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Key Terms and Definitions

In this report the terms below are defined as follows:

**Design effect**: the ratio of the actual variance, under the sampling method actually used, to the variance computed under the assumption of simple random sampling.

**Empirical expectations (first order)**: what an individual thinks others do.

**Empirical expectations (second order)**: what an individual thinks others expect him or her to do.

**Household decision-making**: choices made about various aspects of family life, including how much of the household income should be spent, and on what, whether to have children, and how to raise children.

**Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) ‘4’ Matrix**: a 2x2 grid that plots where a given percent of the population stands on the social norms continuum of change (where attitudes or practices may change first). Each cell shows what percentage of the population reports that corresponding combination of old/new attitudes and practices.

**Likert scale**: a choice of four to five pre-coded responses which allows an individual respondent to express how much s/he agrees or disagrees with a particular statement. It is the most widely used approach to scaling responses in survey research which allows for ascribing quantitative value to data, to make it amenable to statistical analysis.

**New practice**: behaviours which Voices for Change seeks to promote and make more common. Core examples include: increased decision-making by women at the household level; a reduction in violence against women; and women seeking – and being supported in seeking – leadership at the local, state and federal levels.
**Old practice:** existing behaviours which Voices for Change seeks to shift because of their negative effects on women and girls. Core examples include: restricted decision-making by women at the household level; committing physical violence against women; and women not seeking – or being supported in seeking – leadership at the local, state and federal levels.

**Normative expectations (first order):** what an individual thinks others should do.

**Normative expectations (second order):** what behaviour an individual thinks others approve of (particularly relative to the individual’s own behaviour).

**Violence against women and girls (VAWG):** physical acts of violence such as being slapped, pushed, hit, kicked, whipped, or threatened with a weapon such as a gun or a knife.

**Pluralistic ignorance:** when many privately do not approve of an existing social norm but comply because they wrongly believe the majority of others do accept it (Prentice and Miller 1993).

**Reference group:** others whose opinions are relevant to one’s decision about how to act and what to believe.

**Social desirability bias:** inaccuracy in survey results due to respondents providing the answer they think enumerators want to hear, rather than the most accurate response.

**Social norms:** behavioural rule to which individuals prefer to conform, conditional on their expectation that 1) most people in their relevant network conform to it and 2) most people believe they should conform to it. Social norms are held in place by the expectation of positive social rewards for compliance or negative social sanctions for deviant behaviour.

**Tipping point:** the moment at which a social norm can rapidly change from an old to a new practice. This usually happens when widespread desire for approval from key influencers and others drives rapid behaviour change.

**Target behaviour:** old practice that this programme seeks to change: violence against women and girls, nonparticipation of women in household decision-making, and nonparticipation of women in leadership.
### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGW</td>
<td>Adolescent Girls and Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Community Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Demographic and Health Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Enumeration Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAP</td>
<td>Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHREC</td>
<td>National Health Research Ethics Committee of Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODK</td>
<td>Open Data Kit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td>Practical Sampling International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Primary Sampling Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHaSA</td>
<td>Strategy for the Harmonisation of Statistics in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4C</td>
<td>Voices for Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAWG</td>
<td>Violence Against Women and Girls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Voices for Change (V4C) is an ambitious, multi-pronged initiative promoting the empowerment of and respect for women at multiple levels of Nigerian society. Programming is focused in four Nigerian states (Enugu, Kaduna, Kano, and Lagos) and uses mass communication (such as radio programmes), targeted outreaches, coordination with key influencers, and legislative change to shift young people’s attitudes and behaviours about girls and women. V4C has identified three key behaviours which it specifically seeks to change:

- The role of women in household decision-making
- The prevalence of violence against women and girls (VAWG)
- The prevalence of women standing for leadership positions

The Attitudes, Practice, and Social Norms survey presented here was commissioned as the baseline study for a three-wave panel survey. The study also includes measures of young people’s expectations about what behaviours and attitudes are common in their communities. This data enables the identification of social norms and will allow measurement of how these change over time. Overall, the panel study will evaluate V4C’s effectiveness in reaching its programme goals.

This study is unique in that it is one of the first population-representative quantitative studies to identify social norms and track changes in these norms over time. Although the primary objective of this panel survey is to measure how attitudes and practices among respondents change over time, the baseline
survey itself provides rich data on existing beliefs, practices, and social norms.

A key element of this report is to understand whether social norms play a significant role in determining behaviour in V4C’s focal programme areas. Findings from this baseline study will enable V4C and its implementing partners to plan and conduct interventions better tailored to the current attitudes of Nigerian youth, as well as to identify the common patterns of influence which they experience.

**Study design**

This report is based on a multi-year panel survey monitoring the efficacy of V4C programming, particularly social marketing which targets norms related to gender violence and women’s empowerment. The baseline survey was concluded in June 2015. A total of 2,397 men and 2,401 women aged between 16 and 25 were interviewed, providing significant data on knowledge, attitudes, and practices in key V4C areas. Respondents formed a representative sample of young people in the four Nigerian states where V4C interventions are implemented – Enugu, Kaduna, Kano and Lagos.

Quantitative data was supplemented with qualitative data from 48 focus groups and interviews with key influencers such as religious and traditional leaders. This qualitative information unpacks the trends found in the survey, exploring how and why target behaviours persist, what types of people most strongly influence Nigerian youth, and what strategies may be most effective to catalyse further change. These focus groups will be tracked over time to further understand how and why behaviours, attitudes, and norms may be changing.

**Report contents**

This report is organised in four sections. First, it presents an overview of social norms theory. V4C has devised an innovative approach called the KAP ‘4’ Matrix, which maps social norms change onto a more conventional theory of change framework. This allows evaluators to assess the potential for a tipping point in collective behaviour, as well as whether social norms are changing over time.

Secondly, the report presents an overview of the demographic characteristics of the sample. This allows readers to better understand V4C’s target population (youth ages 16-25).

The heart of the report is devoted to understanding the baseline prevalence of V4C’s key behaviours among Nigerian youth (absence of VAWG, household decision-making by women, and women standing for/holding leadership positions). For each behaviour, the report first explores whether data indicates the presence
of a social norm. Then, analysis turns to attitudes and behaviours at the individual level. The KAP '4' Matrix is used to identify what percentage of the target population is currently located at which stage of change. This provides a baseline from which to evaluate future programming, and it also identifies the level of incongruence between personal attitude and behaviour – indicating the potential for tipping points in behaviour among Nigerian youth.

The main report concludes with a summary of programming implications, with an eye towards informing and strengthening future V4C programmes.

The report also includes significant appendices which provide more detailed information on social norms theory and the survey design. These appendices are designed to be as transparent as possible so that other social norms-oriented development initiatives can apply and build upon the innovations presented in this report.

Main findings

A detailed summary of report findings is presented in Section 3, preceding the discussion of each target behaviour. Overall, the study finds that social norms do not uniformly affect youth behaviour for all three V4C programmatic areas. In some cases, attitude, practice, and social norm dynamics appear to be consistent across the four target states (Enugu, Kaduna, Kano and Lagos); in other cases – particularly women in leadership – there appear to be significant differences between northern and southern regions of Nigeria. These findings have significant implications for future V4C programming.

According to the study, more than 20% of young women experienced violence in their household in the month preceding our survey. Yet, public disapproval of VAWG is already strong (nearly universal), which suggests that VAWG does not follow the conventional pattern of social norms. The private nature of VAWG likely contributes to the disconnect between public attitudes and private practice. Furthermore, while condemnation of VAWG is widespread, further probing shows that both men and women still may justify and/or rationalise VAWG in certain situations. The main implication, then, is programming which focuses on communicating the harms of VAWG would be redundant given the widespread knowledge and agreement within the population. More successful programming could include more targeted information campaigns promoting zero-tolerance for VAWG (dispelling beliefs that it is sometimes justifiable), as well as creating community networks that can more effectively translate social disapproval of VAWG into targeted sanctions of men who continue the practice.
In terms of women’s role in household decision-making, many young people appear to be at the earliest stage of change (pre-knowledge). Women currently play a limited role in household decision-making, and this is both expected and accepted across ages and for both genders. The uniformity of expectations in behaviour makes it difficult to conclusively determine whether and to what extent a social norm exists. However, like VAWG, the private nature of household decision-making suggests that public knowledge and sanctioning would likely have limited effect in shaping private household dynamics. Qualitative results indicate distinct spheres of influence for men and women with men still being considered the household head – often for religious or traditional reasons. The report identifies a significant opportunity for V4C to expand awareness of the benefits of having women play greater decision-making roles in the home.

Of V4C’s three focal areas, women in local leadership exhibits characteristics most indicative of a social norm. It is a public behaviour with defined expectations of social sanctions. The study finds that both young men and young women desire to be more active in local leadership than they currently are. It appears likely that the expected disapproval from older adults plays an important role in reducing the number of women who stand for leadership positions. Qualitative data highlight a number of common perceptions about women’s ability to lead and make decisions under pressure which justify the current low level of women in leadership positions. Given the desire among young women to be more active in leadership, it appears that this behaviour has the potential for reaching a tipping point. If key influencers such as parents and elders can be persuaded of the merits of having female leaders, a substantial number of young women say that they are ready and interested to fill these roles.
Section 1: Introduction, Theory and Methods

This section provides background theory on social norms and why social norms are critical to consider in V4C work.
It clarifies how scholars – and consequently the V4C programme – have adapted the conventional theory of change to measure progress in processes that involve social norms.

This section provides background theory on social norms and why social norms are critical to consider in V4C work. It clarifies how scholars – and consequently the V4C programme – have adapted the conventional theory of change to measure progress in processes that involve social norms. Overall, this section reviews how the conventional theory of change translates into an assessment of respondents’ knowledge, attitudes, and practices – and an assessment that accounts for the effects of social norms. This assessment framework, developed by the V4C programme, is a theoretically novel contribution called the KAP ‘4’ Matrix.

1.1 Introduction

V4C is an innovative and ambitious project that breaks new ground by using both traditional and new media to reach its audience and lay the foundation for change in the social norms governing gender relations in Nigeria. The project’s focus on girls and young women is driven by the dismal gender equality figures in Nigeria1 and the fact that at least 44%2 of the population is under 15. The design of the project is based on the WeChange™ principle – the understanding that individual attitudes and behaviour won’t change until a critical mass of people within society change.

Hence, V4C is working to:

1. **Empower girls and women**
   V4C aims to increase the self-esteem of 20,000 girls and women aged 16-25 in post-secondary education. This group has the potential to change not only their own lives but also to influence those around them, and to create a society-wide momentum and a pathway for change that will, in time, bring benefits to other vulnerable girls and women. To address this, V4C has established virtual and physical forums for networking and support where young women can discuss issues that matter to them, such as healthy relationships and future careers. It is expected that young women will feel a sense of community, share skills and ideas with one another, and in turn build their confidence.

2. **Transform societal views**
   V4C is working with 12,000 boys and men to try to transform attitudes. Activities include establishing spaces where boys and men can safely explore and challenge deeply held beliefs that are harmful to girls and women. V4C is also targeting traditional and religious leaders (including female leaders), the wives of male leaders, and media personalities. These people are seen as role models and will be supported to speak out in various forms of media,

---

3. WeChange is the option adopted in the Business Case for the V4C programme. It aims to work with a broader range of partners to harness wider momentum of change for the rights of girls and women by working with boys and men, key influencers, social movements and on relevant laws.
promoting positive behaviour and norms for society to adopt.

3. Law change

V4C wants to see that the right laws are in place to support gender equality, and that central and local government budgets better respond to women’s needs. V4C activities seek to make changes in three areas:

- The law – Only four of Nigeria’s 36 states currently have laws against domestic violence. V4C is supporting advocacy to secure two new bills at the federal level and in target states. One is dealing with violence against women and the other focuses on equal opportunities.

- The budget – In parallel to the above, V4C will support advocacy for securing a stronger gender focus in budgets and projects in target states.

- Changing the rules within political parties – V4C is encouraging political parties to become more representative and is providing support to women to participate more actively in party politics.

The main goals of the first survey wave – conducted between December 2014 and June 2015 – were:

- To provide a baseline from which to monitor changes in gender-related attitudes and behaviours among Nigerian youth over the next three years, and

- To evaluate the role of V4C in catalysing these changes.

The survey included many questions probing respondents’ knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) and social norms in the three V4C focal areas (household decision-making, gender-based violence, and leadership). Results from this baseline survey, presented below, enabled V4C to estimate what percentage of Nigerian youth are at different stages of the continuum of change, as well as how many youth will need to demonstrate changes in KAP given V4C targets.

The baseline survey also offers a wealth of insights into how respondents’ friends, family, and other key influencers may play a role in perpetuating, or shifting, behaviour. Globally, this survey is one of the first to attempt to measure the presence of social norms in a population-representative quantitative study. Findings demonstrate that social norms and the perception of others shape different gender-related practices through different mechanisms and to different extents. Qualitative results from the focus group discussions and interviews with key influencers compliment quantitative survey data. They clarify causal mechanisms driving the behaviours and attitudes observed in the statistically representative survey. Qualitative data also provides additional insights into the most effective strategies for catalysing social change.
Identifying when and how social dynamics influence KAP will enable V4C to more effectively design programming content and strategy. This report is designed not only to inform internal V4C programming, but also to act as a reference for other change initiatives seeking to incorporate a social norms dimension into their work. In the body of this report as well as the appendices, V4C provides detailed reporting of its qualitative and quantitative methodologies. The report’s analysis of baseline data using social norms theory seeks to provide a useful example of social norms research for other organisations.

This report begins with an overview of the V4C’s programme and its underlying theories of change and social norms; followed by sampling methodology, survey logic, and analytical strategy. We present baseline KAP data as well as an assessment of the extent to which social norms determine behaviour related to household decision-making, gender-based violence, and women’s participation in leadership positions. The report concludes by discussing implications for V4C strategy based on the baseline survey’s findings.

1.2 Theory

1.2.1 Background

The survey enables us to assess two key dimensions of the V4C programme: 1) how many individuals are meeting the KAP benchmarks set to measure programme success, and 2) whether social norms are a significant factor in perpetuating a behavioural regularity. Point 1 allows us to monitor how many people are affected by V4C during the course of the programme, while point 2 enables us to evaluate what outreach strategies are likely to be most effective given our assessment of regional norms.

1.2.2 Social Norms

A social norms-based approach to development recognises that individuals are not isolated – nor are their actions and opinions isolated – from the people that surround them. Decisions about what to believe and how to behave are not made in a vacuum, but rather one’s perception of prevailing attitudes and practices can have a strong influence on how that person chooses to act. This means that to be effective, development projects often have strong incentives to properly identify where social norms exist, and how perceptions of acceptable behaviour may strengthen or impede a given initiative.

Therefore, the development community has increasingly sought to understand where social norms exist and how social norms influence programme success. This section provides a brief overview of social norms theory; additional theory is available in Appendix A. Subsequent sections build on these theories to develop a framework for identifying social norms and evaluating their change over time.
Social norms are different from individual attitudes, beliefs or opinions in that one’s actions conform to what one perceives to be expected behaviour, particularly by those people whose opinion matters most. These opinion influencers are called the reference group – the people whose opinion generally matters most when individuals decide how to act and what values they should hold.

Furthermore, social norms are held in place by a combination of positive and negative sanctions (or the expectation that these sanctions will occur). For example, individuals may conform to a social norm because they seek approval from their reference group, or because they fear disapproval from the same group should they deviate from this norm. Examples of social norms currently targeted by the international development community include female genital mutilation or child marriage.

It is worth noting that the same behaviour may represent a social norm in some places, while in other places it may simply be a prevailing behaviour resulting from personal decision-making (“behavioural regularity”). Without in-depth analysis it may be difficult to distinguish which common behaviours are driven by social norms – a distinction which is critical for the successful design and implementation of some development initiatives.

Much of this report is devoted to this process of identifying where and when an individuals’ behaviour is determined by their expectations of the beliefs and behaviours of those around them. This report also explores whether violence against women and girls (VAWG), women’s role in household decision-making, and women’s participation in local leadership constitute social norms in Nigeria.

Social norms theory distinguishes between two types of expectations, both of which are important when seeking to properly measure social norms or social norms change (see Figure 1.1). Empirical expectations reflect what one expects others to do. Normative expectations involve expectations about what others should do. Additionally, social norms theory considers both first and second-order expectations. First-order expectations are the expectations that an individual has for others, while second order expectations are what that individual thinks those other people expect of him or her.

Overall, social norms are defined as behavioural rules to which individuals prefer to conform, conditional on their expectation that 1) most people in their relevant network conform, and 2) most people believe they should conform (Bicchieri 2006). Social norms are held in place by the expectations of positive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 1.1: Social Norms Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What Self Believes About:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: What I do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others 1st Order</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: What others do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: What others think I do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others 2nd Order</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: What I think I should do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: What I think others should do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: What others think I should do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social norms theory distinguishes between two types of expectations, both of which are important when seeking to properly measure social norms or social norms change (see Figure 1.1). Empirical expectations reflect what one expects others to do. Normative expectations involve expectations about what others should do. Additionally, social norms theory considers both first and second-order expectations. First-order expectations are the expectations that an individual has for others, while second order expectations are what that individual thinks those other people expect of him or her.

Overall, social norms are defined as behavioural rules to which individuals prefer to conform, conditional on their expectation that 1) most people in their relevant network conform, and 2) most people believe they should conform (Bicchieri 2006). Social norms are held in place by the expectations of positive.
social sanctions for compliance or negative social sanctions for deviant behaviour (Mackie et al. 2012).

Social norms are difficult to change through messaging or outreach that targets individuals without considering their social networks. Even if specific individuals change their attitudes, they may not change their behaviour because they anticipate disapproval or negative sanctioning applied to those who do not conform to the norm. Negative sanctioning can be more subtle than outright punishment, including loss of respect in the community or exclusion from significant events or institutions (Desai 2014).

Instead, to shift social norms a society-wide approach is required. Beyond targeting simply those who are affected by harmful norms – adolescent girls and women in the case of VAWG – programming must also reach out to those who maintain and support these norms. For this programme, such groups include men and boys, religious and traditional leaders, and older women. These groups are called reference groups because it is their behaviour, opinions, and others’ expectations about what behaviours this group considers acceptable that shape social norms.

1.2.3 Adapting Social Norms Theory to V4C Context

The social norms approach adopted by V4C has its origins in the DFID Strategic Vision for Girls and Women (Desai 2014). The Vision “aims to unlock the potential of women and girls, to stop poverty before it starts. It empowers girls and women, enabling them to have voice, choice and control.”

