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Aims of the study

• Could a parenting programme increase positive parenting?
• Could it reduce harsh discipline?
• Could it decrease child conduct problems?
Rewards (A Little Something Extra)

Praising Our Children

Naming Feelings

Say What You See

Special Time with Your Child

Parent Goals and Ground Rules

Problem Solving

Consequences

Cool-Down (Time-Out)

Ignoring Difficult Behaviors

Keeping Children Safe (Household Rules)

Giving Clear and Positive Instructions

Thatch Roof: Limit Setting

Mud Walls: Positive Parenting

Building a Rondavel of Support for You and Your Child

Sunshine of Positive Attention
Lonwabo is playing with pots and pans while Mother is sms-ing

Look! I'm a soldier! I will protect you!

That's nice...

You're dead!

WHACK!
Screened for eligibility (n=380)

Eligible participants (n=330)

Completed baseline (n=310)

Randomised (n=296)

Intervention (n=148)
  - Post-test interviews: n=139
  - Post-test observations: n=120

Control (n=148)
  - Post-test interviews: n=148
  - Post-test observations: 140

Design and procedure
Measures

• Child behaviour:
  – Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory

• Positive parenting: from the PARYC:
  – Supporting positive behaviour
  – Setting limits

• Harsh discipline: from the ICAST:
  – Physical discipline
  – Severe physical discipline
  – Psychological discipline
Data analysis

1. Pre-post difference (average, and 95% CI)
   - Control arm
   - Intervention arm: All
   - Intervention arm: <5 versus ≥5 sessions

2. Model-based effect sizes (and CIs)
   - Linear mixed model, included child age, child gender, location, time point, arm (fixed effects); participant, programme group (random effects)
Who was included in our sample?

- **Caregivers:**
  - Age ranged 18-75, mean of 34.
  - The majority (186, 63%) were single and had never married
  - All but one caregiver was female
  - Most (180, 61%) had some high school education
  - Only 44 (15%) were working
  - 241 (81%) were the child’s biological mother

- **Children:**
  - 159 (54%) were male
  - Child ages covered the full spectrum of 2-9, with a mean of 5.2 years
  - Intensity scores on the ECBI ranged from 89-225 (mean 133.9)
  - Problem scores on the ECBI ranged from 15-36 (mean of 24.9)
## Means: Positive Parenting Intensity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline (std. dev) [95% CI]</th>
<th>Post-test (std. dev) [95% CI]</th>
<th>Change score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td>49.23 (11.42) [47.39 – 51.07]</td>
<td>49.88 (11.33) [48.05 – 51.71]</td>
<td>1.165 [-0.6 – 2.9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
<td>47.55 (9.31) [46.05 – 49.05]</td>
<td>54.86 (9.37) [53.30 – 56.42]</td>
<td>5.581 [3.3 – 7.8]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Means: Positive Parenting Intensity

Baseline vs. Post-test

- Control
- Intervention
## Means: Harsh Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline (std. dev) [95% CI]</th>
<th>Post-test (std. dev) [95% CI]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td>11.78 (8.60) [10.40 – 13.17]</td>
<td>6.65 (6.57) [5.58 – 7.71]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
<td>11.39 (7.35) [10.20 – 12.58]</td>
<td>5.27 (5.89) [4.29 – 6.25]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Means: Harsh Discipline

Baseline vs. Post-test:
- Control: Steady decrease
- Intervention: Steady decrease

Comparison between groups:
- Control: No significant change
- Intervention: Significant decrease
## Means: Child Conduct Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline (std. dev) [95% CI]</th>
<th>Post-test (std. dev) [95% CI]</th>
<th>Change score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>24.61 (5.07) [23.79 – 25.42]</td>
<td>16.05 (7.93) [14.73 – 17.37]</td>
<td>-1.96 [-3.9 – 0.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intensity:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>143 (23.14) [139.27 – 146.73]</td>
<td>115.64 (27.50) [111.20 – 120.07]</td>
<td>-26.69 [-30.7 – 22.7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>141.21 (22.85) [137.53 – 144.89]</td>
<td>111.58 (24.82) [107.45 – 115.70]</td>
<td>-3.54 [-10.4 – 3.3]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Means: Child conduct (problem)
Means: Child conduct (intensity)
Summary

• Positive parenting:
  – Intervention significantly increased positive parenting

• Harsh parenting:
  – Decreased in both groups – jury out as to whether we have had a significant effect

• Child conduct problems:
  – Both problem and intensity scores reduced significantly in both groups
  – Intervention reduces intensity of child conduct problems
What next?

• Significance testing of the intervention’s effect on:
  – Harsh parenting
  – Secondary outcomes:
    • Monitoring and supervision
    • Maternal depression
    • Maternal social support
    • Parenting stress
• Complete and analyse one-year follow-up data
• **Parenting for Lifelong Health**
• Explore moderators (parent ill-health, substance abuse, intimate partner violence, etc.)
• Explore ways to reduce barriers to attendance