

Measuring resilience in the context of conflict-related sexual violence

Clark, Janine; Jefferies, Philip; Foley, Sarah; Ungar, Michael

DOI:

[10.1177/08862605211028323](https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605211028323)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Clark, J, Jefferies, P, Foley, S & Ungar, M 2021, 'Measuring resilience in the context of conflict-related sexual violence: a novel application of the Adult Resilience Measure (ARM)', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605211028323>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

This document is the Author Accepted Manuscript version of a published work which appears in its final form in *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*.

Clark JN, Jefferies P, Foley S, Ungar M. Measuring Resilience in the Context of Conflict-Related Sexual Violence: A Novel Application of the Adult Resilience Measure (ARM). *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. July 2021. Copyright © 2021 The Author(s).
doi:10.1177/08862605211028323

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Appendix B: Tables

Table 1: Respondents (n = 449) by ethnicity

BiH	Colombia	Uganda
Bosniak <i>n</i> = 85	Afro-Colombian <i>n</i> = 49	Acholi <i>n</i> = 76
Serb <i>n</i> = 30	Mestizo <i>n</i> = 44	Lango <i>n</i> = 76
Croat <i>n</i> = 6	Indigenous <i>n</i> = 19	
Other <i>n</i> = 5	Other <i>n</i> = 47	
	Did not understand <i>n</i> = 12	

Table 2. Factor loadings of the four-factor model for BiH

	1. Social and community relations	2. Family support & relationships	3. Cultural participation & belonging	4. Abilities and opportunities
Item 18	.73			
Item 19	.71			
Item 16	.61		.33	
Item 15	.60			
Item 14	.55			
Item 21	.50			
Item 23	.41			
Item 11	.34			
Item 2				
Item 17		.91		
Item 5		.88		
Item 24		.76		
Item 6		.34		
Item 12		.32		

Item 3			
Item 26		.80	
Item 27	.36	.72	
Item 28		.46	
Item 22		.45	
Item 25		.44	.34
Item 10		.40	
Item 9			
Item 4			.60
Item 13			.56
Item 8			.41
Item 7			
Item 20			
Item 1			

Note. Items in bold were retained on the factor.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics (Mean, SD) for the factors and group comparisons in the BiH sample

	1. Social and community relations	2. Family support & relationships	3. Cultural participation & belonging	4. Abilities and opportunities
Overall sample	30.34 (5.95)	20.44 (4.14)	24.36 (4.21)	16.83 (2.59)
<i>Age (median split)</i>				
<55 (n=58)	29.58 (6.43)	20.26 (4.40)	24.23 (4.15)	17.05 (2.50)
≥55 (n=68)	30.99 (5.49)	20.60 (3.93)	24.47 (4.29)	16.63 (2.66)
Mann-Whitney U test	<i>p</i> =.315	<i>p</i> =.935	<i>p</i> =.661	<i>p</i> =.376
<i>Ethnicity †</i>				
Bosniak (n=84)	29.93 (6.28)	20.13 (4.42)	24.58 (6.06)	16.58 (2.39)
Serbian (n=30)	31.67 (4.97)	21.50 (3.17)	24.33 (3.34)	17.33 (2.02)
Mann-Whitney U test	<i>p</i> =.302	<i>p</i> =.208	<i>p</i> =.491	<i>p</i> =.295
<i>Marital status</i>				
Not married (n=24)	29.96 (4.95)	20.00 (4.29)	23.29 (5.55)	16.33 (2.84)
Married (n=65)	30.37 (5.72)	20.42 (3.96)	24.16 (3.94)	16.98 (2.42)
Mann-Whitney U test	<i>p</i> =.694	<i>p</i> =.714	<i>p</i> =.796	<i>p</i> =.375
<i>Number of children †</i>				