The four pillars of the DFID gender strategy are:

1. Completion of primary and secondary education
2. Economic empowerment
3. Ability to live free from violence
4. Universal sexual and reproductive health and rights.

These are viewed as “game changing” outcomes which are critical to empowering women and girls. To achieve this, an “enabling environment” that unlocks girls’ and women’s potential is also required, defined as one which:

1. Drives social transformation and shifts discriminatory norms and institutions that lock girls and women out of progress, including any form of violence
2. Strengthens effective social, political and economic institutions that work for girls and women, including the most vulnerable. Engaging boys and men as active citizens for gender equality
3. Promotes girls and women as leaders in politics and public life, and as active citizens with a voice in society.
A key component of social norms is the fear of disapproval from others and the desire for their approval. When deviation from a common practice is broadly disapproved of, the existence of a social norm can increase resistance to changing certain discriminatory behaviours. Commonly cited examples include delaying marriage in the community where early child marriage is common, or refusing to cut one’s daughter in a community where female genital cutting is prevalent.

However, through observation alone, it can be difficult to distinguish social norms from other patterns of behaviour common among a group of people. For example, a certain group of individuals may practice a behaviour out of convenience, or because they have never really considered alternative practices. For this reason, deeper inquiry is often needed to determine what role social norms play in driving patterns of behaviour.

Even though many behaviours may be determined in part – if not completely – by social forces, most large-scale programme evaluations focus solely on measuring individual attitudes and behaviours. This report breaks new ground by incorporating questions grounded in social norms theory, as well as qualitative focus group data. Using information of this kind, analysts can determine the extent to which a social norm may be present for a target behaviour, and the possibility of reaching a collective tipping point in group behaviour.

1.2.4 V4C’s Targeted Practices
V4C has identified three negative behaviours that impact hugely on the enabling environment for girls and women in Nigeria. The issues targeted for change by V4C are:

1. Violence against women and girls (VAWG)
2. Non-acceptability of girls and women as local leaders
3. Non/limited involvement of girls and women in household decision making.

These issues were chosen on the basis of their relevance to V4C’s core target audience (girls and women aged 16-25), the likelihood of changing discriminatory practices within the programme lifetime, and the importance of these issues to creating a better enabling environment.

The rationale for the choice of this group was:

1. This audience is more likely to be open to change and V4C is more likely to see results;
2. This audience, particularly the educated youth, are likely to become the future leaders of Nigeria, taking up positions in business, politics and civil society;
3. Youth are potentially more willing to challenge discriminatory social norms and construct more positive norms in the future.

V4C’s approach is based on the insight that a society-wide response is required, working at the individual, community, and social-structural levels. Through interventions at all three levels, V4C believes that social change can be prompted, sustained and accelerated more effectively than by working on one level alone.
1. At the individual level, V4C works with adolescent women and girls to provide them with the skills, knowledge and confidence to challenge discriminatory social norms and create change in their colleges, homes, workplaces and communities;

2. At the community level, V4C works with men and boys, religious and traditional leaders, and networks of women and girls to create a critical mass of support for gender equality, accelerating change and shifting negative norms;

3. At the social-structural level, V4C works to change discriminatory laws, create better policies, and direct assets towards women and girls, sending a message about changed social norms through media, as well as political and legal structures.

The programme includes a strong social marketing element, including the broadcast of radio dramas that highlight the value of new practices that empower women. V4C uses behaviour change communications to shift attitudes in the wider society, and to inform citizens that others have changed their attitude (Desai 2014).

### 1.2.5 Theory of Change

Appendix A.2-3 outlines the Theory of Change adopted by V4C and used as the basis for the social norms measurement.

At the outset, V4C programme implementers did not know to what extent the three behaviours targeted by V4C were driven by individual attitudes or by social norms. The analysis in the following sub-sections provides a framework for assessing the extent to which social norms affect behaviour in key V4C areas.

In brief, V4C has identified two pathways by which individuals can shift from the old practice’s social norm to create a new social norm. First, individuals acquire information both about the new practice and about how many people around them approve of the practice. Then, individuals either change their personal attitude to approve of the new practice followed by a similar change in behaviour, or their behaviour changes first followed by gradual increased support for the new practice. This latter pathway (called reluctant abandonment) is unique to social norms because it relies on one’s desire for approval to change behaviour, even when an individual may not personally agree with the new practice.

Adoption of new ideas about gender equality is not a one-off decision like buying a mobile phone or a new dress. Rather, it involves receiving new information, considering the arguments for and against change, public debate and discussion, a shift in attitudes, and a decision as to change to the new norm. V4C’s monitoring and evaluation strategy is based on tracking movement along a continuum of attitude and behaviour change, and communications will be designed to target different stages in the change process. The more contacts an individual has with the V4C programme and messages – and the more contact that person’s reference group also has with V4C programming – the more likely he or she is to progress along the pathway to change (Desai 2014).
Figure 1.2: Correlation of expectations with behavioural regularities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What I do</th>
<th>What others do</th>
<th>What others think I do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I think I should do</td>
<td>What I think others should do</td>
<td>What others think I should do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Standard measures of (personal) behaviour and attitude
- Social Convention
- Social Proof
- Social Norm

Figure 1.3: KAP '4' matrix

```
Old Practice ----------------- New Practice

Old Attitude ----------------- New Attitude

Old Practice   | New Practice
Old Attitude   | New Attitude

Old Practice   | New Practice
Old Attitude   | New Attitude
```
1.3 Measurement of Group Norms and Individual Practices

1.3.1 Quantitative Measurement of Social Norms

Identifying the existence of a social norm – as well as its strength and potential for change – requires a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. Survey data provides a representative snapshot of the population as a whole, while focus groups and interviews serve the purpose of more tightly identifying why the practice is or is not approved of, and potential mechanisms that may facilitate change. Methods used to collect quantitative and qualitative data for this study are described in Appendix B.1 and Appendix B.2 respectively.

As illustrated in Figure 1.1 (Section 1.2.2), there are six key questions which are used to identify the presence and pervasiveness of a social norm. Importantly, two of these questions (“What I do” and “What I think I should do”) are also essential for measuring the prevalence of personal attitudes and behaviour – critical for KAP analysis, as discussed in the following section (1.3.2).

Figure 1.2 illustrates how conventional survey measures differ from the strategies designed to identify social norms. Typically, surveys ask what respondents do and what behaviours they approve of. However, social norms hinge on expectations about others – the criteria circled in green.

The second and sixth cells in Figure 1.2 are the most critical respondents’ perceptions of “what others do” and “what others think I should do”) (Mackie et al. 2012). A stable social norm exists if there is an expectation that others practice a behaviour, and there is widespread perception that others, on average, approve of the behaviour (and disapprove of non-conformity).

Appendix A.4 elaborates on the typology V4C uses to translate social norms theory into survey questions, and how to use the results to identify the existence of social norms. The section also discusses how survey results can indicate potential tipping points – prime opportunities for catalysing widespread adoption of the new behaviour.

See Figure 1.2: Correlation of expectations with behavioural regularities

It is important to highlight that in some cases analysis may indicate that a social norm does not exist. The illustration above also demonstrates how different combinations of expectations correlate with different behavioural regularities. Hence, it is particularly important to assess whether social norms appear to be a factor in driving targeted behaviours, as different types of behavioural regularities may warrant different types of intervention.

See 1.3.2 Measuring Individual Change: The KAP ‘4’ Matrix

Measurement of individual-level change leverages the two questions in the social norms schema (see Figure 1.2) which assess personal attitudes and behaviours (“What I do” and “What I think I should do”). As explored in Annex A.2, personal change from old attitudes and beliefs to new attitudes and beliefs can be plotted in a 2x2 matrix. Each cell represents a different combination of old/new attitude and old/new practice. This reflects the two possible pathways of change: attitudes changing first, or behaviour changing first.

For the purposes of evaluation, V4C has distilled these two pathways of individual-level change into the KAP ‘4’ Matrix (see Figure 1.3). In the survey, respondents were asked to report
on their engagement in new/old behaviours as well as whether they hold new/old attitudes about the practice in question (violence against girls and women, for example, or a woman participating in household decision-making).

See Figure 1.3: KAP ‘4’ Matrix

Based on survey responses, each individual is placed in one of the four matrix cells. By plotting the percentage of individuals in each cell of this matrix, it becomes possible to evaluate how far along the continuum of change the overall population is, and along which of the two pathways (attitude or behaviour changing first). Specifically, aggregate data is used to estimate what percent of the target population is currently situated in each cell (representing each stage of change). This visualisation of individuals’ current attitudes and actions helps benchmark progress towards the goal of willing (and sustainable) abandonment of the old practice.

In the aggregate, responses give us an indication of which pathway of change is likely to be more common (change in attitude first, or change in behaviour before attitude). Baseline data also provides us with initial measurements from which to assess how much progress has been made in future survey waves toward the achievement of a stable equilibrium where most of the population both approves of and practices the new behaviour.

If the majority of respondents self-report practising the old behaviour and subscribing to the old attitude, this suggests that education and raising awareness about the benefits of the new practice could be particularly successful.

If, however, a large percentage of respondents are categorised in the lower left quadrant (new attitude/old practice), widespread education about the benefits of the new behaviour is likely to be redundant. In these cases, the norm is at a tipping point. Resources would be better used to generate widespread awareness about the depth and breadth of public support for the new behaviour, as well as to potentially model this new behaviour by key influencers. This can be accomplished, for example, through public campaigns that raise awareness and spread common knowledge about how many people support the new practice.

A similar analysis also can be conducted on first order expectations (what respondents think others do and think). This illustrates where Nigerians themselves perceive the people around them to be on the continuum of change. An analysis of second order expectations illustrates what Nigerian youth think others expect of their own behaviour and opinions.

1.3.3 Key Social Norms and Survey Questions

This section provides a more detailed description of the actual questions used to measure attitudes, practices, and social norms in each of the three target behaviours. In many cases, response options measured behaviour frequency and/or belief intensity. This data will allow us to track more nuanced changes in attitude and behaviour levels. However, for the purpose of analysis, the majority of these scaled results were subsequently translated into binary values (0/1). This process is also described below.

Violence against women and girls

Key questions used in the analysis are listed below, along with their corresponding letter in the social norms matrix (Section 1.2.2 and Appendix A). Questions A and B were used in the attitude and practice analysis, while the full set of questions was used in
the social norms analysis. Respondents were also asked whose opinion they care about most when deciding how to act towards women. Their responses (“parents”, “spouse”, “peers”, etc.) were used to replace the bracketed text in Questions C and F.

A. For women: How often in the last month did a man hit or slap you? [often/sometimes/rarely/never]

A. For men: How often in the last month did you hit or slap a woman you know? [often/sometimes/rarely/never]

B. In other families around here, how often does a man hit or slap a woman in a month? [often/sometimes/rarely/never]

C. How much would [people who matter to the respondent] guess that a man in your family hits or slaps a woman?

D+E. Sometimes a husband is annoyed or angered by the things his wife does. Would you approve or disapprove if a husband hit or beat his wife in the following situations? [goes out without telling him; neglects the children; argues with him; refuses to have sex; doesn’t cook food properly.]

F. How much would [people who matter to the respondent] approve or disapprove if a man in your family hit or slapped a woman?

Personal VAWG behaviour is measured differently for men and women in this study, with men stating how often they hit a woman in their household in the last month, and women stating how often they personally were hit by a man in their household the last month. All other metrics are measured in the same way for men and women.

To calculate percentages of the population experiencing or committing violence against women in the household, survey responses collected on a four-point scale were subsequently converted into a binary measure of VAWG occurrence. “Never” was coded as zero, while “rarely”, “sometimes”, and “often” were coded as one. This classification of “rarely” was put alongside “sometimes” and “often” because the timeframe specifically given in the question was “in the last month” – behaviours that are occurring even infrequently but within the month time period are considered frequent enough to indicate that the behaviour continues to be practiced fairly regularly.

Wording of the VAWG behaviours was drawn from language in the 2013 Nigeria DHS survey. However, the four-point frequency scale used to measure responses in the V4C study differs from the DHS, which offers strictly binary yes/no response choices to VAWG questions. The frequency of VAWG measured in V4C’s study is significantly higher than that reported in the 2013 Nigeria DHS data, and it appears that inclusion of the “rarely” option captures greater prevalence of the behaviour. Recoding of the data such that “rarely” was equated with an absence of the behaviour results in a decline in reported rates of VAWG by up to 30 percent.

The importance of a “rarely” option in capturing ongoing VAWG suggests two insights: firstly, it is possible that many respondents, both men and women, think about occasional VAWG as being a different phenomenon from more frequent VAWG. It appears that occasional hitting of women in the household is considered acceptable, rather than respondents holding a zero-tolerance attitude toward VAWG. Additionally, then, this data suggests that the DHS data may be
underreporting the percentage of women affected by domestic violence, since respondents dismiss infrequent behaviours as not being memorable or of sufficient magnitude to qualify as a “yes” response when asked if the behaviour occurs.

Personal approval or disapproval of VAWG (Question D) is operationalised as a binary measure of whether respondents stated that a man was justified in hitting a woman in one of the following five scenarios (replicating DHS language): 1) she goes out without telling him, 2) she neglects the children, 3) she argues with him, 4) she refuses to have sex with him, and/or 5) she doesn’t cook food properly. This same value is also used to indicate respondents’ first-order normative expectations (Question E) – whether respondents approve or disapprove of men hitting women and their households under one of these five circumstances.

Women in household decision making

Key questions used in the analysis are listed below, along with their corresponding letter in the social norms matrix (Section 1.2.2 and Appendix A). Questions A and B are used in the attitude and practice analysis, while the full set of questions are used in the social norms analysis.

Each question was asked regarding six different types of decisions (major household purchases, purchasing daily household needs, what to do with the man’s earnings, what to do with the woman’s earnings, when to have sexual relations, and how many children to have). Response options were on a four-point scale: none, little, some, a lot. Average responses were calculated across the five areas. Again, respondents were asked whose opinion they care about most when deciding how to act towards women. Their responses (“parents”, “spouse”, “peers”, etc.) were used to replace the bracketed text in Question F.

A. What’s the reality now? How much is the woman’s opinion considered in your family?

B. In general, how much is a woman’s opinion considered in families around here when they make decisions?

C. In your view, how much should a woman’s opinion ideally be considered in your family?

D+E. In general, how much should a woman’s opinion be considered in other families around here when they make decisions?

F. In your view, how much would [people whose opinion matters to the respondent] think a women’s opinion should be considered in your family?

Responses to the five areas were averaged to create an overall decision-making score. For the analysis below, this value was converted to a binary score, where values 0-1.99 were coded as zero, and values 2-4 were coded as one. Therefore, the values in this survey that correspond with the “new” behaviour/attitude represent the percentage of people who say that women’s opinions should or do matter somewhat or a lot at the household level (compared to those who say that women’s opinions should or do not matter or matter only a little).

The second order empirical question (Question C in the social norms typology) was not asked for household decision-making. It was found to be an awkward question to ask in survey format, it was deemed not as crucial for understanding overall behaviour dynamics, and it was also cut to streamline survey length.
Women in local leadership

Key questions used in the analysis are listed below, along with their corresponding letter in the social norms matrix (Section 1.2.2 and Appendix A). Questions A and B are used in the KAP analysis, while the full set of questions are used in the social norms analysis.

A. Would you ever like to be selected for leadership of an organisation (Community Development Association (CDA), school, professional/trade association, etc.)? [no/probably not/probably yes/yes]

B. Around here, how often are women selected for leadership of an organisation (CDA, school, professional/trade association, etc.)? [never/rarely/sometimes/often]

E. Would you approve or disapprove if a woman around here was selected for leadership of a political organisation (CDA, school, professional/trade association, etc.)? [strongly approve/moderately approve/neither approve nor disapprove/moderately disapprove/strongly disapprove]

F. In your opinion, how many people around here approve of women being selected for the leadership of a local organisation (CDA, school, professional/trade association, etc.)? [very few or none/less than half/about half/more than half/almost everyone]

Scale responses to these questions were then converted into binary variables to calculate prevalence of the attitudes and behaviours.

Noteworthy here is the fact that Question A asks for personal interest in taking a leadership role, regardless of the respondent’s gender. Therefore, in the results presented in Section 3.3, responses for men measure whether or not young men personally want to take leadership roles, crossed with whether they think women should be in local leadership. Measuring men’s personal leadership preferences provides a useful baseline for assessing whether discrepancies between action and behaviour is linked to gender norms or to practical factors that limit people’s participation in these roles, regardless of gender. Men’s first order expectations about women participating in leadership are explored in section 3.3.2.

This set of questions did not ask Questions C or D from the social norms typology, primarily because they did not make logical sense or were difficult to communicate succinctly. This is in part because the leadership module, in essence, combines different behaviours: one’s personal desire to participate in leadership, and one’s approval of women standing for leadership positions regardless of one’s personal desire to do so. Question C could have been asked in two ways (“How often do people expect you to want to stand for a leadership position” or “How often do people think that women take leadership roles around here”). The first question is rather convoluted without providing clear additional insights, while value for the second question theoretically should be the same value as Question B, since the behaviour is public. For this latter reason, Question B is used as a proxy for Question C.

Question D would ascertain whether individuals thought they should stand for local leadership, regardless of whether they do or not. Since local leadership is more commonly thought of as something that is desired, rather than obligatory, such a question does not make sense. Therefore, Question E is used as a proxy to measure
1.3.4 Quantitative Data Analysis

The statistical analysis package Stata/IC Version 13.1 was used for data management and for analysis to take into account the effects of a clustered survey on the variant structure of each of the variables analysed.

The survey enabled the analysis of multiple layers of attitudes and behaviours – individual-level KAP, group-level KAP, and the prevalence of social norms related to target behaviours. Indicator variables were selected with careful thought to KAP M&E needs and the importance of measuring social norms. The survey is divided into three modules: 1) household decision-making; 2) VAWG; and 3) leadership.

Questions aim to measure:

- Actual KAP of target population
- Target population’s perceptions of influencers’ KAP
- Target population’s KAP of influencers’ expectations and behaviours. Each plays a role in social norms

Outside research suggests that anxiety-inducing contexts may affect reports of political action. Therefore, the order of question blocks was randomised between the VAWG module and political engagement module to control potential bias and framing effects due to survey order.

The Grameen Foundation’s Progress Out of Poverty Indicators for Nigeria 2003 informed a series of baseline questions which we asked to estimate the respondent’s likelihood of living in a household below a certain poverty line.

