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Parenting for Lifelong Health-Philippines
The Philippines is an archipelago of 7,107 islands in Southeast Asia.

105 M population
22% live below national poverty threshold
Violence Against Children in the Philippines

High prevalence of violence inflicted on Filipino children (2016 National VACS, N=3,866)

78.4% of girls and 81.5% of boys experienced physical and/or psychological violence in childhood

• 66% experienced physical violence → 60% perpetrated by family members
• 63% experienced psychological violence → 38% perpetrated by family members
Reducing Violence Through Parenting Interventions

- Substantial evidence that parenting programs are effective interventions to reduce harsh parenting, improve parent-child relns, and reduce other risk factors for child maltreatment (e.g. Chen & Chan, 2016)

- Emerging evidence in LMICs (Knerr et al. 2013) and on transportability of evidence-based interventions (Gardner et al. 2016)

- Critical that interventions are effective, culturally relevant, economical and scalable
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Masayang Pamilya Para sa Batang Pilipino (MaPa)  
[Happy Family for the Filipino Child]
**NEEDS ASSESSMENT**
- qualitative & quantitative data collected from community caregivers
- consultative workshop with stakeholders, service providers, and experts

**PROGRAM ADAPTATION**
- program design workshops
- development of local content & materials for Masayang Pamilya (MaPa)
- training of first pool of MaPa facilitators
- pretest-posttest evaluation
- implementation of MaPa program with 2 parent groups (N=30)

**FEASIBILITY STUDY**

**Cultural Adaptation Process**

**Information Gathering**

**Preliminary Design**

**Preliminary Testing**

**Program Refinement**

Barrera & Castro, 2006
MaPa Target Outcomes

1. To reduce the risk of child maltreatment
2. To strengthen the caregiver – child relationship
3. For caregivers to learn and practice effective and nonviolent skills to manage negative child behavior
4. To enhance caregiver and child well-being
MASAYANG TAHANAN

Roof: Rules & Managing Child Behavior

Walls: Positive relationship between parent & child

- Setting Household Rules & Routines
- Nonviolent Discipline Strategies
- Solving Problems

Using Praise & Rewards for Positive Behaviors
- Talking About Feelings
- One-on-One Time with Your Child
- Setting Parent Goals

Sunshine of Positive Attention
- Parent groups: [15 parents + 2 facilitators]
- 12 sessions: [1 session/week or every 2 weeks]
- Pre-program home visit to set parent goals
- SMS to remind & encourage about MaPa practice
- Emphasis on collaborative discussion & problem solving
- Modeling of positive behaviors (e.g. accept, praise)
- Practicing skills in the parent group and at home
1. One-on-One Time with Your Child
2. Say What You See
3. Talking About Feelings
4. Praising and Rewarding Our Children
5. Giving Specific, Positive & Realistic Instructions
6. Household Rules and Routines
7. Redirecting Negative Behaviors
8. Ignoring & Giving Attention to Other Behaviors
9. Using Consequences for Refusing to Follow Instructions
10. Cool-Down for Aggressive Behaviors
11. Resolving Conflicts in the Family
12. Reflecting and Moving On
Komiks 1: One-on-One Time Kasama ang Anak

Meron akong limang minuto para mag-one-on-one time kasama mo, Nina. Ano ang gusto mong gawin?

Magluto po tayo ng adobo, Nay!

Ito yung manok, Nay. Ilalagay natin ito.

Okay, Anak! Ito pa ang mga piraso ng manok.

Pagkatapos, pwede na natin ilagay ang dahon ng laurie at haluuin.

Okay.

Wow, Nina! Ang galing mong magluto, Anak.

Nanay, tikman mo na ang chicken adobo na tinin
Pilot Implementation:
Randomized Controlled Trial
Pilot RCT Design

Baseline interviews: n = 120

Random Assignment

Masayang Pamilya (MaPa)

n = 60
(4 parent groups)

Family Development Services
(4Ps program)

Posttest interviews: n = 60

Testing the program within the national conditional cash transfer service delivery system
Variables Assessed at Baseline and Posttest

- Frequency of Child Maltreatment [ICAST-Intervention]
- Parenting Behaviors [Parenting of Young Children Scale / PARYC]
- Attitude towards physical punishment [MICS]
- Parenting Stress [Parenting Stress Index]
- Depression, Anxiety, Stress [DASS-21]
- Well-being [WHO-5 Well-being Index]
- Child behavior and development [Eyberg Child Beh Inventory; Ages & Stages Q]
- Intimate Partner Violence [Conflict Tactics Scale]
- Marital Satisfaction [Index of Marital Satisf action]
- Parent history of maltreatment [ICAST-R]
- Demographic variables [household structure; econ deprivation; etc]
## Baseline Characteristics (N = 120)

### Adult demographics

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>36 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or Partnered</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not completed high school</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of another caregivers in the household</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Child demographics

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>3.8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in school</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child disability</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maltreatment in the Past Month at Baseline

