Hi Alex,

For Malaysia data a few questions as I finalize the presentation slides…

Are we sure that CTS is in the wrong direction for exposure condition, decrease in reporting incidents of IPA in exposure condition (women p = .09, men = .075)? If so, there are implications for overall IPA rates derived from CTS compared to the data we have from Phase I (also a random sample, rates were higher and there was no exposure to the poster, but n was much smaller). Just wanting to reconfirm.

Yes, assuming I am doing these things right:

From conditions\_key.xlsx, 0 = control, 1 = campaign

Any incidence in past year, i.e., a response of less than 7 on CTS2-S items == 1

Incidence in the year before, or never on CTS2-S item s == 0

Then sum these 1's and 0's to make a scale,

These are the means

1 Men       Control   1.69

2 Men       Campaign  1.32

3 Women     Control   1.88

4 Women     Campaign  1.52

If this is a very surprising result, I wonder if it is an artifact of the way the data are being summarized, where every item is crunched down to 1 = in last year no matter how many times, 0 = not in past year or never.  I'm guessing this is a standard way of encoding, but maybe we can think of something else or at least look at the distribution of responses at some point to see how much fidelity in the data we're losing by doing that.  Maybe we can do something more quantative at some point, where we directly encode the approximate number of incidents, or at least use them as a likert/ordinal variable.  I guess we can look at individual items to see if that is likely to help.

Item Q60 – If someone is being abused by their partner/spouse the best way they can protect their children in such a situation is – ‘tolerate the abuse to avoid the possibility of divorce’ – for women this is p = .07. Can you confirm direction for exposure condition (are they more/less likely to say this than control group)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Acceptability of IPA – does a man have a good reason to hit his wife if…** | **Women** | **Men** |
| 3 – yes if she disobeys him (exposure group less likely to say yes) | p = .04 |  |
| 4 – yes if she leaves the home without his permission (exp less likely to say yes) | p = .03 |  |
| 6 – yes if she wants to continue her education or do paid work outside the home (exp less likely to say yes) |  | p = .07\* |
| 7 – yes if she refuses to have sex with him (exp less likely to say yes) | p = .02 |  |
| 9 – yes if he suspects that she is unfaithful/cheating (exp less likely to say yes) | p = .03 |  |
| 10 – yes if he finds out that she is unfaithful/cheating (exp less likely to say yes) | p = .02 |  |
| Scale (all items 1-10 combined, exp less likely to say yes overall) | p = .01 |  |

\*only 8 total yes responses. Typically, any n below X would be removed from analysis.

Your output for acceptability of IPA includes ‘binomial model’ (women, p = .000) and scale in table above. Can you confirm the difference between scale and binomial model?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender relations** *(strongly agree = 1, 2, 3, 4 = strongly disagree)* | **Women** | **Men** |
| 8 - I think there is nothing a woman can do if her husband wants to have relations with other women (exp less likely to say…) |  | p = .05 |
| 12 – I think that a man owns his wife (exp less likely to say…) |  | p = .04 |
| Individual scale (8 individual items, exp more likely to say I think *more equalitarian views*) |  | p = .02 |
| Community scale (8 community items, exp more likely to say my community thinks *more equalitarian views*) |  | p =.07 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Help-seeking** | **Women** | **Men** |
| 3b d – do you think the couple (Rahima/Yusuf) will want to seek help? (no, maybe, yes – exp more likely to say maybe or yes) | p =.051 |  |
| 2b religious leaders (if you were being abused, and would seek help, exp more likely to say it would be from…) | p = .046 |  |
| 2b social institutions (if you were being abused, and would seek help, exp more likely to say it would be from…) | p = .02 |  |
| Q 68 don’t get involved (exp less likely to say…) | p =.02 |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Self-efficacy** | **Women** | **Men** |
| Individual scale (exp more likely to say, I can solve relationship problems – through such things as effort, resourcefulness, awareness of solutions available, use of coping skills) | p = .01 |  |