1.3.5 Qualitative Data Analysis

The overall aim of the qualitative research component is to compliment quantitative results by providing further insights into the attitudes and practices of all key demographics relevant to the V4C programme. Specifically, the objective of the focus group discussions (FGDs) and in-depth interviews was to confirm and unpack KAP trends identified through the baseline survey, and to clarify mechanisms by which behaviours and attitudes are preserved or changed.

Qualitative data will be collected from the same focus groups at regular intervals in order to compare how norms change in subsequent years, and how this change is attributable to V4C work. A total of 48 FGDs and 20 in-depth interviews were carried out in the four Nigerian states of Enugu, Kaduna, Kano and Lagos.

Appendix B.2 provides additional details about how qualitative data was collected for this report.

1.3.6 Ethical Considerations

For both the quantitative survey and qualitative focus group discussions, V4C, the survey company and the field supervisors ensured that the ethical regulations of the project that guarantee voluntary participation and confidential data management were met. Interviews were conducted in settings that guaranteed auditory and, wherever possible, visual privacy. The protocol, consent forms, draft questionnaires, and focus group discussion guides were approved by the National Health Research Ethics Committee of Nigeria (NHREC).

V4C also ensured that its survey would not make any respondents more vulnerable as a result of answering questions on recent abuse. The most sensitive survey questions, as well as
the framing language, for the VAWG module specifically, were drawn almost directly from the 2008 DHS survey. V4C has applied steps that the DHS took (consent language, available counselling services) to minimise harm from these questions. In addition, only one respondent was enumerated per household in order to reduce the possibility that an abuser in the household understood the questions being fielded. Procedures were in place for dealing with re-traumatisation.

At the start of all interviews, respondents were informed of the purpose and nature of the study through the information and consent form. As part of the consent procedure, the respondent was informed that the data collected would be held in strict confidence, and that he/she was free to terminate the interview at any point or to refuse to answer any questions that he/she felt uncomfortable with or unable to answer.

Participation in the study was on a voluntary basis. No inducements were made. It was not possible to guarantee anonymity because of the panel nature of the study, but respondents were assured that their data will be held confidentially, and only summaries at state-level by sex will be produced, and that these summaries are sufficiently aggregated to ensure that no one community or individual could be identified. Efforts were made to ensure that respondents were clear that refusal to participate would not result in any negative consequences.

Violence against women and some other issues covered in the survey are sensitive issues; and men and women may be afraid to answer such questions. For this reason, particular care was taken to ensure that all questions were asked sensitively, in a supportive and non-judgemental manner. Interviewers were trained to be aware of the effects that the questions may have on the respondent and, if necessary, terminate the interview if the effect seemed too negative.

Part of the training provided to the researchers and fieldworkers covered survey techniques as well as how to respond and, if necessary, provide support to someone who reports experiencing violence. Interviewers are trained to assist if asked, but told not to force anyone into an intervention.
Finally, V4C and the survey company ensured the physical safety of respondents and interviewers. If the focus of the survey became widely known — either within the household or among the community — the topic of the interview may have become known to a perpetrator of violence. For people experiencing violence, the mere act of participating in a study may provoke further abuse. This may place the respondent or the interview team at risk of violence, either before, during or after the interview. For this reason, the following measures were adopted to ensure that the research topic did not become widely known:

- To enable the respondent to explain the study to others safely, the survey was framed as the Study on People’s Knowledge, Attitude and Practices on Social Issues and was introduced at the local and household levels in this manner.

- In all communications, discussions and paperwork about the study during the research period, the safe name was used.

- Interviews were only conducted in a private setting. Only children younger than 2 years old were permitted to be present. Where necessary, locations outside the household where the interview could be conducted in private were used (such as in a nearby field or at a local clinic, church or mosque).

- The respondent was free to reschedule (or relocate) the interview to a time (or place) that was more convenient for him or her.

- Interviewers were trained to terminate or change the subject of discussion if an interview was interrupted by anyone.

1.3.7 Support for Respondents

Respondents taking the survey could potentially become upset when answering questions about violence. They could also be currently experiencing violence and want assistance with the situation. In order to respond to these needs, the survey developed multiple ways to link interviewees to support. First, interviewers offered a list of local and regional services as well as a national hotline to respondents. In order to ensure that the list of services did not reveal the nature of the survey to people who did not participate, the list included services for a range of health problems (e.g., malaria, HIV/AIDS, alcohol use) as well as child abuse and violence. Interviewers were instructed to indicate which organisations and agencies provided services for sexual violence, as well as other forms of violence, so that the respondents clearly understood where to obtain the necessary services. The social welfare officers in states where the survey was conducted, were contacted in advance to ensure cooperation should their services be required. No female or male respondents requested services.
Section 2: Demographic Characteristics of the Survey Sample

The results below describe selected demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of survey participants and their households.
Key demographic characteristics include sex and age distribution, education, marital status, religious affiliation, media exposure, social networks and household economics. For the following results, when data is presented for each state they include the composite samples of both rural and urban.

2.1 Gender and Age Distribution of the Sample

As previously described, this study interviewed female and male respondents between the ages of 16 and 25. Females and males were sampled from separate communities.

In total 2,401 females and 2,397 males were sampled in the four states (see table C.1). The distribution of respondents’ ages is less consistent, with 16, 18, 20, and 25 being the most represented ages. In Kano state, 25 year-olds comprise over 20% of respondents (see table C.1). Given that these individuals will remain in the survey as they age out of the target cohort, the V4C survey will be able to demonstrate with a fair degree of robustness how individual people of the target age range respond to programming, even as they age out of the young adult bracket.

Across gender and state, the number of 16 to 20 year olds makes up a slightly larger percentage of the 16 to 25 year old population, than 21 to 25 year olds (see table C.1).

2.2 Education

At the household level, school attendance rates are highest for Enugu state, followed by Lagos (measured by whether all 16 to 18 year olds in a respondent’s household are enrolled in school). One would expect this household-level statistic not to vary based on whether the respondent is male or female; however, in northern states women more commonly report that not all 16 to 18 year-olds are enrolled in school. One reason for this discrepancy might be that male respondents are less likely to think of girls and young women as being eligible for further schooling.

As shown in table C.3, education rates are lowest in Kano state, where 20% of men and 40% of women in the sample never attended school. A total of 23% of female respondents in Kaduna also report never attending school. For all other cohorts, the percent of respondents who have no formal education is in the single digits. Among those who have attended school, a secondary education is the most common (almost three quarters of respondents). Males and females in Lagos are most likely to have attended college (10%) and respondents in Enugu also show high college and graduate school attendance rates.
Respondents not currently enrolled in school were asked why they left. For women in northern states, the most common reason by far was marriage (19-23% of respondents). This reason was far more common than parents’ opposition to further education (3% in Kaduna and 1% in Kano). Getting a job and needing to help at home were more common reasons for leaving school among men compared to women. Finances appear to not be a significant barrier, with the exception of males in Kano, 5% of whom state that school became too expensive to attend.

2.3 Marital Status
Nigeria’s Marriage Act of 1990 does not specify any minimum age limit. It merely states that unless a party is a widow or widower, one must obtain the written consent of either the parents or guardian where the person who is to marry is under the age of 21. The expert body that monitors the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) further stipulates that 18 years is the minimum age of marriage for both males and females.

Overall, 33% of female and 11% of male respondents reported that they had been married (see table C.1). Depending on the state, between 3% and 18.8% of men in the sample were married. Marriage rates for women are higher across the board, although there is a marked difference in marriage rates between northern and southern states. In the south, an average of 18% of female respondents were married, while in the north almost half (48%) of female respondents were married.

2.4 Religious Affiliation
Nigeria has diverse religious representation, though the predominant religions are Christianity (Catholic and Protestant) and Islam. Due to a diverse historical, economic and cultural context, northern residents are predominantly Muslim while the southern states are mostly Christian.

Respondents in Enugu province are overwhelmingly Christian; those in Kano are overwhelmingly Muslim; while respondents in Lagos and Kaduna have mixed religious affiliations. In southern states, at least half of respondents reported worshipping almost every day; that number increases to over 75% for respondents in the north. Upwards of 97% of respondents reported worshipping at least once a week. This frequency of worship – and regular exposure to one’s religious community – confirms the emphasis V4C is placing on working with religious leaders to address norms and behaviours targeted by the initiative.

2.5 Media Exposure
Among respondents, radio appears to be the most commonly consumed type of media (47% listen daily), followed by TV (40% daily), and then social media (26% daily) (see table C.5). Only 13% of respondents did not listen to the radio at all, while 28% did not watch TV, and 59% did not use social media. All but 47 respondents who listen to the radio reported listening to at least one radio station that is partnering with V4C.

Media exposure varies more by state than by gender, and radio exposure is fairly consistent across cohorts. Daily TV consumption ranges from 70% of respondents in Lagos to 22% in Kano. Similarly, daily social media use ranges from about 50% in Lagos to 15% in Kano and 12% in Kaduna.
Differences between respondents in northern and southern states are also apparent when one considers mobile phone use. Respondents in Enugu and Lagos states overwhelmingly own mobile phones, and more than 90% of phone owners (male and female) provided their phone numbers to enumerators. In Kaduna and Kano, however, mobile phone ownership is lower, ranging from 60% for women in Kaduna to 74% for males in Kano. In these states, most mobile phone owners were also willing to provide contact numbers to the enumerators. However due to lower ownership rates, fewer respondents’ phones numbers were obtained, which may pose additional difficulties in finding panel participants in future survey waves.

2.6 Household Status

Nigeria continues to rank low on the Human Development Index (HDI), ranking 153rd out of 187 countries in 2011, with 61% of the population living below the poverty line. In order to understand the socioeconomic resources of the households in which respondents lived, due in part to the wide range of employment circumstances, the survey did not directly ask for personal or household income. Instead, it used a group of questions taken from the Grameen Foundation’s 2003 Progress out of Poverty Index for Nigeria to generate a poverty index score for each respondent.

The index scores welfare on a scale of 0 to 100, with higher scores indicating higher welfare. According to the initial Progress out of Poverty report, a score of 39 or lower indicated at least a 14% chance of living below the $0.25 per day poverty line (purchasing power parity) and at least a 42% chance of living below the $0.50 per day poverty line.

Specific indicators used to compile the index include household size, schooling, floor quality, roof quality, source of water, type of latrine, and possession of a TV, stove, mattress or radio.

Results indicate that the main source of variation in welfare level between cohorts occurs at the state level, rather than between genders. Lagos scores highest (64.6), followed by Enugu (56.6), Kaduna (45.3), and Kano (37.5) (see table D.2).

In terms of assessing respondents’ professional status, on average men were slightly more likely to be students and to be employed than women. A higher percentage of women than men were unemployed, regardless of whether they were actively seeking work or not. Over two thirds of respondents in Enugu were students, compared to half of respondents in Lagos, and less than half of respondents in the northern states. The cohort least likely to be enrolled in school is women in Kano (33%).

One third of respondents in Lagos are employed (both males and females), followed by males in Kano and Kaduna (25% and 19% respectively). Very few women from Kaduna and Kano in the sample were employed (6% and 3% respectively). Conversely, while less than 10% of respondents in most cohorts report being unemployed and not actively seeking work, 36-48% of women in Kaduna and Kano self-report in this category. This result, with the demographic data described above, suggests that women in the north are marrying at a younger age and are more likely to be engaged full-time in child-rearing, compared to their male colleagues, and women in the southern states.

The data also suggests that male social networks may be more robust than women’s. Respondents were asked how
many people they knew that fit certain criteria (owned a mosquito net, gave birth to a baby in the last 12 months, had a child die within the last 12 months, was a female head of household). In general, men across the different states reported knowing a higher number of people in each category, including categories that one might expect to be more traditionally a “woman’s issue”.

Few respondents reported living on their own, with most living with their parents or other relatives. The one exception is in the north, where women are significantly more likely to live with their spouse’s family (32% in Kaduna and 36% in Kano).

In Lagos, the majority of respondents’ households are fairly small (2-5 people). The most common household size for Enugu and Kaduna is 6-9 people. Kano state has the largest households, with half of respondents reporting household sizes of 10 or more individuals.

Overall, women reported having more children than men. Women in Kaduna and Kano also reported having more children than women in southern states. Notably, 9% of women in Kaduna and 13% of female respondents in Kano self-reported as having between 4 to 6 children.

### 2.7 Social Networks

The survey asked respondents to indicate whose opinion mattered most to them in shaping their attitudes and practices on different issues. In social norms terminology, this is called the respondent’s main reference group. Results indicate that a respondents’ reference group varies based on the issue.

Regarding women’s role in household decision-making, respondents in all cohorts overwhelmingly report that parents or other relatives are the main reference group (81%) (see table D.4). The main deviation from this finding is that women in Kaduna and Kano are significantly more likely to report their spouse as the primary reference group for household decision making (25% to 28%).

Regarding how men treat women, however, the results are slightly different. Parents or other relatives remain the primary reference group (47% across all cohorts). Yet, peers seem to play a much more significant role, particularly for both genders in Kano state (21% of women and 26% of men) and men in Enugu (27%). Peers seem to be least influential in Kaduna state. A total of 15% of respondents identify religious leaders as a key reference group – this number is fairly consistent across cohorts, except for males in Kano state, where 28% of respondents indicate religious leaders to be an important reference group.

13% of respondents say that one’s spouse is also influential in determining acceptable behaviours towards women. Again, this number is fairly consistent across cohorts, with exceptions being men in Lagos and Kaduna (5% each), and highest for women in Kano state (27%). Notably, this finding suggests that in Kano and Enugu, men report looking at least in part to their spouses for cues about acceptable behaviour toward women.

For both decision-making and the physical treatment of women, social media plays a much less significant role. Barely 1% of respondents indicated that social media plays a significant role in shaping these types of attitudes and behaviours towards women.
Section 3: Results and Discussion

This section presents findings on the prevalence of behaviours targeted by V4C violence against women and girls, non-participation in household decision-making, and non-participation in local leadership.
Analysis considers the existence of social norms and where Nigerian youths stand on a continuum of change using the KAP ‘4’ Matrix. Qualitative evidence from focus groups, along with interviews with key influencers, supplements the numerical data to better identify why old practices persist and what strategies may facilitate change.

Results are presented in three parts, with each section corresponding to a target behaviour. Each part first presents an assessment of whether the old practice is a social norm. This assessment is made using the typology to examine personal beliefs and behaviour, as well as the first and second-order expectations about others’ beliefs and behaviour (detail of the typology is presented in Annex A.4). The subsection provides a discussion of implications for programme implementation based on whether others’ approval appears to influence young Nigerians’ behaviour.

Further analysis of respondents’ personal attitudes and behaviour is used to pinpoint where the Nigerian youth of different states stand along in the continuum of change in the KAP ‘4’ Matrix between old and new practices. These KAP ‘4’ results help identify where tipping points may exist (opportunities to quickly shift large numbers of youth from old to new practices). They also identify where old practices are most strongly entrenched.

The survey also discusses Nigerian youths’ expectations about where others are on this same continuum of change. By comparing differences in the distribution of self-reported attitudes and practices versus expectations about others’ behaviours and beliefs, this survey is able to identify potential knowledge gaps (particularly situations where a majority of youth think others approve of the old practice more than they actually do). This is key in highlighting potential tipping points.

Throughout each subsection, qualitative results are included to provide additional depth to the empirical findings (and to highlight instances where qualitative and quantitative results presented a more complex situation). The implications of the findings and opportunities analysed in this part of the report are presented in Section 4.
3.1 Violence Against Women and Girls

Results Summary

- The large majority of Nigerian youth disapprove of VAWG and expect that others disapprove of the practice as well. Yet, 2 out of 5 young women report still experiencing VAWG occasionally. This marked difference between approval and practice suggests that VAWG is not primarily driven by a social norm. This implies that public disapproval of what is predominantly a private practice is not sufficient (currently) to prevent VAWG in many cases.

- While Nigerians (both youth and adults) generally disapprove of VAWG, deeper probing reveals that many people continue to consider VAWG justifiable under certain circumstances. Furthermore, both men and women do not seem to think that occasional violence is the same as committing or experiencing VAWG.

- Young men collectively think that on average other men disapprove of VAWG more than the young men surveyed actually do. This indicates a need to be judicious in V4C programming, because if men realised that the practice is more prevalent and more acceptable than they think, then they may be more willing to practice VAWG themselves. Women, on the other hand, appear to have a more accurate perception of how common VAWG is and whether the practice is approved of.

- Across the four states, more than 1 out of 5 women disapprove of VAWG but still personally experience it at least occasionally. Therefore it would seem that shifting women’s perceptions of whether they can be justifiably beaten is not enough to induce change. Rather, programming has the potential for a bigger impact if it focuses on the 30% of young men who consider VAWG to be justified in certain situations.

- Lagos has the highest population of youth (82%) who both disapprove of VAWG and do not practice/experience it themselves. About half of Nigerian youth in Enugu, Kaduna, and Kano are in this category, while 15% of youth both approve of and practice/experience VAWG in these states.
3.1.1 Social Norms Analysis

Respondents were asked a series of questions about the prevalence and acceptability of violence against women and girls, both within their household and in society more broadly (see section 1.3.3). Below are the weighted averages of results from the five social norm indicators. Numbers represent prevalence of the new practice and attitude among Nigerian youth in Enugu, Kaduna, Kano, and Lagos states.

Table 3.1: Weighted averages of attitude/behaviour for VAWG
(personal, first and second-order expectations) (Standard errors in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I...</td>
<td>think</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>I...</td>
<td>think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Do</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Do</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Do</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Do</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1 shows population weighted averages of the original Likert scale values measured for each of the social norms questions. This table also shows standard deviations for each value, where smaller standard deviations indicate greater convergence of attitude or behaviour within that stratum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I...</td>
<td>I think others...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Do</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Do</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Do</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Do</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second table (Table 3.2) shows the frequency of the new behaviour and attitude based on the binary coding described in section 1.3.3. The results are ordered to fit the social norms schema, making it easier to identify the presence or absence of social norm dynamics.
A striking trend in this data is that while young people disapprove of violence against women, and expect that others disapprove of violence against women, a much smaller number of youth live in environments free from violence against women.

In all states, we saw that more than 8 out of 10 young people (men and women) expect that people whose opinion matters to them would not approve of VAWG in the respondent’s household (question F). Furthermore, with only two exceptions, more than 7 out of 10 young people do not approve of others hitting women in their households.

