average justification

Key Patterns

- All three age groups had identical total responses of 1,697 and were analyzed across all 70 countries.
- Justification decreases with age, though the differences are relatively small across groups.
- The youngest group (15–24) has the highest justification rate, which may reflect lower education attainment, less life experience, or greater cultural influence in that age group.
- **Question raised:** Is the decline with age driven by maturity, higher education attainment among older cohorts, or generational shifts in attitudes?

Key Takeaway: Younger people are slightly more likely to justify violence than older people. This could reflect the ongoing generational impact of education and awareness programs, or simply that younger

people have had less time to develop more nuanced views. Either way, youth-focused education interventions are important.

Query 9: Employment Status Impact

Objective: Determine whether employment status and type of employment influences violence justification rates.

Findings by Employment Type

- **Employed for kind (paid in goods/services):** 21.56% average justification — highest
- **Unemployed:** 17.67% average justification
- **Employed for cash:** 17.15% average justification — lowest

Key Patterns

- 5,099 total responses analyzed across all 70 countries, roughly evenly split across the three categories.
- People employed for kind show the highest justification rate, suggesting that non-cash compensation is associated with lower economic empowerment and greater vulnerability.
- Cash employment correlates with the lowest justification rate — financial independence may reduce acceptance of violence.
- The gap between employed for kind and employed for cash is 6.41 percentage points, suggesting economic empowerment type matters, not just employment itself.

Key Takeaway: Economic empowerment type matters. Being employed for cash — which implies greater financial independence — correlates with lower violence justification. Policies that formalize employment and move workers from in-kind to cash compensation may have downstream benefits for gender attitudes.

Query 10: Urban vs Rural Residence

Objective: Compare violence justification rates between people living in urban and rural areas.

Findings

- **Rural residents:** 21.14% average justification
- **Urban residents:** 14.47% average justification
- **Difference:** 6.67 percentage points

Key Patterns

- Both groups had 1,697 total responses across all 70 countries.
- Rural residents are significantly more likely to justify violence — a 6.67% gap is meaningful at scale.
- Highest recorded rate: urban 9.9%, rural 9.8% — both similar at the maximum, but averages diverge substantially.
- This likely reflects differences in education access, economic opportunity, exposure to media and rights advocacy, and community enforcement of traditional gender norms in rural settings.

Key Takeaway: Rural communities show notably higher violence justification rates. Geographic targeting of education and outreach programs — particularly in rural areas of high-justification countries — should be a priority for intervention.

Query 11: Marital Status Analysis

Objective: Identify whether marital status influences how likely someone is to justify violence.

Findings by Marital Status

- **Widowed, divorced, or separated:** 18.59% average justification — highest
- **Married or living together:** 18.31% average justification
- **Never married:** 15.65% average justification — lowest

Key Patterns

- Responses were near-equal across groups: 1,701 (widowed/divorced/separated), 1,702 (married), 1,702 (never married).
- People who have never been married justify violence the least — possibly because they have less direct experience with intimate partner dynamics that normalize control.
- Widowed, divorced, and separated people have the highest justification rate despite having fewer responses — this is statistically notable.
- The difference between the highest and lowest group is 2.94 percentage points — smaller than education or residence differences, suggesting marital status is a weaker predictor of attitudes.

Key Takeaway: Marital status has a moderate influence on justification rates. Never-married individuals are the least likely to justify violence. Relationship history and exposure to intimate partner dynamics appear to shape, but not dominate, attitudes toward violence.

SECTION 4: High-Risk Identification

Query 12: Top 20 Worst Country-Demographic Combinations

Objective: Identify the specific country and demographic intersections with the highest violence justification rates.

Top Country-Demographic Combinations

- **Morocco (3/20 entries):**
 - Female, employed for kind: 71.72% justification — highest in dataset
 - Female, rural residence: 66.25%
 - Female, no education: 62.12%
- **Timor-Leste (4/20 entries):**
 - Female, employed for kind: 65.25%
 - Female, no education: 59.38%
 - Female, married or living together: 57.5%
 - Female, age 25–34: 57.45%
- **Eritrea (1/20 entries):**
 - Female, employed for kind: 62.37%
- **Chad (4/20 entries):**
 - Female, employed for cash: 61.85%
 - Female, primary education: 61.13%
 - Female, age 25–34: 57.8%

- Female, married or living together: 57.75%
- **Mali (8/20 entries — 40% of the top 20):**
 - Female, employed for kind: 61.68%
 - Female, no education: 59.5%
 - Female, rural residence: 59.3%
 - Female, married or living together: 58.93%
 - Female, primary education: 58.38%
 - Female, age 25–34: 58%, Female, age 35–49: 57.72%
 - Female, employed for cash: 57.48%

Key Patterns

- All 20 of the top 20 highest justification entries are female — no male demographic combination appears in this list.
- Mali dominates with 8/20 entries (40%), making it the single most concerning country in the dataset.
- Employed for kind appears as the most common high-risk employment demographic.
- Being female, uneducated, rural, and employed for kind in Morocco represents the most extreme intersection of risk factors.