Physical Abuse
- Yes, 74%
- No, 26%

Emotional Abuse
- Yes, 93%
- No, 7%

Neglect
- No, 53%
- Yes, 47%
Risks for Maltreatment

Parent Experienced Corporal Punishment as Child
- Yes, 80%
- No, 20%

Parent Agrees or Strongly Agrees in the Necessity of Corporal Punishment
- Yes, 9%
- No, 91%

Parent experienced at least one instance of violence from partner in past month
- Yes, 40%
- No, 60%
RESULTS
(Intention-To-Treat)
# Child Maltreatment

## Overall Frequency of Child Maltreatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MaPa</td>
<td>12.45 (12.00)</td>
<td>6.80 (9.32)</td>
<td>14.55***</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>14.07 (15.45)</td>
<td>13.27 (9.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Graph showing the overall frequency of child maltreatment comparing MaPa and Control groups at baseline and 1-month follow-up.]
Physical and Emotional Abuse

### Frequency of Physical Abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MaPa</td>
<td>3.37 (4.38)</td>
<td>1.59 (3.48)</td>
<td>8.83**</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.03 (5.45)</td>
<td>3.46 (3.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency of Emotional Abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MaPa</td>
<td>6.35 (5.24)</td>
<td>3.89 (4.96)</td>
<td>12.89***</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>7.18 (7.29)</td>
<td>7.08 (4.97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Parenting Behavior

#### Dysfunctional Parenting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MaPa</td>
<td>112.10 (13.41)</td>
<td>101.84 (10.53)</td>
<td>24.87***</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>108.93 (15.05)</td>
<td>111.40 (10.53)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Positive Parenting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MaPa</td>
<td>102.28 (11.04)</td>
<td>103.34 (12.11)</td>
<td>3.23+</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>101.70 (13.20)</td>
<td>99.43 (12.31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Child Behavior Problems

**ECBI-Problem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MaPa</td>
<td>6.80 (6.43)</td>
<td>7.20 (6.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>8.53 (6.96)</td>
<td>8.54 (6.96)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F statistic** 1.11  **Effect Size** -0.19

**ECBI-Intensity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MaPa</td>
<td>120.00 (21.59)</td>
<td>115.76 (19.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>123.93 (21.82)</td>
<td>123.05 (19.86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F statistic** 4.03*  **Effect Size** -0.36
**Parenting and Child Behavior in Past 24 Hours**

### Daily Child Problem Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MaPa</td>
<td>8.97 (4.35)</td>
<td>6.54 (4.84)</td>
<td>8.00**</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>8.77 (5.25)</td>
<td>9.03 (4.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Daily Positive Parenting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MaPa</td>
<td>7.50 (1.24)</td>
<td>7.86 (1.19)</td>
<td>7.52**</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>7.28 (1.52)</td>
<td>7.24 (1.18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary of Results**

**POSITIVE EFFECTS**
- Less overall maltreatment
- Less physical abuse
- Less emotional abuse
- Less neglect
- Less dysfunctional parenting
- Less over-reactivity
- Less Intrusiveness
- Less child behavior problem intensity
- Less daily child behavior problems
- More daily positive parenting
- More parental self-efficacy

**NO DIFFERENCE**
- Positive parenting (borderline)
- Parenting stress
- Parental mental health
- Child communication development
- Child socio-emotional development
- Intimate partner violence
- Intimate partner negotiation
- Marital satisfaction
- Number of hours of sleep per week

**NEGATIVE EFFECTS**
Limitations

- Methodological limitations
  - Only used self-report data: social desirability may affect responses

- Small sample size
  - Limited power to examine potential differences based on population characteristics (e.g., gender, age, baseline measures)
  - Needs replication in other Filipino communities

- 1-month post-intervention assessment only (follow-up is forthcoming)
  - Sustainability and sleeper effects are as yet unknown
  - Cannot examine process of change (i.e., potential mediators of effects)
## Challenges and Opportunities in Implementing and Scaling Parenting Programs

### Congruence with National Plans and Systems
- National, provincial, municipal, city, barangay level acceptance & buy-in
- Integration of the intervention program in existing service delivery systems

### Integrating Scientific Evidence and Practice
- Filipino and international scientists collaborate to bridge knowledge gaps
- Fostering scientific / evidence-based perspectives & skills in service delivery processes, programs & policies

### Engaging Community and Family
- Parent leaders, “city links” (4Ps staff) worked w/ MaPa facis & researchers
- Support parent engagement & help address barriers to participation
Future Directions

development / adaptation of MaPa for families with Teens and Babies
feasibility testing of MaPa programs
training of community facilitators to deliver MaPa
regional RCT trials of MaPa program
Thank you! Salamat!


...and the MaPa families who made this possible!
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Global and Regional Review of Evidence and Best Practices

Parenting Programmes in East Asia and the Pacific

Dr Jamie M. Lachman, Universities of Oxford and Glasgow
Parenting for Lifelong Health, Maestral International
High rates of violence against children, especially at home.

300 million children 0-5 years exposed to violence (Walker, 2011)

75% of children 2-16 experience child maltreatment at home (UNICEF 2014)

Cycle of violence mediated by parent-child relationships.