Yet young women continue to experience high levels of personal violence from men in their households, particularly outside of Lagos. Even though they disapprove of the practice, more than half of young women in Kaduna – and 4 out of 10 women in Kano and Enugu – report having been hit or slapped at least “rarely” by a man they knew within the last month. The rate is 1 in 4 for women in Lagos. Young people’s expectations that the women around them live in for violence-free households also are much lower – only 3 to 6 out of 10 youth think VAWG does not occur in any of the surrounding households (question B).

Qualitative research indicates that a man who beats a woman is usually perceived as irresponsible. Respondents said that beating is never a solution to any problem or misunderstanding in the family. They also said that the habit of beating a female member of household by a man is likely to have negative effect on the children’s attitude in future (violently inclined) and the possibility of the woman sustaining injury.

Generally, respondents claimed not to know anyone who would like men to hit women less; rather, they would not want men to hit women at all. Despite this, the majority of the respondents indicated that some women insult or dominate their husbands or male partners, and that in this instance, beating was seen as a corrective measure. In a focus group in Kaduna, a female respondent noted:

“We have been talking about men but some women also cause it. Let’s take, for instance, this boyfriend and girlfriend situation; some girls will want their boyfriends or fiancés to torture them, they see it as a sign of love.”

On a related note, the influence of friends was identified by some respondents as a reason for beating women. In this instance, a man is encouraged by his friends to show that “he is in charge”, particularly in cases of frequent altercations between the woman and the man.

The large difference between expectations about what behaviours occur and about what behaviours are acceptable suggests that social disapproval does not strongly affecting rates of household VAWG. In other words, VAWG continues in private, although an overwhelming majority of youth expect key influencers to disapprove of the behaviour. Table 3.2 shows that young people’s expectations about others’ actions and others’ beliefs are markedly different. This suggests that social norms (or at least social norms alone) are not a primary driver of the behaviour (see Appendix A).
Women in all states but Kano show more consistency than men between their actual rates of VAWG disapproval and their expectations about others’ opinions. Kano also appears to be the only state in which more than one third of young women (39%) still approve of a man committing VAWG in at least one of five specific scenarios (burning food, refusing sex, going out without telling him, neglecting the children, or arguing with him). 24% of young women approve of VAWG in certain situations in Enugu, 16% in Kaduna, and only 5% in Lagos.

The pattern is different for men. Young men in all states except Lagos collectively report thinking that their reference group (including peers) generally disapproves of VAWG more than their demographic group actually does. In other words, young men expect others to disapprove of VAWG more than is indicated they actually do in this survey. If the reference group is one’s peers, this is also an example of pluralistic ignorance – a situation where many people privately disapprove of a behaviour but continue to practice it because they incorrectly assume that a majority of other people do approve of the practice (Prentice and Miller 1993). In this case, greater transparency about others’ attitudes could work against V4C programming – if men become aware that VAWG is seen less negatively among their peers than expected, they may be more willing to commit acts of VAWG in the household themselves.

Overall, the survey suggests that violence against women in these four Nigerian states is a convention rather than a social norm. A large majority of respondents believe that hitting women is wrong; yet, the practice persists at high levels. It may be that given the lack of negative sanctions for committing VAWG and the disparity between reported approval and practice of VAWG, hitting a woman in one’s household is perceived to be more common than it actually is. This suggests the reality may be more complex: that there is a difference between “disapproval” in the general sense and zero-tolerance for VAWG. Many respondents are quick to say that they disapprove of VAWG, but in conversation caveats frequently emerge that justify or legitimise VAWG in certain circumstances. This tacit approval of VAWG under certain circumstances may also contribute to the lack of social sanctioning that appears to exist – that is, those who commit VAWG are not punished by their social group.

The widespread acceptability of circumstances where the beating of female member of one’s household is justified highlights the extent to which, in many settings, VAWG is conceptualised as a form of chastisement for female behaviour that transgresses certain expectations. Women appear to make distinctions regarding the circumstances under which such beatings may or may not be “acceptable”. Qualitative research suggests that individuals make complex judgments about the acceptability of VAWG by considering who does what to whom, and for what reason. In many settings, men may be granted social permission to hit a female household member in situations where it would be unacceptable for a man to hit a colleague or neighbour.

However, exactly how attitudes towards VAWG may influence women’s experiences of violence at an individual level is not clear. It may be that the experience of violence “‘teaches” women that VAWG is acceptable. Alternatively, those women who believe that women deserve abuse in certain circumstances may be less likely to challenge male authority and therefore be protected from abuse.
3.1.2 Self-reported Attitudes and Practice

Although results suggest limited social norms driving ongoing VAWG, it is still useful to use the continuum of change plotted by the KAP ‘4’ Matrix to determine how close Nigerian youth are to adopting the new practice. Data presented below in table 3.3 uses a 2x2 matrix to plot what percentage of Nigerian youth report what combination of old or new attitudes or practices (the strategy for reading results is described further in section 1.3.2). The table presents where young people in the four target states stand in the continuum of change, with regard to adopting attitudes and practices that eschew VAWG.

Table 3.3: Personal KAP on VAWG
Table 3.3: Personal KAP on VAWG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kano</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Am hit/I hit; Approve
- Am hit/I hit; Disapprove
- Am not hit/Do not hit; Approve
- Am not hit/Do not hit; Disapprove

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of VAWG but support beliefs (A-) and act in ways (P-) that promote VAWG or still experience VAWG.

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of VAWG; support new beliefs (A+) relating to VAWG; but continues old behaviour that promote or still experience (P-) VAWG.

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of VAWG; support old/current beliefs (A-) relating to VAWG; but engage in new behaviour that discourages or do not experience (P+) VAWG.

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of VAWG; support new beliefs (A+) relating to VAWG; and also engage in new behaviour that discourages or do not experience (P+) VAWG.
3.1.2.1 Self-reported Attitudes and Practice: women

Data in the upper left quadrant of the KAP ‘4’ Matrix shows women who experience violence and approve of it and men who commit violence and approve of it. More females in Kano, Enugu and Kaduna (26%, 16% and 10% respectively) and only 1% in Lagos reported having been hit or slapped at least “rarely” by a man they knew within the last month and think this behaviour is permissible.

The female respondents in the qualitative research alluded to the following as reasons why it is permissible to beat a woman:

“It is only normal for a man to beat an erring wife. When a woman is stubborn and does not listen to the husband.”

Female FGD respondent, Lagos.

“Women don’t deserve beating from their husbands but some women do, because they don’t choose to understand and encourage their husbands. If they listen to little gossip, they will start shouting at their husbands they don’t have manner of approach, if the man gives you a slap, next time you will know how to approach him.”

Female FGD respondent, Kaduna.

The lower left quadrant of the KAP ‘4’ Matrix represents the percentage of young women who do not approve of violence against women and yet have experienced VAWG in the last month. The percentage of young women in this category ranges from 18% in Kano to 46% in Kaduna.

The upper right quadrant shows that there are few young women who do not experience VAWG but who still think it is permissible. These numbers contrast with those of young men (below), who show much higher likelihood of self-identifying in this category. The data suggests that young women desire change, but are not able to achieve the elimination of VAWG because change is contingent on men’s behaviour.
The lower right quadrant indicates that for young women, the elimination of VAWG and its support varies dramatically by state. Only 4 out of 10 young women in Kaduna both disapprove of VAWG and also have not personally experienced VAWG at the last month. In Lagos though, 7 out of 10 young women self-identify in this category. About half of young women in Enugu and Kano disapprove of VAWG and also do not experience VAWG.

The above analysis clearly shows that the majority of young women in the four states disapprove of VAWG but up to 56% of young women in Kaduna experience VAWG even though they think it is wrong. This suggests that young women are not in control of, or do not feel empowered in their household situation to oppose on-going VAWG committed by male household members. This underscores the importance of also understanding where young men stand in the KAP ‘4’ Matrix of change, as it was noted that almost 20% of male respondents state that VAWG is not acceptable but still report hitting a woman in the last month.

3.1.2.2 Self-reported Attitudes and Practice: men

Overall, distribution of young men in the KAP ‘4’ Matrix follows a pattern similar to that of young women, but with some important distinctions discussed below. Actual prevalence of men committing VAWG may be higher than is measured in the survey because self-reported VAWG is likely underreported by male respondents, who may be hesitant to share answers that they expect may be unacceptable to the enumerator. Yet, despite the possibility of underreporting, these results still show that between 15% and 38% of young men reported that they hit or slapped a woman in their household at least “rarely” within the last month (38% in Enugu, 33% in Kano, 26% in Kaduna, and 15% in Lagos).

Data in the upper left quadrant of the KAP ‘4’ Matrix shows what percentage of young men commit violence against women and approve of it. About 1 out of 7 men in Enugu, Kano, and Kaduna beat a woman at least “rarely” in the last month, and think this behaviour is acceptable. Only 2% of young men in Lagos fall into this category.

One difference between KAP ‘4’ results for men and women is seen in the upper right quadrant of the matrix. Compared to women, the percentage of men who approve of VAWG but claim not to practice it is higher. Results suggest the possibility that young men who approve of and practice VAWG are hesitant to report their actual behaviour because they know that it is not acceptable, but they are willing to share their hypothetical support for the practice.

Similarly to results for women, the surveys reveal in the lower left quadrant that between 10% and 20% of young men state that VAWG is not acceptable, but still report having hit a woman in their household in the last month.

The lower right quadrant shows that between 44% and 82% of young men report that they both disapprove of VAWG and also do not practice it. Again, Lagos shows a significantly higher percentage of respondents in this “VAWG-free” category compared to all other states. Enugu and Kano states have the lowest frequency of young men reporting both new attitudes and practices.

Overall, as with the results for women, the data presented here shows that a strong majority of young men (between 66% and 95%) in all four states do not approve of VAWG. The varying patterns of approval rates among women and men in the different states are likely reflecting many different contextual factors. One possible explanation for this is cultural differences in what are
considered acceptable means for husbands to control or chastise their wives. Therefore, public information campaigns that focus on why VAWG is not acceptable are likely redundant – most young people already hold this belief, but it appears that other barriers, which will be discussed below, inhibit the translation of these attitudes into practice.

3.1.3 Expectations of Others’ Attitudes and Practices (first-order expectations)

The same KAP ‘4’ Matrix analysis was conducted on respondents’ expectations about how others behave, as well as how respondents think others should behave (first order expectations). These expectations reflect young people’s perceptions of what behaviour is common, how frequently or widely practiced this behaviour is, and whether respondents approve of the behaviour when practiced by others. This analysis, when compared to the analysis of personal attitudes and beliefs above, is useful in identifying where there is widespread misperception about what behaviours are common and commonly approved of.

This analysis is particularly useful for behaviours such as VAWG, because while respondents may be reluctant to admit personally engaging in VAWG (thereby under representing the prevalence of these behaviours), respondents are more likely to accurately report their knowledge or perception of how often on average they see this behaviour occurring in their neighbourhood or social circle. Thus, assuming that people have accurate knowledge of others’ behaviour, these numbers on the prevalence of VAWG may be more accurate than those reported above. When comparing the two, it is vital to note that these expectations are about behaviours and attitudes in the population as a whole, rather than specifically among Nigerian youth.

Table 3.4 presents a cross tabulation of the frequency of expectations that VAWG does/does not and should/should not occur in other households nearby. Section 3.1 illustrated how a large majority of young people do not approve of VAWG in other households, yet the large majority also expects VAWG to occur. The KAP ‘4’ matrices below unpack this finding to show what percentage of the target population hold which combination of expectations about old and new attitudes and practices among the general population.

Table 3.4: Young people’s expectations of others’ attitudes and practices on VAWG
Table 3.4: Young people’s expectations of others’ attitudes and practices on VAWG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th>Do hit; Approve (old)</th>
<th>Do hit; Disapprove (old/new)</th>
<th>Do not hit; Approve (old/new)</th>
<th>Do not hit; Disapprove (new)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>1st 23 33</td>
<td>2nd 49 40</td>
<td>3rd 4 10</td>
<td>4th 25 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>12 19</td>
<td>55 46</td>
<td>4 10</td>
<td>29 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kano</td>
<td>30 19</td>
<td>23 26</td>
<td>11 11</td>
<td>37 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>45 39</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>51 56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of VAWG; but support beliefs (A-); and act in ways (P-) that promote VAWG or still experience VAWG

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of VAWG; support new beliefs (A+) relating to VAWG; but continue old behaviour that promote or still experience (P-) VAWG

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of VAWG; support old/current beliefs (A-) relating to VAWG; but engage in new behaviour that discourages or do not experience (P+) VAWG

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of VAWG; support new beliefs (A+) relating to VAWG; and also engage in new behaviour that discourages or do not experience (P+) VAWG
Results in the matrix’s lower left quadrant show that approximately half of all young women in Enugu, Kaduna, and Lagos do not approve of VAWG but expect that it occurs at least occasionally in surrounding households (not just youths’ peer group). This value is only slightly lower for young men (again in all states except Kano) – ranging from 39% to 45%. The qualitative research on this issue reveals that:

“If you beat a woman, you will see the guys they will gang up and beat you mercilessly. They believe you don’t have the right to beat a woman even if it is your wife, they believe if you really want to fight, you go and meet men like you.”

Female FGD respondent, Enugu

“There is no situation that will make people approve you of beating your wife.”

Female FGD respondent, Lagos

Kano proves to be an interesting exception to these trends, as only about 1 out of 4 young women and young men disapprove of VAWG but expect it to still occur in other households. This percentage is much lower compared to the other three states. This data suggests two possible realities for Kano state. First, it may be that VAWG is not frequently discussed, and therefore respondents do not have a clear sense of how frequently a behaviour occurs in other families. Alternatively, VAWG prevalence may depend on one’s immediate social network, with some pockets of the population exhibiting high rates of VAWG and its support, with other pockets disapproving of VAWG and practicing it more infrequently. This finding is bolstered by the qualitative research with a respondent reporting that:

“Even though some women are stubborn, beating is out of it. Because it’s not right and it not ideal even if she does anything wrong, there are other ways to handle her – [but] not by beating her.”

Female FGD respondent, Enugu
“75% will disapprove because they are learned, they understand the gravity of beating a woman, and they understand everything it can cause. While 25% will approve because they will think that is what she brought on herself, she should take it. This 25% will approve because they think that’s the way to correct her.”

Female FGD respondent, Kano

These results underscore the fact that VAWG continues to be perceived by young people in all four states as being fairly common in the broader society, even if incidence at the household level is occasional. At the same time a smaller percentage of young people approve of VAWG (see upper left quadrant in table 3.4). Based on this analysis, information campaigns and programming would be more effective if they target reference groups and create publicity about how widespread disapproval of VAWG is.

Programming could also include empowerment initiatives that give young people the skills to promote non-acceptability of VAWG as noted by the widespread disapproval documented in this report. In addition, young people could be trained to publicise and model positive change for the older generations.

3.1.4 Perception of Others’ Expectations (second-order expectations)

Respondents were asked: “What do I think others expect of me and my household?” This is what second-order norms analysis helps clarify in table 3.5. Analysis of second order expectations using the KAP ‘4’ Matrix framework shows an even more pronounced iteration of the disconnect between the prevailing attitude and prevailing behaviour explored above.

Table 3.5: Perception of others’ expectations of VAWG

Young people overwhelmingly say that they expect others to disapprove of VAWG if it occurred in their own household (2nd and 4th quadrants). This is the main difference between table 3.5 (where respondents noted that others are less likely to expect respondents to experience VAWG in their households) and table 3.4, which reported whether VAWG occurs in other households.

From the quantitative data presented in 3rd quadrant of table 3.5, it is not clear why respondents’ households would be perceived to have lower rates of VAWG than is actually measured for respondents’ households (see table 3.3). This may be due to young people not being physically present in their family’s household because of schooling or employment, preventing them from witnessing VAWG. Alternatively, it may be that young people are still living under their parents/guardians and would not be interested in committing VAWG once they start their own families.
Table 3.5: Perception of others’ expectations of VAWG

Key:
- orange circle: Do hit/Am hit; Approve (old)
- orange cross: Do hit/Am hit; Disapprove (new/old)
- red circle: Do not hit/Am not hit; Approve (old/new)
- red cross: Do not hit/Am not hit; Disapprove (new)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kano</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of VAWG, but support beliefs (A-) and act in ways (P-) that promote VAWG or still experience VAWG

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of VAWG; support new beliefs (A+) relating to VAWG; but continue old behaviour that promotes or still experience VAWG

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of VAWG; support old/current beliefs (A-) relating to VAWG; but engage in new behaviour that discourages or do not experience VAWG

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of VAWG; support new beliefs (A+) relating to VAWG; and also engage in new behaviour that discourages or do not experience VAWG

ATTITUDE: Others think my household should hit
PRACTICE: Others think women in my house are hit
Additionally, VAWG may be occurring but others do not think that it does due to the private nature of this practice in the household. This situation is consistent with the qualitative data, which suggests that people think VAWG is not as common when compared with the household behaviour as suggested by the quantitative data.

“I don’t think any person will approve of a wife being beaten, even in the days of our fathers, it is not approved, if you don’t like her any longer, tell her to go rather than beating. Any person that approves that should be taken to psychiatric hospital.”

Male traditional leader, Enugu

“Some women talk to their husband just anyhow, forgetting that the husband is the head of the family. Some men can tell their wives to do some things and the wife forgot to do it, the man will beat her because of that.”

Male FGD respondent, Kano

Male community leader, Kaduna

Though the majority of young respondents disapprove of VAWG, they express some situations where a man may beat a woman.
3.2 Women in Household Decision Making

Results Summary

- For this issue, Nigerian youth generally appear to be in the very earliest (pre-knowledge) stage of change. Currently, women play only a limited role in household decision-making, and that is the level of involvement that is expected and approved of by others. There is a significant opportunity to expand Nigerian youths’ awareness of and approval of women’s ability to more actively participate in household decisions.

- The uniformity of responses in the survey data makes it difficult to determine whether a social norm exists, or whether everyone simply is aware of how others normally behave and think. However, qualitative data suggests that, like VAWG, social norms play only a limited role in shaping behaviour. In other words, public approval or disapproval of women’s ability to make household decisions will not be a strong driver of whether or not practices change privately behind household doors.

- Qualitative research suggests that men and women are perceived to have distinct spheres of influence within the household, with the man continuing to hold the role of household head and ultimate decision-maker. In some cases, the attitudes that men should be the household patriarchs are given religious and/or historical justifications.

- Overall, the survey identifies an opportunity to increase awareness about the possibility (and benefits) of women having an expanded decision-making role in their homes.
3.2.1 Social Norms Analysis

Respondents were asked a series of questions about the prevalence and acceptability of women participating in household decisions, both within their own household and in society more broadly (Section 1.3.3).

