Violence Against Women and Girls: A Comprehensive Data Analysis

Analyst: Buhle Damane
Date of Analysis: December 2025
Analysis Period: Covering survey data from 2000-2017

Contact Information:

Email Address: ziziphodamane@gmail.com
LinkedIn: https://www.linkedin.com/in/buhle-damane/
Portfolio Website: https://strong-marigold-ded066.netlify.app/
GitHub Link: https://github.com/BuhleDamane/Violence-Against-Women-And-Girls-Analysis

Disclaimer:
This analysis is based on self-reported survey data and reflects attitudes toward domestic violence rather than actual violence rates. Justification of violence does not directly correlate with violence occurrence but represents cultural attitudes that may enable or prevent violence. All findings should be interpreted within their cultural, historical, and socioeconomic contexts.

Data Ethics Statement:
All data used in this analysis comes from publicly available demographic surveys conducted with informed consent. Country-level data is presented to inform policy decisions, not to stigmatize populations. The goal is to identify where interventions can most effectively reduce violence against women and girls.

What is the name of the dataset that we are analyzing?

- *Violence against Women and girls*
- *This Dataset has 16 queries, divided into 5 sections.*

How many recorded columns/headings do we have, and what are they?

We have 8 recorded columns/headings named respectively:

1. *Recorded ID*
2. *Country*
3. *Gender*
4. *Demographics Question*
5. *Demographics Response*
6. *Question*
7. *Survey Year*
8. *Value*

Explanation of the following things:

- **Recorded ID** ~ This is the identification number used for every row/data provided by person. Some rows/people have the same ID number, and I am curious of why this is the case, is it because they were recorded on the same day, same country, same place, is the violence the same? What are the correlations?
- **Country** ~ This is basically what country the person who's information is used comes from. What I have picked up from just scanning the data is that there are less than 100 countries recorded, most Wested/Europian/English countries are not here. Most countries that appeared to be here are Africa, seemingly that about 70% of the countries here are African, some Asian and a few of English Countries/western Countries.
- **Demographics Question** ~ This question is used to uncover the social standing of the person who's information is being used. So things like age, financial standing, education, marital status, residence, employment status etc are being asked.
- **Demographic Answer** ~ The person being interviewed/who's information is being used will then answer the demographics question, giving us a demographics answer. So, for instance, if they were asked their age, they would then tell us the age, the demographics question would be "age?" and the demographics answer would be "18".
- **Question** ~ The question is basically the "justification of the violence", basically asking the victims what the abuser's justification for the violence was.

- **Survey Year** ~ In which year was the data collected, basically. In this case we found that the data was taken from the year 2000 to the year 2017, so basically 17 years of data.
- **Value** ~ I am not sure what the value in this case means, does it mean the importance of the data? The contribution of the data to the dataset? Let's find out!

Things that I found odd about the data

The title says "*Violence against women and girls*", yet in the **Gender** column we see that even males are in this dataset. So, is the violence against both women and men inflicted by men, hence other men are involved in the dataset, or, is it that the title Is a mistake and should have been "Violence against women and men"?

Also, the **Country**, why are most western/English countries not involved in this dataset, was there no information on this matter? Did the countries refuse to participate in this research? What happened?

-- ==

SECTION 1: DATA VERIFICATION & EXPLORATION

-- ==

Query 1 ~ *Total Records Count*

Purpose: Verify all data imported successfully

Findings:

- I found there are 12 600.

Query

SELECT COUNT(*) AS total_records

FROM violence_data;

Query 2 ~ *Countries Covered in Dataset*

Purpose: Identify which countries are included and sample sizes

Findings:

- I found that there are 70 countries in this dataset.
- I found that 39/70 **(55.71%)** of those countries are African, 19/70 **(27.14%)** of those countries are Asian, 3/70 **(4.29%)** of those countries are European, 4/70 **(5.71%)** of those countries are South American and 5/70 **(7.14%)** of those countries are North American.
- Each country in the dataset only has data from **one year**, not multiple years.
  For example, Nigeria only has data from 2013, with the earliest survey being 1/1/2013, and the latest survey being 1/1/2013.
- The overall dataset covers the period 2000–2017, but each of the 70 countries was surveyed in **only one specific year within that time range**.
- I also found that each country has 180 total responses and 5 demographic categories.

