# Assessing the Impact of Social Stigma and Sexual Health Behavior on Perceived Vulnerability to HIV Infection Among Adolescent Girls in Kenya

## Bethany Jones, Dr. Helen Mahony, Dr. Daniel Grischy, and Dr. Karin Brewster Florida State University, Public Health Program, College of Social Sciences and Public Policy

## Abstract

- Significant social stigma surrounding HIV/AIDS in Kenya.
- Sexual Health Behavior highly related to risk of HIV transmission. Adolescent Girls particularly vulnerable to HIV transmission.
- Secondary data analysis using dataset containing survey data from 328 schools in Kenya. Using dataset of survey responses from female respondents.
- Statistically significant associations found in research question 1, 2, and 3. results indicate social stigma not a good predictor variable for perceived HIV vulnerability and condom use.

## Introduction

- Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) bears a disproportionate amount of the global burden of HIV.
- In 2021 60% of new HIV infection were in SSA. 67% of people living with HIV live in SSA (Moyo et al, 2023).
- Adolescents are more vulnerable to HIV due to several societal and economic factors. Girls are a particularly vulnerable population. Girls aged 15 and older make up 66% of new HIV infections (Dzinamarira & Moyo, 2024).
- Adolescents in SSA are economically marginalized increasing their vulnerability to transactional sex, illicit drug use, and cultural stigmatization of HIV decreases willingness to test or receive treatment for HIV (Dzinamarira & Moyo, 2024).
- Risky sexual health behaviors increase risk of HIV transmission. Unprotected sexual intercourse is the most common risk factor increasing HIV transmission risk. Underlying social factors associated with increased high-risk behaviors are lower income and education levels (Wondmeneh & Wondmeneh, 2023).

### **Research Questions**

- Does social stigma around HIV impact perceived vulnerability to HIV infection?
- 2. Does social stigma around HIV impact condom use?
- Does sexual activity impact perceived vulnerability to 3. HIV?

### Methodology

- Secondary data analysis using dataset "Education, HIV, and Early Fertility: Experimental Evidence from Kenya".
- Dataset sourced from Open Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.
- 328 schools in Kenya surveyed from 2003-2007. Dataset 3 used in study contained survey responses from female study.

<u>Respondent demographics:</u>

N = 4462 (mode grade = 7, standard deviation for grade = 0.801)

Gender: N= 4462 (100% female)

#### **Data Analysis**

- Binary logistic regression conducted to answer research question 1.
- Binary logistic regression conducted to answer research question 2.
- Odds ratio conducted to answer research question 3.
- 3 questions indicating social stigma summed to create social stigma score.

### R Tab

HIV S Scor Τ

HIV S<sup>1</sup> Score

The stat

The confidence interval does not contain 1 so results statistically significant. Odds ratio greater than 1, perceived vulnerability increased by sexual activity.