None (n=25)	32.00 (4.90)	19.56 (5.29)	23.32 (5.44)	16.04 (2.73)
1 (n=20)	29.80 (6.67)	21.00 (3.87)	24.80 (3.62)	17.15 (2.28)
2+ (n=81)	29.99 (6.04)	20.58 (3.80)	24.57 (3.90)	16.99 (2.60)
One-way ANOVA	$p=.299$	$p=.692$	$p=.687$	$p=.235$
<i>Education ‡</i>				
High school (n=58)	30.48 (9.76)	19.83 (4.40)	24.74 (4.29)	16.86 (2.66)
University (n=51)	29.96 (5.13)	21.20 (3.46)	23.41 (4.28)	16.65 (2.53)
Mann-Whitney U test	$p=.462$	$p=.127$	$p=.072$	$p=.559$
<i>Location §</i>				
Town (n=44)	30.43 (5.41)	19.66 (4.70)	23.20 (4.35)	16.59 (2.64)
Suburbs (n=44)	30.00 (5.79)	20.50 (3.45)	24.74 (4.57)	16.80 (2.81)
Village (n=33)	30.06 (6.83)	21.03 (4.33)	25.15 (3.55)	17.06 (2.33)
One-way ANOVA	$p=.967$	$p=.272$	$p=.050$	$p=.760$
<i>Employment status</i>				
Unemployed (n=91)	30.23 (6.07)	20.31 (4.07)	24.43 (4.35)	17.00 (2.78)
Employed (n=25)	30.76 (5.00)	21.28 (4.27)	24.20 (4.02)	18.00 (1.87)
Mann-Whitney U test	$p=.833$	$p=.146$	$p=.703$	$p=.233$

Note: ANOVA uses Kruskal-Wallis test; † Groups were created using a median split and a ‘no children’ group; ‡ No participants reported completing only primary school or not completing primary school; § Only five participants reported living in a city, so were excluded from the comparative analysis. ¶ Six individuals identified as Croat and five as ‘other’, but these groups were small and so excluded from the comparative analysis.

Table 4. Correlations between the ARM factors and psychosocial variables in the BiH sample

	1. Social and community relations	2. Family support & relationships	3. Cultural participation & belonging	4. Abilities and opportunities
1. TEC	.08	.02	.24**	.10
2. CES	.06	.00	.17	.05
3. Consequences of sexual violence	-.14	-.22*	-.21*	-.10
4. Current problems	-.17	-.23**	-.22*	-.08
5. Feeling safe in community	.31***	.32***	.32***	.30***
6. Feeling able to ask for help	.40***	.39***	.31***	.25**
7. Perceived health	.11	.18*	-.01	.04
8. Perceived QoL	.18*	.28**	.07	.07

Note: All correlations are Spearman; * $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$, *** $p<.001$.

Table 5. Factor loadings of the four-factor model for Colombia

	1. Family support & relationships	2. Community support & belonging	3. Contextual support & opportunities	4. Support from friends
Item 17	.81			
Item 5	.79			
Item 6	.73			
Item 24	.65			
Item 12	.47	.34		
Item 7	.35			
Item 27		.61		
Item 25		.55		
Item 15		.49		
Item 16		.46		
Item 26	.35	.44		
Item 23		.40		
Item 20		.38		
Item 19		.36		
Item 21		.35	.33	
Item 22				
Item 28				
Item 4			.61	
Item 1			.57	
Item 3			.50	
Item 11			.45	
Item 9			.45	
Item 2			.40	
Item 10			.39	
Item 8			.35	
Item 13			.32	
Item 14				1.01
Item 18				.71

Note. Items in bold were retained on the factor.