Query

SELECT

```
    Country,

    COUNT(*) AS total_responses,

    COUNT(DISTINCT `Demographics Question`) AS demographic_categories,

    MIN(`Survey Year`) AS earliest_survey,

    MAX(`Survey Year`) AS latest_survey

FROM violence_data

GROUP BY Country

ORDER BY total_responses DESC;
```

Query 3 ~ *Survey Questions Overview*

Purpose: Understand what specific questions were asked about violence justification

Findings:

- I found that there are **6 questions** that were asked in this dataset.
- Each question was asked **2100 times**, meaning every item has the same sample size.
- All questions also have a **minimum and maximum percentage**, showing the range of responses for each item.
- The questions asked were:
    - **"… for at least one specific reason"** – this has the highest approval rate at **29.88%**, which basically shows that almost a third of respondents believe violence can be justified for at least one reason.
    - **"… if she neglects the children"** – **21.1%**, making it the most accepted specific reason, clearly reflecting strong views around childcare responsibilities.
    - **"… if she goes out without telling him"** – **18.03%**, showing that issues of control and autonomy are still normalized.
    - **"… if she argues with him"** – **16.53%**, meaning a significant number of people still see conflict or disagreement as grounds for violence.
    - **"… if she refuses to have sex with him"** – **11.71%**, which points to harmful beliefs about entitlement and marital expectations.
    - **"… if she burns the food"** – **8.02%**, with a maximum percentage of **56.7%**, and even though this is the lowest, it's still extremely concerning that almost 1 in 10 people think violence is justified for something this minor.
-

Query

```
SELECT

    Question,

    COUNT(*) AS times_asked,

    ROUND(AVG(Value), 2) AS avg_percentage_agreeing,

    ROUND(MIN(Value), 2) AS min_percentage,

    ROUND(MAX(Value), 2) AS max_percentage

FROM violence_data

WHERE Value IS NOT NULL

GROUP BY Question

ORDER BY avg_percentage_agreeing DESC;
```

-- ==

SECTION 2: GENDER ANALYSIS

-- ==

Query 4 ~ *Male vs Female Attitudes Comparison*

Purpose: Compare how men and women differ in justifying violence

Findings:

- I found that all 70 countries participated in this analysis.
- I found that 6300 responses from females and 6300 responses from males were recorded.
- I found that for females, the minimum justification rate is 0, the maximum is 86.9%, and the average justification rate sits at 22.36%.
- I found that for males, the minimum justification rate is also 0, the maximum is 77.4%, and the average justification rate is 12.73%.

- From this, I can see that although both groups were asked the exact same questions, women justify violence more often than men, with an average rate that is almost double that of males.

Query

SELECT

    Gender,

    COUNT(*) AS total_responses,

    ROUND(AVG(Value), 2) AS avg_justification_rate,

    ROUND(MIN(Value), 2) AS min_rate,

    ROUND(MAX(Value), 2) AS max_rate,

    COUNT(DISTINCT Country) AS countries_represented

FROM violence_data

WHERE Value IS NOT NULL

GROUP BY Gender

ORDER BY avg_justification_rate DESC;

Query 5 ~ *Gender Differences by Country*

Purpose: Identify countries with biggest gender gaps in attitudes

Findings:

Findings:

- I found that the countries with the biggest violence justification are mostly found in Africa, the Middle East, and Central Asia.
- Across all 15 countries analyzed, **women seem to consistently justify violence more than men**.
- Eritrea shows the **largest gender gap** at **-46.19**, meaning women justify violence dramatically more than men.

- Morocco and Tajikistan follow closely with gaps of **-45.21** and **-44.30**, again showing extremely high differences between male and female justification levels.
- Even in countries where men's justification levels are relatively high (like Mali, Chad, Niger, and Ethiopia), the **female averages are still noticeably higher**, reinforcing that the gender pattern is consistent across regions.
- The smallest gap within the top 15 still remains significant, with Gambia showing -**16.23**, which still indicates a strong difference between males and females.
- Overall, this analysis makes it clear that in these countries, **women are more likely to justify violence across all surveyed contexts**, and the gaps are not small—they range from **about -16% to -46%**, which is substantial.

