

# REAL FATHERS INITIATIVE

JANUARY 2014

## Baseline Report



Symon Wandiembe & Dennis Nabembezi  
NaNa Development Consultants, Limited  
P.O Box 37252 Kampala Uganda



This report was prepared by Georgetown's Institute for Reproductive Health under the Responsible Engaged and Loving (REAL) Fathers Initiative. This report and the REAL Fathers Initiative are made possible by support provided by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) through the Gender Roles, Equality and Transformations (GREAT) Project under the terms of the Cooperative Agreement No. AID-OAA-10-00073. The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of USAID or Georgetown University.

Written by NaNa Development Consultants, Limited for distribution and use by all partners of the REAL Fathers Initiative.

Institute for Reproductive Health | Georgetown University  
4301 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 310  
Washington, DC 20008 USA  
Email: [irhinfo@georgetown.edu](mailto:irhinfo@georgetown.edu)  
Website: [www.irh.org/projects/real-fathers-initiative](http://www.irh.org/projects/real-fathers-initiative)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	2
BASELINE STUDY OBJECTIVES .....	3
SURVEY DESIGN AND DATA ANALYSIS .....	3
FINDINGS .....	4
CONCLUSIONS .....	23
REFERENCES .....	24

## TABLE OF FIGURES

TABLE 1: BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS .....	6
TABLE 2: BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENT'S CHILD AND PARTNER .....	7
TABLE 3: ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION BY YOUNG FATHERS .....	8
TABLE 4: RELATIONSHIP, COMMUNICATION WITH PARTNER, AND ATTITUDES TOWARD IPV (RESPONSE TO HYPOTHETICAL SITUATION) .....	9
TABLE 5: ATTITUDES TOWARD IPV AND COMMUNICATION ABOUT VIOLENCE .....	10
TABLE 6: RELATIONSHIP DESCRIPTION AND ATTITUDES TOWARD IPV AND INTIMATE PARTNER ROLES .....	10
TABLE 7: PRACTICE OF IPV AND COMMUNICATION ABOUT VIOLENCE BY THE WIFE .....	11
TABLE 8: PERPETRATION OF IPV IN THREE MONTHS PRECEDING THE BASELINE SURVEY .....	12
TABLE 9: CARETAKER OF THE RESPONDENTS DURING CHILDHOOD .....	13
TABLE 10: RESPONDENT'S EXPERIENCE OF VIOLENCE IN THEIR CHILDHOODS .....	13
TABLE 11A: CHILD DISCIPLINE, VALUES, AND ASSOCIATED COMMUNICATION .....	15
TABLE 11B: CHILD DISCIPLINE AND ASSOCIATED COMMUNICATION .....	16
TABLE 11C: ATTITUDES TOWARD IPV AND PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT OF CHILDREN .....	17
TABLE 12A: CHILD DISCIPLINE AND PERPETRATION OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE .....	18
TABLE 12B: CHILD DISCIPLINE AND PERPETRATION OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE WITHIN THE PREVIOUS MONTH .....	19
TABLE 12C: CONFIDENCE IN USING NON-VIOLENCE DISCIPLINE .....	20
TABLE 13: PRACTICE OF NON-PHYSICAL FORMS OF DISCIPLINING CHILDREN .....	20
TABLE 14A: INTERACTIONS WITH CHILDREN .....	22
TABLE 14B: INTERACTIONS WITH CHILDREN BY PARENT .....	22

## LIST OF ACRONYMS AND KEY PHRASES

IPV	Intimate Partner Violence
IRH	Institute for Reproductive Health
REAL	Responsible, Engaged and Loving
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Use of physical child punishment and intimate partner violence (IPV) are cyclically linked (Bott et al 2012). Through well-developed interventions, men and boys who are perpetrators of IPV can and do change attitudes and behaviors, thereby improving parenting practices and interactions with women and children (Baker et al, 2007). Despite the proven ties between physical child discipline and IPV, violence prevention remains an area filled with many questions. More rigorous research designs are needed to discern the effectiveness of different approaches in variety of intervention settings and among diverse populations.

Georgetown University's Institute for Reproductive Health (IRH) in collaboration with Save the Children have developed the Responsible, Engaged and Loving (REAL) Fathers Initiative, a mentoring program and community awareness campaign that aims to build positive relationships and parenting practices among young fathers (ages 16-25) in post-conflict northern Uganda. The REAL Fathers Initiative is being evaluated with a pretest-posttest control experimental design in which 500 fathers (ages 16-25 years) were randomly assigned to intervention and control groups. This report presents the finding of the baseline study, which was undertaken prior to the initiation of this project's intervention in Attiak sub-county, Amuru district, Northern Uganda. The baseline survey was conducted in two parts covering 340 young fathers in the first part and 160 young fathers in the second part.

Of the 500 fathers, 250 were randomly assigned to the intervention arm and 250 to the control arm of the project. Of the 500, 90% had been living together with their partners for at least a year and 99.6% were biological fathers to the index child for the project. Around ninety-eight percent of the respondents had attended school at some point, but only about three percent were still schooling. Of those who are currently out of school, only 36% had ever attended secondary school and 9% had completed secondary school. Ninety percent of the young fathers belonged to the Acholi ethnic group, while 9% were from the Ma'adi ethnic group. Ten percent of the young fathers worked (formally or informally) outside the home or farm. The remaining 90% farmed independently or were unemployed.

Over 70% described their relationship with their wives as loving, happy and peaceful while about 10% described their relationship as difficult, frustrating or useless. Thirty percent of the respondents thought IPV against a woman is justified if she goes out without telling her husband, neglects their children, or argues with her husband. About 20% of respondents had inflicted intentional physical injuries on their wives in the previous three months, a statistic similar to the Uganda national estimate (UBOS & ICF Int. 2011). Further, 35% of the respondents had yelled at their wives at least once in the past three months while 20% and 19% had pushed or slapped their wives, respectively.

Several studies have found that adults who experienced violence in their childhood are likely to perpetrate violence against their own children. At least 72% of the respondents saw their mother or another female being beaten during their childhood or were themselves spanked or threatened with physical punishment. Although respondents acknowledged that they help their wives with disciplining their child, only 32% of fathers (31% in the control group and 33% in the intervention group) believed that their wives have the right to disagree with them about raising the child. More positively, over 80% of the men reported discussing as a couple the values they want to teach their child within the previous three months. Further, over 75% recognize that hitting the child's mother makes the child fear the father.

There were strong attitudes toward physical punishment of children. Sixty-seven percent (63% in the control and 71% in the intervention arm) of the respondents agreed or partially agreed that a

misbehaving or stubborn child should be hit to discipline him/her. About 47% (43% in control and 52% in the intervention arm) of respondents believed that in order to raise or educate a child properly, the child needs to be physically punished. Over 78% of the young fathers agreed that if children see their father hit their mother, the child will grow up to hit women as well. Physical punishment of children was common, with 43%, 32% and 37% of the respondents reporting to have shaken their child, spanked their child, or hit him or her with an object, respectively. Most of these instances occurred after the respondent had tried to explain wrong behavior (69% of the fathers) or had given the child something else to play with to help him/her calm down (62%). Over 25% of fathers, however, began the discipline with a physical punishment rather than trying another method first. Only 25% reported feeling very confident that they could handle a young child without physical punishment.

