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REAL Fathers Approach

- Addresses the intersection of intimate partner and child violence.
- Reaches young fathers before expectations, attitudes and behaviors are more set.
- Provides an entry to promoting more gender-equitable and positive masculinities.
- Effective, scalable approach, with evidence from Uganda.
REAL Fathers: Project Components

- **Select & Train Mentors**
  - 20 mentors trained, committed and mobilized

- **Home Visits**
  - 326 young fathers sensitized through 7 home visits and 7 group sessions

- **Group Meetings**
  - 326 female partners engaged in select sessions

- **Poster Series**
  - Display posters to elicit socio-emotional responses and reinforce the 7 key themes

- **Community Celebrations**
  - Share changes, Make commitments, Model behaviors, Celebrate change
Evaluate
Objectives

In Senegal, how effective is REAL Fathers in

1. Preventing young men’s use of **violent discipline** with under-five children;

2. Preventing men’s perpetration of **intimate partner violence**; and

3. Improving men’s use of **positive parenting and communication skills**

**Exploratory question:** Does REAL Fathers prevent mother’s use of violent discipline with under five children?
Quasi-Experimental Longitudinal Quantitative Evaluation: In brief

- **Sites.** 8 villages selected in each of 2 communes: Kedougou and Tomboronkoto

- **Baseline and Endline Survey** (12 months post-baseline) with the intervention group

- **Eligibility & Participants.** 330 young fathers aged 16-35 years with children 0-5 years & their female partners (N=330) living in the selected villages

- **High retention at endline:** >99%

- **High program participation:** 27% attend all 14 sessions; 73% attend 11-13 sessions
YOUNG FATHERS

74% of young fathers attended at least primary school (Baseline)

62% of families had difficulty meeting their food needs in the past month, compared to 79% at baseline***

7% of men reported consuming any alcohol in the past month

*p<0.10; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
real fathers

child caregiving and discipline
Parenting Attitudes and Norms

**Mean Nonviolent Attitudes (Range: 1-3)**

Compared to baseline: 2.3 (men), 1.8 (women)

6 indicators; higher score showing nonviolent attitudes

**Mean Nonviolent Descriptive Norms (Range: 1-4)**

Compared to baseline: 3.1 (men), 2.9 (women).

2 indicators; higher score less supportive of VAC

**Mean Nonviolent Injunctive Norms (Range: 1-4)**

Compared to baseline: 2.7 (men), 2.3 (women).

5 indicators; higher score less supportive of VAC

*p<0.10; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
Parenting: Childcare and Confidence in Using Non Violence Discipline

Father’s engagement in childcare
Compared to baseline: 4% (men), 5% (women);
Includes 4 indicators, assessing if fathers are always, usually, or equally involved in caring for U5 children

Confident to use nonviolent discipline
Compared to baseline: 66% (men), 18% women;
% reporting very confident

*p<0.10; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
35%*** of fathers used physical punishment in past 3 months after participation in REAL Fathers.

- Psychological Aggression: 36%
  - Compared to baseline, 33%

- Physical Punishment: 35%***
  - Compared to baseline, 65%

- Harsh Physical Punishment: 5%
  - Compared to baseline, 4%

- Any violent discipline: 46%***
  - Compared to baseline, 71%

*p<0.10; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01
Which factors were significantly associated with men’s physical punishment?

- Not confident that can avoid physical punishment: 2.3
- Injunctive norms that violence is expected: 2.3
- Uses nonviolent discipline: 3.3
- Nurturing care: 4.3
- Sensitive to social sanctions: 8.3
- Attitudes favorable to violent discipline: 9.1

Significantly **less** risk

Significantly **more** risk for using physical punishment

*Adjusted Odds Ratios*
42%*** of mothers used **physical punishment** in past 3 months after participation in REAL Fathers

- **Psychological Aggression**: 43%***
  
  Compared to baseline, 79%

- **Physical Punishment**: 42%***
  
  Compared to baseline, 82%

- **Harsh Physical Punishment**: 3%***
  
  Compared to baseline, 19%

- **Any VAC**: 51%***
  
  Compared to baseline, 89%

*p<0.10; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01
real fathers

relationship and
intimate partner violence
Partner Communication
Compared to baseline: 89% (men), 69% (women);
Includes 7 indicators, assessing whether partners talk about their day and their feelings, and express appreciation in past month

Frequency of Quarrelling
Compared to baseline: 18% (men), 54% (women);
% reporting quarreling sometimes or often

*p<0.10; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
Descriptive and Injunctive IPV Norms

Mean Nonviolent Descriptive Norms (Range: 1-4)
Compared to baseline: 3.32 (men), 3.24 (women).
2 indicators; higher scores less supportive of IPV

Mean Nonviolent Injunctive Norms (Range: 1-4)
Compared to baseline: 2.76 (men), 2.8 (women).
2 indicators; higher score less supportive of IPV

*p<0.10; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of IPV</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>REAL Fathers</th>
<th>% Change Compared to Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercive Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td>77%*</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional IPV</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%***</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical IPV</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%***</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual IPV</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%**</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any IPV</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%***</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31%*** of women experienced ANY IPV in past 3 months after participation in REAL Fathers.

*p<0.10; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01
Factors significantly associated with women’s emotional or physical IPV experience

- Better relationship quality: 0.48
- Regular partner communication: 0.8
- Attitudes accepting of IPV: 1.1
- Husband engaged in household work: 3.5 (Emotional IPV), 4.9 (Physical IPV)
- Descriptive norms that IPV is typical: 5.9

Significantly less risk
Significantly more risk for using physical punishment

Adjusted Odds Ratios
Key Learnings

- REAL Fathers is an **acceptable and effective method** at preventing men’s use of violent discipline with under five children and IPV with their partner
- REAL has an **indirect effect** on preventing women’s use of violent discipline

Recommendations

- **Increase participation of female partners and female mentors**
- Incorporate **economic empowerment**
- Work with **Community Health Workers to support mentors and supervisors** during the Group Session on Family Planning.
- **Engage village leaders** in mentor training to project monitoring and help scale the program
- Dissemination of successful project outcomes, including back to the local communities themselves, will **support the sustainability of results** by affirming participants’ behaviors
Thank you!