Table 6. Descriptive statistics (Mean, SD) for the factors and group comparisons in the Colombian sample

	1. Family support & relationships	2. Community support & belonging	3. Contextual support & opportunities	4. Support from friends
Overall sample	24.16 (6.65)	37.24 (7.18)	42.53 (5.26)	6.32 (2.43)
<i>Age (median split)</i>				
<42 (n=79)	28.34 (5.45)	17.13 (5.39)	23.00 (4.04)	16.10 (2.73)
≥42 (n=91)	30.02 (6.59)	16.76 (5.43)	24.08 (3.86)	16.52 (2.70)
Mann-Whitney U test	$p=.057$	$p=.679$	$p=.137$	$p=.289$
<i>Ethnicity</i>				
Afro-Colombian (n=49)	24.61 (6.22)	37.24 (7.31)	42.90 (5.04)	5.90 (2.50)
Indigenous (n=19)	23.74 (6.33)	35.89 (6.21)	41.50 (6.56)	6.63 (1.71)
Mestizo (n=44)	24.98 (6.70)	37.98 (8.43)	41.61 (6.21)	6.50 (2.57)
‘Other’ (n=47)	23.62 (7.04)	37.36 (6.22)	43.15 (3.83)	6.45 (2.49)
One-way ANOVA	$p=.769$	$p=.748$	$p=.477$	$p=.517$
<i>Marital status</i>				
Not married (n=65)	23.17 (7.00)	35.98 (6.94)	42.52 (4.87)	6.11 (2.59)
Married (n=21)	23.75 (6.48)	35.26 (9.66)	42.21 (5.18)	6.29 (2.37)
Mann-Whitney U test	$p=.733$	$p=.764$	$p=.817$	$p=.772$
<i>Number of children †</i>				
None (n=13)	22.38 (7.07)	34.92 (7.58)	41.31 (3.88)	5.23 (2.31)
1-2 (n=49)	23.53 (7.88)	36.94 (7.58)	42.32 (5.02)	6.24 (2.45)
3+ (n=108)	24.65 (5.99)	37.59 (7.02)	42.74 (5.54)	6.44 (2.31)
One-way ANOVA	$p=.530$	$p=.375$	$p=.202$	$p=.331$
<i>Education</i>				
No schooling (n=19)	21.05 (6.77) ^a	34.53 (7.50)	41.69 (4.44)	5.74 (2.47)
Primary (n=69)	23.58 (6.71)	36.09 (7.24)	41.26 (5.85) ^a	6.24 (2.34)
Secondary (n=51)	24.88 (6.62)	38.68 (6.40)	43.83 (4.65) ^a	6.27 (2.80)
Technical college (n=51)	26.19 (5.88) ^a	39.13 (7.38)	43.68 (4.66)	6.90 (1.89)
One-way ANOVA	$p=.046^*$, $\varepsilon^2=.05$	$p=.034^{\ddagger}$, $\varepsilon^2=.05$	$p=.022^*$, $\varepsilon^2=.06$	$p=.444$
<i>Location</i>				
City (n=75)	25.12 (6.69)	38.96 (6.78) ^a	43.93 (3.61) ^a	6.49 (.28)
Town (n=55)	23.04 (7.25)	36.40 (6.96)	42.41 (5.31)	6.48 (.32)
Rural area (n=39)	24.15 (5.41)	35.18 (7.72) ^a	40.31 (6.80) ^a	5.67 (.37)
One-way ANOVA	$p=.212$	$p=.014^*$, $\varepsilon^2=.05$	$p=.039^*$, $\varepsilon^2=.04$	$p=.162$

<i>Employment status</i>				
Unemployed (n=58)	22.57 (7.83)	35.51 (7.76)	42.45 (4.74)	5.64 (2.52)
Employed (n=62)	24.95 (6.25)	38.44 (7.43)	42.43 (6.06)	6.60 (2.49)
Mann-Whitney U test	$p=.114$	$p=.044^*$, $d=.22$	$p=.535$	$p=.038^*$, $d=.22$

Note: ANOVA uses Kruskal-Wallis test; Dwass-Steel-Critchlow-Flinger pairwise tests were used for post-hoc comparisons; † Groups were created using a median split and a ‘no children’ group; ^a significant difference between groups when $p<.05$; d / ε^2 effect size. ‡ Although a significant difference was detected, there were no significant differences in the pairwise comparisons.