Query

SELECT

    Country,

    ROUND(AVG(CASE WHEN Gender = 'M' THEN Value END), 2) AS male_avg,

    ROUND(AVG(CASE WHEN Gender = 'F' THEN Value END), 2) AS female_avg,

    ROUND(

      AVG(CASE WHEN Gender = 'M' THEN Value END) -

      AVG(CASE WHEN Gender = 'F' THEN Value END), 2

) AS gender_gap,

    CASE

      WHEN AVG(CASE WHEN Gender = 'M' THEN Value END) >

        AVG(CASE WHEN Gender = 'F' THEN Value END)

      THEN 'Men more likely to justify'

      ELSE 'Women more likely to justify'

    END AS gap_direction

FROM violence_data

WHERE Value IS NOT NULL

GROUP BY Country

HAVING male_avg IS NOT NULL AND female_avg IS NOT NULL

ORDER BY ABS(gender_gap) DESC

LIMIT 15;

==

SECTION 3: EDUCATION IMPACT ANALYSIS

==

Query 6: *Education Level Impact on Attitudes*

Purpose: Analyze how education correlates with violence justification

Findings:

- I found that all four education levels (No education, Primary, Secondary, and Higher) had **840 responses each**, and all 70 countries were included in this analysis.
- The average justification rate is clearly higher among people with **no education**, sitting at **21.29%**, which places them under the "Moderate Concern" category.
- Primary education follows closely with an average justification of **19.78%**, which also still sits under "Moderate Concern," showing that moving from no schooling to basic schooling does not drastically reduce justification.
- Those with **secondary education** show a noticeable drop with **15.68%**, but still fall under "Moderate Concern," meaning harmful attitudes are still present even at this level.
- The lowest justification rate is among those with **higher education**, at **7.97%**, which is classified as "Lower Concern." This is the only group with attitudes that significantly differ from the rest.
- Overall, the findings show that **as education increases, justification for violence decreases**, and the gap between "higher education" and the other three levels is quite large. This suggests that education plays a meaningful role in shaping beliefs around violence.

Query

SELECT

   `Demographics Response` AS education_level,

   COUNT(*) AS total_responses,

```
    ROUND(AVG(Value), 2) AS avg_justification,

    COUNT(DISTINCT Country) AS countries_analyzed,

    CASE

        WHEN AVG(Value) > 40 THEN 'Critical Level'

        WHEN AVG(Value) BETWEEN 25 AND 40 THEN 'High Concern'

        WHEN AVG(Value) BETWEEN 15 AND 25 THEN 'Moderate Concern'

        ELSE 'Lower Concern'

    END AS concern_level

FROM violence_data

WHERE `Demographics Question` = 'Education' AND Value IS NOT NULL

GROUP BY `Demographics Response`

ORDER BY avg_justification DESC;
```

Query 7 ~ Education Impact by Gender

Purpose: See if education's impact differs between men and women

Findings:

- I found that each education level has **420 responses per gender**, meaning females and males are represented equally across all four categories.
- Across every education level, **women justify violence more than men**, and the gap is honestly quite big in most cases.
- For the **No education** group, females have an average justification rate of **28.34%**, while males sit at **14.24%**, which already shows a massive difference.
- The **Primary education** level shows the same pattern, with females at **26%** and males at **13.55%**. So even with basic schooling, women still justify violence way more than men.
- With **Secondary education**, the numbers drop a bit but the gap stays: females are at **19.17%**, and males are at **12.2%**.
- The lowest averages are in the **Higher education** category, where females sit at **9.28%** and males drop to **6.65%**, which is the smallest gap but still there.

- Overall, what I found is that **education definitely reduces justification**, but **women consistently justify violence more than men at every single education level**, from no schooling all the way to higher education.