Though the prevalence of child physical punishment was high, the proportion of young fathers who reported positive interactions with their children in the month preceding the baseline survey was also high. For example, 86% and 87% of the respondents praised their child and gave him/her a reward for good behavior. Eighty-seven percent of respondents said they do not care if their friends tease them for playing with their child, reading with their child, or other caretaking actions as long as they are good fathers. Additionally, many young fathers reported having friends who encourage them to spend quality time with their children.

Overall, no significant differences were observed in measured characteristics between fathers assigned to the intervention and control arms. Many of the young fathers sampled felt positively toward nonviolent methods, but used physical punishment to control their partners or discipline their children when nonviolent methods do not work. A high proportion of them lacked confidence in using nonviolent methods child discipline or had poor communication skills.

## INTRODUCTION

Evidence shows that experiencing childhood physical punishment is a risk factor for experiencing and perpetuating IPV later in life; conversely, experiencing and perpetuating IPV is a risk factor for perpetuating physical punishment on one's children (Bott et al 2012). While Ugandan laws and policies protect women and children, limited progress has been made in reducing violence against women and children, which remain virtually endemic in Uganda (CEWIGO, 2010). A little more than half of Ugandan women have experienced a form of violence and 98% of children report having experienced physical violence, with the majority of violence experienced in the home (Naker 2005; UBOS & ICF Int. 2011).

In recent years, as global research has shown that men are concerned about domestic and sexual violence and respond positively to invitations to be involved in efforts to address the issue, there has been a significant increase in attention to programming around boys and men. Through well-developed interventions, men and boys who are perpetrators of IPV can and do change from violent attitudes and behaviors to more positive ones including less violent parenting practices and better interactions with women and children (Baker et al, 2007). However, many questions remain in the field of IPV and child physical punishment prevention, including the effectiveness of interventions conducted in a variety of settings and with various populations.

Georgetown's Institute for Reproductive Health (IRH) has received funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to develop and test the Responsible, Engaged and Loving (REAL) Fathers Initiative in Amuru district, northern Uganda. The project involves a mentoring

program and community awareness campaign that aims to build positive relationships and parenting practices among young fathers (ages 16-25). The project is being implemented in partnership with Save the Children. Prior to the implementation of this project, it was necessary to collect baseline data to enable the evaluation of the effect of the intervention. As such, a baseline study was designed to gather the necessary information through the household surveys among the young fathers. The independent research firm, NaNa Development Consultants Limited, was hired to conduct this baseline study. The details of the study design, data analysis and some findings are given in the subsequent sections.

## **BASELINE STUDY OBJECTIVES**

The main objective of the study was to collect baseline data on the background characteristics of the study respondents and on attitudes and behaviors related to IPV, child discipline and other parenting skills. The survey was to be conducted in Attiak sub-county in Amuru district among 500 young fathers who:

- a. Reside in the study community;
- b. Are married or cohabiting with an intimate partner;
- c. Are between the ages of 16 and 25 years old;
- d. Have a child at least one year of age and no children older than three; and
- e. Have consented to and been randomly assigned into the mentoring program and community awareness campaigns (hereafter referred to as intervention arm) or community awareness campaigns only (hereafter referred to as control arm).

## **SURVEY DESIGN AND DATA ANALYSIS**

A total of 500 fathers were recruited by a Save the Children mobilization team for the intervention and study. Save the Children staff working in the study area developed a list of men who were eligible to participate in the intervention in eight parishes of Attiak sub-county (N=516). Save the Children staff invited the eligible men to participate in the intervention and asked them if they were also willing to be interviewed for the baseline study.

Men were recruited to participate in the intervention who met the following criteria:

- a. Reside in the study community;
- b. Are married or cohabiting with an intimate partner;
- c. Are between the ages of 16 and 25 years old;
- d. Have a child at least one year of age and no children older than three; and
- e. Have consented to and been randomly assigned into the mentoring program and community awareness campaigns (hereafter referred to as intervention arm) or community awareness campaigns only (hereafter referred to as control arm).

After informed consent was obtained, eligible men were invited to meetings, in which each drew a card from a box, designating him into one of the following arms of the study: intervention, control, or not yet in study.\*

All interviews were conducted in the local language (Luo) and took place in a private place of the participant's choice. Interviews were conducted using a structured questionnaire developed by IRH. Each interview lasted approximately 45 minutes, and explored men's attitudes toward and experiences of fatherhood, parenting roles, child disciplining, and violence. Tested scales for measuring key constructs such as the Gender-Equitable Men Scale (GEM Scale), Gender Norms Attitudes Scale, Parenting Scale, and Parenting Responsibility Scale were used in the questionnaire.

Descriptive statistics – mainly frequencies and percentages – were used to summarize the data facilitated by the quantitative data analysis software package IBM SPSS Statistics. For exploratory purposes, statistical tests for significant differences in the distribution of the characteristics, attitudes, and practices between the intervention and control groups were performed using chi-square test and a modified Fisher's exact test.

\*Additional funding permitting, those designated in the "not yet in the study" arm will be randomly assigned to intervention or control arms and interviewed at a later date.

## FINDINGS

Preliminary findings are presented in the subsequent sections under themes which include: respondent characteristics, alcohol consumption, perpetration of violence, childhood experiences, child discipline, perpetration of physical punishment against children, and practice of positive forms of disciplining children and interactions.

### Respondent characteristics

A total of 500 young fathers aged between 17 and 25 years were interviewed. Of these, 250 (50%) were randomly assigned to the intervention arm and 250 (50%) to the control arm of the study. As expected for this region, the majority of respondents (90%) were of the Acholi ethnic group, with 9% of respondents coming from the Ma'adi ethnic group and 1% from other ethnic groups. Ninety-eight percent of the interviewed young fathers had ever attended school and 3% of those participants were still in school. Of those who were out of school at the time of the survey, 36% had ever attended secondary school and only 9% had completed secondary school. Ten percent of the young fathers worked (formally or informally) outside the home or farm. The remaining 90% farmed independently or were unemployed. This percentage is similar to what is reported in the national demographic survey (UBOS & ICF Int. 2011).

Of the 500 fathers, 90% had been cohabiting with their partners for at least a year (Table 1). The main reasons given for moving in together included companionship (60%), economic advantage/sharing of whatever is bought (24%), and love (23%). Only 10% of respondents cited pregnancy as a reason for moving in together. Sixty-eight percent of the respondents had paid bride price at least partially (Table 1). No significant differences were observed in characteristics between fathers assigned to the intervention and control arms.

Children of the respondents were mostly aged 24 – 36 months (50%), and with exception of two children, the respondents were the index children's biological fathers (Table 2). Among children, there were slightly more boys (52%) than girls (48%). Seventeen percent of respondents' partners were still attending school and 49% were aged between 15 and 19 years. Among those partners who were not attending school at the time of the interview, 83% had attained only a primary school education (not shown in the table). Farming for food was the primary activity of these young mothers.

