

Violence Against Women and Girls Analysis Summary

A concise overview of the Violence Against Women and Girls data analysis project — written for the recruiter who wants the full picture in the shortest time.

Tool used across all projects: MySQL Workbench · Datasets sourced from Kaggle

Project 2

Violence Against Women and Girls — Attitudes Across 70 Countries, 2000–2017

What This Project Was About

This was the most sensitive and, honestly, the most important dataset I worked with. It captures survey responses from 70 countries on whether people — both men and women — believe a husband is justified in using violence against his wife under specific circumstances: if she burns the food, argues with him, refuses sex, neglects the children, or goes out without his permission. The Value column records the percentage of respondents in each demographic group who agreed that a given scenario justified violence. My job was to find the patterns in those numbers and say something meaningful about them.

What I Discovered

The finding that stopped me in my tracks was this: in 88.57% of the surveyed countries, women justify violence against themselves at a higher rate than men do. In some cases, the gap is enormous — in Eritrea, men show 0% justification while women show 46.19%. In Morocco, the same pattern: 0% for men, 45.21% for women. This is not a data anomaly. It is a consistent, cross-continental signal that women in these countries have internalized the belief that violence against them is, under certain circumstances, acceptable. That is a human rights crisis that goes beyond stopping the violence itself — it requires changing deeply embedded cultural beliefs, and that takes far longer.

Education showed up as one of the most reliable protective factors. People with higher education justify violence at 7.99% on average; people with no education justify it at 21.33%. That gap holds across genders and across continents. But the relationship is not simple — in five countries, including Kyrgyz Republic and Timor-Leste, educated people actually justify violence more than uneducated people. My reading of that is not that education makes things worse, but that in those countries the education system itself may be reinforcing traditional gender hierarchies rather than challenging them. That requires a very different intervention.

Africa and Asia dominate the high-risk end. Mali, Chad, Congo DR, and Afghanistan are in the SEVERE category, with overall average justification rates approaching 40–46%. But the Americas — which contributed only 12.85% of the total dataset — account for 31.25% of countries in the LOW progress category. That is a meaningful overperformance relative to their representation, and it suggests something is working differently in Central and South America that is worth understanding better.

What I Think Could Be Improved

The dataset has a significant geographic gap that I think limits how far the conclusions can be stretched. Africa makes up 55.7% of the data, and Western, high-income nations are almost entirely absent. That absence is not neutral — it means we are looking at a picture of violence justification that skews heavily toward lower-income, predominantly non-Western contexts. Violence and the justification of it exist in every country on earth. The absence of those data points does not mean the problem does not exist there; it may simply mean it was not studied or reported in this format. I would flag that to any reader who tries to use this data to make broad global claims.

I also think the dataset's cross-sectional design — each country surveyed in a single year — limits what we can say about change over time. We can compare countries to each other, but we cannot track whether attitudes within a specific country are improving or worsening. Longitudinal data, even for a subset of countries, would make this analysis significantly more powerful for policy purposes.

My Overall Take

This project required a different kind of analytical discipline than the others. With the Amazon dataset, the goal was commercial insight. Here, the goal was to say something true and useful about a deeply human problem. I tried to hold both the rigour of the analysis and the weight of what the numbers actually represent. A 46.19% justification rate in Eritrea is not just a data point — it represents millions of women who have been conditioned to believe their own abuse is acceptable. I think good data analysis should make you feel the stakes, not just report them. That is what I tried to do here, and I think it is what makes this project the most complete of the three — technically, analytically, and in terms of what it is ultimately trying to say.

— *End of Portfolio Summaries* —