Weighted averages of results from the five social norms measures are presented in the tables below. Numbers represent prevalence of the new practice and attitude among Nigerian youth in Enugu, Kaduna, Kano, and Lagos states.

Table 3.6 shows population weighted averages of the original Likert values measured for each of the social norms questions. This table also shows standard deviations for each value, where smaller standard deviations indicate greater convergence of attitude or behaviour within that stratum.

The battery of social norms questions was asked for a series of different types of decisions because piloting revealed that people thought differently about women’s role depending on the type of decision being considered. The results below present average responses across the different decision areas (large household purchases, daily purchases, how to use man’s earnings, how to use woman’s earnings, sexual relations, and how many children to have). To keep the survey a reasonable length, the “C” question category (what I think others expect happens in my home) was trimmed from the questionnaire. This is because the question plays a less crucial role in both social norms analysis and the measurement of personal attitude and practice.
The average result in many categories is between 1 and 2, which corresponds with “women’s opinion does/should matter a little” and “women’s opinion does/should matter somewhat”. These findings suggest that women’s opinions matter a small to moderate amount for a variety of household decisions but do not matter as much as they could. (A score of 3 was the maximum and corresponds with women’s opinion mattering a lot.) More specific results are analysed below.
The second table (table 3.7) shows the frequency of the new behaviour and attitude based on binary coding described above. These results are ordered to fit the social norms schema from Section 1 (and Appendix A), making it easier to identify the presence or absence of social norm dynamics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.7: Prevalence of new attitude/behaviour for women’s decision making (personal, first and second-order expectations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enugu</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaduna</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kano</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lagos</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, young people show similar trends in their attitudes and behaviours, and personal expectations on average closely match young people’s expectations for others. Young men and women’s average responses were similar as well, with both appearing to approve of the current level of involvement that women have in household decision-making. There also appears to be no misinformation among youth about the level of approval that others hold for women making household decisions.

Location is the one dimension along which significant variation occurs. More than 7 out of 10 young men and women in Enugu and Lagos hold positive expectations about women’s role in household decision-making. They think women do and should have a moderate or strong role, both in their households and in other households.
In Kaduna and Kano, though, only about 3 out of 10 young men and women hold positive expectations about women’s role in household decision-making. Between 3 and 4 out of 10 youth say women do (and should) have an important decision-making role in their own households and other households. A higher number of young men and women (5 in 10) think women (in other households) should have a strong role in decision-making.

One important difference should be noted between how much respondents think a women’s opinion should matter in others’ households (first order normative expectation), and how much they think others approve of women’s opinion mattering in respondents’ households (second order normative expectation). The data shows that in general (and particularly for the northern states), both young men and women think women’s opinion should matter at higher rates than the approval they expect from people whose opinion they value. For household decision making, 8 out of 10 respondents identify parents and other relatives as their main reference – the group whose opinion matters most to young people when forming their opinions about women decision makers (section 2.7).

The difference here between personal attitude/practices and the expectations for others suggests two possible situations. First, young people may be correctly perceiving the attitudes of their parents, other family members, and the older generation does not approve of women’s participation in decision making as much as young people do. It may also be that young people perceive their reference group to be less accepting of women’s opinions than the adults actually are. This would be another example of pluralistic ignorance, and would create an opportunity to raise awareness of the higher level of acceptance of women’s voices in the household than is currently present in society.

Qualitative research distinguishes between these two phenomena – suggesting that a lot of people are in the pre-knowledge stage and do not consider women as having influence. A substantial proportion of the respondents acknowledged that generally the man’s opinion matters most when making decisions. They said that, as the head of the family, the man, largely meets the financial, security and other needs of the household. This position of authority was seen primarily as divinely ordained, as well as having societal and traditional/cultural approval. According to most of the respondents holding this view, the roles of a woman in decision making are supposed to be complimentary and supportive.

The survey found that even among female respondents who felt that it was not inherently wrong for women to take a leading role in decision making, men were still considered the main decision maker in a house. Conversely, a few female respondents said that it is the opinion of a woman that matters most when making domestic decisions in the household. It is interesting to note that some respondents thought women are considered as ‘homemakers’ and by virtue of this, they are more conversant with the needs of the family and can prioritise and actualise these needs more efficiently than men.

In general, results indicate that there is relatively accurate information in society about what behaviours are common, and what behaviours are approved of. However, because of the strong correlation between results in all cells, it is difficult to determine based on the survey data alone whether this congruence is because of a strong social norm that coordinates behaviour.
or whether there are other causes of consistent behaviour and expectations that do not result from social dis/approval.

3.2.2 Self-reported Attitudes and Practice

Given the balance of the different social norm measures, it is especially useful to identify what percentage of youth stand where on the KAP ‘4’ continuum of change. Data presented below in Table 3.8 uses a 2x2 matrix to plot what percentage of Nigerian youth report what combination of old or new attitudes or practices (the strategy for reading results is described further in Section 1.3.2). The table presents where young people in the four target states stand in the continuum of change, with regard to adopting attitudes and practices that support women in decision making.

Table 3.8: Personal KAP on decision making
Table 3.8: Personal KAP on decision making

### Key:
- Fewer opinions matter; Should not (old)
- Fewer opinions matter; Should (new/old)
- More opinions matter; Should not (old/new)
- More opinions matter; Should (new)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kano</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s roles in household decisions; but support beliefs (A-); and act in ways (P-) that promote non-involvement of women in making household decisions or do not participate in making household decisions.

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s roles in household decisions; support new beliefs (A+) that acknowledge women in making household decisions; but continue old behaviour (P-) that promote non-involvement of women in making household decisions or do not participate in making household decisions.

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s roles in household decisions; support old/current beliefs (A-) that women’s opinions should not matter; but engage in new behaviour (P+) that involve women in making household decisions or actually participate in making household decisions.

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s roles in household decision; support new beliefs (A+) that acknowledge women in making household decisions; and also engage in new behaviour (P+) that involve women in making household decisions or actually participate in making household decisions.
People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s roles in household decisions; but support beliefs (A-); and act in ways (P-) that promote non-involvement of women in making household decisions or do not participate in making household decisions.

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s roles in household decisions; support new beliefs (A+) that acknowledge women in making household decisions; but continue old behaviour (P-) that promote non-involvement of women in making household decisions or do not participate in making household decisions.

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s roles in household decisions; support old/current beliefs (A-) that women’s opinions should not matter; but engage in new behaviour (P+) that involve women in making household decisions or actually participate in making household decisions.

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s roles in household decision; support new beliefs (A+) that acknowledge women in making household decisions; and also engage in new behaviour (P+) that involve women in making household decisions or actually participate in making household decisions.

Readers should note that personal behaviour and attitude is measured the same way for men and women, asking about the prevalence of behaviour and attitude within the respondent’s household (versus asking women specifically “how much does your opinion matter”). This is a subtle but important distinction from how personal behaviour/experience was measured for VAWG in Section 3.2.2. The distinction allows for a comparison of how young Nigerians experience levels of influence in their own household, and what the average level of influence is perceived to be in other households.

Young men and women show similar personal attitudes and practices for women’s role in household decision making. However, large variation occurs at the state level.

The lower right quadrant shows the percentage of young people in each state whose personal attitudes and household practices align with V4C goals. In Enugu and Lagos states, 2 out of 3 young men and women express attitudes and practices congruent with V4C’s objectives – that women’s opinions matter in household decisions. Conversely, in the northern states of Kaduna and Kano less than 1 out of 3 young people say that women’s opinions should and do matter in their households.

The upper left quadrant shows the percentage of young people in each state who show both old attitudes and practices (women’s opinion not mattering). Approximately 2 out of 3 young people in Kano and over half the young people in Kaduna say that women’s opinions do not and should not matter in their households. By comparison, less than 2 out of 10 young men and women fall into this category in Enugu and Lagos.

Few respondents fall into the off-diagonal categories (upper right and lower left quadrants). This indicates that youth tend to fall into initial or final stages of change, with few young people in any of the states being at an intermediate state of change.

The regional differences exhibited in this data are echoed by the qualitative research which confirmed that there are varieties of explanations across regions. While some people in the North believe “men should be given absolute power to
take decisions” (FGD male respondent, Kano), others believe women’s decisions should matter most, as they know the problems of the household better than men. Similarly, the qualitative research observed that men are usually busy and spend more time outside the household, with income generation being their main family involvement. However, a majority of respondents from the southern states (Enugu and Lagos) believe both men and women have to make decisions in some areas, for example deciding the scope of education for their children.

Qualitative results suggest that the subordinate role of women in decision making is driven by prevailing attitudes towards women’s capacity to make sound decisions. There are beliefs that women are hasty and men are wise. Women are considered to be less cautious and more sentimental. Thus, women’s decisions could be irrational and susceptible to extravagance and impulsive actions, which could have an adverse effect on the family’s wellbeing.

Conversely, men are considered to have a more mature mind, be strong willed, and be more rational than women while making decisions, albeit being more selfish and less considerate of women’s opinions. Also, since the man normally pays a woman’s dowry, and in most cases owns the house where the family live, he is considered entitled to make final decisions. Furthermore, some people hold the opinion that women are susceptible to misuse of power if in a position of higher authority. This attitude is sometimes responsible for people not willing to support women despite acknowledging that women are competent.

Only a few female respondents said that women being able to make more household decisions was a positive thing, which they justified on the grounds that they are more sensitive to individual needs in the household.

Central to the views on women’s role in decision making were expectations that define the roles and prescribe the behaviours of men and women in relationships. Social expectations of men and women are different, but overlapping and complementary. A man is expected to be a leader and provider of needs, and the man’s dominant position in decision making has its basis in strong cultural, traditional, religious and economic reasons.

However despite this, it was also agreed by a considerable proportion of the respondents that a number of issues in the household are subject to a joint decision between the man and woman. Such issues include: determining the number of children to have, how to raise the children (discipline, type of school to attend) and embarking on projects such as the building of a family house.

“...The truth is women are making decisions [in the households]. For example, women possess unrestricted decision making power for health of children, but their decisions in most cases are limited to things like... having a plan for what to do in case of an emergency [involving a child], but not whether the child should undergo a surgical procedure.”

Male traditional ruler, Enugu.
Interestingly, respondents in homes where the husband and wife are educated and in which women have jobs, both partners are significantly more likely to participate in the final decisions than in homes with uneducated partners or in which the wife does not have salaried work.

While opinions differed slightly on whether a man should provide all the needs of a family, including security, the belief that he should provide most of these needs was shared by many respondents. Women, on the other hand, are expected to be supportive and caring. They should also advise the man, be tolerant, patient and be respectful. A commonly expressed sentiment, as part of women’s socially expected behaviour in a household, is that women should be submissive. This is not a prescription for married women alone but an expectation which younger girls should also follow in a relationship.

These results suggest that the drivers of opinions and practices around women’s decision making are specific to the region, and possibly culture. It appears that an information campaign about women’s decision making would be more useful in Nigeria’s northern region, particularly if it addressed some of the underlying reasons why the old behaviour and practice persist. In the southern states of Enugu and Lagos, since a strong majority of young people have already adopted new attitudes and behaviours, V4C can focus on publicising these numbers to encourage slow adopters to change after realising their behaviour and attitudes are not shared by most of their peers.

3.2.3 Expectations of Others’ Attitudes and Practices (first-order expectations)

Survey data in table 3.9 also indicates where young Nigerians expect others around them to lie on the KAP ‘4’ continuum of change (first order expectations). These first-order KAP ‘4’ results on women’s opinions in decision making show strong regional differences – stronger indications of the regional trends described above in table 3.8.

Table 3.9: Young people’s expectations of others’ attitudes and practices on
Table 3.9: Young people’s expectations of others’ attitudes and practices on women’s decision making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kano</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Neon yellow: Fewer opinions matter; Should not (old)
- Red: Fewer opinions matter; Should (new/old)
- Green: More opinions matter; should not (old/new)
- Pink: More opinions matter; Should (new)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s roles in household decisions; but support beliefs (A-) and act in ways (P-) that promote non-involvement of women in making household decisions or do not participate in making household decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s roles in household decisions; support new beliefs (A+) that acknowledges women in making household decisions; but continue old behaviour (P-) that promotes non-involvement of women in making household decisions or do not participate in making household decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s roles in household decisions; support old/current beliefs (A-) that women’s opinions should not matter; but engage in new behaviour (P+) that involve women in making household decisions or actually participate in making household decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s roles in household decisions; support new beliefs (A+) that acknowledges women in making household decisions; and also engage in new behaviour (P+) that involves women in making household decisions or actually participate in making household decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTITUDE: Women’s opinions should matter
PRACTICE: Women’s opinions do matter
In the southern states it appears that in the aggregate, young people’s expectations about others’ behaviour (and its acceptability) are distributed in a pattern almost identical to the personal behaviour and attitudes shown in section 3.2.2. In other words, “I expect what I experience” and vice versa. As shown in the lower right quadrant, approximately 60-70% of young people in Enugu and Lagos (men and women) both expect women’s opinions to matter in surrounding households and approve of the importance given to women’s decisions.

The upper left quadrant further emphasises how the situation is very different in the northern states of Kaduna and Kano. Approximately 40% of young men and women in these northern states say women’s opinions do not matter in surrounding households, nor should women’s opinions matter.

Despite the regional differences in views, qualitative research from Enugu corroborated the above findings, while respondents from Kaduna, Kano and Lagos counter the supportive data of the importance of women’s opinions in household decision making:

“When women make decisions they carry everyone along. Let’s assume some things are needed in the house for housekeeping, she makes sure that no matter how little that money is she makes sure that she get everything needed.”

FGD male respondent, Enugu

“Even me, I will not do that [approve women having a larger role in decision making]. Women are to support... Women can misuse their power, give a women an inch, she will take 10 miles”

Female FGD respondent, Kaduna

“It is usually the men [that should be making decisions]... It’s because they are the head of the home... It has always been like that even in the time of our fathers.”

Female FGD respondent, Lagos
“It has been happening since our fore fathers, men make decision[s]... Have you ever seen where a woman is a king? It is written in the holy Bible too”

Female FGD respondent, Lagos

“I went to greet somebody at home and when I got there I saw that it was his wife that is making household decision[s], I don’t visit them in that house again because I only ask him to give me phone number of someone, he told me that I should wait that he want to go and take permission from his wife.”

Community leader, Kano

Overall, the data suggests that different programme strategies will be needed to effectively promote women’s decision-making in the north and the south of Nigeria, given that the majority of young people in these states appear to be at different stages of change – likely due to cultural and religious factors associated with each region.

It appears that decision making is linked to masculinity, both in terms of demonstrating household leadership and being able to provide for the family. Not only are women perceived to be less capable decision makers, there is also a fear of social disapproval if men are perceived as weak or sharing decisions with women. Since educated women appear to be more respected decision makers, this may offer an opportunity to create positive role models and demonstrate that women are capable decision makers too. Addressing stereotypes of both masculinity and femininity also appears to be a key component in shifting beliefs about decision making.
### 3.3 Women in Local Leadership

#### Results Summary

- Of the three behaviours targeted in this report, the issue of women in local leadership appears to have the strongest social norms component. This is logical, given the public nature of leadership and the more direct connection between others’ approval, fear of others’ disapproval, and one’s personal decision whether or not to behave in a certain way.

- Nigerian youth (both men and women) report wanting to participate in local leadership more than they actually do. Apart from social norms, these results indicate that there are practical barriers to youth participating in leadership, regardless of gender.

- The implication for women specifically is that information campaigns supporting the expansion of women in leadership roles is likely not the most effective use of resources. The main obstacles to change appear to be access and fear of social disapproval, rather than a lack of desire to participate in leadership roles.

- In terms of social norms, this targeted behaviour appears to be near a tipping point. Young men and women approve of women participating in local leadership at higher rates than the approval they expect among others.

- It may be that publicising how prevalent it is for Nigerian youth to support women leaders could be the necessary catalyst that would encourage more women to stand for leadership positions.

- The data also supports the possibility that Nigerian youth are much more ready and willing to support women taking leadership roles, compared to older adults. In this case, programming that focuses on changing attitudes among older adults (and making those changes publicly visible) would create social conditions more conducive to women participating in leadership.
3.3.1 Social Norms Analysis

Respondents were asked a series of questions about the prevalence and acceptability of women participating in local leadership. Examples of local leadership include Community Development Associations (CDA), and school, professional or trade associations. Weighted averages of results from the five social norm questions are presented in the tables below. Numbers represent prevalence of the new practice and attitude among Nigerian youth in Enugu, Kaduna, Kano, and Lagos states.

Table 3.10 shows population weighted averages of the original Likert scale measured for each of the social norms questions. This table also shows standard deviations for each value, with smaller standard deviations indicating greater convergence of attitude or behaviour within that stratum. In the following analysis, respondents’ opinions of whether other women should stand for leadership positions was used as a proxy for whether the women themselves thought they should stand for leadership positions. This choice improved survey flow while trimming survey length, with the goal of improving respondent attention and answer accuracy.
Table 3.10: Weighted averages of attitude/behaviour for women standing for local leadership on 0-4 scale (personal, first and second-order expectations) (Standard errors in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I...</td>
<td>I think others...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enugu</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>2.54 (0.13)</td>
<td>2.17 (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Do</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.01 (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaduna</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>2.88 (0.08)</td>
<td>1.65 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Do</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.86 (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kano</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>2.65 (0.10)</td>
<td>1.14 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Do</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.71 (0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lagos</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>2.74 (0.08)</td>
<td>1.98 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Do</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.04 (0.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second table (table 3.11) shows the frequency of the new behaviour and attitude based on the binary coding described above. Results are ordered to fit the social norms schema from Section 1, making it easier to identify the presence or absence of social norm dynamics. As in the decision-making section, Question C was trimmed both because it is not central to the social norms analysis (and enables a more streamlined questionnaire), and because the question language would have been awkward.
**Table 3.11: Prevalence of new attitude/behaviour for women in local leadership (personal, first and second-order expectations)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I...</td>
<td>I think others...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kano</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High percentages of youth across the four states (7 out of 10 men and women) hold a personal desire to participate in local leadership. The one exception is women in Kano, where only 4 in 10 women want to stand for leadership positions. In the other three states, there is also a high approval rate among youth for women standing for local leadership (72.8% to 89.9%). However, only 6 out of 10 women and 4 out of 10 men in Kano support women standing for local leadership.

As for what youth expect people around them to do, half of young people in Enugu and Lagos say that women stand for local leadership sometimes or often, but a lower percentage of young people (26.2% to 41%) report the same in Kaduna state. Kano state appears to follow a different dynamic, potentially because of cultural and religious differences. Noteworthy here is that 6 out of 10 young women in Kano support women standing for leadership positions, but only 4 out of 10 young women want to stand for those positions themselves.

