

1 Title: Evaluating the impact of the Mellow Babies group-based parenting programme for supporting
2 at-risk mothers in Tajikistan

3

4 Short Title: Mellow Parenting programme effectiveness in Tajikistan

5

6

7 Authors:

8 Natalie Duncan¹, Ailsa Jones¹, Rachel Tainsh², Nazira Muhamedjonova³, Raquib Ibrahim², Angus
9 MacBeth¹

10 ¹University of Edinburgh, Scotland.

11 ²Mellow Parenting, Glasgow, Scotland

12 ³Independent Consultant

13

14 Corresponding Author: Dr Angus MacBeth

15 School of Health in Social Science

16 The University of Edinburgh

17 Rm. 2.11

18 Elsie Inglis Quad

19 Teviot Place

20 Edinburgh, EH8 9AG

21 Tel: (+44) 650 3893

22 Fax: (+44) 651 3971

23 e-mail: angus.macbeth@ed.ac.uk

24

25

26

27

28 **Abstract**

29 Parental mental health has a long- lasting impact on developmental outcomes for infants
30 and children through its impact on the family environment. Targeted parenting
31 interventions should address both parental health and parenting skills. However, data is
32 limited on how interventions perform in Central Asian populations.

33 Using routine evaluation data from n=194 participants, we modelled the effectiveness of
34 the Mellow Babies (MB) programmes, delivered to mothers from Tajikistan and their
35 children as part of a community support approach. Pre-post intervention changes were
36 measured on depression, anxiety, parenting stress, quality of life, and child behaviour
37 outcomes. Demographics were modelled as covariates.

38 Participation in MB was associated with improvements in maternal mental health, parenting
39 stress, quality of life and child behaviour. Demographic factors moderated interactions
40 between pre and post intervention outcomes, including urban/rural differences, parental
41 employment, marital status and child disability status. Our findings suggest that MB is
42 acceptable, effective and potentially scalable as a parenting intervention in Tajikistan.
43 Future replication using implementation designs and replication of MB in other global
44 settings is merited.

45 *Keywords:* Mellow Parenting, Mellow Babies, Parenting Intervention, Attachment-informed,
46 Maternal Mental Health, Tajikistan, Deinstitutionalisation, Childhood Disability

47

49 Multiple risk factors have been linked to poor developmental outcomes for children
50 including poor maternal mental health, poverty, and reduced access to healthcare(1, 2, 3).
51 Parents' mental health and well-being have a formative and long- lasting impact on
52 developmental outcomes for infants and children. Parental mental health affects young
53 children through its impact on parent-infant interaction and the family environment (4).
54 Maternal depression occurs in around 13–15% of women(5), and chronicity in maternal
55 depression across more than one timepoints is associated with an elevated risk of multiple
56 suboptimal developmental outcomes in children, including elevated rates of externalizing
57 and internalizing problems, poorer achievement of overall developmental milestones in
58 childhood(6). Persistent maternal depression in the first 12-months postpartum has long-
59 range effects on behavioural, social, emotional and educational outcomes such as
60 educational attainment at 16years of age (4, 7, 8). This may also extend to mothers who
61 experienced sub-clinical depressive symptoms (9).
62 Further, maternal anxiety during pregnancy and increased child difficulties such as
63 emotional symptoms, conduct problems and hyperactivity at age 10 (10).
64 However, these risks may themselves be nested within broader social determinants of
65 health and childhood experiences of poverty have been consistently linked to poor
66 developmental and mental health outcomes(11) . Exposure to poverty during childhood
67 increases risk of internalised symptoms, impacting upon psychological wellbeing, and higher
68 instances of externalising behaviours (12). Maternal mental health may also act as a
69 mediating factor between social economic status (SES) and developmental outcomes. Child
70 mental health and cognitive ability may mediated by maternal mental health, particularly

71 prior to 1 year postnatal(13). This study highlights the importance of positive maternal
72 mental health as a protective factor for child wellbeing and learning, particularly within the
73 first year of the child’s life. Further, children of mothers with self-reported positive mental
74 health, support from others, and lower levels of distress displayed better mental health
75 than their peers (14); and associations have been reported between cognitive delay and
76 food insecurity, mediated by maternal mental health(15) .

