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# Socio-Demographics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy levels</td>
<td>6 could not read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0 employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Child Age</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Above data represent the 24 participants who completed both pre- and post- surveys.
Attendance and Engagement

Above data represent all 30 participants who registered for the program at baseline.

Average # Sessions Attended: 9.4 (63%)

Average # Take-Away Activities Completed: 6.8 (62%)

Drop-out rate: 3 (10%)

*Above data represent all 30 participants who registered for the program at baseline*
Programme Outcomes

Above represents the paired t-test results from the 24 participants who completed both pre- and post- surveys.

*   \( p < 0.05 \)
**  \( p < 0.005 \)
Qualitative Results

“My 5-year-old daughter now says, “Mum, thank you!” but before she didn’t do that because I didn’t praise her when she did something good. Also, I now play with my children. I have one-on-one time with them and they are happy because I am a good mother and I have changed thanks to this program.”

- P3, Age 19-

• Positive changes within their family, and in their community

• More time spent with their children

• Improved communications and stress management

• Want to programme to continue for other street-connected families

• Suggest including men because they “raise these children with them”
Next Steps

1. Determine content and delivery considerations for male engagement in parenting programmes (Phase 1 & 2)

2. Develop global community of practice on parenting interventions for street-connected parents (Phase 2)

3. Explore gendered parenting experience, practices, and perceptions of street-connected parents in Eldoret (Phase 3)

4. Adapt the Malezi Bora programme for the inclusion of street-connected male caregivers (Phase 4)
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ABSTRACT

Background: Children of street-connected women in Kenya are at risk of child maltreatment. There have been increasing calls for positive parenting programs for parents experiencing homelessness, however none has one been implemented with this population. We therefore adapted the evidence-based Parenting for Lifelong Health for Young Children program using participatory methods, and piloted the adapted program with street-connected mothers in Kenya. Objectives: To (a) determine if the adapted program was feasible and acceptable with street-connected mothers, and (b) assess indicative effects on child maltreatment, positive parenting, and parental
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core component of PLH</th>
<th>Evidence-based content</th>
<th>Adapted Content</th>
<th>Added Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building positive parent-child relationships</td>
<td>- Child-led play&lt;br&gt;- Descriptive commenting&lt;br&gt;- Socio-emotional communication&lt;br&gt;- Praise and rewards&lt;br&gt;- Positive instruction-giving&lt;br&gt;- Establishing household rules</td>
<td>- Child-directed speech integrated into child-led play&lt;br&gt;- Establishing consistent rules and routines for keeping parents and children safe and healthy&lt;br&gt;- Sleeping routines instead of bedtime routines</td>
<td>- Child and parental rights and responsibilities&lt;br&gt;- Establishing rules to keep parents safe&lt;br&gt;- Keeping track of time for health routines (e.g. clinic visits, medication adherence)&lt;br&gt;- Access to health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective limit-setting and discipline</td>
<td>- Redirecting negative behaviors&lt;br&gt;- Ignoring negative attention-seeking behavior&lt;br&gt;- Cool Down (Time-Out)&lt;br&gt;- Consequences&lt;br&gt;- Resolving Conflicts</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Talking about challenging issues with your partner (e.g. family planning, STIs, education, finances)&lt;br&gt;- Access to social, and legal services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental stress management</td>
<td>- Parental emotional self-regulation</td>
<td>- Re-ordering of stress-management activities</td>
<td>Promoting existing coping strategies (e.g. prayer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery and structure</td>
<td>- Group or individual sessions&lt;br&gt;- Collaborative facilitation&lt;br&gt;- Group discussions and problem-solving&lt;br&gt;- Modeling with Illustrated Stories&lt;br&gt;- Practicing skills&lt;br&gt;- Parent support groups&lt;br&gt;- Transportation and refreshments</td>
<td>Group sessions with individual consultations</td>
<td>- New group practice on parent and child rights and responsibilities&lt;br&gt;- New Illustrated scenarios depicting complex family scenarios&lt;br&gt;- Childcare during program sessions&lt;br&gt;- Service linkage within and after program sessions, with the presence of health, social work, and legal professionals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Socio-demographics of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Characteristics</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Ages 19-</th>
<th>Ages 20+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Age: M (SD)</td>
<td>24.04 (5.54)</td>
<td>18.6 (0.70)</td>
<td>27.93 (3.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children in household: M (SD)</td>
<td>2.74 (2.39)</td>
<td>1.53 (0.72)</td>
<td>4.21 (2.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed: n (%)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can read easily: n (%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>2 (14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can read with a little difficulty: n (%)</td>
<td>10 (41.7)</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
<td>5 (35.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can read but with lots of difficulty: n (%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>4 (28.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot read at all: n (%)</td>
<td>6 (25)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>3 (21.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex, female: n (%)</td>
<td>38 (50)</td>
<td>10 (58.8)</td>
<td>28 (47.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child age, years: M (SD)</td>
<td>7.46 (4.83)</td>
<td>2.62 (1.86)</td>
<td>8.85 (4.52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Above data represent the 24 participants who completed both pre- and post- surveys.
Programme outcomes using paired t-test of baseline and post-assessment scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p-value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARYC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting good behavior</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.95 (3.37)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.27 (2.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting limits</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.25 (3.15)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.89 (2.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental inefficacy</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.58 (2.08)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.78 (4.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICAST-TRIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.88 (2.08)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.00 (4.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Stress (PSS)</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.83 (0.70)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.52 (2.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Above data represent the 24 participants who completed both pre- and post- surveys.
Strengths and Limitations

- Small sample size (N=24 participants)
- Modified outcome measures to fit context
- Data not normally distributed
- Data not continuous
- Social desirability bias

- Exploratory project
- Quantitative results are confirmed by the qualitative analysis
- Real-world implementation (increases generalizability and the likelihood of scalability)