Table 7. Correlations between the ARM factors and psychosocial variables in the Colombian sample

	1. Family support & relationships	2. Community support & belonging	3. Contextual support & opportunities	4. Support from friends
1. TEC	-.12	-.08	-.01	-.00
2. CES	.02	.13	.09	.22**
3. Consequences of sexual violence	-.11	-.01	-.05	.14
4. Current problems	-.21**	-.15	-.10	-.13
5. Feeling safe in community	.13	.17*	.06	.08
6. Feeling able to ask for help	.02	.24**	.26**	.13
7. Perceived health	.27**	.22**	.14	.06
8. Perceived QoL	.24**	.25**	.10	.03

Note: All correlations are Spearman; * $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$, *** $p<.001$.

Table 8. Factor loadings of the six-factor model for Uganda

	1. Cultural & social bonds	2. Familial bonds	3. Individual strengths	4. Cooperation & community	5. Relationships with friends & community	6. Family resources & support
Item 22	.67					
Item 9	.57					
Item 23	.49				.35	
Item 28	.46					
Item 10	.43					
Item 11	.42					

Item 4				
Item 12				
Item 3				
Item 17	.68			
Item 24	.65			
Item 26	.41			
Item 15				
Item 21		.62		
Item 25		.58		
Item 8		.49		
Item 16		.34		
Item 13		.34		
Item 18				
Item 20				
Item 2			1.00	
Item 1			.40	
Item 19				.68
Item 27				.53
Item 14				.32
Item 5				.69
Item 7				.63
Item 6				.52

Note. Items in bold were retained on the factor.

Table 9. Descriptive statistics (Mean, SD) for the factors and group comparisons in the Ugandan sample

	1. Cultural & social bonds	2. Familial bonds	3. Individual strengths & community support	4. Cooperation & community	5. Relationships with friends & community	6. Family resources & support
Overall sample	26.08 (3.59)	12.05 (2.79)	19.25 (3.47)	7.66 (1.84)	14.70 (3.42)	9.70 (2.91)
<i>Age (median split)</i>						
<39 (n=72)	26.20 (4.08)	12.01 (3.07)	19.43 (3.66)	7.64 (1.89)	14.82 (3.47)	9.68 (2.99)
≥39 (n=78)	25.92 (3.12)	12.05 (2.54)	18.96 (3.26)	7.65 (1.82)	14.50 (3.37)	9.65 (2.82)
Mann-Whitney U test	<i>p</i> =.223	<i>p</i> =.649	<i>p</i> =.325	<i>p</i> =.917	<i>p</i> =.482	<i>p</i> =.839
<i>Ethnicity</i>						
Acholi (n=76)	26.00 (4.17)	11.75 (3.34)	20.07 (3.81)	7.46 (2.22)	13.65 (3.73)	9.36 (3.10)
Lango (n=76)	26.16 (2.95)	12.36 (2.10)	18.47 (2.94)	7.87 (1.36)	15.72 (2.73)	10.03 (2.67)
Mann-Whitney U test	<i>p</i> =.641	<i>p</i> =.752	<i>p</i> =.003*, <i>d</i> =.28	<i>p</i> =.656	<i>p</i> <.001*, <i>d</i> =.36	<i>p</i> =.201
<i>Marital status</i>						
Not married (n=34)	26.00 (4.03)	11.44 (3.14)	18.72 (3.63)	7.85 (1.46)	14.42 (3.46)	9.38 (3.03)
Married (n=62)	25.77 (3.96)	12.95 (2.25)	19.18 (3.39)	7.69 (1.89)	15.26 (3.01)	10.37 (2.72)
Mann-Whitney U test	<i>p</i> =.589	<i>p</i> =.021*, <i>d</i> =.28	<i>p</i> =.497	<i>p</i> =.925	<i>p</i> =.245	<i>p</i> =.056
<i>Number of children †</i>						
0-3 (n=53)	27.08 (2.79)	12.08 (2.87)	19.30 (3.53)	7.85 (1.51)	15.44 (3.13)	10.36 (2.97)
4+ (n=99)	25.55 (3.86)	12.04 (2.76)	19.22 (3.46)	7.57 (2.00)	14.30 (3.51)	9.34 (2.82)
Mann-Whitney U test	<i>p</i> =.012*, <i>d</i> =.25	.899	.938	.716	<i>p</i> =.034*, <i>d</i> =.21	.052