77 **Early intervention parenting programmes**

78 From a public health perspective the above evidence highlights the importance of targeting
79 interventions towards mothers in low-income families (14, 15) and that interventions should
80 aim to promote positive childhood experiences (16). Factors including timing and severity
81 of adversity may also be important methodological considerations with evidence suggesting
82 that severe maternal deprivation experienced between 0 – 2 months had a significant
83 impact on functioning in middle childhood and these effects were greater than at earlier
84 developmental stages (17). The study provides evidence and a rationale for engaging in
85 early intervention and prevention of childhood trauma.

86 Meta-analytic studies indicated that parenting interventions (such as Triple P, Incredible
87 Years and Mellow Parenting (MP)) can have a positive impact on children’s behaviour
88 alongside improving parenting skills and parental wellbeing (18, 19). However, there are
89 challenges with the existing evidence base for these interventions including recruitment
90 biases towards including middle-class families in most of the research, raising concerns
91 about the exclusion of families from low socioeconomic backgrounds, over-reliance in the

92 evidence base on data from high income countries (19)and challenges in establishing the
93 independence of evaluation frameworks from intervention delivery (20).

94 Although the evidence base for delivery of parenting programmes in low and middle income
95 countries is growing (21) these generally focus on the impact on parenting approaches and
96 child outcomes, with relatively less focus on the impact on caregiver mental health. There
97 are also challenges remaining around how these evaluations work with contextual factors
98 such as poverty, adversity and cultural sensitivity.

99 There is a growing body of evidence around the application of parenting programmes that
100 use combined targeting of parenting, child behaviour and parental health outcomes. A UK
101 evaluation of MP reported improvements in maternal mental health, parenting confidence,
102 and child conduct problems after participation in the programme(22). Further, most
103 participants in these programmes self-identified as unemployed and presenting with other
104 population level vulnerabilities . A subsequent evaluation of MP reported similar outcomes
105 in terms of wellbeing and confidence for both mothers and fathers who participated in the
106 intervention (23). However, there is limited recent evaluation evidence of the effectiveness
107 of Mellow Parenting in LMIC settings(24).

108 **Tajikistan context**

109 The current study evaluated the delivery of Mellow Babies (a version of Mellow Parenting
110 adapted for infants) in the Central Asia nation of Tajikistan. Mellow Parenting has been
111 adapted to be delivered in non-high resource settings such as Central and Eastern Europe
112 and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CEE/CIS), where health policy has moved to
113 cease the practice of end institutional care rearing for children under the age of 3 years,

114 replacing this with national social protection systems supporting children to live within a
115 family environment. Mellow Parenting groups were introduced to Tajikistan in 2010 in the
116 context of a gatekeeping and reintegration approach to develop family support alternatives
117 and prevent babies at risk entering institutional care settings such as Baby Homes (25). . The
118 Putting Families First Project also built on previous work to develop family support and early
119 intervention alternatives to institutional care and included Mellow Parenting Programmes
120 as part of a package of support for families in the community (26).

121 Tajikistan has seen a steady decrease in poverty rates over the past decade but continues to
122 face economic challenges following COVID-19 and the recent conflict in Ukraine (27). High
123 underemployment within Tajikistan has been linked to high levels of Migration to
124 neighbouring countries such as Russia, which in turn leads to increased vulnerability for
125 “left-behind” women and children (28).