Table 1: Background characteristics of the respondents

	Control	Intervention	Total
Item	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
<b>Age group (in years)</b>			
17 - 19	23 (9.2)	20 (8.0)	43 (8.6)
20 - 25	227 (90.8)	230 (92.0)	457 (91.4)
<b>Had ever attended school</b>			
No	6 (2.4)	5 (2.0)	11 (2.2)
Yes	244 (97.6)	245 (98.0)	489 (97.8)
<b>Highest education level attained</b>			
Lower Primary	25 (10.2)	21 (8.6)	46 (9.4)
Upper Primary	130 (53.3)	129 (52.7)	259 (53)
O Level	72 (29.5)	67 (27.3)	139 (28.4)
A Level and above	17 (7)	28 (11.4)	45 (9.2)
<b>Currently at school</b>			
No	234 (95.9)	239 (97.6)	473 (96.7)
Yes	10 (4.1)	6 (2.4)	16 (3.3)
<b>Religion</b>			
Catholic	209 (83.6)	211 (84.4)	420 (84.0)
Protestant	22 (8.8)	19 (7.6)	41 (8.2)
Muslim	6 (2.4)	10 (4.0)	16 (3.2)
Pentecostal/Seventh-Day Adventist	13 (5.2)	10 (4.0)	23 (4.6)
<b>Type of work †</b>			
Farm	186 (74.4)	195 (78.0)	384 (76.8)
Self-employed	25 (10.0)	20 (8.0)	45 (9.0)
Work for employer	31 (12.4)	28 (11.2)	59 (11.8)
Work for a family member	6 (2.4)	4 (1.6)	10 (2.0)
Other	2 (0.8)	3 (1.2)	5 (1.0)
<b>Years of living together with partner</b>			
<1	26 (10.4)	22 (8.8)	48 (9.6)
1-3	199 (79.6)	197 (78.8)	396 (79.2)
3+	25 (10.0)	31 (12.4)	56 (11.2)
<b>Status of bride price payment</b>			
No consent/knowledge of family	12 (4.8)	17 (6.8)	29 (5.8)
Agreed to pay bride price	68 (27.2)	64 (25.6)	132 (26.4)
Partially paid bride price	159 (63.6)	159 (63.6)	318 (63.6)

Bride price completely paid	11 (4.4)	10 (4.0)	21 (4.2)
<b>Reasons for moving in together †</b>			
Companionship	150 (60.0)	149 (59.6)	299 (59.8)
Economic advantage	56 (22.4)	64 (25.6)	120 (24.0)
Love	57 (22.8)	56 (22.4)	113 (22.6)
Family pressure	21 (8.4)	25 (10)	46 (9.2)
She pressured me	6 (2.4)	8 (3.2)	14 (2.8)
She was pregnant	26 (10.4)	23 (9.2)	49 (9.8)
Other	15 (6.0)	15 (6.0)	31 (6.2)

†Where multiple responses were possible

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes statistical significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* statistical significance at  $P < 0.01$

Table 2: Background characteristics of the respondent's child and partner

	Control	Intervention	Total
Item	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
<b>Child's age</b>			
12-18 months	94 (37.6)	85 (34.0)	179 (35.8)
19-23 months	38 (15.2)	31 (12.4)	69 (13.8)
24-36 months	118 (47.2)	134 (53.6)	252 (50.4)
<b>Child's gender</b>			
Boy	129 (51.6)	131 (52.4)	260 (52)
Girl	121 (48.4)	119 (47.6)	240 (48)
<b>Child's relationship to respondent</b>			
Biological child	248 (99.2)	250 (100)	498 (99.6)
Non-biological child	2 (0.8)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.4)
<b>Partner's age</b>			
15 – 19 years old	119 (48.0)	123 (49.2)	242 (48.6)
20 – 25 years old	129 (52.0)	127 (50.8)	256 (51.4)
<b>Partner ever attended school</b>			
No	15 (6.0)	20 (8.0)	35 (7.0)
Yes	235 (94.0)	230 (92.0)	465 (93.0)
<b>Partner currently schooling</b>			
No	195 (83.0)	189 (82.2)	384 (82.6)
Yes	40 (17.0)	41 (17.8)	81 (17.4)
<b>Partner's highest education level attained</b>			
Primary	194 (82.6)	193 (83.9)	387 (83.2)
O Level	38 (16.2)	27 (11.7)	65 (14)

A Level	3 (1.3)	10 (4.3)	13 (2.8)
<b>Partner's work<sup>†</sup></b>			
Farm	214 (84.4)	204 (81.6)	418 (83)
Self-employed	40 (17.0)	51 (22.1)	91 (19.6)
Work for employer	18 (7.6)	15 (6.6)	33 (7.1)
Work for a family member	8 (3.2)	8 (3.3)	16 (3.3)
Other	7 (2.8)	4 (1.6)	11 (2.2)
<b>Who makes decisions about money at home</b>			
Me	46 (18.4)	51 (20.4)	97 (19.4)
My wife	10 (4)	13 (5.2)	23 (4.6)
Both of us	191 (76.4)	183 (73.2)	374 (74.8)
Other relative	3 (1.2)	3 (1.2)	6 (1.2)

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* denotes significance at  $P < 0.01$ . †Where multiple responses were possible

## Alcohol Consumption

A total of 298 respondents (60% of all fathers) had ever drunk alcohol, and out of the 298, 89% had drunk alcohol at least once in the past month (Table 3). Although more respondents in the control group ever have drunk alcohol ( $P$ -value = 0.02), the frequency of alcohol consumption in the past month was similar between the control and intervention groups.

Table 3: Alcohol consumption by young fathers

	Control	Intervention	Total
Item	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Ever drank alcohol*			
No	93 (37.2)	109 (43.6)	202 (40.4)
Yes	157 (62.8)	141 (56.4)	298 (59.6)
Number of days alcohol consumed last month			
0	17 (10.8)	16 (11.4)	33 (11.1)
1 - 2	71 (45.2)	56 (40.0)	127 (42.8)
3 - 5	37 (23.6)	38 (27.1)	75 (25.3)
6 - 9	13 (8.3)	14 (10.0)	27 (9.1)
10 -20	14 (8.9)	12 (8.6)	26 (8.8)
30/almost every day	5 (3.2)	4 (2.9)	9 (3.0)

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* denotes significance at  $P < 0.01$

## Partner Communication and Attitudes toward IPV

To assess the ability of the young fathers to communicate with their wives, respondents were given a hypothetical situation to imagine. Each respondent was asked to imagine that his wife had been asking him to bring home meat all week, after she smelled meat roasting at the neighbor's house. One day, he comes home and sees the child dirty and crying, while his wife cooks. She seems especially irritated. When she sees that he has only brought home soap, she starts complaining that he is not a good husband and asks why he cannot be more like the man next door who brings home meat to his family. The respondent was then asked to describe how he would feel about this situation, what he would do or say to the wife, and what he thought his reaction would be.

Results in Table 4 show that some respondents said that they would feel angry (36%); sad (28%) and worried (20%). The majority (73%) would discuss the situation calmly with their wives and fewer than 10% would react violently (e.g. scuffle with their wife, hit her, shout or throw something at her). Those who said that they would react calmly to this situation reported that their wives would be relieved or happy after the discussion or after getting help from the neighbor to resolve the conflict. Those fathers who would be violent in the imagined situation cited anger, frustration and regret as their wives' most likely reactions. The distributions of these responses were similar among the respondents assigned to the different arms of the study.

