Cluster randomised controlled trial of the Parenting for Respectability programme to reduce violence against children and intimate partners in Uganda: An effectiveness-implementation Hybrid Type 2 Design
Background
Uganda Parenting for Respectability Implementation Science Study (UPRISE)

• Originally funded through SVRI grant for early prevention of gender based violence (2012)

• Formative research to determine theory of change and cultural factors (2014-2016)

• Pre-post pilot study to examine preliminary qualitative and quantitative impacts (2016-2019)

• Funding from Evaluation Fund to examine different implementation modalities (2020)

• Project expanded to cluster randomised trial with Oak Foundation support (2021)
Study Objectives

Hybrid type 2 design – effectiveness plus implementation

• Text effectiveness of Parenting for Respectability
  • Primary outcomes:
    • Child maltreatment
    • Intimate partner violence
  • Secondary outcomes associated with CM and IPV

• Examine impact of implementation factors
  • Geographical region (Northern and Central Uganda)
  • Community (peri-urban and urban)
  • Facilitators (peer and professional)
  • Group composition (newly formed and existing)
Parenting for Respectability (PfR)

Key programme goals and content

• Fathers, mothers, and other male and female caregivers with children between 0 – 17 years old

  • Focus on parents’ desire for good child behaviour and the family’s respectability

  • Deliberate engagement and inclusion of fathers starting with father-only and mother-only sessions

  • Build parents’ confidence to parent positively and identify solutions through discussion and reflection

  • Promote healthy spousal relationships through reflection on social norms and communication
Parenting for Respectability (PfR)

Programme structure and delivery

• Community based mixed gender programme
  • 10-20 men and women per group
  • 2-3 hours per session

• 16 weekly group sessions
  • First 9 sessions single sex groups
  • Last 7 sessions mixed sex groups
  • Final session community graduation event

• Programme delivery
  • Peer facilitators nominated by community
  • 4 facilitators per group
  • 5 days training pre-programme plus top-up after Session 9
Methods
Hybrid Type II Design

• Cluster randomised controlled trial
  • 54 village clusters
  • 28 in Wakiso; 26 in Amuru
  • 1:1: comparison

• Comparison group: Parenting in a Nutshell (PiN)
  • 2-hour community lecture
  • Delivery by community facilitators
  • Same content as PfR

• 3 assessment timepoints
  • Baseline (August 2021 – during COVID-19 wave)
  • Endline (July 2022)
  • Follow-up (September 2022)

• Data collected using tablets
Recruitment

- Collaboration with SOS Children’s Village
- Wakiso & Amuru Districts in Central and Northern Uganda
- 2,318 parents recruited through community meetings (46% male)
- 844 children ages 10-14 randomly selected for child-report (46% boys)
- 208 facilitators trained (102 PfR; 106 PiN)
Methods: Analytic approach

Step 1: Examine pre-post comparisons between PfR and PiN

1. Examine distribution of variables
2. Determine analytic strategy
   - Multilevel linear regression
   - Multilevel negative binomial regression
3. Intention-to-treat analyses
   - Independent variables: allocation, allocation*time
   - Covariates: region (Wakiso/Amuru)
   - Nested random effects at cluster and participant level

Step 2: Moderator and subgroup analyses including implementation variables

Step 3: Cost-effectiveness and follow-up data analyses

Step 4: Mediator analyses testing mechanisms of change
Preliminary results
Baseline characteristics

• Adults
  • 88% in a partnered relationship
  • 57% parents finished at least primary school level
  • 79% some degree of literacy
  • 84% reported COVID-19 related stress

• Children
  • 11% with some form of disability
  • 99% enrolled in school (but not attending due to COVID-19)
  • 47% single or double orphan
Intimate partner violence at baseline

Male IPV Perpetration
- Yes, 62%
- No, 37%
- Missing, 2%

Female IPV Victimization
- Yes, 65%
- No, 25%
- Missing, 10%

Adult-Report
Child maltreatment at baseline

**Male-Parent Figure**
- Yes, 62%
- No, 26%
- Missing, 12%

**Female-Parent Figure**
- Yes, 83%
- No, 15%
- Missing, 2%

**Child-Report**
Participant flow

- Retention at post-test
  - 82% adults; 84% children
  - Dropout mainly due to relocation or inability to contact

- Participation rates
  - 88% PfR (14 out of 16 sessions)
  - 84% PiN (out of 1 session)

- Remarkable due to COVID-19 context!
Preliminary results: Main outcomes

Overall child maltreatment

- 21% reduction reported by parents (IRR=0.79, 95%CI 0.67, 0.94)

- No change detected by child-report
  - Male-parent: B=0.13, p=.800 (95%CI -0.86, 1.11)
  - Female-parent: B=-0.16, p=.774 (95%CI -1.24, 0.92)
Preliminary results: Main outcomes