|             | 5   |   |   |   |             |
|-------------|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| le 1: E     | Binary Logis  | stic regress  | sion for RQ   | 1   |             |
|             |   | 95% C   |   |   |             |
|             | Exp(B)  | Lower   | Upper   | Sig   | В           |
| Stigma<br>e | 1.111   | 1.033   | 1.196   | 0.005   | 0.106       |
| e n va      | alue for Reg  | search que  | stion 1 wa  | s <b>p= 0.005</b>   | which is    |
| •           |   | •   |   | 5 <u>p- 0.005</u>   | VVIIICIT IS |
| atistic     | ally signific   | ant.  |   |   |             |
|             |   |   |   |   |             |
|             |   |   |   |   |             |
| hle 2.      | <b>Binary Log</b>   | istic regre   | ssion for R   | 72  |             |
|             | Dinary Log  | istic regie   | 55101110111   |   |             |
|             |   | 95% C.I. for Exp(B)   |   |   |             |
|             | $E_{VD}(P)$   | Lower   | Upper   | Sig   | В           |
|             | Exp(B)  |   | Opper   |   | -           |
| tigma       | 0.885   | 0.818   | 0.957   | 0.002   | -0.122      |
| tigma       |   |   | ··  |   |             |
| -           |   |   | ··  |   |             |
|             | 0.885   | 0.818   | 0.957   | 0.002   | -0.122      |
| p val       | 0.885<br>ue for Rese  | 0.818<br>earch ques   | 0.957   |   | -0.122      |
| p val       | 0.885   | 0.818<br>earch ques   | 0.957   | 0.002   | -0.122      |
| p val       | 0.885<br>ue for Rese  | 0.818<br>earch ques   | 0.957   | 0.002   | -0.122      |
| p val       | 0.885<br>ue for Rese<br>ly significa  | 0.818<br>earch ques   | 0.957   | 0.002   | -0.122      |
| p val       | 0.885<br>ue for Rese<br>ly significa<br>Table 3<br>Block 0: classifica  | 0.818<br>earch ques<br>nt.  | 0.957   | 0.002<br><b>p= 0.002</b> w  | -0.122      |
| p val       | 0.885<br>ue for Rese<br>ly significa  | 0.818<br>earch ques<br>nt.  | 0.957   | 0.002<br><b>p= 0.002</b> w  | -0.122      |
| p val       | 0.885<br>ue for Rese<br>ly significa<br>Table 3<br>Block 0: classifica  | 0.818<br>earch ques<br>nt.  | 0.957   | 0.002<br><b>p= 0.002</b> w  | -0.122      |
| p val       | 0.885<br>ue for Rese<br>ly significa<br>Table 3<br>Block 0: classifica<br>Observed<br>HIV<br>Vulnerability  | 0.818<br>earch ques<br>nt.<br>ation table for RQ1   | 0.957<br>tion 1 was   | 0.002<br><b>p= 0.002</b> W<br>Correct<br>percentage<br>0.0<br>100.0         | -0.122      |
| p val       | 0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885 | 0.818<br>earch ques<br>nt.<br>ation table for RQ1<br>Pre<br>0.0<br>0.00 0   | 0.957<br>tion 1 was   | 0.002<br><b>p= 0.002</b> w<br>Correct<br>percentage<br>0.0                  | -0.122      |
| p val       | 0.885<br>ue for Rese<br>ly significa<br>Table 3<br>Block 0: classifica<br>Observed<br>HIV<br>Vulnerability  | 0.818<br>earch ques<br>nt.<br>ation table for RQ1<br>Pre<br>0.0<br>0.00 0   | 0.957<br>tion 1 was   | 0.002<br><b>p= 0.002</b> W<br>Correct<br>percentage<br>0.0<br>100.0         | -0.122      |
| p val       | 0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885<br>0.885 | 0.818<br>earch ques<br>nt.<br>ation table for RQ1<br>Pre<br>0.0<br>0.00 0   | 0.957<br>tion 1 was   | 0.002<br><b>p= 0.002</b> W<br>Correct<br>percentage<br>0.0<br>100.0         | -0.122      |
| p val       | 0.885<br><b>Ue for Rese</b><br><b>Jy significa</b><br>Table 3<br><i>Block 0: classifica</i><br>Observed<br>HIV<br>Vulnerability<br>Overall<br>percentage<br>Table 4     | 0.818         earch ques         nt.         ation table for RQ1         0.00         0.00         0.00         0.00         0         0.00         0 | 0.957<br>tion 1 was   | 0.002<br><b>p= 0.002</b> W<br>Correct<br>percentage<br>0.0<br>100.0         | -0.122      |
| p val       | 0.885<br><b>Ue for Rese</b><br><b>Jy significa</b><br>Table 3<br><i>Block 0: classifica</i><br>Observed<br>HIV<br>Vulnerability<br>Overall<br>percentage<br>Table 4     | 0.818 earch ques nt. ation table for RQ1 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.  | 0.957<br>tion 1 was<br>dicted HIV Vulnerability<br>0 1.00<br>1798<br>2603 | 0.002<br><b>p= 0.002</b> w<br>Correct<br>percentage<br>0.0<br>100.0<br>59.1 | -0.122      |
| p val       | 0.885<br><b>Ue for Rese</b><br><b>Jy significa</b><br>Table 3<br><i>Block 0: classifica</i><br>Observed<br>HIV<br>Vulnerability<br>Overall<br>percentage<br>Table 4     | 0.818 earch ques nt. ation table for RQ1 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.  | 0.957<br>tion 1 was   | 0.002<br><b>p= 0.002</b> w<br>Correct<br>percentage<br>0.0<br>100.0<br>59.1 | -0.122      |