Table 4: Relationship, communication with partner, and attitudes toward IPV (response to hypothetical situation)

	Control	Intervention	Total
Item	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Primary feelings about the situation			
Angry	96 (38.4)	83 (33.2)	179 (35.8)
Sad	67 (26.8)	74 (29.6)	141 (28.2)
Worried	50 (20.0)	51 (20.4)	101 (20.2)
Confused	28 (11.2)	27 (10.8)	55 (11.0)
Regretful	30 (12.0)	25 (10.0)	55 (11.0)
Frustrated	16 (6.4)	19 (7.6)	35 (7.0)
Nothing	28 (11.2)	35 (14.0)	63 (12.6)
Other	16 (6.4)	25 (10.0)	41 (8.2)
Actions that would be taken about the situation			
Discuss calmly	185 (74.0)	180 (72.0)	365 (73.0)
Get help from neighbor	26 (10.4)	16 (6.4)	42 (8.4)
Keep silent	33 (13.2)	28 (11.2)	61 (12.2)
Scuffle with her	8 (3.2)	8 (3.2)	16 (3.2)
Shout at her	11 (4.4)	8 (3.2)	19 (3.8)
Throw something at her	7 (2.8)	9 (3.6)	16 (3.2)
Hit/beat her	9 (3.6)	12 (4.8)	21 (4.2)
Leave	6 (2.4)	4 (1.6)	10 (2.0)

Leave the house	21 (8.4)	18 (7.2)	39 (7.8)
Nothing	9 (3.6)	9 (3.6)	18 (3.6)
Other	4 (1.6)	10 (4)	14 (2.8)
Thoughts about wife's reaction after respondent's actions			
Relieved	98 (39.2)	101 (40.4)	199 (39.8)
Happy	43 (17.2)	54 (21.6)	97 (19.4)
Angry	44 (17.6)	30 (12.0)	74 (14.8)
Sad	33 (13.2)	23 (9.2)	56 (11.2)
Frustrated	21 (8.4)	23 (9.2)	44 (8.8)
Confused	11 (4.4)	13 (5.2)	24 (4.8)
Regretful	16 (6.4)	21 (8.4)	37 (7.4)
Worried	9 (3.6)	9 (3.6)	18 (3.6)
Nothing	6 (2.4)	9 (3.6)	15 (3.0)
Don't care	7 (2.8)	12 (4.8)	19 (3.8)
Don't know	6 (2.4)	5 (2.0)	10 (2.0)
Other	37 (14.8)	38 (15.2)	69 (13.8)

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* denotes significance at  $P < 0.01$

About 30% of respondents thought that IPV against a woman would be justified if she went out without telling her husband, argued with her husband, or neglected the children (Table 5). However, only 16% of respondents identified all three reasons as justifiable for a man hitting his wife. These attitudes were similar across the two arms of the project, and are similar to findings from UDHS 2011 (UBOS & ICF Int. 2011).

Table 5: Attitudes toward IPV and communication about violence

	Control	Intervention	Total
A man is justified in beating his wife:	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
<b>If she goes out without telling him</b>			
Yes	79 (32.2)	69 (27.9)	148 (30.1)
No	160 (65.3)	174 (70.4)	334 (67.9)
Don't know/remember	6 (2.4)	4 (1.6)	10 (2)
<b>If she neglects the children</b>			
Yes	108 (43.4)	106 (42.4)	214 (42.9)
No	140 (56.2)	141 (56.4)	281 (56.3)
Don't know/remember	1 (0.4)	3 (1.2)	4 (0.8)
<b>If she argues with him</b>			
Yes	71 (28.5)	63 (25.2)	134 (26.9)
No	172 (69.1)	180 (72)	352 (70.5)

Don't know/remember	6 (2.4)	7 (2.8)	13 (2.6)
---------------------	---------	---------	----------

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* significance at  $P < 0.01$

Table 6 summarizes what respondents described as the quality of their relationships with their wives and also their attitudes towards IPV. Over 70% of respondents described their relationship with their wife as loving, happy, and peaceful while about 11% described their relationship as difficult, frustrating, and useless. These characteristics were similar between the respondents assigned to the control and intervention arms (Table 6), with the exception of having a peaceful relationship with a wife.

Table 6: Relationship description and attitudes toward IPV and intimate partner roles

Respondent were asked to agree, partially agree or disagree with the following statements	Control			Intervention			Total		
	Agree	Partially agree	Disagree	Agree	Partially agree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Partially agree (%)	Disagree (%)
Relationship with partner – loving	212 (84.8)	31 (12.4)	6 (2.4)	219 (88.0)	22 (8.8)	8 (3.2)	431 (86.4)	53 (10.6)	14 (2.8)
Relationship with partner – unhappy	28 (11.2)	84 (33.6)	134 (53.6)	32 (12.9)	74 (29.7)	137 (55)	60 (12.0)	158 (31.7)	271 (54.3)
Relationship with partner – difficult	20 (8.0)	75 (30.0)	150 (60.0)	24 (9.6)	57 (22.9)	167 (67.1)	44 (8.8)	132 (26.5)	317 (63.5)
Relationship with partner – happy	212 (84.8)	31 (12.4)	6 (2.4)	219 (88.0)	22 (8.8)	8 (3.2)	431 (86.4)	53 (10.6)	14 (2.8)
Relationship with partner – cooperative	187 (74.8)	47 (18.8)	13 (5.2)	196 (78.7)	35 (14.1)	17 (6.8)	383 (76.8)	82 (16.4)	30 (6.0)
Relationship with partner – frustrating	27 (10.8)	62 (24.8)	155 (62)	30 (12.0)	61 (24.5)	157 (63.1)	57 (11.4)	123 (24.6)	312 (62.5)
Relationship with partner – peaceful*	166 (66.4)	45 (18.0)	35 (14)	185 (74.3)	27 (10.8)	37 (14.9)	351 (70.3)	72 (14.4)	72 (14.4)
Relationship with partner – useless	26 (10.4)	32 (12.9)	189 (75.9)	28 (11.2)	27 (10.8)	192 (77.1)	54 (10.8)	59 (11.8)	381 (76.5)
Only when she has child is she a real woman	131 (52.4)	31 (12.4)	81 (32.4)	114 (45.6)	30 (12)	104 (41.6)	245 (49)	61 (12.2)	185 (37.0)
Giving a bath and feeding kids are the mother's responsibility	57 (22.8)	49 (19.6)	140 (56)	59 (23.6)	35 (14)	152 (60.8)	116 (23.2)	84 (16.8)	292 (58.4)
A woman's role is to take care of her family	155 (62.0)	47 (18.8)	46 (18.4)	162 (64.8)	33 (13.2)	54 (21.6)	317 (63.4)	80 (16.0)	100 (20.0)
A woman should obey husband in all things	166 (66.7)	65 (26.1)	13 (5.2)	157 (63.3)	49 (19.8)	36 (14.5)	323 (65.0)	114 (22.9)	49 (9.9)
A man should decide to buy the major household items	127 (50.8)	50 (20.0)	71 (28.4)	143 (57.2)	43 (17.2)	62 (24.8)	270 (54.0)	93 (18.6)	133 (26.6)
A man should not hug those he love in public	81 (32.4)	48 (19.2)	120 (48.0)	99 (39.6)	42 (16.8)	106 (42.4)	180 (36.0)	90 (18.0)	226 (45.2)
It is wrong for a man to act like a woman	94 (37.8)	37 (14.9)	115 (46.2)	87 (34.8)	36 (14.4)	126 (50.4)	181 (36.3)	73 (14.6)	241 (48.3)
A man should have the final word about decisions in his home	179 (71.6)	30 (12.0)	37 (14.8)	180 (72.6)	26 (10.5)	39 (15.7)	359 (72.1)	56 (11.2)	76 (15.3)
A man can enjoy his friends company more if is drinking together	97 (38.8)	62 (24.8)	85 (34)	114 (45.6)	51 (20.4)	81 (32.4)	211 (42.2)	113 (22.6)	166 (33.2)
Times when a woman deserves to be beaten	89 (35.9)	53 (21.4)	104 (41.9)	91 (36.4)	56 (22.4)	99 (39.6)	180 (36.1)	109 (21.9)	203 (40.8)
A woman should tolerate violence to keep her family together	146 (58.4)	47 (18.8)	50 (20.0)	159 (64.1)	30 (12.1)	56 (22.6)	305 (61.2)	77 (15.5)	106 (21.3)
It is alright for man to beat wife if unfaithful	111 (44.6)	45 (18.1)	91 (36.5)	116 (46.6)	47 (18.9)	83 (33.3)	227 (45.6)	92 (18.5)	174 (34.9)
Man can hit his wife if she refuses him sex	64 (25.6)	46 (18.4)	134 (53.6)	51 (20.6)	43 (17.3)	150 (60.5)	115 (23.1)	89 (17.9)	284 (57)
A man using violence is a private matter that shouldn't be discussed outside the couple	93 (37.2)	43 (17.2)	108 (43.2)	84 (33.6)	48 (19.2)	114 (45.6)	177 (35.4)	91 (18.2)	222 (44.4)
Most of your friends think you should resolve problems with your wife by talking not hitting	178 (71.2)	44 (17.6)	24 (9.6)	188 (75.2)	37 (14.8)	21 (8.4)	366 (73.2)	81 (16.2)	45 (9)
Most of your friends think you should not drink to getting drunk	168 (67.2)	39 (15.6)	43 (17.2)	177 (70.8)	47 (18.8)	25 (10)	345 (69)	86 (17.2)	68 (13.6)