Query

SELECT

   `Demographics Response` AS education_level,

   Gender,

   COUNT(*) AS responses,

   ROUND(AVG(Value), 2) AS avg_justification

FROM violence_data

WHERE `Demographics Question` = 'Education' AND Value IS NOT NULL

GROUP BY `Demographics Response`, Gender

ORDER BY education_level, Gender;

==

SECTION 4: DEMOGRAPHIC PATTERNS

==

Query 8 ~ *Age Group Analysis*

Purpose: Identify which age groups most/least justify violence

Findings:

- I found that all three age groups had **840 responses each**, and all 70 countries were represented in this analysis.
- The age group **15–24** has the highest average justification rate at **19.03%**, which basically shows that younger people are slightly more likely to justify violence compared to the other groups.
- The next group, **25–34**, has an average of **17.78%**, which is a small drop but still very close to the younger age group.
- The **35–49** group has the lowest average justification at **17.45%**, which honestly isn't a huge difference, but it still shows that justification decreases a bit as people get older.

- All age groups have a **minimum justification of 0**, but the maximum values go quite high and are above **80%** for all of them — which means in some countries, extreme attitudes are still present regardless of age.
- Overall, what I found is that **the differences between age groups are not that dramatic**, but younger people (15–24) still justify violence the most, and the oldest group (35–49) justifies it slightly less.

Query

SELECT

   `Demographics Response` AS age_group,

   COUNT(*) AS total_responses,

   ROUND(AVG(Value), 2) AS avg_justification,

   ROUND(MIN(Value), 2) AS min_justification,

   ROUND(MAX(Value), 2) AS max_justification,

   COUNT(DISTINCT Country) AS countries

FROM violence_data

WHERE `Demographics Question` = 'Age' AND Value IS NOT NULL

GROUP BY `Demographics Response`

ORDER BY avg_justification DESC;

Query 9 ~ *Employment Status Impact*

Purpose: Analyze if employment affects attitudes toward violence

Findings:

- I found that all three employment groups had **840 responses each**, and all 70 countries were included in this part of the analysis.
- The group with the highest average justification is **"Employed for kind"** at **21.54%**, which basically means people who work but get paid in goods or services instead of money justify violence the most.

- The **Unemployed** group comes next with **17.63%**, which is still fairly high but noticeably lower than those employed for kind.
- The lowest justification rate is among people **"Employed for cash,"** sitting at **17.13%**, which shows a very small difference compared to the unemployed group but still the lowest overall.
- Overall, what I found is that **employment status does seem to have an impact**, with people who are paid in-kind showing the highest acceptance of violence, while those earning cash have the lowest. The gap isn't massive, but it's clear enough to see a pattern.

Query

```
SELECT

    `Demographics Response` AS employment_status,

    COUNT(*) AS total_responses,

    ROUND(AVG(Value), 2) AS avg_justification,

    COUNT(DISTINCT Country) AS countries_analyzed

FROM violence_data

WHERE `Demographics Question` = 'Employment' AND Value IS NOT NULL

GROUP BY `Demographics Response`

ORDER BY avg_justification DESC;
```

Query 10 ~ *Urban vs Rural Residence*

Purpose: Compare attitudes between urban and rural populations

Findings:

- I found that both **Rural** and **Urban** groups had **840 responses each**, and all 70 countries took part in this analysis.
- The **Rural group** has the highest average justification rate at **21.02%**, which shows that people living in rural areas are more likely to justify violence compared to those in cities.
- The **Urban group** comes in much lower with **14.34%**, which is quite a big difference when you compare the two.

- Both groups have a **minimum justification of 0**, but the maximum values are very high and are **82.1%** for rural and **74.4%** for urban, meaning extreme attitudes still exist in both settings.
- Overall, what I found is that **residence type does have a clear impact**, and people in rural areas tend to justify violence more than people living in urban areas, and the gap is pretty noticeable.

Query

SELECT

   `Demographics Response` AS residence_type,

   COUNT(*) AS total_responses,

   ROUND(AVG(Value), 2) AS avg_justification,

   ROUND(MIN(Value), 2) AS lowest_rate,

   ROUND(MAX(Value), 2) AS highest_rate,

   COUNT(DISTINCT Country) AS countries

FROM violence_data

WHERE `Demographics Question` = 'Residence' AND Value IS NOT NULL

GROUP BY `Demographics Response`

ORDER BY avg_justification DESC;

Query 11 ~ *Marital Status Analysis*

Purpose: Examine if marital status correlates with violence justification

Findings:

- I found that all three marital status groups had **840 responses each**, and all 70 countries were included, so the data is evenly balanced.
- The highest average justification rate comes from the **Widowed, divorced, separated** group at **18.52%**, which honestly surprised me a bit because I expected married people to be higher, but this group actually tops the list.

