

Family Violence Reduction Within a Parenting Intervention in Rwanda:

It is estimated that 250 million children globally are at risk for lost developmental potential because of

consequences of alcohol intake.¹⁵ Items

mean squared residual (SRMR) < 0.08, and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) < 0.06.^{22,23} χ^2 statistics are not considered due to high sensitivity to sample size.²⁴ RMSEA values are interpreted with caution as they usually indicate better model fit with larger degrees of freedom.²⁵ We report standardized estimates along with exact *P* values and 95% confidence intervals. Analyses were performed in R²⁶ using the Lavaan package.²⁷

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive sample information is shown in Table 1. Among the 509 included children, 42.7% were exposed to violent discipline at baseline. Among the 490 female caregivers, 26.7% reported IPV victimization and 2.1% reported problematic alcohol

consumption at baseline. Among the 441 male partners, 11.9% reported IPV perpetration and 4.5% reported problematic alcohol consumption. Father engagement in child care was reported in 64% of the families at baseline.

Qualitative Results

This section discusses the thematic coding of postintervention caregiver interviews. Quotations are provided in Table 2. Caregivers reflected on program-related changes in their own behaviors such as enhanced communication techniques, which reduced conflict, IPV, and violent discipline. Additionally, caregivers attributed the knowledge learned through SM “coaches” to a reduction in daily stressors that

before the intervention and reflected on how using learned alternatives to violent punishment from SM had strengthened their relationship with their children.

2 Qualitative Results from Postintervention Interviews with Female and Male Caregivers

Theme and Subthemes	Household Demographics	Quotations	Female, = 21	Male,
---------------------	------------------------	------------	--------------	-------

2 Continued

Theme and Subthemes	Household Demographics	Quotations	Female, = 21	Male, = 11
	Female, dual-headed, old age, not new primary caregiver. Male: partner of primary caregiver, dual headed household	prayer house!" Now the place I used to go praying, the church has been closed. I don't feel free to congregate at other places."		

RMSEA = 0.059). Similar to model 2.A for female caregivers, we find that SM reduced violent discipline (estimate = -0.329, $P < .001$), but not IPV perpetration or alcohol problems.

3. :

The model shows adequate fit across all indices (SRMR = 0.052, CFI =

0.897, RMSEA = 0.057). We see that SM is associated with increased father engagement (estimate = 0.292, $P = .001$), but has no effect on emotion dysregulation or parenting warmth in males. With regard to male caregiver behavior changes serving as mechanisms of change, we find that emotion dysregulation postintervention predicts IPV perpetration 12 months later (estimate = 0.151, $P = .028$) but

we do not estimate indirect effect given the lack of an intervention effect on emotion dysregulation. We do not see any effects of changes in father engagement or parenting warmth on violent discipline or IPV perpetration.

DISCUSSION

In line with global estimates, we find that 43% of the parents in our

Model Results Male Caregivers

Outcome	Predictor	Estimate		95% CI LL	95% CI UL
Model 1B					
Risk for violence (baseline to postintervention)					
	Violent discipline 1	Daily hardships 0	0.020	.485	—0.044 0.076

study use violent discipline and 27% of the female caregivers report IPV victimization at baseline. Using qualitative and quantitative methods, we cast light on risk factors for family violence and mechanisms through which the SM intervention reduced rates of violence. Qualitative findings indicate that daily hardships and alcohol problems predict violent discipline and IPV. These associations are replicated in the quantitative results in female caregivers, but not in male caregivers. We see interrelationships between violent discipline and IPV in both the qualitative and quantitative data. In the quantitative data, we find that maternal IPV