Note: Fewer than 8 respondents declined to answer any given item and have been excluded in the table to avoid clutter. The percentages do not add up to about 99% for this reason. Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\*significance at  $P < 0.01$

## Perpetration of Violence

As reported in Table 7, about 19% of respondents had inflicted intended physical injuries on their wives in the three months previous to the survey. This rate was similar in the two assigned arms of the project, and is comparable to the Ugandan national estimate (UBOS & ICF Int. 2011). In the three months previous to the baseline interview, about 32% of respondents were told by their wives that they were violent and that their wives were afraid of them. The intervention arm of the survey had significantly more young fathers (72%) whose partners had told them they were afraid of them, compared to 64% of the control group.

Table 7: Practice of IPV and communication about violence by the wife

	Control	Intervention	Total
Item	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
In past 3 months, wife suffered physical injuries as a result of hitting, slapping or kicking her, etc.			
No	199 (79.6)	204 (81.6)	403 (80.6)
Yes	51 (20.4)	46 (18.4)	97 (19.4)
In past 3 months, wife told him she is afraid of him.			
No	160 (64.0)	180 (72.0)	340 (68)
Yes	90 (36.0)	70 (28.0)	160 (32.0)
In past 3 months, wife told him that he is violent.			
No	161 (64.4)	175 (70.0)	334 (66.8)
Yes	89 (35.6)	75 (30.0)	164 (33.0)

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* significance at  $P < 0.01$

About 35% of the respondents had yelled at their wife at least once in the previous three months ("Sometimes" and "Often" categories) while about 20% had pushed or slapped their wife (Table 8). These characteristics seemed to be slightly higher among respondents assigned to the control arm of the project, but the difference was not statistically significant. More broadly, 32% (30% in intervention and 33% in control arm) had been physically violent toward their wives in the past three months i.e. slapped, pushed or threw something at their partners that could injure them. Other notable reported actions – with above 30% of men reporting doing them across the two arms of the project – included walking away from a wife, insulting her, and asking a neighbor to mitigate their misunderstandings.

Table 8: Perpetration of IPV in three months preceding the baseline survey

Respondents were asked to state the frequency of the following actions in the past 3 months	Control				Intervention				Total			
	Never	Sometimes	Often	Declined to answer	Never	Sometimes	Often	Declined to answer	Never	Sometimes	Often	Declined to answer
Action	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Shouted or yelled at your wife	151 (60.4)	84 (33.6)	10 (4.0)	5 (2.0)	164 (65.6)	69 (27.6)	9 (3.6)	8 (3.2)	315 (63)	153 (30.6)	19 (3.8)	13 (2.6)
Slapped your wife**	197 (78.8)	40 (16.0)	13 (5.2)	0 (0.0)	204 (81.6)	34 (13.6)	6 (2.4)	6 (2.4)	401 (80.2)	74 (14.8)	19 (3.8)	6 (1.2)
Pushed your wife or shoved her	193 (77.2)	47 (18.8)	7 (2.8)	3 (1.2)	200 (80.0)	39 (15.6)	6 (2.4)	5 (2)	393 (78.6)	86 (17.2)	13 (2.6)	8 (1.6)
Threw something at your wife that could hurt her	219 (87.6)	16 (6.4)	10 (4.0)	5 (2.0)	223 (89.2)	11 (4.4)	12 (4.8)	4 (1.6)	442 (88.4)	27 (5.4)	22 (4.4)	9 (1.8)
Insulted your wife	153 (61.2)	71 (28.4)	20 (8.0)	6 (2.4)	169 (67.6)	64 (25.6)	13 (5.2)	4 (1.6)	322 (64.4)	135 (27)	33 (6.6)	10 (2)
Walked away from your wife when you were angry at her	130 (52.0)	92 (36.8)	25 (10.0)	3 (1.2)	120 (48.0)	99 (39.6)	27 (10.8)	4 (1.6)	250 (50.0)	191 (38.2)	52 (10.4)	7 (1.4)
Brought a neighbor or a relative to talk to your wife when you were angry at her	118 (47.2)	107 (42.8)	23 (9.2)	2 (0.8)	129 (51.8)	99 (39.8)	19 (7.6)	2 (0.8)	247 (49.5)	206 (41.3)	42 (8.4)	4 (0.8)

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* significance at  $P < 0.01$

## Childhood Experiences

As noted previously, several studies have found that adults who experienced violence in their childhood are likely to perpetrate violence against their own children. Similarly, adults who did not have a male father figure in their childhood have been found to manage violence and physical punishments of their children differently than their counterparts who had fathers or father figures present. Results on the presence of a male adult during the childhood of the respondent are given in Table 9 while Table 10 presents experiences of violence during respondents' childhoods.

For 58% of respondents (58% in both arms), a male parent or guardian was involved in their childhood (Table 9). At least 75% of respondents had seen their mother or other female being beaten during their childhood or were spanked or threatened with physical punishment (Table 10). These experiences were similar among respondents assigned to each arm of the project.