- The **Married or living together** group follows very closely with **18.21%**, which means there is almost no difference between people who are currently partnered and those who were previously partnered.
- The **Never married** group has the lowest average justification at **15.83%**, showing that people who have never been in a formal or long-term partnership justify violence less than the other two groups.
- Overall, what I found is that marital status does have a small impact, but the differences are not extremely huge. Still, people who have been in a relationship before, whether currently married or previously married, tend to justify violence a little more than people who have never been married.

Query

SELECT

   `Demographics Response` AS marital_status,

   COUNT(*) AS total_responses,

   ROUND(AVG(Value), 2) AS avg_justification,

   COUNT(DISTINCT Country) AS countries_analyzed

FROM violence_data

WHERE `Demographics Question` = 'Marital status' AND Value IS NOT NULL

GROUP BY `Demographics Response`

ORDER BY avg_justification DESC;

===

SECTION 5: ADVANCED ANALYSIS

===

Query 12 ~ *Top 20 Worst Country-Demographic Combinations*

Purpose: Identify specific demographics in specific countries with highest justification rates

Uses: Subquery, multiple aggregations

Findings:

- The first thing that stood out to me is that **all 20 of the highest averages come from female respondents**. Not a single male demographic appears here, which already tells me that the normalization of violence is disproportionately internalized among women in these countries.

- **Morocco, Mali, Chad, and Timor-Leste dominate the list**, showing up repeatedly across employment, education, age, and marital status groups. This consistency suggests systemic issues in these countries that cut across multiple demographic layers.

- The **highest value overall is Morocco (Employed for kind – Female) at 71.72%**, which is extremely high. This group alone shows how vulnerable women in informal or unpaid work arrangements can be.

- **Employment status** seems to be the biggest driver in this dataset. "Employed for kind" appears multiple times, and every time it shows up, the justification rate is above 60%. Even "Employed for cash" in Chad and Mali appears in the upper bracket (around 57–62%).

- **Education level** is another strong factor. Women with **no education or only primary education** consistently fall within the top 20, especially in Morocco, Mali, Chad, and Timor-Leste. This clearly suggests that education plays a major role in reducing justification of violence.

- **Rural residence** also shows up among the highest values, particularly in Morocco and Mali. Rural environments seem to reinforce norms that make violence more acceptable or "normalised."

- When looking at **marital status**, married women (or those living with a partner) appear in the top ranking for Mali and Timor-Leste. What this suggests is that intimate relationships, especially in certain settings, may reinforce beliefs that justify violent behaviour.

- **Age groups** like 25–34 and 35–49 from Mali, Chad, and Timor-Leste appear on the list too, all scoring around 57–58%. These are key reproductive and household-building ages, making this a particularly sensitive finding.

- Overall, what I found in Query 12 is that **the highest-risk profiles overlap heavily**: female, rural, low education, informal employment, and either married or in the 25–49 age bracket. These factors seem to stack on top of each other and collectively contribute to the highest justification rates observed.

<u>Query</u>

SELECT

    Country,

    `Demographics Question`,

    `Demographics Response`,

    Gender,

    ROUND(AVG(Value), 2) AS avg_justification,

    COUNT(*) AS sample_size

FROM violence_data

WHERE Value IS NOT NULL

GROUP BY Country, `Demographics Question`, `Demographics Response`, Gender

HAVING COUNT(*) >= 3 -- At least 3 responses for reliability

ORDER BY avg_justification DESC

LIMIT 20;

Query 13 ~ *Violence Justification Reasons - Most to Least Accepted*

Purpose: Rank specific reasons people use to justify violence

Uses: Aggregation, ordering by severity

Findings:

- So firstly, all the categories had **2,100 measurements each**, across the same **70 countries**, which means the dataset is very balanced. Nothing is over-represented or under-represented, so the rankings feel quite reliable.
- The highest average acceptance rate is **"At least one reason" at 29.88%**, which basically shows that almost a third of people believe *there is at least some situation* where violence is justified. That, on its own, already says a lot about how normalized these behaviours still are.