126 Research suggests high prevalence rates for depression (26%), anxiety (17%), and PTSD
127 (17%) amongst Tajik women (29). Further, the high levels of migration mean that Tajik wives
128 are vulnerable to being separated from their husbands, having little-to-no financial or social
129 support, and often left dependent on their in-laws (30). Evidence suggests that Tajik women
130 are at high risk of domestic violence at the hands of their husband/in-laws and at least 23%
131 of married women have experienced domestic violence (31). Violence against women and
132 girls (VAWG) is a major problem in Tajikistan, driven by conservative gender norms, the
133 culturally ascribed position of young women, and poverty, although there is evidence for
134 the effectiveness of violence reduction programmes (30). Tajik women also have elevated
135 levels of stress and poor living conditions, with suicide rates increasing by 176% from 2008 –
136 2010, and suicide completion and attempt statistics for Tajikistan were reported as three

137 suicides for every one attempt, in contrast to the global statistics one suicide for every 10 –
138 20 attempts (32). As childhood experiences of poverty, poor maternal health and limited
139 access to healthcare all increase the risk of poor child outcomes, targeted early
140 interventions for at-risk families in Tajikistan may be one way to mitigate the impact of
141 these social and demographic risk factors.

142 **Current Project**

143 The current study analysed pre- and post-data collected from mothers who participated in
144 the Mellow Babies intervention, targeting families of babies aged 0 – 18 months. We sought
145 to evaluate associations between participation in a Mellow Babies group and maternal
146 mental health outcomes for Tajik mothers. The secondary aim was to evaluate evidence for
147 associated improvements in parenting stress, quality of life, and child behaviour following
148 participation in a Mellow Babies group. Finally, we aimed to identify baseline predictors of
149 outcomes in the sample. It was hypothesised that participation in a group would be
150 associated with improved maternal mental health, and reduced parenting stress but that
151 sociodemographic factors would affect the degree of improvement on outcomes.

152 **Materials and Methods**

153 **Design** An uncontrolled retrospective cohort design was used to assess pre-post
154 intervention changes on the primary and secondary outcomes. Data were available from
155 participants who took part in Mellow Babies interventions in Tajikistan between 2016 –
156 2020 and were collected as part of participation in the intervention. Participants were
157 aware that anonymised data would be used for subsequent evaluation of the programme.

158 **Participants and eligibility.** To be eligible for participation in the group mothers had to have
159 at least one child under the age of 18 months with whom they had frequent contact. It was
160 a requirement that their children participated in Mellow Babies groups.

161 The total sample was n=195. The mean age of participants was 33.20 years of age (SD=7.52),
162 and the mean age of babies was 5.52 months (SD=3.09). All participants attended 12 or
163 more sessions of the programme. There were 194 participants who completed at least one
164 outcome measure at baseline and post intervention. Figure 1 details the flow of participant
165 data through the study.

166

167 Figure 1: Flow diagram of participant data in study

168

169 **Measures *Depression and Anxiety Stress Scale 21 (DASS-21)*:** The DASS-21 is a 21-item self-
170 report questionnaire measuring depression, anxiety, and stress. Statements are presented
171 on a 4-point Likert scale based on frequency of symptom. The DASS-21 has high internal
172 consistency overall and across each construct (Depression $\alpha = .88$; Anxiety $\alpha = .82$; Stress $\alpha =$
173 $.90$; Overall $\alpha = .93$; (33)). Cross-cultural studies have also found evidence for reliability and
174 validity when administering the DASS-21 across different settings (34).

175 ***Parenting Daily Hassle Scale (PDHS)*** The PDHS is a 20-item self-report questionnaire
176 measuring daily parenting stress based on how often the parenting challenges occur (on a 4-
177 point Likert scale) and their intensity (5-point Likert scale). The frequency is scored out of 80
178 and the intensity score is out of 100. Both measures have acceptable internal consistency

179 (frequency $\alpha = .81$ and intensity $\alpha = .91$; (35). The PDHS has two subscales measuring
180 challenging behaviour (single item factor loading ranged from $\alpha = .31 - .81$) and parenting
181 tasks (single item factor loading ranged from $\alpha = .40 - .78$) (35).