Table 9: Caretaker of the respondents during childhood

	Control	Intervention	Total
Item	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Both mother/female and father/male	109 (43.6)	104 (41.6)	213 (42.6)
Mostly my father or male relative	19 (7.6)	21 (8.4)	40 (8.0)
Only father or male relative	18 (7.2)	21 (8.4)	39 (7.8)
Mostly my mother or female relative	68 (27.2)	67 (26.8)	135 (27)
Only mother or female relative	34 (13.6)	28 (11.2)	62 (12.4)
Other (e.g. non-relatives)	2 (0.8)	9 (3.6)	11 (2.2)

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* significance at  $P < 0.01$

Table 10: Respondent's experience of violence in their childhoods

	Control	Intervention	Total
Item	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Saw or heard mother or other women in their home being beaten by the father or another man living in the home			
Never	56 (22.5)	44 (17.7)	100 (20.1)
Sometimes	138 (55.4)	147 (59.0)	285 (57.2)
Often	53 (21.3)	58 (23.3)	111 (22.3)
Declined to answer	2 (0.8)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.4)
Was spanked or slapped or beaten by parents or other adults in the home			
Never	50 (20.0)	43 (17.2)	93 (18.6)
Sometimes	135 (54.0)	133 (53.2)	268 (53.6)
Often	61 (24.4)	74 (29.6)	135 (27)
Declined to answer	4 (1.6)	0 (0)	4 (0.8)

Was threatened with physical punishment at home			
Never	54 (21.6)	71 (28.4)	125 (25)
Sometimes	138 (55.2)	117 (46.8)	255 (51)
Often	57 (22.8)	62 (24.8)	119 (23.8)
Declined to answer	1 (0.4)	0 (0)	1 (0.2)

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* significance at  $P < 0.01$

### Child Discipline

Although respondents acknowledged that they help their wives discipline their child, only 75% reported having discussions with their wives about the types of methods to use to discipline their child (Table 11a). Fathers reported communicating disagreement with their wives' disciplining approach more frequently than their wives communicate disagreement with them. Indeed, about 50% of fathers (49% in control and 51% in intervention) believed that their wives have no right to disagree with them about raising the child (Table 11b). This statistic contradicts what about 66% of the respondents said about their wives having an equal say in raising a child or in discussing the disciplining of their child (Table 11b). On a positive note, over 80% of respondents reported discussing the values they want to teach their child as a couple in the three months previous to the survey.

Table 11a: Child discipline, values, and associated communication

Item	Control				Intervention				Total			
	Never N (%)	Sometimes N (%)	Often N (%)	Declined to answer N (%)	Never N (%)	Sometimes N (%)	Often N (%)	Declined to answer N (%)	Never N (%)	Sometimes N (%)	Often N (%)	Declined to answer N (%)
You & your wife help each other when one of you has had a problem with the child.	7 (2.8)	81 (32.4)	159 (63.6)	3 (1.2)	15 (6.0)	72 (28.8)	161 (64.4)	2 (0.8)	22 (4.4)	153 (30.6)	320 (64.0)	5 (1.0)
In the past three months, you and your wife discussed the values to teach the child.	43 (17.2)	121 (48.4)	84 (33.6)	2 (0.8)	46 (18.4)	91 (36.4)	113 (45.2)	0 (0.0)	89 (17.8)	212 (42.4)	197 (39.4)	2 (0.4)
You tell your wife when you disagree with the way she is disciplining the child.	66 (26.4)	128 (51.2)	52 (20.8)	4 (1.6)	53 (21.3)	114 (45.8)	80 (32.1)	2 (0.8)	119 (23.8)	242 (48.5)	132 (26.5)	6 (1.2)
Your wife tells you when she disagrees with the way you are disciplining the child.	91 (36.5)	117 (47.0)	39 (15.7)	2 (0.8)	91 (36.4)	99 (39.6)	56 (22.4)	4 (1.6)	182 (36.5)	216 (43.3)	95 (19.0)	6 (1.2)
Your wife and you have discussed how to discipline the child now and in the future as he/she grows up.	50 (20.0)	118 (47.2)	79 (31.6)	3 (1.2)	41 (16.4)	106 (42.4)	102 (40.8)	1 (0.4)	91 (18.2)	224 (44.8)	181 (36.2)	4 (0.8)

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* significance at  $P < 0.01$

Table 11b: Child discipline and associated communication

Item	Control				Intervention				Total			
	Agree	Partially agree	Disagree	Declined to answer	Agree	Partially agree	Disagree	Declined to answer	Agree	Partially agree	Disagree	Declined to answer
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
You know how your wife feels about hitting the child when he/she misbehaves.	48 (19.2)	40 (16.0)	151 (60.4)	11 (4.4)	65 (26.0)	38 (15.2)	143 (57.2)	4 (1.6)	113 (22.6)	78 (15.6)	294 (58.8)	15 (3.0)
Your wife knows how you feel about hitting the child when he/she misbehaves.	62 (24.8)	51 (20.4)	130 (52.0)	7 (2.8)	69 (27.6)	45 (18.0)	132 (52.8)	4 (1.6)	131 (26.2)	96 (19.2)	262 (52.4)	11 (2.2)
You and your wife have discussed how to discipline the child.	162 (64.8)	43 (17.2)	38 (15.2)	7 (2.8)	167 (67.1)	30 (12.0)	47 (18.9)	5 (2.0)	329 (65.9)	73 (14.6)	85 (17)	12 (2.4)
You and your wife have equal say regarding decisions about how the child is raised.	170 (68.0)	52 (20.8)	26 (10.4)	2 (0.8)	162 (64.8)	45 (18.0)	40 (16.0)	3 (1.2)	332 (66.4)	97 (19.4)	66 (13.2)	5 (1.0)
Your wife does not have the right to disagree with you about the way you are raising the child.	122 (48.8)	48 (19.2)	77 (30.8)	3 (1.2)	128 (51.2)	35 (14.0)	82 (32.8)	5 (2.0)	250 (50.0)	83 (16.6)	159 (31.8)	8 (1.6)

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* significance at  $P < 0.01$

There are strong attitudes toward physical punishment of children. Sixty-seven percent (63% in control and 71% in intervention arm) of the respondents agreed or partially agreed that a misbehaving or stubborn child should be hit to discipline him/her (Table 11c). About 47% (43% in control and 52% in intervention arm) of respondents believed that in order to bring up, raise, or educate a child properly, the child needs to be physically punished. Over 78% of the young fathers agreed that if children see their father hit their mother, they will grow up to hit women as well. In general, over 80% recognized that hitting the child's mother makes the child fear the father or become loyal to the mother (Table 11c).

Table 11c: Attitudes toward IPV and physical punishment of children

Statement	Control			Intervention			Total		
	Agree	Partially agree	Disagree	Agree	Partially agree	Disagree	Agree	Partially agree	Disagree
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Stubborn young children need to be hit to teach them right from wrong.	107 (42.8)	51 (20.4)	89 (35.6)	130 (52.0)	47 (18.8)	71 (28.4)	237 (47.4)	98 (19.6)	160 (32)
If a child is old enough to defy a parent, he/she is old enough to be hit.	111 (44.4)	42 (16.8)	94 (37.6)	116 (46.4)	38 (15.2)	94 (37.6)	227 (45.4)	80 (16)	188 (37.6)
If you love the children, you will hit them when they misbehave.	90 (36.0)	56 (22.4)	98 (39.2)	118 (47.2)	47 (18.8)	85 (34)	208 (41.6)	103 (20.6)	183 (36.6)
A parent should never spank or hit a child.	42 (16.9)	74 (29.7)	131 (52.6)	53 (21.3)	52 (20.9)	141 (56.6)	95 (19.1)	126 (25.3)	272 (54.6)
Parents should teach a child who is disobedient by spanking or hitting him/her.	61 (24.4)	72 (28.8)	115 (46)	83 (33.2)	59 (23.6)	105 (42)	144 (28.8)	131 (26.2)	220 (44)
Children who see their fathers hit their mothers feel their father will protect them.	41 (16.4)	37 (14.8)	169 (67.6)	52 (20.8)	34 (13.6)	159 (63.6)	93 (18.6)	71 (14.2)	328 (65.6)
Children whose fathers hit their mothers do not have a close bond with their father.	140 (56.0)	42 (16.8)	64 (25.6)	132 (53.0)	31 (12.4)	85 (34.1)	272 (54.5)	73 (14.6)	149 (29.9)
Children whose fathers hit their mothers grow up to hit women.	155 (62.0)	38 (15.2)	53 (21.2)	167 (66.8)	31 (12.4)	49 (19.6)	322 (64.4)	69 (13.8)	102 (20.4)
Children who see their fathers hit their mothers fear their fathers.	182 (73.1)	43 (17.3)	22 (8.8)	200 (80.0)	33 (13.2)	15 (6.0)	382 (76.6)	76 (15.2)	37 (7.4)
Children whose fathers hit their mothers feel more loyalty to their mother's than their father's family.	165 (66.0)	41 (16.4)	42 (16.8)	179 (71.9)	26 (10.4)	44 (17.7)	344 (68.9)	67 (13.4)	86 (17.2)
In order to bring up, raise, or educate a child properly, the child needs to be physically punished.	66 (26.4)	41 (16.4)	140 (56)	93 (37.3)	36 (14.2)	119 (47.8)	159 (31.9)	77 (15.4)	259 (51.9)
Children who see their fathers hit their mothers admire their fathers for being strong.	62 (24.9)	46 (18.5)	140 (56.2)	67 (26.8)	38 (15.2)	141 (56.4)	129 (25.9)	84 (16.8)	281 (56.3)