<i>Education</i>						
No schooling (n=84)	25.82 (3.93)	12.15 (2.66)	18.94 (3.79)	7.49 (1.89)	14.85 (3.41)	10.00 (2.88)
Primary (n=63)	26.43 (3.19)	12.00 (3.01)	19.70 (3.04)	7.90 (1.83)	14.48 (3.54)	9.35 (2.95)
Mann-Whitney U test	$p=.350$	$p=.997$	$p=.261$	$p=.168$	$p=.676$	$p=.177$
<i>Location ‡</i>						
City/town (n=34)	25.69 (4.03)	10.85 (3.67)	20.61 (3.62) ^a	7.29 (2.50)	12.79 (3.81) ^{ab}	7.88 (2.86) ^{ab}
Trading centre (n=27)	26.33 (3.60)	11.85 (2.89)	18.70 (3.69)	7.41 (1.60)	15.04 (3.23) ^a	10.26 (2.98) ^a
Village (n=91)	25.69 (4.03)	12.57 (2.21)	18.94 (3.27) ^a	7.88 (1.60)	15.29 (3.09) ^b	10.19 (2.65) ^b
One-way ANOVA	$p=.939$	$p=.079$	$p=.034^*$, $\epsilon^2=.05$	$p=.321$	$p<.001^*$, $\epsilon^2=.09$	$p<.001^*$, $\epsilon^2=.11$
<i>Employment status</i>						
Unemployed (n=84)	26.35 (3.80)	12.42 (2.33)	18.86 (3.73)	7.86 (1.70)	15.05 (3.21)	9.82 (3.04)
Employed (n=63)	25.84 (3.38)	11.63 (3.35)	19.76 (3.19)	7.35 (2.04)	14.15 (3.73)	9.54 (2.82)
Mann-Whitney U test	$p=.202$	$p=.348$	$p=.156$	$p=.142$	$p=.150$	$p=.597$

Note: ANOVA uses Kruskal-Wallis test; Dwass-Steel-Critchlow-Flinger pairwise tests were used for post-hoc comparisons; † Groups were created using a median split, though there were not enough individuals to form a ‘no children’ group; ‡ city and town groups were combined as there were too few individually; ^{ab} significant difference between groups when $p<.05$; ϵ^2 effect size.

Table 10. Correlations between the ARM factors and psychosocial variables in the Ugandan sample

	1. Cultural & social bonds	2. Familial bonds	3. Individual strengths & community support	4. Cooperation & community	5. Relationships with friends & community	6. Family resources & support
1. TEC	.16	-.09	.00	-.01	.14	-.06
2. CES	.22**	.06	-.12	.08	.23**	-.02
3. Consequences of sexual violence	.05	-.25**	-.20*	-.03	-.05	-.09
4. Current problems	.05	-.18*	-.20*	-.04	.03	-.09
5. Feeling safe in community	.11	.13	.22**	.22**	.08	.13
6. Feeling able to ask for help	.00	.26**	.01	.07	.26**	.19*
7. Perceived health	.02	.05	.17*	-.04	-.04	.02
8. Perceived QoL	.06	.18*	.23**	.04	.02	.16

Note: All correlations are Spearman; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.