Key Takeaway: Violence justification reaches extreme levels (60–71%) when multiple vulnerability factors intersect in the same individual: female gender, lack of education, rural residence, and non-cash employment. Mali and Morocco require the most urgent multi-dimensional interventions.

Query 13: Violence Justification Reasons — Most to Least Accepted

Objective: Rank the specific justification scenarios by average acceptance rate across all countries.

Findings

- **1st — At least one reason:** 29.91% acceptance, measured 4,248 times
- **2nd — Neglects children:** 27.01% acceptance, measured 4,251 times
- **3rd — Goes out without permission:** 18.14% acceptance, measured 4,250 times
- **4th — Argues with husband:** 16.57% acceptance, measured 4,248 times
- **5th — Refuses sex:** 11.7% acceptance, measured 4,250 times
- **6th — Burns food:** 7.79% acceptance, measured 4,230 times

Key Patterns

- Neglecting children ranks 2nd, suggesting violence is most 'accepted' when tied to motherhood failures — a deeply gendered cultural norm.
- Refusing sex ranks 5th, meaning marital rape justification, while lower, still exists at 11.7%.
- Even the most 'trivial' reason (burning food) retains a 7.79% acceptance rate across 70 countries.
- All 6 scenarios were measured a nearly identical number of times, confirming methodological consistency.

Key Takeaway: Violence is most frequently justified through failures of domestic duty and challenges to male authority. This ranking reveals which cultural narratives are most deeply embedded and should inform the focus of public awareness campaigns.

Query 14: Countries with Critical Justification Levels (Above 50% Average)

Objective: Flag countries requiring urgent intervention by identifying those with an overall average justification rate above 50%.

Findings

No countries were found with an overall average justification rate above 50%. While individual demographic combinations within countries exceed 50% (as seen in Query 12), no country reaches this threshold at the aggregate level.

Key Takeaway: While no country averages above 50% overall, the absence of a 'critical' tier country is only partially reassuring. Several countries in the SEVERE category (Query 15) are approaching this threshold, and specific demographic subgroups within those countries already exceed it significantly.

SECTION 5: Advanced Analysis & Policy Implications

Query 15: Comprehensive Country Risk Classification

Objective: Classify all 70 countries into risk tiers based on overall average justification rates and analyze gender gaps by country.

Risk Classification Results

- **SEVERE — High Priority (6 countries, 8.57%):**
 - Timor-Leste: 46.21% | Chad: 42.44% | Congo DR: 41.58%
 - Guinea: 40.26% | Afghanistan: 40.16% | Mali: 39.42%
 - 5/6 are African; Timor-Leste (Asia) is the exception
- **MODERATE — Attention Required (22 countries, 31.43%):**
 - Range: Azerbaijan (30.49%) to Morocco (22.61%)
 - 17/22 (77.27%) African, 4/22 (18.18%) Asian, 1/22 (4.55%) European
- **LOW-MODERATE — Monitor (26 countries, 37.14%):**
 - Range: Cambodia (19.46%) to Egypt (10.12%)
 - 14/26 African, 7/26 Asian, 2/26 European, 3/26 Americas
- **LOW — Positive Progress (16 countries, 22.86%):**
 - Range: Moldova (9.91%) to Peru (0.91%)
 - Americas represent 31.25% of this group despite contributing only 12.85% of total data

Gender Gap Highlights

- **Countries where men justify violence MORE than women (8 countries):**
 - Kyrgyz Republic (+6.51%), Armenia (+7.15%), Jordan (+8.4%), Ukraine (+3.66%)
 - Lesotho (+2.89%), Eswatini (+3.23%), Mozambique (+2.16%), South Africa (+1.29%)
- **In 62/70 countries (88.57%),** women justify violence more than men — an overwhelming pattern.
- **In 15/70 countries (21.43%),** men show 0% justification, yet women in those same countries still show significant rates.

Regional Patterns

- **Africa:** 56.41% of African countries in SEVERE or MODERATE categories — most urgent region
- **Asia:** 73.68% of Asian countries in LOW-MODERATE or LOW — more variation, better overall

- **Europe:** 66.67% in LOW category despite 3-country sample
- **Americas:** 66.67% in LOW category — strongest positive performance relative to dataset representation
- **Notable outlier:** South Africa, despite its history, falls in the LOW category (3.48% average) — a demonstration that policy and education can drive change.

Key Takeaway: Africa requires the most urgent continental intervention. The gender gap analysis — where women justify violence against themselves far more than men do — points to a systemic internalization of patriarchal norms that cannot be solved by addressing violence alone. Cultural change, education, and women's empowerment must work together.

Query 16: Education Impact Across Countries — Advanced CTE Analysis

Objective: Measure exactly how much education reduces violence justification in each country by comparing 'No Education' vs 'Higher Education' respondents.

VERY STRONG Impact — Education Reduces Justification by 30%+ (2 countries)

- **Kenya:** No Education: 40.92% → Higher Education: 8.62% — Impact: 32.30%
- **Tanzania:** No Education: 35.93% → Higher Education: 4.55% — Impact: 31.38%

In these two countries, education is a transformative tool. Achieving universal higher education access could cut violence justification by nearly a third.