Interestingly, young men in Kano also report that women are in leadership positions less often than the rate observed and reported by young women (26% versus 41%). This suggests an information disconnect between what women actually do in the community and what men observe them doing. Raising awareness of women’s current leadership roles — and their positive effects on family and community — may lay the groundwork for broader promotion of women’s leadership in Kano.

Despite the high rate of willingness to take part in local leadership among youth in three states, their expectations of others’ approval of this is much lower. Less than half of youth (29.1% to 48.3%) think that their reference group should approve if they were to stand for leadership positions.

A general attitude among all categories of respondents was that women would like to be in leadership positions more often than they are, irrespective of the positions. This view was based on beliefs that women: also want to enjoy the same rights as men; feel they have more to offer the country/their community; want to change people’s mindsets about women’s capabilities; want to be known/seen; and want to join the global trend of having more female leaders.

“'What a man can do, a woman can do better,' so if we are being given this opportunity, I think we are going to lead more than the men. So we want a change. Some women are positive-minded and politically conscious.'”

Female FGD respondent, Enugu
Yet, most of the respondents claimed not to know anyone who approved of women standing for leadership positions at least as much as men. A few said they believe that about 20% of people would approve of women standing for leadership positions. The major point raised against women taking these positions, even among a large number of women, was the general belief that men are divinely ordained to be leaders while women should provide supportive functions.

Indeed, many female respondents said that women endure significant intimidation and harassment before rising to the top levels. Their reluctance to stand for political positions was also as a result of the belief that they will not be voted for. Qualitative research indicates a negative reaction from people when women are in leadership roles. With some seeing it as ‘going against the tradition of the community and their religion’, and that such women are deviating from what is desired and expected of them for their own gratification.

In order to better understand those who are influential in the lives of Nigerian youths, respondents were asked to identify those whose opinion matters to them. Parents, spouses and friends were all listed as trusted people with sound judgements. Religious leaders were also listed, with respondents saying most would rely on holy books and would say that women are not suited for leadership. Respondents also said that traditional and community leaders would see it as taboo or culturally offensive for a woman to be in a leadership role.

Of the three behaviours targeted by V4C, women in local leadership appears to be the behaviour that most exhibits signs of being a social norm – and specifically, a social norm near a tipping point. Within almost all of the survey data, young people’s expectations about what others do is congruent with what behaviour they think others approve of. In this case, young people report relatively low rates of expected social approval for women in leadership roles, and that rate is consistent with the observed frequency of women in actual leadership positions.

The data shows strong indications of secret deviants and reluctant practitioners, as described in Appendix A. Crucially, both young men and women (again apart from Kano) are more supportive of women taking local leadership roles (about 70-85%), both compared to their personal desire to participate (70%), and compared to their expectations about others’ approval (30-50%).

In summary, young people think that their society disapproves of women in leadership roles almost twofold more than young people actual disapprove of it. Shedding light on the latent high rates of support among youth for women in leadership may help catalyse a tipping point, enabling the large number of young women who desire leadership roles to make the step.

It is worth noting, though, that older people may be less tolerant of women in leadership – this, too, could contribute to the discrepancy between respondents’ support and the level of support they expect from others. While young people in Nigeria are ready for women to take on more leadership, current participation is dictated by the expectations and approval of other strata in society.
For example, if parents, elders, and religious figures are the people whose opinion most shapes women’s participation, and these groups are perceived by young people to disapprove of women’s leadership, then the old norm will be held in place despite a large desire among youth to see more women in leadership roles. This dynamic could lead to the discrepancy between expectations of what others think and do, compared to one’s own personal expectations.

3.3.2 Self-reported Attitudes and Practices

Again, a continuum of change plotted in the KAP ‘4’ Matrix highlights the potential for a tipping point – a situation in the near future in which a large number of youth could switch from old to new practices. The survey shows an overwhelming majority of young women say they approve of women standing for local leadership positions (nearly 9 out of 10 women for Enugu, Kaduna and Lagos). Only Kano is an exception, with just 6 out of 10 women expressing approval of women’s local leadership. In general, 7 out of 10 women are already interested in standing for local leadership themselves, with Kano again the exception (4 in 10 women).

Table 3.12 disaggregates these numbers to plot what percentage of young people hold the different combinations of old and new attitudes and practices relative to V4C’s stance on women taking leadership at the local level.

Table 3.12: Personal KAP on local leadership
Table 3.12: Personal KAP on local leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th>Do not want to lead; Women should not (old)</th>
<th>Do not want to lead; Women should (new/old)</th>
<th>Do want to lead; Women should not (old/new)</th>
<th>Do want to lead; Women should (new)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>5 8</td>
<td>17 14</td>
<td>7 18</td>
<td>66 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>10 19</td>
<td>27 24</td>
<td>5 14</td>
<td>63 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kano</td>
<td>34 19</td>
<td>25 12</td>
<td>6 40</td>
<td>35 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>7 10</td>
<td>22 20</td>
<td>7 16</td>
<td>64 54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s contribution in leadership; support beliefs (A+); and act in ways (P+) that promote non-participation in local leadership or do not participate in local leadership.

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s contribution in leadership; support new beliefs (A+) that accept women to participate in local leadership; but continue old behaviour (P-) that promotes non-participation of women in local leadership or do not participate in local leadership.

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s contribution in leadership; support old/current beliefs (A-) that disapprove women’s participation in local leadership; but engage in new behaviour (P+) that promotes women’s participation in local leadership or participate in local leadership.

People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s contribution in leadership; support new beliefs (A+) that accepts women to participate in local leadership; and also engage in new behaviour (P+) that promotes women’s participation in local leadership or participate in local leadership.

**ATTITUDE:** Support women standing for leadership

**PRACTICE:** Personal interest in leading
The large majority of women support other women taking local leadership roles. This is seen by the higher percentages in the 2nd and 4th quadrants of the KAP ‘4’ Matrix.

Variation comes between women’s support of and desire to participate in local leadership. Comparison of the bottom left and right quadrants shows that among the majority of women who support women taking leadership roles at the local level, it is approximately twice to three times as common to want to participate in local leadership. The lower left quadrant shows that in all states, between 20-25% of women say they would approve if other women were elected to local leadership, but they themselves do not want to lead. Kano is the only state that deviates from the trends described above, showing a higher relative percentage of women who support women in leadership but do not want to take leadership positions themselves.

Kano is also the only state with large numbers of young women in the upper left quadrant of the matrix (old attitude, old practice), with 34% of young women saying that they do not want to participate in local leadership nor do they think women should participate in leadership. For all other states, 10% or less of young women report holding both old attitudes and old practices.

The empirical pattern remains similar for men. With the exception of Kano state, the data reveals that less than 1 out of 5 young men themselves wants to participate in leadership and would not support women to do same (2nd quadrant). By comparison, about 3 out of 5 young men themselves want to participate in leadership and equally support women to take on leadership roles (4th quadrant). As for Kano state, there are more young men (40%) who themselves want to take on leadership positions and would not support women to take on similar roles, as compared to young men (28%) who would take on leadership positions and also support women to do the same.

All states, and particularly Kano, show that there is a larger percentage of young men (14-40%) compared to young women (5-7%) who want leadership positions themselves and would not support women to take on leadership roles (2nd quadrant). Interestingly, apart from Kano, more than 60% of young women approve of female participation in leadership and also desire to be in leadership themselves. In Kano only 34% of young women self-identified in this category (4th quadrant).

Qualitative research reveals that a significant number of young women would like to see women taking up leadership positions, but they themselves do not want to participate. The reasons for this vary from: lack of interest; perceived societal pressures; and lack of financial wherewithal or a financier, as contesting for a political post would require money to offset campaign expenses.

In unpacking why men do or don’t support women in local leadership, the majority of the respondents said that most people prefer men to women standing for leadership positions. They said that men are believed to be physically strong and more intelligent, able to face uncertainties associated with contesting for and being in leadership positions, and usually have a higher educational background (this was especially common in the north).

The survey observed that religion has a significant association with the level of women’s involvement in leadership. Both Islamic and Christian religions were variously cited by respondents as providing great support for men
standing for leadership positions. The most commonly raised point in support of this stance, even among women, was the general belief that men are divinely ordained to lead while women should provide support. However, about one third of the respondents – both men and women – were not opposed to women holding leadership positions in non-government organisations, schools or churches.

In summary, it appears that in Kano state the majority of men do not approve of women in leadership roles (although they themselves often desire leadership positions). In Kano, young women also do not see themselves taking on these roles (although a majority of young women would approve of other women in local leadership). For the other states, a large majority of young people – both men and women – already support women taking on leadership roles. Therefore, programmatic efforts may want to target the 20-30% of young people who support women in local leadership but are not yet interested in taking on such responsibilities themselves.

3.3.3 Expectations of Others’ Attitudes and Practices (first-order expectations)

This section focuses on how frequently women in their community stand for local leadership positions, and whether they would support a woman to stand for a local leadership position. Findings related to young people’s expectations for women in leadership capture a slightly different dimension of behaviour compared to VAWG and decision making. This is due to the public and open nature of leadership as compared to VAWG or household decision making, which are not usually openly discussed or experienced in the public domain.

Table 3.13: Young people’s expectations of others’ attitudes and practices on local leadership
Table 3.13: Young people’s expectations of others’ attitudes and practices on local leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th>Women do not stand; Women should not (old)</th>
<th>Women do not stand; Women should (new/old)</th>
<th>Women do stand; Women should not (old/new)</th>
<th>Women do stand; Women should (new)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>5 12</td>
<td>42 28</td>
<td>5 7</td>
<td>48 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>12 18</td>
<td>50 46</td>
<td>4 7</td>
<td>34 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kano</td>
<td>25 52</td>
<td>34 22</td>
<td>14 7</td>
<td>27 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>6 17</td>
<td>39 32</td>
<td>8 8</td>
<td>47 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s contribution in leadership; support new beliefs (A+) that promote women’s participation in leadership.
- People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s contribution in leadership; support old/current beliefs (A-) that promote non-participation in leadership.
- People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s contribution in leadership; support new beliefs (A+) that promote women’s participation in leadership.
- People (aged 16-25) with awareness (K+) of women’s contribution in leadership; support new beliefs (A+) that promote women’s participation in leadership; and also engage in new behaviours (P+) that promote women’s participation in leadership.
In Enugu, Kaduna and Lagos states, nearly 9 out of 10 young women and men say they would support a woman if she was selected for local leadership (only 6 out of 10 for Kano youth). Comparison of the lower right and left quadrants shows that about half of these young supporters say that they do not see women in leadership positions in their area. This suggests that young people – both men and women – are willing to be supportive of women taking on greater leadership in their communities, if those women are empowered and enabled to do so.
Section 4: Programming Implications
Initially, Voices 4 Change’s baseline study of attitudes, practices, and social norms was designed to be just that: a baseline measurement of attitudes and behaviour that would enable measurement of personal and social change over the next 5 years.

However, through the use of novel social norms analysis and a KAP “4” framework, the study reveals the importance of the baseline data itself. This study has shown how the prevalence of positive attitudes and practices varies, both across behaviour areas and across demographics (particularly gender and state). This distribution has distinct programming implications for each of the three target behaviours.

Furthermore, social norms analysis of the baseline data shows that behaviour may be influenced in ways that differ from the theory of change originally proposed. Results suggest that not all of the target behaviours are strongly influenced by social norms. In the case of VAWG, there may be a public norm against VAWG while it continues to persist – and frequently be justified – behind the doors of one’s household. Regarding household decision-making, behaviours are again private, and this lack of transparency – compounded by widespread acceptance of current gender roles – also suggests that social norms do not play a strong role in influencing behaviour. Of the three behaviour areas, women in leadership displays the strongest signs of being a social norm, and a behaviour where young people are ready to embrace a new norm of greater women’s participation.

Therefore, while social norms do not play as strong a role in determining behaviour as was initially expected, this study demonstrates the importance of conducting an initial social norms analysis in development initiatives. Without a social norms analysis, assumptions are made about how personal knowledge versus social pressure affect behaviour, and these assumptions shape programming, often without data to support these programming choices. With clearer measures of whether social norms exist, programmes are empowered to choose outreach strategies that more accurately (and effectively) map onto a population’s personal decisions and social dynamics.

Modifying normative information can be a powerful way to introduce social change. When behaviours are not publicly visible, people’s perceptions of what is normal may be skewed because they lack information about what others are thinking and doing. V4C’s intervention can help correct this by providing accurate information about the views of community members. This not only leads to a better sense of how one’s peers think, but also opens opportunities for targeting key influencers to acknowledge and talk about the shift in attitudes. Showing that there is wider public support for women taking a greater role in decision making...
at home, and also for having positions in local leadership, for example, could help shift the consensus on these issues. For some extremely personal behaviours and experiences, such as experiencing or committing VAWG, individuals may not want to feel there is an audience of other people involved in potential courses of action. In this case, normative information could be adapted so as to avoid the impression that an audience is watching and judging an individual’s response to the situation (Tankard and Paluck 2015).

4.2 Violence Against Women and Girls

Overall, there is widespread disapproval of VAWG, and there is widespread knowledge that others disapprove of the practice as well. However, because of a lack of social sanctions, such as public disapproval or ostracising of perpetrators, widespread disapproval currently has little bearing on the behaviours in households. The lack of laws punishing VAWG also enables behaviour to lag behind approval in the movement towards a new norm of not engaging in VAWG.

Information campaigns that emphasise why VAWG is wrong will likely be redundant given the widespread disapproval that already exists for the practice; programming may be more effective if it targets reference groups and creates publicity about how widespread disapproval of VAWG is.

Strengthening laws against VAWG and empowering people to take a stand against it in their social circles could put additional pressure on men to stop this unpopular practice. A public awareness campaign focusing on the large numbers of people who disapprove of such violence (and publicly share their negative opinion of men who practice VAWG) could be an effective strategy to promote more widespread abandonment of the practice.

However, hitting a woman in one’s household is still viewed as partially being brought on – and possibly justified – by the woman’s behaviour. Furthermore, occasional hitting of a woman appears to be thought of differently from more regular VAWG (and therefore is condoned more often). It would be useful to educate the public about how VAWG is never acceptable, regardless of a woman’s behaviour, or the frequency of violent acts.

It appears that there is a misperception that VAWG is only a lower class issue, or one relegated to drunks and social miscreants – possibly because VAWG in other socio-economic classes is more private and thus others have limited knowledge that the practice still occurs within these groups. Young Nigerians might benefit from information on how VAWG continues to affect women in all socioeconomic strata, and therefore is everyone’s problem and responsibility.

Programming could also include empowerment initiatives that give young people the skills to push back on key reference groups like peers, adults, and even religious figures to educate them both about why VAWG is not acceptable and – perhaps more importantly – about how widespread disapproval of VAWG is among the younger generation. Youth could be trained to publicise and model positive change for the older generations.

Programming may be more effective if it is tailored to the differences in the norms that we observed in each state. For example, approval rates of violence are lowest in Lagos (around 5%) and much higher in the three other states (up to 35% in Kano). There
is also a large reporting gap in the prevalence of domestic violence in the two northern states: in both Kaduna and Kano, women report much higher rates of violence than men (up to 25 points higher). Also, men report that violence rates are significantly higher in surrounding households than in their own (up to 40 points higher), again suggesting an underreporting of the prevalence of these behaviours.

Family members and elders appear to be important reference groups for this behaviour and programming should also target these groups so that their perception of what behaviours are acceptable and what behaviours merit sanctioning may change.

In highlighting the prevalence of attitudes or behaviours, it is important to consider how sharing information may have effects contrary to those desired by the programme (cases where people might realise that their positive behaviour is in the minority and thus feel pressure to revert). For example, if young men consider their peers to be an important reference group, and they become aware that VAWG is seen less negatively among their peers than expected, they may be more willing to commit acts of VAWG in the household.

4.3 Household Decision Making

We found that self-reported attitudes and practices are fairly evenly split between two equilibria: the opinion of women in households does and should matter a good deal; and her opinion does and should matter only a little. Quantitative and qualitative evidence suggest that this even distribution is in part due to a widespread perception that women should make some household decisions, but that men should make more.

Of the three issues explored in this report, women’s opinions in household decision-making is the most entrenched in the old behaviours and attitudes. Individuals appear to hold strong stereotypes about women and men’s abilities, as well as how their different dispositions would affect the quality of decisions they make. Messaging that counters these stereotypes – particularly through positive role models and through messaging from key influencers – could start to change attitudes.

Conceptions of masculinity matter – both in that men are perceived to be the stronger and more level-headed partners in a household, and also that men have a position of power and prestige to maintain. This position is threatened by women taking equal roles in household decisions. Conversations on what it means to be a strong man, if messaged from key influencers and targeted reference groups, could shift how both men and women think about masculinity, with implications for household dynamics.
While the qualitative data suggests that limited decision making for women is a common practice across Nigeria, the quantitative data suggests that this practice is even more entrenched in the north. This suggests that different programme strategies will be needed to effectively promote women’s decision making in the north and the south of Nigeria, given that the majority of youth in these states appear to be at different stages of change, likely due to cultural and religious factors associated with each region.

It appears that an information campaign about women’s decision making would be more useful in the north, particularly if it worked with religious and cultural leaders to address some of the underlying beliefs that enable the old behaviour and practices to persist. In the south, survey data suggests that acceptance of women in decision making is more widespread than is commonly perceived. V4C therefore may want to focus on publicising these numbers to encourage slow adopters to “tip” after realising that their behaviour and attitudes are not shared by as many of their peers as they thought.

Since educated women appear to be more respected decision makers, this may offer an opportunity to create positive role models and demonstrate that women are capable too. Addressing stereotypes of both masculinity and femininity also appears to be a key component of shifting beliefs about decision making.

4.4 Local Leadership

Shedding light on the latent high rates of support among youth for women in leadership may help catalyse a tipping point, enabling the large number of young women who quietly desire leadership roles to actually do so. While many people still see leadership as a man’s role, it appears that this perception is based, to a high degree, on the lack of female role models in leadership who could dispel these perceptions.

Therefore, creating mentorship programmes, training, or leadership pathways could help more women have access to leadership roles. These women’s stories can be publicised so that other men and women start to shift their attitudes about whether women in leadership is desirable. This assistance could also address the practical concern that appears to be experienced by men and women who want to take a more active leadership role: financial backing or the wherewithal to garner the local support needed to win the position.