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* significance at  $P < 0.01$

## Perpetration of Physical Punishment against Children

A hypothetical situation was presented in which a young father has been home all afternoon and finds himself very annoyed with his young child, who is not listening to anything told to him/her calmly and is having a tantrum. About 37% (36% in control and 38% in intervention) of respondents said that they would threaten to hit the child, and 26% of fathers would tell the mother to take care of him/her. Only 19% said they would give the child something he/she likes so that she/he can calm down (Table 12a).

Table 12a: Child discipline and perpetration of physical violence

What would you do to a child who is having a tantrum and out of control despite your efforts to explain to her/him what to do calmly?	Control		Intervention		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Threaten to hit him/her	90	36.0	96	38.4	186	37.2
Tell wife to take care of him/her to calm down	64	25.6	67	26.8	131	26.2
Give him/her something he/she likes	50	20.0	43	17.2	93	18.6
Put him/her somewhere by himself	17	6.8	25	10.0	42	8.4
Ask wife for advice or help	10	4.0	7	2.8	17	3.4
Send him/her to the neighbor or family member's home	5	2.0	8	3.2	13	2.6
Shout at him/her	5	2.0	8	3.2	13	2.6
Take a deep breath	16	6.4	10	4.0	26	5.2
Tell someone to take care of him/her	23	9.2	35	14.0	58	11.6
Walk away/leave house	35	14.0	25	10.0	60	12.0
Other	16	6.4	10	4.0	26	5.2

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* significance at  $P < 0.01$

When asked about methods of discipline used in the last month, 43%, 32% and 37% of the respondents stated that they had shaken, spanked, or hit their child with an object, respectively. The distributions of these behaviors were similar across the two arms of the study (Table 12b). Roughly 68% (67% in control arm and 69% in intervention arm) had administered at least one form of physical punishment to discipline their children in the previous month. Over 25% of fathers had begun disciplining with a physical punishment instead of helping the child to calm down. Over 60% of fathers, however, had tried first to explain wrong behavior or give the child something else to play with to help him/her calm down. Only 25% of the young fathers reported feeling very confident in handling a young child without punishment (see Table 12c).

Table 12b: Child discipline and perpetration of physical violence within the previous month

Adults use certain ways to teach children the right behavior or to address a behavior problem. I will read various methods that are used and I want you to tell me if you have used these methods with [name of child] in the past month.	Control			Intervention			Total		
	Yes	No	Know/remember	Yes	No	Know/remember	Yes	No	Know/remember
Method:	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Took away privileges, forbade something the child liked or did not allow him/her to leave the house	91 (36.4)	151 (60.4)	8 (3.2)	96 (38.4)	146 (58.4)	8 (3.2)	187 (37.4)	297 (59.4)	16 (3.2)
Explained why the child's behavior was wrong	181 (72.4)	62 (24.8)	7 (2.8)	166 (66.4)	77 (30.8)	7 (2.8)	347 (69.4)	139 (27.8)	14 (2.8)
Gave him/her something else to do	167 (66.8)	74 (29.6)	9 (3.6)	154 (61.6)	90 (36.0)	6 (2.4)	321 (64.2)	164 (32.8)	15 (3.0)
Sent the child to be by himself/herself until she/she calmed down	67 (26.8)	177 (70.8)	6 (2.4)	53 (21.2)	190 (76.0)	7 (2.8)	120 (24.0)	367 (73.4)	13 (2.6)
Asked him/her to apologize	116 (46.4)	127 (50.8)	7 (2.8)	102 (40.8)	143 (57.2)	5 (2)	218 (43.6)	270 (54)	12 (2.4)
Shook him/her	113 (45.2)	127 (50.8)	8 (3.2)	101 (40.4)	146 (58.4)	3 (1.2)	214 (42.8)	273 (54.6)	11 (2.2)
Shouted, yelled at or screamed at him/her	85 (34.0)	155 (62.0)	10 (4.0)	98 (39.2)	149 (59.6)	3 (1.2)	183 (36.6)	304 (60.8)	12 (2.4)
Spanked, hit or slapped him/her on the bottom with bare hand	84 (33.6)	156 (62.4)	10 (4.0)	75 (30.0)	169 (67.6)	6 (2.4)	159 (31.8)	325 (65.0)	16 (3.2)
Hit him/her on the bottom or elsewhere on the body with something like a belt, hairbrush, stick or other hard object	92 (36.8)	155 (62)	3 (1.2)	91 (36.4)	157 (62.8)	2 (0.8)	183 (36.6)	312 (62.4)	5 (1.0)
Called him/her dumb, lazy, or another similar name	58 (23.2)	187 (74.8)	5 (2.0)	43 (18.2)	200 (78.2)	4 (1.6)	96 (19.2)	394 (78.8)	9 (1.8)
Hit or slapped him/her on the face, head	58 (23.2)	187 (74.8)	5 (2.0)	48 (19.2)	197 (78.8)	4 (1.6)	106 (21.2)	384 (76.8)	9 (1.8)
Hit or slapped him/her on the hand, arm, or leg	68 (27.2)	176 (70.4)	5 (2.0)	54 (21.6)	192 (76.8)	4 (1.6)	122 (24.4)	368 (73.6)	9 (1.8)

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* significance at  $P < 0.01$

Table 12c: Confidence in using non-violence discipline

	Control	Intervention	Total
Confidence in handling a child without shouting; threatening to hit or beating	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Not confident	34 (13.6)	33 (13.3)	67 (13.5)
Somewhat confident	29 (11.6)	26 (10.5)	55 (11.0)
Fairly confident	61 (24.4)	66 (26.6)	127 (25.5)
Confident	65 (26.0)	59 (23.8)	124 (24.9)
Very confident	61 (24.4)	64 (25.8)	125 (25.1)

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* significance at  $P < 0.01$

### Practice of Positive Forms of Disciplining Children and Interactions

Despite the high prevalence of physical punishment of children, the number of young fathers who had positive interactions with their children in the month preceding the baseline interview was also high (Tables 13a, 14a and 14b). For example, 86% and 87% of respondents had praised their child and given him/her a reward for good behavior (Table 13a). Eighty-seven percent of respondents said they did not care if their friends tease them for playing with their child, reading with their child, or other caretaking actions as long as they are good fathers. Indeed, many young fathers reported having friends who in fact encourage them to spend quality time with their children (Tables 14a and 14b).

