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Background

• Stigma can be described as:
  • deeply discrediting
  • Associated with undesirable characteristics,
  • reduces that individual’s status in the eyes of society

• Effects of Stigma on HIV programming
  • Poor uptake of HIV testing
  • Delays in treatment utilization
  • Non-disclosure to those who need to know
  • Decreased self-worth with reduced self actualization

• Hence something that is agreed needs to be eliminated
Background 2

• Nigeria have developed initiatives to reduce stigma and discrimination at national or local settings
  • Community mobilization and IEC;
  • Mass media;
  • Workplace policies; and
  • Development of effective anti-stigma legislation

• In the last National Strategic Plan for HIV and AIDS (2010 – 2015) the development of anti-discrimination laws was considered the major strategy

• Measurement of success was the passing of appropriate legislation
ENR and the development of anti-discrimination laws

- Enhancing Nigeria’s Response to HIV and AIDS (ENR) is a DFID-funded 6 year program in Nigeria.
- Aims to reduce barriers and increase access and to HIV services in 8 focal states.
- Considered Stigma as a major barrier.
- Worked with government and civil society to get anti-stigma laws passed in focal states.
- Till date 7 states have anti-discrimination laws passed in the country.
- Needed to determine the effect of laws on the attitude of persons towards PLHIV.
Methodology
Goal and Objectives of Study

• **Goal:** To determine the effectiveness of anti-discrimination laws in reducing stigma towards PLVs

• **Objectives:**
  • Determine whether there are differences in the level of stigma and accepting attitudes of persons in states with anti-discrimination laws when compared with states with no laws
  • Determine if there are significant differences in the reduction of stigma in states with appropriate when compared with states without such legislation
Data Source

• Data from the National HIV/AIDS & Reproductive Health Survey (NARHS) was used. (2007 and 2012)
• These cross-sectional surveys were conducted using a multi-stage stratified sampling approach.
• Sample sizes
  • 2007: Total sample size: 11,521
  • Selected states: 2,564
  • 2012: Total sample size: 31,235
  • Selected states: 6,943
Selection Criteria for non-interventions sites

- Similar HIV epidemiology
- Similar Stigma status in 2007
- Contiguous or in the same geopolitical zone
- No efforts to develop anti-stigma laws
Analysis

• Analyze the data using SPSS Statistical version 17.0
• Statcalc
• Statistical inferences generated
  • Chi square
  • Adjusted Odds ratio
  • Logistic regression
Stigma Measurement

• NARHS survey sought response from a number of questions aimed to measure attitude towards PLHIV
• Stigma in study was measured using composite indicator of 4 questions
• Accepting attitude = correct response for all questions
• Stigmatic attitude: at least one answered wrongly
  • Composite index has been used before in research in Nigeria
  • Subjected to reliability test and found to good internal consistency
  • Also being used by the ENR program to assess changes it aims to achieve
Results
Demographic Characteristics of States with Anti-discrimination laws and those without such laws in 2007 and 2012

Demographics characteristics of both Study groups in 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>ASLS</th>
<th>Non ASLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15-24yrs</td>
<td>No secondary ed</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-39yrs</td>
<td>At least secondary</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40+yrs</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15-24yrs</td>
<td>No secondary ed</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-39yrs</td>
<td>At least secondary</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40+yrs</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Characteristics of both Groups in 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>ASLS</th>
<th>Non ASLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15-24yrs</td>
<td>No secondary ed</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-39yrs</td>
<td>At least secondary</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40+yrs</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15-24yrs</td>
<td>No secondary ed</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-39yrs</td>
<td>At least secondary</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40+yrs</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Comparison of stigma levels in States with Anti-discrimination laws and those without such laws in 2007 and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stigmatising attitude</th>
<th>Accepting attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007</strong></td>
<td>ASLS</td>
<td>Non ASLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigmatising</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012</strong></td>
<td>ASLS</td>
<td>Non ASLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigmatising</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further Analysis

• In both groups of states there was a significant decrease in level of stigma

• The odds of a person from states with laws have an accepting attitude towards PLHIV was 2.6 times more
  • (95%CI: 2.3-2.8)

• Logistic regression revealed that accepting attitude was only associated with:
  • Location in a state with an anti-discrimination law
    • (AOR):0.385;95%CI:0.347-0.487);
  • Having a higher education
    • (AOR):0.501;95%CI:0.448-0.560)
Conclusion

• Stigma is reducing in Nigeria
• Reduction is more pronounced in states with anti-stigma laws.
• The passage of such laws should be promoted

• The National Assembly in Nigeria passed an anti-discrimination law in 2014
• It is hoped that the national law will further reduce stigma and discrimination country-wide
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