It appears that while young people may be more open to women in leadership positions, elders, and older adults more broadly still often oppose women taking these roles because of how they see women’s abilities and duties. Programming that targets these elders and influencers could help catalyse a faster change.
Kano state is a special case in this issue area, as young women show less interest in participating in local politics. Raising awareness of women’s current leadership roles, and their positive effects on family and community, may lay the groundwork for broader promotion of women’s leadership in this state. If there are no local female leaders, programming should work with key influencers to create a supportive climate for a woman to take this role, and then she can subsequently be promoted by these leaders as an example for others to follow.

There are two more broad issues that arose during our research as a barrier to women taking leadership positions. These are illiteracy, and an aversion to taking part in what is perceived to be corrupt politics.
Appendix A: Additional Social Norms Theory
A.1 Translating Social Norms Theory into a Survey Framework

Social norms are behaviour regularities that meet the following criteria:

1. Belief that the behaviour is widespread among one’s reference group (1st order expectations)

2. Conscious or unconscious belief that others from one’s reference group approve or disapprove of the target action (2nd order normative expectations)

3. Motivation to comply with the target action through the approval or disapproval of others.

Thus, to properly ascertain whether a social norm influences behaviour, a study’s methodology must measure six elements: empirical and normative expectations for one’s self, for others, and for others’ expectations about the respondent.

For each target behaviour, the survey includes at least six questions to gather data on the six cells of this matrix (one’s own behaviour, one’s expectations about others’ behaviours, and what behaviour the respondent thought others would expect, as well as the degree of approval of each of these categories). By comparing cell values and level of deviation between cells from the table above, multiple relevant characteristics were identified which allowed the following:

a. Identifying the presence of a social norm

b. Quantifying the intensity and uniformity of a behaviour regularity and/or a norm

c. Placing individual respondents on the KAP ‘4’ continuum of change (enabling extrapolation to the general 16-25 population)

d. Identifying norms that may be nearing tipping points, both at individual and group levels.

As a result, V4C is able to identify what normative and empirical expectations exist within the population, and how V4C programming can capitalise on these expectations.
A.2 Theory of Change: Individual Level

The Stages of Change model (Shell-Duncan and Hernlund, 2007) proposes that individuals move through five stages when changing behaviour:

- **Pre-contemplation (whether conscious or unconscious):** An individual is either unaware or aware of the issue and its consequences but is not considering behaviour change.
- **Contemplation:** An individual begins to wonder if the issue relates to her/his life and is considering behaviour change.
- **Preparation:** An individual gets more information and develops intent to act or starts preparing to change behaviour.
- **Action:** An individual begins to try new and different ways of thinking and behaving.
- **Maintenance:** An individual recognises the benefits of the behaviour change and continues to practice new behaviour.

Using this model, individuals can be categorised according to their readiness to change, and interventions and messages can be designed for each stage along the pathway to change. This model has been widely used for designing health interventions, such as those addressing smoking, weight loss or drug addiction. The Stages of Change model can be seen as more appropriate to issues where individual attitudes are more important than shared social norms. It suggests that each individual proceeds along the pathway to change at his or her own pace, and is not strongly influenced by the rate at which others in society change. It suggests that change will be gradual and incremental, rather than sudden and transformational.
If a matrix is created with knowledge and attitude on one axis, and practice on the other, these stages can be plotted as:
So under a personal attitude, the stages of change could be expected to flow as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Action</th>
<th>Old Attitude</th>
<th>New Action</th>
<th>New Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oblivion (unaware and support old)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation (aware and support new)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-contemplation (aware and support old)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEMPLATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTEMPLATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparaton (aware and support new)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, in a social change model, there are two possible pathways for change:

1. **Attitude change before behaviour change**, which is a more conventional individualistic model. This route to change is more likely where the desired new behaviour is not easily visible to others, and therefore people do not see others modelling the new norm. An example of such a behaviour might be domestic violence.

2. **Behaviour change before attitude change**, where individuals change to the new behaviour because they see others change around them, although they may not change their attitude. This route is more likely where the desired change is clearly visible and public, such as child marriage, and is therefore subjected to social regulation and peer pressure.
Thus, under a social norms typology (Shell-Duncan et al. 2011), the following five alternative stages of change can be identified:

- **Non-contemplator:** Not considering behaviour change
- **Contemplator:** Considering behaviour change
- **Reluctant practitioner (latent potential for change):** Supporting old/current beliefs relating to an issue; but engages in new behaviour that promotes new norms
- **Reluctant abandoner (still, successful behaviour change):** Supporting new beliefs relating to an issue; but continues old behaviour that promotes old/current norms
- **Willing abandoner:** Supporting new beliefs relating to an issue; and also engages in new behaviours that promotes new norms.

These five stages of social norms change fit into our schematic as illustrated below, with the possibility for action to change before behaviour, or behaviour to change before action. Note that there are two versions of non-contemplation and reluctant abandonment, depending on whether one is aware of the new practice. Each pathway culminates ideally in willing abandonment (key for maintenance).
Knowledge acquisition facilitates the transition from old to new attitudes. However, in the case of social norms, two types of knowledge are relevant: knowledge about the women’s empowerment issue itself, and knowledge about others’ beliefs and expectations. A successful KAP instrument will assess both types of knowledge, as well as corresponding attitudes about this knowledge.

In summary, V4C has identified two pathways for behaviour change. One pathway (attitude change, then action) can apply to both personal and social norms. The other pathway (via reluctant abandonment) is unique to social norms. By measuring both individuals’ current attitudes and actions, we can benchmark progress towards the goal of willing (and sustainable) abandonment, regardless of the change pathway.

A.3 Theory of Change: Group Level

To understand how adoption of the new behaviour at the individual level translates to group-level change, one must consider theories of diffusion. Diffusion theory is based upon concepts about how new ideas spread through society and has been used to understand the up-take of new technologies. The theory suggests that individuals fall into groups based on their openness to new ideas. Some people – “innovators” and “early adopters” – are quick to take up new ideas, whilst others are slower – the “late majority” and “laggards”.

Diffusion relies upon ideas of social influence: a “critical mass” of “opinion leaders” spreading new ideas; a “tipping point” is reached when change rapidly accelerates; and the new behaviour is widely adopted and becomes the new norm. The Diffusion approach is more appropriate when social norms are strong and where people’s behaviour is driven by their expectation of others. This model suggests that change may occur quickly once a tipping point is reached, but reaching this point may take a long time.
It is not known to what extent the behaviours targeted by V4C are driven by individual attitudes or by social norms. For behaviours predominantly determined by individual circumstances and opinions, a linear trend in behaviour is expected from successful programming – as more people are exposed to the intervention, more people change their behaviour. However, if individual behaviour is influenced by social norms, we would expect change to be much slower at first, with a rapid rate of change once the tipping point has been reached. Therefore, it is important to measure both attitudes and practices in the KAP survey so that the programme can understand how and when widespread attitudes are changing, even if measurable behaviour remains the same.

V4C’s model of social norms change uses elements of both theories – and in fact, the diffusion model also includes stages of change, where the individual becomes aware of the innovation, considers it, and decides whether or not to adopt it. Thus, the two approaches can complement each other.

The diffusion model guides the V4C communications strategy, using opinion leaders, celebrities, religious and traditional leaders, brand ambassadors and social networks to spread new ideas through society. The approach is designed to maximise the exposure which any individual may have to V4C’s messages, and to use popular and respected figures to promote the change.
A.4 Typology for Social Norms Measurement

The survey instrument was designed to maximise data collection for all six cells presented above for as many V4C target behaviours as possible, while keeping the survey engaging for the respondent and limiting survey length to approximately 50 minutes.

For modules on household decision-making and VAWG, basic questions about one’s own behaviour were modelled on DHS survey questions. Examples include making decisions about different types of purchases and whether it is acceptable to hit a woman in certain situations. For the political leadership module, questions were adapted from the African Union and UNDP’s Strategy for the Harmonisation of Statistics in Africa (SHaSA) governance module. These basic questions were then expanded into a longer set of questions that included expectations about others’ and one’s own opinions related to the same behaviour.

Overall, the survey instrument includes up to six questions per target behaviour. Each question corresponds to different levels of information about attitudes and practices that are needed to determine the presence of (or change in) social norms. For ease of reference, each cell has been labelled with a letter, and this letter consistently corresponds to the equivalent survey question asked in regards to the target behaviour. The resulting social norms matrix is indicated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Self Believes About:</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Others 1st Order</th>
<th>Others 2nd Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empirical</strong></td>
<td>A: What I do</td>
<td>B: What others do</td>
<td>C: What others think I do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative</strong></td>
<td>D: What I think I should do</td>
<td>E: What I think others should do</td>
<td>F: What others think I should do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decision-Making
- Change in Attitudes and Practice for gender gap in decision making (various kinds of decisions)
- Social norms for women’s decisions (in general) ABDEF
- Change in decision-making between the time period before the survey (t-1), survey baseline, and future survey rounds

Violence Against Women and Girls
- Change in Attitudes about violence (various kinds of violence)
- Social norms about physical, psychological, and verbal abuse ABCDEF
- Change in Attitudes about intervening in violence ADE

Leadership
- Social norms about women in leadership (at 5 levels) ABCDEF
- Change in perceived opportunities for women AD
- Social norms about whether a woman’s opinion should be considered ABCDEF
- Difference in opinion mattering between men and women ABCDEF
- Change in perceived practice about voting AD

Masculinity
- Mostly similar to above, except less documentation for questions C and F, so may need to use B as a proxy for norms.

Ideally, indicators in each of the six cells will be calibrated to the same scale: a binary 0/1, a continuous scale from 0 to 1 if measuring frequency, or a Likert scale of the same size for each question. By using scales of the same size, we are able to directly compare relative magnitudes of responses, both at the individual and aggregate levels.

The presence and strength of a social norm is identified by comparing values in key cells of this matrix. A social norm is likely to be present and stable if what others do aligns with respondents’ perceptions of others’ expectations about their own behaviour. There also needs to be an expectation that others indeed have some opinion about what is appropriate in one’s own household (F cannot equal zero). In other words, a stable social norm exists if:

It is also possible to calculate the intensity and uniformity of a behaviour. This is true both at the individual and group level. For the individual, are one’s expectations of others consistent with expectations for oneself? For the group, how much variance is there in attitudes within the population, or behaviour within the population?
As the table below illustrates, the individual and combined levels of A, B, and C indicate how frequently a behaviour occurs. The individual and combined levels of D, E, and F indicate how strongly individuals approve of this behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Perceived) Intensity/Uniformity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+B+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+E+F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A social norms framework of analysis can also identify what norms are likely unstable and/or may be nearing a tipping point. Tipping points can be considered at an individual level (how likely is it that my behaviour will change) and at the group level (how likely is it that a majority of the population will shift to the new norm). Both levels are important – understanding what it will take to influence individual-level behaviour increases the likelihood of individuals adopting the new practice, and it is only once a critical mass of people engages in the new behaviour that it becomes sustainable. This is because social norms usually involve a fear of negative sanctions or disapproval, so a majority of people need to adopt the new behaviour for it to be self-reinforcing.
Individual-level tipping points, listed in order of situations most promising for change:

1. **High number of secret deviants (new attitude/new practice):**
   
   \[ A = D \]
   \[ A \neq C \]
   \[ A \neq (F = B) \]

2. **High number of reluctant practitioners (new attitude/old practice)**
   
   \[ A \neq D \]
   \[ A = C \text{ if public}; A \neq C \text{ if private} \]
   \[ A \neq (F = B) \]

3. **Reluctant abandoners (old attitude/new practice)**
   
   \[ A \neq D \]
   \[ A = (F = B) \]
   \[ A = C \text{ if public}; A \neq C \text{ if private} \]

Group tipping points, listed in order of situations most promising for change:

1. **Misperception of mean attitude (new more prevalent than believed)**
   
   \[ \text{ave}(E) \neq \text{ave}(F) \]

2. **Misperception of mean practice (new practice more prevalent than believed)**
   
   \[ \text{ave}(B \text{ or } A) \neq \text{ave}(C) \]
Appendix B:
Methods
B.1 Quantitative Methods

An attitude, practice and social norms survey was conducted with 16-25 year old females and males using a three-round cluster household survey design. This report is for the baseline round.

B.1.1 Survey Methodology

V4C is an innovative and ambitious project that breaks new ground by using both traditional and new media to reach its audiences and lay the foundations for changes in the social norms governing gender relations in Nigeria.

Programming is carried out in four Nigerian states, and thus the survey is designed to accurately measure the attitudes and behaviours of youth in these states. Programming includes radio dramas with a large but not total coverage of the population in the participating states; “Safe Spaces” after school workshops; and partnerships with key influencers (religious and traditional leaders, pop icons, etc.). Repeated annual surveys are proposed as a basis for re-evaluating attitudes, practices and social norms. Therefore, V4C is using a cohort longitudinal survey to monitor and evaluate its radio (and other) programming and corresponding KAP progress.

In order to accurately measure changes across the knowledge, attitude and practice spectrum, it is important to select a population that most closely approximates the age at which both the direct intervention (i.e. face-to-face and online interactions) and the radio content programming targets.

B.1.2 Survey Universe

The sample universe consisted of 16 to 25 year old females and males in the local government areas (LGAs) within the four programme implementation states (Enugu, Kaduna, Kano, and Lagos). Because it was not possible to determine the exact radio catchment area for the relevant stations in each state, enumeration areas were randomly selected regardless of potential radio exposure under the assumption that radio coverage, while not complete, was still fairly homogenous across the state. The sample frame included all residences, but excluded post-secondary institutional dormitories.

To ensure that every male and female between the ages of 16 and 25 had an equal opportunity of selection within the sample universe, in the final sampling stage, a household listing was undertaken prior to the survey enumeration, rather than quicker and cheaper approaches like random walks. A random walk has the deficiency of not being able to ensure that everybody has an equal chance of selection, and can result in nontrivial bias and imprecise weights. In some situations, random walks have been shown to under-represent populations living on the outskirts of a Primary Sampling Unit (PSU) – who are often systematically different from those living closer to a PSU centre (poorer, higher percentage of ethnic minority, etc.)[1]. As the last Nigerian census was conducted in March 2006 this could not be relied upon to be sufficiently up-to-date to provide a reliable population estimate of male and female 16-25-year-olds in the enumeration areas (EAs) sampled for this survey. A household listing in the sampled EAs listed 52,500 individuals, to build male and female 15-25-year-old within- EA sample frames. The household listing also enables the project to select replacement respondents as the sample matures and attrition occurs. EAs were selected randomly using a list from the last census in 2006.
In total, 4,798 respondents completed the survey representing 2,401 households for females across the four states, and 2,397 households for males. The average response rate was 97.5% (see table B.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual-level response rate</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Kano</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed individual survey</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household refusal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected respondent refusal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual response rate</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the mapping and listing of households in each EA cluster, the list of all members found in each cluster was populated into a spreadsheet for sampling of respondents. The list of respondents was stratified by age and gender within the EA. Eligible people (aged 16 to 25 years) in each cluster were listed by sex, and from the list of each sex, a random sample of five were selected. The final list of five males and five females was used for the survey. Additionally, a back-up list from which to draw names in cases of survey refusals was produced.

The number of respondents enumerated per PSU was maintained at five males and five females. This is for two reasons:

1. The design effect calculation, described below, is based upon five males and five females being enumerated per PSU, to minimise design effect.

2. The survey team structure and logistics were set up in the intervention area to efficiently enumerate 10 respondents per PSU, and significant changes to this would potentially introduce logistical inefficiencies.

As a side note, the piloting of the enumeration procedures in the four states also provided preliminary indications of the prevalence of 16-25 year olds who listen to the radio stations where V4C broadcasts its content. The information available on radio station listenership indicated that between 20-30% of the radio listening cohort were aged 16-25 years old.
B.1.3 Establishing Baseline and Counterfactuals

Given the coverage of partner radio stations within V4C’s four target states, it was difficult to find residents living outside the radio catchment area. Furthermore, the areas that are excluded from the radio catchment area are likely to be systematically different from areas receiving the radio signal in ways which could bias analysis were this non-listening group to be used as a control group. Therefore, it is necessary to explore alternative strategies for demonstrating that any observed changes over time are attributable to V4C programming rather than exogenous influences.

Firstly, a before and after intervention measurement approach can be considered in a project where no robust counterfactual group can be identified, which is the case with the V4C, primarily because of the widespread radio programme coverage. Measurements before, during and after the intervention period provide the basis for causative inference. This baseline report is the “before intervention”, asking respondents to report a change in attitude and practice in the year prior to the programme’s implementation. This data creates a baseline rate of change and provides the empirical basis for causal inference, when contrasted with later observations from the same respondents.

B.1.4 Calculating Design Effect and Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey #</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End year 1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End year 2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End year 3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At baseline implementation, it was anticipated that there would be a total of four rounds of the KAP survey, and therefore new 16 year-old recruits would be sampled each year and the respondents from previous surveys who became older than 25 years old would still be enumerated. Therefore for this rolling sample recruitment for the panel participants, 30 new 16 year-old participants would be added each year, and the total sample would grow with each enumeration, as indicated in the right-hand column in Table B.1.4. Separate cohorts for men and women would double the sample size in the right-hand column of Table B.2.
The distribution of social norms within the community and between communities is such that high design effects or inter-class cluster correlation should be expected. This becomes particularly problematic for sampling where the people within an EA have social norms that are more similar than that the variation across the whole sample. By definition, a social norm is one that is commonly held in the population (with little variance). The best way of estimating a value for the design effect for a particular variable is by reviewing previous surveys enumerated with the same or similar variables. The only secondary data available is from the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) for Nigeria, 2008. This survey did not focus on enumerating social norms, but does report on female circumcision prevalence, which is a social norm that is often targeted.

The report on the results of the DHS survey\(^4\) indicates a design factor of 4.163 for female circumcision of women aged 15-49 years. There were 41 women enumerated in each of the PSUs. They report 4.163 as a design effect, but in the narrative text, clarify that what was called a design effect is in fact the ratio between the standard error using the given sample design and the standard error that would result if a simple random sample had been used. This is more commonly referred to as the design factor. The design effect is the square of the design factor, and represents the ratio between the variance using a clustered design and the variance that would result if simple random sampling alone had been used. The value of the design effect is used to multiply the simple random sample calculation of the required number of respondents to take into account the class correlation observed for a particular variable of interest. Clearly resources cannot stretch to a sample size 17 times larger than just simple random sampling.