- After that, the strongest individual reason people use is **"Neglects children" at 21.10%**. This one makes sense because it's tied to care responsibilities, but still, one in five people thinking violence is a valid response is definitely concerning.
- **"Goes out without permission"** is the next biggest one at **18.03%**, and honestly this one reflects strong control dynamics in relationships. It basically shows that mobility and "obedience" are still big pressure points in many communities.
- **"Argues with husband"** follows very closely at **16.53%**, which again reinforces that emotional conflict or disagreement is being treated as a justification for harm.
- One of the more sensitive categories, **"Refuses sex,"** sits at **11.71%**, and even though it's lower compared to the others, anything above zero here is already problematic. It means a significant number of people still hold coercive sexual expectations inside relationships.
- Lastly, the least accepted reason is **"Burns food" at 8.02%**, which is still shockingly high given that it's literally a simple mistake in the kitchen, yet almost 1 in 10 people still see violence as a valid response.
- Overall, what I found is that **practical household responsibilities and control over movement drive the highest justification rates**, while issues like food mistakes and sexual refusal appear lower on the list but still very concerning. The pattern reveals a deeper issue: people justify violence most when it connects to gender roles and expectations around care, obedience, and "proper" behaviour in a household.

Query

SELECT

  CASE

    WHEN Question LIKE '%burns the food%' THEN 'Burns food'

    WHEN Question LIKE '%argues with him%' THEN 'Argues with husband'

    WHEN Question LIKE '%goes out without telling%' THEN 'Goes out without permission'

    WHEN Question LIKE '%neglects the children%' THEN 'Neglects children'

    WHEN Question LIKE '%refuses to have sex%' THEN 'Refuses sex'

    WHEN Question LIKE '%at least one specific reason%' THEN 'At least one reason'

    ELSE 'Other'

```
    END AS violence_reason,

    COUNT(*) AS times_measured,

    ROUND(AVG(Value), 2) AS avg_acceptance_rate,

    ROUND(MIN(Value), 2) AS min_acceptance,

    ROUND(MAX(Value), 2) AS max_acceptance,

    COUNT(DISTINCT Country) AS countries_covered

FROM violence_data

WHERE Value IS NOT NULL

GROUP BY violence_reason

ORDER BY avg_acceptance_rate DESC;
```

Query 14 ~ *Countries with Most Critical Levels (Above 50% justification)*

Purpose: Flag countries needing urgent intervention

Uses: HAVING clause for filtering aggregated data

Findings:

-   After running the query, I actually found **no country** that crossed the 50% average justification threshold. Not a single one.
-   This means that even though certain *demographic groups* inside specific countries show very high justification rates (some even above 60% or 70% in earlier queries), when you look at the country as a whole, the **overall average stays below 50%**.
-   At first, I thought at least one or two countries might pop up, because some of the individual results were extremely high. But the national averages balanced out, probably because not all groups in that country justify violence at the same level.
-   So in short, there were **zero countries flagged** under this strict criterion.
-   What this really tells me is that the problem isn't always the entire country, sometimes it's specific **demographics**, like rural women, low-education groups, or certain age brackets, driving the high numbers. When everything is averaged together, those spikes get diluted.

- Overall, the takeaway is that while **no country hits the "critical" 50%+ danger zone**, the earlier breakdowns show that there are still very serious hotspots inside countries that shouldn't be ignored.

Query

SELECT

    Country,

    COUNT(*) AS total_measurements,

    ROUND(AVG(Value), 2) AS overall_avg_justification,

    ROUND(MAX(Value), 2) AS highest_recorded,

    COUNT(DISTINCT `Demographics Question`) AS demographics_covered

FROM violence_data

WHERE Value IS NOT NULL

GROUP BY Country

HAVING AVG(Value) > 50

ORDER BY overall_avg_justification DESC;

Query 15 ~ *Comprehensive Country Ranking with Risk Classification*

Purpose: To create a full ranking of all countries, classify their levels of risk, and see how men and women differ in how they justify violence.

Uses: CTE (Common Table Expression), CASE statement, complex classification

Findings:

- When I looked at the full ranking, the first thing that stood out is that **no country fell into the "Critical – Urgent Intervention Needed" category**, but a handful of them came very, very close. The "Severe - High Priority" countries are really the ones raising alarms here.
- At the top of the list is **Timor-Leste**, sitting with an average justification rate of **46.21%**, which is honestly way too high. And the highest single measurement in the whole

dataset for Timor-Leste goes up to **85.2%**, which is wild. Their gender gap is also noticeable, women justify violence **way more** than men here.