#### No change between null model and independent variable

1798

2603

0.0

100.0

#### model.

#### Block 0: classification table for RO2

HIV

Overall

Vulnerability

percentage

1.00

|                           |     |      | Predicted did pupil use<br>condom last time they had<br>sex |       |
|---------------------------|-----|------|---|-------|
| Observed                  | No  | Yes  |   |       |
| Did pupil use condom last | No  | 3118 | 0   | 100.0 |
| time they had sex         | Yes | 1344 | 0   | 0.0   |
| Overall                   |     |      |   | 69.9  |
| percentage                |     |      |   |       |

#### Table 7

Block 1: classification table for RQ2

|                           |  |     | Predicted did pupil use<br>condom last time they had<br>sex |     | Percentage correct |
|---------------------------|--|-----|---|-----|--------------------|
|                           |  |     |   |     |                    |
| Observed                  |  |     | No  | Yes |                    |
| Did pupil use condom last |  | No  | 3118  | 0   | 100.0              |
| time they had sex         |  | Yes | 1344  | 0   | 0.0                |
| Overall                   |  | •   | •   | •   | 69.9               |
| percentage                |  |     |   |     |                    |

#### No change between null model and independent variable model

Table 8 Odds ratio showing the relationship between sexual activity and HIV vulnerability 95% Confidence Interval Lower Upper Odds Ratio for ever | 1.489 1.316 1.685 had sex (yes/no) 4351 N for Valid Cases

he results indicate that social stigma is not a good idicator of both perceived vulnerability to HIV and ondom usage. Despite the statistically significant elationship. Social stigma may not be a good redictor variable for perceived HIV vulnerability or ondom usage because there might not be a strong nough association between predictor and outcome ariables, interaction effects, or omitted variable las.

Odds ratio indicates that respondents who were not exually active were 48.9% more likely to feel less ulnerable to HIV. Respondents who are not sexually ctive have lower risk of HIV transmission which may ontribute to their perception of decreased ulnerability to HIV.

Duflo, Esther, Dupas, Pascaline, and Kremer, Michael. Replication data for: Education, HIV, and Early Fertility: Experimental Evidence from Kenya. Nashville, TN: American Economic Association [publisher], 2015. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2019-10-12. https://doi.org/10.3886/E112899V1

Dzinamarira, T., & Moyo, E. (2024). Adolescents and young people in sub-Saharan africa: Overcoming challenges and seizing opportunities to achieve HIV epidemic control. Frontiers in Public Health, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1321068

Moyo, E., Moyo, P., Murewanhema, G., Mhango, M., Chitungo, I., & Dzinamarira, T. (2023). Key populations and Sub-Saharan Africa's HIV response. Frontiers in Public Health, 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1079990

Wondmeneh, T. G., & Wondmeneh, R. G. (2023). Risky sexual behaviour among hiv-infected adults in sub-saharan Africa: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BioMed Research International*, 2023(1). https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/6698384

## Acknowledgements

Thank you to my research mentor Dr. Helen Mahony. I also want to thank my Honor in the Major committee members Dr. Daniel Grischy and Dr. Karin Brewster for their advice and support.

#### Discussion

#### References