Intimate partner violence

- 38% reduction in self-reported IPV victimisation (IRR=0.62, 95%CI 0.48, 0.81)
- 40% reduction in self-reported IPV perpetration (IRR=0.60 (95%CI 0.45, 0.79)
- No change detected in child report of partner conflict (B=-0.01, p=.965, 95%CI -0.28, 0.27)
### Preliminary results: Secondary outcomes

**Child maltreatment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>IRR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child physical abuse</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.51, 0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child physical abuse-male parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-0.37, 0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child physical abuse-female parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-0.44, 0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child emotional abuse</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.69, 0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child emotional abuse-male parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-0.63, 0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child emotional abuse-female parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-0.91, 0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community sexual violence</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-0.11, 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community physical violence</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-0.13, 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child sexual abuse</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-0.30, 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal punishment endorsement</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-1.21, -0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal punishment endorsement</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-1.03, -0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All outcomes effects in expected direction even if not significant.
### Preliminary results: Secondary outcomes

#### Intimate partner relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>IRR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercion-perpetration</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.57, 0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion-victimisation</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.56, 0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual violence-perpetration</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.59, 1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual violence-victimisation</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.63, 1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation (self-initiated)</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.87, 1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation (partner-initiated)</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.88, 1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive partner relationships</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-0.35, 0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All outcomes effects in expected direction even if not significant.
## Preliminary Results: Secondary Outcomes

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender socialisation</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.87, 2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender socialisation</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.27, 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectability</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.34, 0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectability; male-parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.01, 0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectability; female-parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.13, 0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual behaviour communication</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.24, 0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual behaviour communication; male-parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.13, 0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual behaviour communication; female-parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.03, 0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All outcomes effects in expected direction even if not significant.
## Preliminary results: Secondary outcomes

### Positive parenting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive parenting</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>2.91, 4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive parenting; male-parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-0.52, 3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive parenting; female-parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.45, 2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental monitoring</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.21, 2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental monitoring; male-parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.20, 1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental monitoring; female-parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-0.10, 1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All outcomes effects in expected direction even if not significant.
Preliminary results: Secondary outcomes

Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational aspirations</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.15, 0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational aspirations</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.24, 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational expectations</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.03, 0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational expectations</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.22, 0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent support of education</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.90, 1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent support of education; male-parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.66, 1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent support of education; female parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.40, 1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All outcomes effects in expected direction except educational aspiration though very small negative and non-significant effect.
## Preliminary results: Secondary outcomes

### Child behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour problems</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-1.56, -0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour problems</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-1.43, 0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalising behaviour</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>-0.93, -0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalising behaviour</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.87, 0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalising behaviour (irritability)</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-0.72, -0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalising behaviour (irritability)</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.75, 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-social behaviour</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.08, 0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-social behaviour</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.38, 0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All outcomes effects in expected direction even if not significant.
Preliminary results: Secondary outcomes

Other outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parenting stress</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>-1.94, -0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent depression</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>-1.37, -0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food insecurity</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.16, 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food insecurity</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.26, 0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child necessities</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.33, 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child necessities</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.01, 0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver substance abuse</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.29, 0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All outcomes effects in expected direction except caregiver substance abuse and food insecurity (parent-report).
Summary of results

• Positive effects across parent-reported primary outcomes
  • Reduced overall maltreatment, physical, and emotional abuse
  • Reduced intimate partner violence and coercion

• Positive effects key secondary outcomes linked to IPV/VAC
  • Increased equitable gender socialisation
  • Reduced acceptability of corporal punishment
  • Improved positive parenting, monitoring, support of education
  • Improved parental mental health
  • Improved child behaviour

• Lack of evidence for effectiveness
  • Most child report outcomes (except gender socialisation, respectability, and provision of basic child necessities)
  • Sexual violence outcomes (potential floor effect)
  • Positive partner relationships
Interpretation

- **Optimistic:** Promising intervention effects at post-intervention for PfR
  - High participation and retention rate
  - Successful engagement of male caregivers
  - Substantial improvement in main and secondary outcomes

  OR

- **Pessimistic:** Change in knowledge/attitudes but not behaviour
  - Parents have learnt socially desirable responses to questionnaires
  - Lack of evidence from child-report assessments
    - Not exposed to intervention
    - Smaller sample size
Limitations

- Potential social desirability bias due to self-reported assessments
- Short-term effects immediate post-intervention
- Potential floor effect with very low pre/post values (e.g., child sexual abuse)
- Possible intervention dosage effect
- Smaller child sample size = reduced power
- Reproducibility due to COVID-19?
Next steps

• Additional analyses
  • Sustainment of effects at follow-up assessments
  • Subgroup analyses by gender and implementation
  • Moderators and mediators
  • Associations with process outcomes
  • Cost-effectiveness analyses

• Parenting for Respectability-Digital
  • Part of Global Parenting Initiative
  • Adapt PfR for remote, digital, and hybrid delivery
  • Implementation science study focusing on scale-up
THANK YOU!
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