Model Results Female Caregivers

Outcome	Predictor	Estimate		95% CI LL	95% CI UL
Model 1A					
Risk for violence (baseline to postintervention)					
Violent discipline 1	Daily hardships 0	0.076	<.001	0.036	0.119
Violent discipline 1	Alcohol problems 0	0.050	.357	−0.029	0.188
IPV victimization 1	Daily hardships 0	0.082	<.001	0.044	0.128
IPV victimization 1	Alcohol problems 0	0.079	.046	−0.011	0.162
Autoregressive path					
Alcohol problems 1	Alcohol problems 0	0.160	.157	0.043	0.464
Violent discipline 2	Violent discipline 1	0.494	<.001	0.338	0.652
IPV victimization 2	IPV victimization 1	0.424	<.001	0.176	0.646
Predictors of violence outcomes (cross-lags)					
Violent discipline 2	IPV victimization 1	0.174	.019	0.040	0.327
Violent discipline 2	Alcohol problems 1	0.100	.244	−0.044	0.293
IPV victimization 2	Violent discipline 1	0.051	.476	−0.090	0.190
IPV victimization 2	Alcohol problems 1	0.194	.109	−0.033	0.448
Model 2A					
Risks for violence (baseline to postintervention)					
Violent discipline 1	Daily hardships 0	0.079	<.001	0.044	0.116
Violent discipline 1	Alcohol problems 0	−0.001	.988	−0.064	0.071
IPV victimization 1	Daily hardships 0	0.068	<.001	0.039	0.100
IPV victimization 1	Alcohol problems 0	0.085	.015	0.011	0.151
Autoregressive paths					
Alcohol problems 1	Alcohol problems 0	0.240	.033	0.078	0.522
Violent discipline 1	Violent discipline 2	0.455	<.001	0.336	0.590
IPV victimization 1	IPV victimization 2	0.461	<0.001	0.276	0.654
Predictors of violence outcomes (cross-lags)					
Violent discipline 2	IPV victimization 1	0.175	.002	0.069	0.283
Violent discipline 2	Alcohol problems 1	0.051	.425	−0.045	0.208
IPV victimization 2	Violent discipline 1	0.028	.586	−0.07	0.137
IPV victimization 2	Alcohol problems 1	0.125	.049	−0.011	0.253
Treatment effects					
Violent discipline 1	Treatment	−0.327	<.001	−0.495	−0.164
IPV victimization 1	Treatment	−0.107	.224	−0.281	0.057
Alcohol problems 1	Treatment	0.084	.307	−0.066	0.255
Model 3A					
Risks for violence (baseline to postintervention)					
Violent discipline 1	Daily hardships 0	0.077	<.001	0.043	0.113
Violent discipline 1	Alcohol problems 0	−0.002	.957	−0.069	0.078
IPV victimization 1	Daily hardships 0	0.068	<.001	0.040	0.100
IPV victimization 1	Alcohol problems 0	0.085	.015	0.012	0.152
Autoregressive paths for caregiver behaviors					
Alcohol problems 1	Alcohol problems 0	0.240	.026	0.088	0.514
Violent discipline 2	Violent discipline 1	0.446	<.001	0.327	0.578
IPV victimization 2	IPV victimization 1	0.422	<.001	0.239	0.600
Predictors of violence outcomes (cross-lags)					
Violent discipline 2	IPV victimization 1	0.152	.007	0.041	0.266
Violent discipline 2	Alcohol problems 1	0.052	.377	−0.037	0.209
IPV victimization 2	Violent discipline 1	0.017	.746	−0.078	0.119
IPV victimization 2	Alcohol problems 1	0.116	.058	−0.009	0.235
Autoregressive paths for intervention mechanisms					
Emotion dysregulation 1	Emotion dysregulation 0	0.681	<.001	0.558	0.805
Father engagement 1	Father engagement 0	0.710	<.001	0.535	0.894
Parenting warmth 1	Parenting warmth 0	0.160	<.001	0.117	0.203
Intervention effects on mechanistic change					
Emotion dysregulation 1	Treatment	−0.004	.954	−0.148	0.155
Father engagement 1	Treatment	0.520	.151	0.171	0.869

10. Easterbrooks MA, Katz RC, Kotake C, Stelmach NP, Chaudhuri JH. Intimate partner violence in the first 2 years of life: implications for toddlers' behavior regulation. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2018;33(7):1192