- **Chad, Congo DRC, Guinea, Afghanistan, and Mali** are also all in the "Severe - High Priority" range, with averages above 39%. These countries show the same trend: very high peak values, large justification numbers, and huge gender gaps where women report significantly higher acceptance than men. Mali especially has a massive gender gap of -**27.78**, meaning women justify violence almost 30 percentage points more than men.

- Moving down the ranking, most countries fall into the "Moderate - Attention Required" group. These are places sitting roughly between 20% and 35% average justification. Countries like **Azerbaijan, Tanzania, Sierra Leone, Niger, Burundi, Gambia, Uganda, Zambia, and Senegal** sit here, and even though their averages are lower than the severe group, the gender gaps in many of these are still worrying. Again, women generally report higher justification, which is honestly heartbreaking because it reflects real lived experiences and social conditioning around violence.

- Then there's the "Low-Moderate - Monitor" category. These countries still show concerning levels, but nowhere near the extremes we saw earlier. There are quite a few African nations here: **Liberia, Nigeria, Lesotho, Zimbabwe, Madagascar, Rwanda**, and others. Most of them still have values in the teens, with some hitting low twenties.

- The last group is the "Low - Positive Progress", and thankfully this part of the list is quite long. Countries like **Moldova, Guyana, Armenia, Maldives, Mozambique, Haiti, Albania, Guatemala, Bolivia, South Africa, Ukraine, Turkey, Philippines**, and many more are here. Some countries even have averages under 5%, which is actually impressive considering how high some of the upper countries were.

- A pattern that really kept repeating is that **almost every country has comprehensive data**, meaning at least four demographic categories were measured. That gives a lot of confidence in the consistency of comparisons.

- One thing I also couldn't ignore is the gender gap statistics. In most countries, **women justify violence higher than men**, sometimes by 20, 30, or even 45 percentage points. Only a few countries, like Kyrgyz Republic, Eswatini, Jordan, South Africa, and Guyana, had men reporting slightly higher levels than women.

- Overall, what this ranking showed me is that average justification varies hugely across countries, but the trends are consistent:
  - **High-risk countries** often have extremely high maximum values and massive gender gaps.
  - **Moderate-risk countries** still show meaningful justification rates but not at crisis levels.
  - **Low-risk countries** show strong progress and much lower tolerance for violence.

- This query basically gave me the full "helicopter view", not just who is doing badly, but also how each country compares, where gender plays a role, and which places might need urgent attention versus those that are improving.

Query

WITH country_summary AS (

    SELECT

        Country,

        ROUND(AVG(Value), 2) AS avg_justification,

        ROUND(MAX(Value), 2) AS max_justification,

        COUNT(*) AS total_responses,

        COUNT(DISTINCT `Demographics Question`) AS demographics_covered,

        ROUND(AVG(CASE WHEN Gender = 'M' THEN Value END), 2) AS male_avg,

        ROUND(AVG(CASE WHEN Gender = 'F' THEN Value END), 2) AS female_avg

    FROM violence_data

    WHERE Value IS NOT NULL

    GROUP BY Country

)

SELECT

    Country,

    avg_justification,

    max_justification,

    total_responses,

    male_avg,

    female_avg,

    ROUND(male_avg - female_avg, 2) AS gender_gap,

```
CASE

    WHEN avg_justification >= 50 THEN 'CRITICAL - Urgent Intervention Needed'

    WHEN avg_justification >= 35 THEN 'SEVERE - High Priority'

    WHEN avg_justification >= 20 THEN 'MODERATE - Attention Required'

    WHEN avg_justification >= 10 THEN 'LOW-MODERATE - Monitor'

    ELSE 'LOW - Positive Progress'

END AS risk_classification,

CASE

    WHEN demographics_covered >= 4 THEN 'Comprehensive data'

    WHEN demographics_covered >= 2 THEN 'Moderate data'

    ELSE 'Limited data'

END AS data_quality

FROM country_summary

ORDER BY avg_justification DESC;
```

Query 16 ~ *Education Impact Across Countries (Advanced CTE)*

Purpose: Show education's protective effect country by country

Uses: Multiple CTEs, complex joins, analytical ranking

Findings:

- When I looked at the full ranking, the first thing that stood out is how strong education's impact is in almost every country. Some countries show massive differences between people with no education and those with higher education, it's honestly striking.
- At the top of the list are Kenya and Tanzania, both in the **"Very Strong Impact"** category. Kenya has a gap of **32.31 percentage points** and Tanzania follows closely with **31.38**, meaning people with no education justify violence over 30% more than those with higher education, which is huge.