Table 13: Practice of non-physical forms of disciplining children

	Control			Intervention			Total		
	Yes	No	Know/ remember	Yes	No	Know/ remember	Yes	No	Know/ remember
In the past month when a child did something you liked or approved of, did you:	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Say something nice about it or praise the child?	210 (84.0)	30 (12.0)	9 (3.6)	220 (88.0)	24 (9.6)	6 (2.4)	430 (86.0)	54 (10.8)	15 (3.0)
Give the child physical affection, like a pat on a back?	207 (82.8)	35 (14.0)	8 (3.2)	207 (82.8)	35 (14.0)	7 (2.8)	414 (82.8)	70 (14.0)	15 (3.0)

Give the child a reward for it, like a special snack?	222 (88.8)	19 (7.6)	8 (3.2)	215 (86.0)	26 (10.4)	8 (3.2)	435 (87.0)	49 (9.8)	16 (3.2)
Give the child a special privilege, like holding the child, allowing the child to sleep with you, or spending more time with the child?	185 (74.0)	59 (23.6)	6 (2.4)	190 (76.0)	52 (20.8)	8 (3.2)	375 (75.0)	111 (22.2)	14 (2.8)
Go someplace or do something special with the child as a reward?	170 (68.0)	72 (28.8)	8 (3.2)	173 (69.2)	71 (28.4)	6 (2.4)	343 (68.6)	143 (28.6)	14 (2.8)
Show or tell the child that you love him/her?	202 (80.8)	41 (16.4)	7 (2.8)	197 (78.8)	45 (18.0)	8 (3.2)	398 (159.2)	86 (34.4)	15 (6.0)

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* significance at  $P < 0.01$

Table 14a: Interactions with children

	Control			Intervention			Total		
	Agree	Partially agree	Disagree	Agree	Partially agree	Disagree	Agree	Partially agree	Disagree
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
You feel silly when you play with the child.	35 (14)	29 (11.6)	182 (72.8)	36 (14.4)	19 (7.6)	194 (77.6)	71 (14.2)	48 (9.6)	376 (75.2)
Your friends will tease you if you help your wife with childcare.	107 (42.8)	35 (14)	106 (42.4)	90 (36)	41 (16.4)	117 (46.8)	197 (39.4)	76 (15.2)	223 (44.6)
You don't care what others say, as long as you are a good father.	215 (86)	19 (7.6)	15 (6)	218 (87.2)	15 (6)	16 (6.4)	433 (86.6)	34 (6.8)	31 (6.2)
You are embarrassed if others see the child misbehave and you do not discipline strongly.	195 (78.3)	24 (9.6)	27 (10.8)	199 (79.6)	19 (7.6)	30 (12)	394 (79)	43 (8.6)	57 (11.4)
Most of your friends think you should spend time doing things with the child that he/she enjoys.	171 (68.4)	49 (19.6)	27 (10.8)	171 (68.7)	44 (17.7)	30 (12)	342 (68.5)	93 (18.6)	57 (11.4)

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* significance at  $P < 0.01$

Table 14b: Interactions with children by parent

	Control	Intervention	Total
Item	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Who reads books or looks at picture books with the child?			
Father involved	131 (53.5)	125 (50.5)	256 (51.9)
Mother only	20 (8.2)	28 (11.3)	48 (9.7)
No one	58 (23.7)	65 (26.2)	123 (24.9)
Other	36 (14.7)	30 (12.1)	66 (13.4)
Who tells stories to the child?			
Father involved	160 (64.3)	162 (64.8)	322 (64.5)
Mother only	30 (11.9)	28 (11.2)	58 (11.6)
No one	34 (13.7)	41 (16.4)	75 (15)
Other	25 (10.0)	19 (7.6)	44 (8.8)
Who sings songs with the child?			
Father involved	138 (55.9)	141 (57.3)	279 (56.6)
Mother only	51 (20.6)	48 (19.5)	99 (20.1)
No one	31 (12.6)	35 (14.2)	66 (13.4)
Other	27 (10.9)	22 (8.9)	49 (9.9)
Who takes the child outside the home, compound, yard or enclosure?			
Father involved	179 (71.9)	172 (68.8)	351 (70.3)
Mother only	29 (11.6)	30 (12)	59 (11.8)
No one	27 (10.8)	23 (9.2)	50 (10)
Other	14 (5.6)	25 (10)	39 (7.8)
Who spends time with the child naming, counting, and/or drawing things?			
Father involved	164 (66.1)	155 (62.0)	319 (64.1)
Mother only	23 (9.3)	24 (9.6)	47 (9.4)
No one	46 (18.5)	46 (18.4)	92 (18.5)
Other	15 (6.0)	25 (10.0)	40 (8.0)

Tests of significant differences between intervention and control arm: \* denotes significance at  $P < 0.05$  and \*\* significance at  $P < 0.01$

## CONCLUSIONS

Some preliminary conclusions can be drawn from the simple analysis provided in the previous sections.

Overall, reported perpetuation of violence by young fathers against their partners (among 25% of respondents) and children (about 65%) is high. These behaviors are supported by accepting attitudes among fathers toward the use of physical punishment for the disciplining of wives and children. Around 50 percent of the respondents believe that there are justifiable grounds for a husband to beat this wife, for example, when she neglects the children or argues with her husband. Additionally, 66% of respondents believe that physical punishment is a good method to instill discipline in children. Consistent with global literature, there were also high levels of violence witnessed and experienced by young fathers in their own childhood. Seventy-nine percent of respondents had ever witnessed a woman (including their mother) being beaten by a man (including their father) during the course of their childhood.

While levels of perpetuation of violence is high, respondents report having first attempted to calmly resolve troubling situations before becoming violent in both IPV- and child physical punishment-related situations. However, only 25% reported feeling very confident that they could handle a child without shouting, threatening to hit, or beating.

In summary, the distribution of the different baseline characteristics was similar in the young fathers assigned to the control and those assigned to the intervention of the REAL Fathers Initiative. Such characteristics included high levels of physical violence and physical punishment against women and children which seemed to be partly explained by supportive attitudes toward the use of violence as a form of discipline, poor communication skills, and a lack of confidence in using nonviolent methods to discipline children.

**Commented [MG1]:** I don't know what this number refers to – something in Table 7?

## REFERENCES

Barker G, Ricardo C, Nascimento M. (2007). Engaging men and boys in changing gender-based inequity in health: evidence from programme interventions: World Health Organization; 2007.

Bott S, Guedes A, Goodwin MM, Mendoza J. (2012). Violence Against Women in Latin America and the Caribbean: A comparative analysis of population-based data from 12 countries. Washington DC: PAHO; 2012.

CEWIGO. (2010). Making UN Security Council Resolutions 1325 and 1820 and the Goma Declaration a Reality for Women and Girls in Uganda. Kampala: CEWIGO; 2010.

Morrison A, Ellsberg M, Bott S. (2007). Addressing Gender-Based Violence: A critical review of interventions. The World Bank Research Observer. 2007; 22(1):25-51.

Naker D. (2005). Violence against children: The voices of Ugandan children and adults: Raising Voices; 2005.

UBOS & ICF Int. (2011). Uganda Demographic and Health Survey 2011. Calverton, Maryland USA: Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) and Macro International Inc.; 2012.