STRONG Impact — Education Reduces Justification by 20–30% (18 countries)

- Senegal (29.53%), Ethiopia (28.87%), Pakistan (26.59%), Niger (26.31%), Morocco (26.21%), Burundi (25.83%), Mali (24.99%)
- 13/18 (72.22%) of these countries are African — Africa has the most to gain from education investment.
- **Mali is notable:** Despite ranking in the SEVERE overall category, Mali shows a 24.99% education impact — meaning heavy education investment there could produce dramatic results.

MODERATE Impact — Education Reduces Justification by 10–20% (24 countries)

- Cameroon (19.50%), Afghanistan (17.13%), Chad (13.89%), India (11.89%)
- Chad and Afghanistan, both SEVERE-rated, show only MODERATE education impact — education alone will not solve their problems. Multi-faceted interventions are required: legal reforms, economic development, and cultural campaigns.

SLIGHT Impact — Education Reduces Justification by 0–10% (21 countries)

- Honduras (9.85%) to Maldives (0.82%)
- Many of these countries already have LOW overall justification rates — education has less room to make an impact because attitudes are already relatively progressive. This is a 'floor effect.'

MINIMAL / NEGATIVE Impact — Education Associated with Higher Justification (5 countries)

- **Timor-Leste:** No Education: 46.93%, Higher Education: 48.18% — Impact: -1.25%
- **Ukraine:** No Education: 0%, Higher Education: 2.37% — Impact: -2.37%
- **Moldova:** No Education: 0%, Higher Education: 3.39% — Impact: -3.39%
- **Armenia:** No Education: 0%, Higher Education: 5.14% — Impact: -5.14%
- **Kyrgyz Republic:** No Education: 0%, Higher Education: 20.38% — Impact: -20.38%

Interpreting the Negative Impact Countries

- **Measurement issue:** Ukraine, Moldova, Armenia, and Kyrgyz Republic show 0% for no-education respondents, likely because very few people in these countries have no education at all — making that sample unreliable.
- **Cultural reinforcement:** In Kyrgyz Republic specifically, the -20.38% gap is dramatic. Education may be reinforcing rather than challenging traditional gender roles if the educational system itself teaches patriarchal values.
- **Timor-Leste:** A different dynamic — here, educated people (48.18%) justify violence more than uneducated (46.93%). This warrants specific cultural investigation, not just more schooling.

Regional Education Impact Summary

- **Africa:** Average education impact of 17.23% — strongest region. Highest payoff for education investment.
- **Asia:** Average 12.89% — mixed results (Pakistan strong, Kyrgyz Republic negative).
- **Europe:** Mixed, but justification already low overall.
- **Americas:** Average 6.94% — smallest impact due to floor effect; justification already low.

Key Takeaway: Education is a powerful but context-dependent tool. It works best in countries with high baseline justification and limited current education access — particularly Africa. In countries where education appears to have no effect or a negative one, the education system itself may need reform to actively challenge rather than reinforce gender inequality.

Conclusion & Policy Recommendations

Key Findings Summary

- Violence against women is normalized to some degree in all 70 surveyed countries — no justification scenario has a 0% acceptance rate globally.
- Women justify violence against themselves at nearly double the rate of men (22.29% vs 12.85%), a consistent pattern across 88.57% of countries surveyed.
- Africa faces the most severe challenge, with 56.41% of its countries in SEVERE or MODERATE risk categories.
- No country reaches an average justification rate above 50%, though several individual demographic subgroups within countries do.
- Education, urban residence, cash employment, and younger age are all associated with lower justification rates.

Priority Intervention Areas

- **Priority 1 — High-impact education investment:** Kenya, Tanzania, Senegal, Ethiopia, and Pakistan show 25–32% justification reduction from education. These are high-return targets.
- **Priority 2 — Multi-faceted intervention:** Mali, Chad, Afghanistan, and Congo DR are SEVERE-rated but show only moderate education impact — requiring legal reform, economic development for women, and public campaigns alongside education.
- **Priority 3 — Investigate education system failures:** Kyrgyz Republic, Armenia, and Timor-Leste show negative education impact, suggesting education is reinforcing rather than challenging patriarchal norms.
- **Priority 4 — Sustain progress in low-justification countries:** Americas and Europe are performing well. The focus should be on maintaining cultural change, not assuming the work is done.
- **Priority 5 — Rural and informal workforce targeting:** Rural residents and those employed for kind show the highest justification rates and likely have the least access to education and advocacy programs.

Data Considerations

- The dataset significantly over-represents Africa (55.7%) and under-represents Europe and high-income nations, limiting the generalizability of global conclusions.
- Each country's data was collected in a single year, making it a snapshot rather than a longitudinal measure of change.
- The absence of Western countries from the dataset is itself a research question worth pursuing — was it by design, refusal to participate, or data unavailability?
- The 'Value' column represents the percentage of respondents agreeing that a scenario justifies violence — it is an attitude measure, not a direct measure of violence incidence.

— *End of Project 3 Analysis Report* —