Long-term effects on children’s mental health and behavior problems, and later life chances

Estimated cost of violence against children 1.36% to 2.52% of GDP in East Asia and Pacific region
Consequences of violence

Mental health
Injury
Risky behaviours
Disease
Maternal & child health
Poor nutrition
Low cognitive stimulation

- WHO: INSPIRE (2016)
Demand for programs that reduce violence in low- and middle-income countries

**INSPIRE: Seven Strategies for Ending Violence against Children**

- Implementation and enforcement of laws
- Norms and values
- Safe environments
- Parent and caregiver support
- Income and economic strengthening
- Response and support services
- Education and life skills
Parenting programs may reduce violence in LMICs

- Evidence from high income countries - for reducing child abuse and other child/parent risk factors (Chen & Chan 2015)

- Emerging evidence in LMICs (Knerr et al 2013; in 2018, over 80 rigorous trials)

- Transported & homegrown programs equally effective - as long as based in core principles (Gardner et al 2016; Leijten et al 2016)

- Barriers due to licensing, cultural appropriateness, affordability, and capacity to go to scale (Mikton 2012)
In East Asia and the Pacific, UNICEF work on parenting support is often under:

- Child Protection,
- Education,
- Early Childhood Development
- Communication for Development.
EAPRO
Regional Meeting
7-9 June 2016, Manila.

Objectives: Learning exchange, shared understanding of frameworks and principles, review plans and programs

12 countries: Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Pacific Island Countries, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam

Participants: International experts and researchers, delegates from national governments, practitioners and specialists from UNICEF HQ, regional and country offices, as well as individuals from other organizations.
EAPRO Meeting Results

- Most parenting programs are new, or being evaluated and preparing for scale up from 2017 to 2018.

- **Majority** of programs are for *parents of young children* (ECD, 0-8 or 0-5).

- **Few** programs targeted for *parents of adolescents*.

- **Level of Intervention**: mostly Universal and Selective, with some Indicated.

- Address *behavior and relations of parents and children; cognitive stimulation, health and nutrition.*

- Small scale reach: between 500 participants to 25,000 annually

- Limited research done on effectiveness
Systematic Review of Evidence in East Asia and Pacific

- McCoy et al 2018
  - 10 RCTs and 1 quasi-RCT
  - 5 China, 5 Thailand, 1 Indonesia
  - Total: 2,334 participants

- Intervention characteristics
  - Target age: 0 to 15 years (most >5)
  - 6 group, 3 individual, 2 combined
  - Delivery by health professionals

- Meta-Analysis results
  - Medium effects for reducing abusive, harsh, & negative parenting
  - Small effects for increasing positive parent-child interactions
  - Most did not directly measure VAC
Systematic Review of Evidence in East Asia and Pacific

- Gardner et al (forthcoming)
  - 19 RCTs
  - 53% universal; 47% selective
  - Total: 2,839 participants (16-765)

- Geographical focus
  - Majority in China (N=13)
  - 4 in Thailand; Indonesia & Philippines

- Intervention characteristics
  - Target age: 2 to 18 years (most >5)
  - 11 group, 2 individual, 5 combined
  - 10 professionals; 9 semi-professional
Other EAPRO Parenting Initiatives

- Philippines
- Thailand
- Malaysia
- Regional Review
Integration with conditional cash transfer system through Department of Welfare and Social Development

1. Formative evaluation and cultural adaptation of PLH for Young Children
2. Feasibility pilot in Metro Manila (N=30)
3. RCT with govt Family Development Services as comparison (N=120)
4. Expansion to 3 provinces and multisite RCT (N=540)
5. Adaptation and piloting of PLH for Babies and Teens

More in Professor Alampay’s presentation!
Parenting for Lifelong Health – Thailand
2017-2020

Collaboration with Ministry of Public Health

1. Country mapping exercise and needs assessment – identified poorest region in Northeast Thailand

2. Formative evaluation with local stakeholders

3. Adaptation of PLH for Young Children (2-9) with local parenting experts

4. Pilot to test feasibility and cultural acceptability (N=60)

5. RCT by community nurses and village health volunteers (N=120)
Malaysia Positive Parenting Project

2017-2019

Collaboration with National Family and Population Development Board (LPPKN)

1. Strengthening existing government parenting program to reduce violence against children

2. Intervention design: 5 module program for parents of children ages 0 to 18

3. Groups divided by developmental stage: 0-2, 2-9, 10-18

4. Feasibility pilot in 2 provinces (N=90)

5. Training of trainers and further testing
Regional Review of Parenting Programs

2017

Objectives

• Provide guidance on the design, implementation and scale up of effective parenting programs

• Strengthen enabling environment for nurturing care, policy and services for children

Activities

• Regional desk review & in-country/remote review of 6 countries

• Cambodia, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste

• Focus on violence and other outcomes

• Case studies to highlight effective programs and approaches
In Summary…

- Lots of positive activity since 2016 regional meeting
- Strong policy framework for supporting positive parenting programs
- Encouraging involvement of government and NGO sector (health, social development, education)
- Need for more programs focusing on adolescents
- Need to build EVIDENCE in other countries, esp in lower-income countries
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