In this case the variable of interest from the DHS is female circumcision that has a design effect value of 17.33 – which can be considered as very high. This was from a DHS PSU cluster size of 41 households – a large number of respondents per PSU – but using the following equation:

\[
\text{Design effect} = 1 + \rho (n - 1)
\]

where \(n\) = observations within a cluster

\(\rho\) = inter-cluster correlation - a measure of the similarity between two elements within a cluster compared to two elements randomly selected across clusters.

The reader will notice that \(\rho\) is calculated by substituting \(n = 41\) and \(\text{DEFF} = 17\) in the equation above, resulting in an estimated value of \(\rho=0.408264\). Using this, Figure B.3 presents the estimated design effect for a range of respondents within each PSU.
Given that there are not the survey resources to accommodate a design effect >2, it can be seen in figure B.3 that if there are five respondents/PSU, we can expect a design effect of 2.634 for our best proxy for social norms, namely female circumcision practice. Therefore the baseline survey sample will be structured to have five males and five females in each PSU and enumerate more PSUs than would have been the case if a larger number of males and females were enumerated in each PSU. With this strategy it is hoped that the actual design effects will be in the order of magnitude of 2 rather than 17.

To test that our estimated design effects were reasonable, and that the survey would be sufficiently powered, we analysed survey results to confirm effect size. The design effects of the following questions from the enumerated baseline survey and the intervention areas were calculated for the following indicators that were thought to be most likely to attract high design effects, i.e. the social norm in a particular location might affect the way everybody in that location answered that question and that might be different to other locations. Questions such as these were expected to attract intra-cluster correlations (i.e. respondents within the same area/communities would likely respond in a similar manner) resulting in high design effects.
Table B.4: Dichotomised variables for the seven questions created and analysed for design effects by sex (16-25) within 4 states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-binary</th>
<th>Mean design effect</th>
<th>Min design effect</th>
<th>Max design effect</th>
<th># strata design effect &gt;2 (n/8)</th>
<th>Strata design effect &gt;2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.37 How much do other people consider your views?</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kano_females_16-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.38 How much do you think other people should consider your views?</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kano_females_16-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.03 Approve man hitting wife if argues with him</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kano_females_16-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.04 Approve hitting wife if refuses sex</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kano_females_16-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.06 In the last month, how often has a man in your family hit or slapped a woman?</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kano_females_16-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.12 Female interactions with men: Hit or slapped you in the last month?</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kano_females_16-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.18 Male interactions with females: Hit or slapped a woman in the past month</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the results in table B.4, the mean design effects across all eight strata was well below two for all seven questions tested above. In a few cases, individual stratum exhibited design effects slightly larger than two. The stratum Kano female 16-25 attracted higher than 2 design effects in 6/7 of the indicators tested above. This indicates that females in Kano exhibited a greater inter-cluster correlation in their responses while exhibiting different patterns on responses across different EA’s.
B.1.5 Construction of Weights

The approximately equal sample size per reporting domain, modified by the finite population correction factor indicates that this survey is not self-weighting (a sample survey where each respondent enumerated represents the same number in the total population). Or in other words, the sampling intensity varies across states. Therefore, when reporting across all states, the weighting of responses representing the inverse probability of respondent selection needs to be taken into account.

What follows is a description of what the anticipated weighting system for the 2014 baseline was, and why this resulted in a flawed weighting system that should not be used for analysis. It goes on to explain how a well conducted 2017 census could remedy this situation and provide an even better weighting system than one based upon EA selection probability using 2006 census data.

Intended 2014 Baseline Weight Construction

The construction of a probability weight for each respondent (i.e. the inverse probability of a respondent selection, that when summed across all respondents within the domain will equal the population estimate for that domain) was planned to be achieved by the following steps (these are a little more complicated than the standard weighting for a household survey to represent a population because male and female 16-25-year-olds are two separate populations for which weights need to be derived):

1. To avoid selecting different enumeration areas for males and females (thereby increasing significantly the cost of enumeration), either one of the sexes would be chosen to be used to create these EA selections with probability proportional to the size of either the male or female 16-25 year old population. Then the selection of an EA proportional to the size of the chosen indicator sex would then be calculated, but both sexes would be enumerated in the same EA.

2. From the last national census (2006), derive the estimate of the number of 8-17-year-olds males and females separately in each EA within the four states. This age cohort is used because it represents the best predictor of the 2014 population of 16-25-year-old males and females.

3. Select the requisite number of EA’s per state, through linear systematic sampling of an ordered list of EA’s with a random start, with EA selection proportional to the number of either male or female 8-17-year-olds in each EA.

4. Conduct household listing in the selected EAs, to identify the number of males and females in the age group 16-25.

5. After enumerating five questionnaires for each sex within each sample EA, then calculate two survey weights.

6. Male and female weights calculated as the inverse probability of either male or female (16-25 year-old) selection within an EA.
**What Actually Happened**

PSI engaged a consultant from the National Population Council, who was requested to provide a selection of the required EA’s accompanied by a probability of EA selection for both male or female 16-25-year-old populations.

This was not possible with the quality and availability of the 2006 census data. Therefore the probability of the EA selection provided had the following short comings:

1. The probability of selection reflected probability proportional to the total population of the EA, and not the probability of EA selection proportional to the population of males or females aged 16-25 years old.

2. Infact, the probability of selection of the EA did not even reflect the total population of the EA, but the average population of all EAs within an LGA.

3. Typically, EAs are very similar in size, and therefore a weight proportional to the size of the average EA might not vary significantly from a weight of the actual EA population. But this was not the case in the 2006 census. The inverse of the probability of the selection of the EA’s enumerated in the KAP baseline ranged from 64 to 497. This estimate of the average size of an EA within an LGA shows unusually large variation in EA size.

If one proceeded with using this probability of EA selection that was not a close reflection of the population of the EA, it would be impossible to construct a weight that reflected an estimate of the overall population, let alone the population of males and females aged 16-25.

It is therefore advisable not to use a weighted analysis at this stage as it will introduce bias in the data that is not easily explainable. And the unweighted analysis by individual states is the most appropriate. Given that the sampling intensity between states differed to ensure a similar level of precision of key indicator estimates within each state, then without an appropriate weighting system, combining data from different states into the overall programme analysis is problematic as regards to variance estimates. Particularly so when trying to estimate overall numbers of males or females in the age cohort affected. Until a robust weighting system has been implemented, the least biased way of expressing impact would be percentage of males and females within state, and an average across all states, but this cross state analysis is not without its biases.
How To Remedy The Situation

1. The 2006 census data is not reliable enough to go back to create a selection of probability of EAs selected based upon the population of male and female 16-25-year-olds, even if access to such census microdata was possible.

2. The 2016 census was originally scheduled to occur at the midline of the project, fortunate timing for V4C. But unfortunately, it has since been delayed to 2017.

3. If the 2017 household census is successfully completed, and the microdata is available, then good estimates of the 19-28-year-old population will be available and provide an empirical basis for retro-weighting of the 2014 baseline 16-25-year-old males and females. This depends on:
   a. the microdata is accessible to estimate the population of 19-28-year-old males and females for each EA of the four programme states.
   b. the weight construction steps outlined above for the 2006 census are implemented using 2014 census data.

B.1.7 Preparation for Survey Implementation

Prior to the commencement of the survey, a three-day pilot test was conducted in Epe, Lagos, with the senior survey implementing staff after they had been trained. The pilot study was conducted outside the main study sites; however, it was an area that is demographically and culturally similar to the main study sites. Members of the survey company, Practical Sampling International (PSI), and V4C participated in the pilot study and, following each day of the pilot a group meeting was held to discuss improvements to the survey process, methodology and instrument. By the third day, all participants were confident that the survey design was clear and comfortable for respondents. The survey questions and procedures were improved in response to findings from the pilot.

In addition, the senior survey staff were provided with sufficient social norms training and familiarity with the survey questions and platform to subsequently train the full complement of enumerators in each target state.

Overall, two levels of training were implemented:

1. Central training of trainers and supervisors
2. Subsequent trainings in each state where the survey was conducted.

At the central training, all supervisors were guided through in-depth sessions on the survey objectives and methodology, enhancing their understanding of their roles in the survey, the survey process, ethical considerations and the procedures to assure adherence to the sampling strategy and enumeration of quality data. Social norms questions tend to be more complex than conventional survey questions. Therefore, significant time was spent explaining the purpose of these questions, and talking with survey professionals about how best to communicate underlying survey concepts in each question. In both central and state-level trainings, each question in the questionnaire was reviewed and role-played, and possible challenges were identified and addressed.
The training sessions covered the following topics: 1) background on the purpose of the survey and on data collection and design; 2) a participatory review of the questionnaire and practice interview techniques in class, including role playing; 3) sampling procedures and assignment of sampling areas; 4) the procedures for and importance of maintaining confidentiality; 5) sensitivity toward study subjects; 6) protecting the privacy of respondents; 7) referral services and procedures; 8) identification and response to adverse effects; 9) interviewer safety; and 10) child protection policy.

The survey questionnaire was translated into major local languages encountered in the four states by professional translators. These languages are Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba. The translation particularly focused on ensuring choice of words that are widely understood in the study sites – especially important for social norms questions. The translated questionnaire was then reverse-translated back into English to ensure that the questions were comprehensible and accurately conveyed survey concepts in all three languages.

All the translations were then programmed into the Open Data Kit (ODK) questionnaire, so that a single questionnaire could be conducted in English or any of the three other languages. The ODK Collect (the open source android survey capture application) has the ability to change back-and-forth between any of the four languages during enumeration of a questionnaire.

B.1.8 Data Collection

The survey was administered for all target groups through one-on-one, face-to-face interviews in private settings that assured the confidentiality of information provided by the respondent. Participation in this study was voluntary. For those respondents aged under 18, consent to continue the survey with the minor was sought from the parent or guardian. It was the responsibility of all interviewers conducting the interview to provide all necessary information to the potential respondents, or potential respondent guardians/parents in the case of those under 18, so as to allow potential respondents to make an informed decision on whether to participate or not.

As this is proposed to be a panel longitudinal cohort survey, personal identifiers were recorded to ensure efficient return to the same respondents in the same household. These personal identifiers include name of the respondent, a geo-coordinate of the household, up to two telephone contact numbers, and a photograph of the dwelling. Respondents were advised that we wish to perform a number of follow-up surveys. The respondents were assured that all information and discussions will remain confidential, along with the household/respondent identifiers that have to be recorded to enable an efficient return to the same respondent in future survey rounds.
The survey was administered using handheld Android devices loaded with the ODK Collect android app. This permits:

- Rigorous data validation logic to be built into the questionnaire and ensures enumerator compliance with the questionnaire sequence and logic. Experience from previous studies by other projects clearly indicates that self-administered paper and pencil questionnaires are difficult for respondents to complete due to complex skip patterns. This often results in missing data. ODK questionnaires can be programmed to automatically make the necessary skips, thus addressing this and many other data entry quality issues.

- A reduction in supervisory tasks to only those where the data-validation logic cannot be pre-programmed into an ODK Collect questionnaire because these specific checks require respondent’s or other locality specific information.

- An almost complete removal of any post-enumeration data management procedures other than backup procedures and ensuring that all completed surveys are submitted to the ODK aggregate server.

- No subsequent data entry is required.

The pilot was an important environment in which to determine any outstanding important non-ODK quality assurance procedures that needed to be undertaken. The Statistical Services Centre of Reading University in the UK further reviewed the completed questionnaires once they were uploaded to Reading University’s FormHub server (which aggregated all of the ODK Collect form submissions).

**B.2 Qualitative Methods**

Qualitative research supplements survey data in order to gain a more nuanced understanding of old and new social norms. Focus groups have been shown to more deeply identify key influencers and the target populations’ knowledge, attitudes and practices surrounding social norms. The specific questions for these groups are developed to be similar in language to the quantitative survey’s questions, but with an open-ended structure. Focus groups were comprised of similar types of respondents where possible to ensure conformity and privacy of participants. Based on techniques used to study social norms in Senegal, content analysis was performed on focus groups’ notes to identify norms and actual/potential norm change.

**B.2.1 Methods**

Two different qualitative methods were used in this study: focus group discussions (FGD) and key influencer interviews (KII). The focus group discussions were held with general community members including male and female Nigerian youth and adults aged 16-45 years. Specifically, three focus groups were conducted in all the study locations: 1) youth (in/out of school) aged 16–25; 2) young adult (in/out of school) aged 26–34; 3) mature adults aged 35–45. The in-depth interviews were carried out among: 1) community leaders; 2) religious leaders; 3) and traditional leaders. Tables B.9 and B.10 show the details of the qualitative interviews carried out.
Participants were carefully selected and prioritised to enable the interviewers to obtain the most accurate and in-depth responses. Interviews and discussions were planned with adequate intervals between events to ensure enough time to conduct all interviews.

The recruiters and data collectors that were engaged on this project were those who resided in the study states and have proven experience working on several social research projects in the past. The respondents were drawn from PSUs 2km away from the sectors/enumeration areas used during the quantitative phase to ensure that respondents who participated in that phase were not used for the qualitative session, as using these set of respondents could introduce bias in the final output.

Within the sectors, we used a randomised method of contact to ensure that these respondents were not neighbours, friends, relatives, co-workers or members /activists in the same organisation. Using a screening questionnaire the recruiters only enlisted respondents that fitted the respondent categories with regards to gender, age, urbanisation, student/non-student, influence role, and religion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category (In/Out School)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Urbanisation</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Kano</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In School</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16–20</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of School</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16–20</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In School</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16–20</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of School</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16–20</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In School</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16–20</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of School</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16–20</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In School</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16–20</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of School</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16–20</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>16–20</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B.10: Qualitative research details: key influencers – in-depth interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>Traditional leaders</th>
<th>Religious leaders</th>
<th>Community leaders</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kano</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each recruited respondent was given an invitation card that clearly stated the date, time, venue, name and contacts of the interviewer and supervisor. They were also informed that the FGDs would be in phases and aside from the one they will be attending this year, they will also be invited for the subsequent discussions in the next wave of the survey, the following year. Only respondents who were ready to be part of the follow up FGDs were recruited.

All data collectors were adequately briefed and trained on the use of the tools, and went through mock practices. They were well supported and supervised during the data collection. A pilot/pretest of the tools was conducted for the different respondent categories which included younger (in-school) male and female respondents; out-of-school female respondents; and influencers, which was a mixed group. A total of four FGDs were conducted. After the conclusion of each FGD, a debriefing session took place where PSI and V4C teams made further edits to the discussion guide and also discussed the issues that arose from the sessions and offered solutions where necessary.
B.2.2 Ethical Considerations

Ethics in research is about respecting the rights of others. This study obtained appropriate written ethical approvals from the National Health Research Ethics Committee (NHREC) of Nigeria. At the community level, gatekeepers were recognised and approval was given for access into the study locations, and participation in the study was voluntary.

All the respondents were provided with adequate information to enable them to make an informed decision to participate or otherwise in the study. Thereafter they confirmed their participation by signing the consent form before the interview/discussion commenced.

B.2.3 Data Analysis

The analysis for qualitative data for this report was based on the highlighted specific objectives. Qualitative data from the focus group discussions and in-depth interviews were transcribed by competent third parties to avoid biases and to ensure quality. Qualitative data and verbatim quotations were classified under the specific themes covered in the study. The qualitative findings also complement the quantitative analysis in the final baseline survey report.
Appendix C:
Sample Characteristics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
<th>Female (Enugu)</th>
<th>Male (Enugu)</th>
<th>Female (Kaduna)</th>
<th>Male (Kaduna)</th>
<th>Female (Kano)</th>
<th>Male (Kano)</th>
<th>Female (Lagos)</th>
<th>Male (Lagos)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (% of strata)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married now</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own mobile phone</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave phone number</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With family</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With partner’s family</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This location</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different residence</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C.2: Sample implementation — household status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
<th>Female (All)</th>
<th>Male (All)</th>
<th>Female (Enugu)</th>
<th>Male (Enugu)</th>
<th>Female (Kaduna)</th>
<th>Male (Kaduna)</th>
<th>Female (Kano)</th>
<th>Male (Kano)</th>
<th>Female (Lagos)</th>
<th>Male (Lagos)</th>
<th>Male (Lagos)</th>
<th>Male (Lagos)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student and working</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed, looking</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed, not</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty Index (mean)</strong></td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know # hhlds w/ nets (mean)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know # hhlds w/ baby (mean)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know # hhlds w/ child death (mean)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know # hhlds w/ female head (mean)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C.3: Sample implementation — education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
<th>Female (All)</th>
<th>Male (All)</th>
<th>Female (Enugu)</th>
<th>Male (Enugu)</th>
<th>Female (Kaduna)</th>
<th>Male (Kaduna)</th>
<th>Female (Kano)</th>
<th>Male (Kano)</th>
<th>Female (Lagos)</th>
<th>Male (Lagos)</th>
<th>Male (Kano)</th>
<th>Female (Kano)</th>
<th>Male (Kano)</th>
<th>Female (Lagos)</th>
<th>Male (Lagos)</th>
<th>Male (Lagos)</th>
<th>Male (Lagos)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not all 6-18 in school</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 6-18 in school</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Own schooling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended in past</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently attending</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never attended</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary or none</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year college</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year college</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate school</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difficulty paying</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 times per year</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ times per year</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Left school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too expensive</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents opposed</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got job</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help at home</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C.4: Sample implementation — social networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female (All)</th>
<th>Male (All)</th>
<th>Female (Enugu)</th>
<th>Male (Enugu)</th>
<th>Female (Kaduna)</th>
<th>Male (Kaduna)</th>
<th>Female (Kano)</th>
<th>Male (Kano)</th>
<th>Female (Lagos)</th>
<th>Male (Lagos)</th>
<th>Male (Lagos)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igbo</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoruba</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulani</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionalist</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worship frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost every day</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and decisions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents or relatives</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious leaders</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How men treat women:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents or relatives</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious leaders</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C.5: Sample implementation — media exposure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
<th>Female (All)</th>
<th>Male (All)</th>
<th>Female (Enugu)</th>
<th>Male (Enugu)</th>
<th>Female (Kaduna)</th>
<th>Male (Kaduna)</th>
<th>Female (Kano)</th>
<th>Male (Kano)</th>
<th>Female (Lagos)</th>
<th>Male (Lagos)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radio frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ times daily</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ times weekly</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TV frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ times daily</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ times weekly</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social media frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ times daily</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ times weekly</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No V4C stations</strong></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Questionnaires

Survey questionnaires and both discussion and interview guides are available on request to the V4C Programme at info@v4c-nigeria.com
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