- A large group falls into the **"Strong Impact"** category, including Senegal, Ethiopia, Pakistan, Niger, Morocco, Burundi, Mali, Zimbabwe, Guinea, Cote d'Ivoire, Zambia, Lesotho, Sierra Leone, Gambia, Eritrea, Burkina Faso, Congo DRC, Cambodia, and Ghana. Their gaps are between 20 and 30 points, showing that education clearly lowers violence justification in a meaningful way.
- The **"Moderate Impact"** countries include Cameroon, Gabon, Uganda, Benin, Afghanistan, Togo, Angola, Rwanda, Nigeria, Turkmenistan, Albania, Namibia, Egypt, Chad, Yemen, Liberia, India, Eswatini, Tajikistan, and Nepal. These show smaller, but still important gaps, roughly 10–19 points, meaning education helps, but other social or cultural factors may also be influencing attitudes.
- The **"Slight Impact"** group contains Honduras, Guyana, Myanmar, Comoros, São Tomé and Príncipe, Azerbaijan, Madagascar, Jordan, Turkey, Mozambique, Haiti, Bangladesh, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Malawi, Congo, Colombia, Bolivia, Indonesia, Dominican Republic, South Africa, the Philippines, Peru, and Maldives. Their gaps are mostly under 10 points, so education has some effect, but it's much less dramatic here.
- Finally, the **"Minimal/Negative Impact"** countries are Timor-Leste, Ukraine, Moldova, Armenia, and Kyrgyz Republic. In some of these, higher education groups justify violence slightly more than those with no education. This was really surprising and suggests that other factors, like social norms, conflict history, or inequities in who gets educated, might be outweighing the protective effect of schooling.

- Across almost all countries, a clear pattern repeats: education generally lowers acceptance of violence, and the size of the gap is a strong indicator of how transformative education can be.

- Overall, this ranking showed me exactly where education is doing the most work, where it helps moderately, and where its influence is surprisingly weak or reversed. It gives a full "helicopter view" of education's protective effect globally, not just numbers, but real insight into which countries might need more focus on educational access and social programming to reduce violence.

Query

WITH no_education AS (

  SELECT

    Country,

    ROUND(AVG(Value), 2) AS no_edu_avg

```sql
    FROM violence_data

    WHERE `Demographics Question` = 'Education'

    AND `Demographics Response` LIKE '%No education%'

    AND Value IS NOT NULL

    GROUP BY Country

),

higher_education AS (

    SELECT

        Country,

        ROUND(AVG(Value), 2) AS higher_edu_avg

    FROM violence_data

    WHERE `Demographics Question` = 'Education'

    AND `Demographics Response` LIKE '%Higher%'

    AND Value IS NOT NULL

    GROUP BY Country

)

SELECT

    n.Country,

    n.no_edu_avg AS no_education_acceptance,

    h.higher_edu_avg AS higher_education_acceptance,

    ROUND(n.no_edu_avg - h.higher_edu_avg, 2) AS education_impact,

    CASE

        WHEN (n.no_edu_avg - h.higher_edu_avg) > 30 THEN 'Very Strong Impact'

        WHEN (n.no_edu_avg - h.higher_edu_avg) > 20 THEN 'Strong Impact'

        WHEN (n.no_edu_avg - h.higher_edu_avg) > 10 THEN 'Moderate Impact'

        WHEN (n.no_edu_avg - h.higher_edu_avg) > 0 THEN 'Slight Impact'
```

```sql
        ELSE 'Minimal/Negative Impact'
    END AS impact_level
FROM no_education n
INNER JOIN higher_education h ON n.Country = h.Country
ORDER BY education_impact DESC;
```