182 **Quality of Life, Enjoyment and Satisfaction Scale (QoLESS).** The QoLESS is a 16-item self-
183 report questionnaire measuring overall quality of life in terms of satisfaction and enjoyment
184 in areas of health, work, relationships, and overall wellbeing. Statements are presented on a
185 5-point Likert scale ranging from “very poor” to “very good”. It has high internal consistency
186 ($\alpha = .90$) and test-retest reliability ($\alpha = .93$;(36)).

187 **Richman’s Behaviour Checklist (RBCL).** The RBCL is a 21-item parent-reported questionnaire
188 that measures child behaviour problems. Each item presents three statements and asks the
189 parent to put an “x” in the box corresponding to the statement that is most true to their
190 child’s behaviour. RBCL was reported to have high test re-test reliability ($r=.81$;(36, 37)).

191 **Procedure:** Mellow Babies groups were delivered as part of the Putting Families First
192 Project. All participants lived in Tajikistan and were identified based on their previous
193 involvement with the organisation. Mothers were asked to provide consent to participate in
194 the evaluation before data was collected. Over the study period 16 separate Mellow Babies
195 groups were delivered. Each participant took part in one group with the numbers of
196 participants in each group ranging from five to twelve. Fifteen of the 16 groups met face-to-
197 face and one group of ten met online. Participants consented to taking part in the Mellow
198 Babies Programme. Pre-intervention measures were completed before the first session.
199 The groups took place over 14 weeks, one session per week, and were facilitated by two
200 trained Mellow Parenting facilitators. Each session lasted 4.5 hours and was split into

201 morning, lunch, and afternoon activities. The morning activity consisted of parents
202 reflecting childhood and the ways in which that may have impacted their current parenting
203 approach. The second part of the session was lunch, during this time parents spent time
204 with their child on a joint activity. The aim of this was to strengthen the parent-child
205 relationship. The third part of the day was the workshop which focused on parents' videos
206 of interactions with their child. This activity provided an opportunity for participants to
207 receive supportive feedback from facilitators and fellow parents. The child groups took
208 place alongside parent sessions, allowing parents to participate in morning and afternoon
209 activities. All post-intervention measures were collected at either on session 13, 14 or at a
210 home visit after last session.

211 **Data analysis and approvals**

212 Ethical approval for the data analysis was received from the University of Edinburgh Health
213 in Social Science Ethics Committee. Associations between participation in MB and outcomes
214 were analysed using paired-samples t-tests. Where data were non-parametric the Wilcoxon
215 signed rank test was used. Pearson's correlations were conducted to test for associations
216 between baseline demographics and scores on pre-intervention measures. Finally, one-way
217 ANCOVAs were carried out to measure the effect of categorical demographics on outcomes,
218 assessing interactions between pre and post scores controlling for the following baseline
219 demographics: residence, education, employment, child disability, and marital status. Effect
220 sizes were reported as Cohen's d for pre-post comparisons, and η_p^2 for ANCOVAs.

221 **Results**

222 **Demographics** Baseline demographics are displayed in Table 1. Based on the available data,
223 the majority of participants were of Tajik nationality, living in an urban setting. Most
224 participants reported either being married or living with their partner. Almost two thirds of
225 participants were unemployed. The majority of participants had education to secondary
226 school level or above. With regard to children, the majority of participants identified their
227 child as having a disability. Where recorded attendance rates were very high with all
228 participants attending at least 12 sessions out of 14, and 83.8% of participants attending all
229 14 sessions (based on 79.8% of all pre-post evaluation data).

230

231 **Table 1.** Participant demographics and engagement with programme

232

Study variable	Frequency (%)
Nationality (N=132)	
Tajik	121 (91.7%)
Uzbek	8 (6.1%)
Other	3 (2.2%)
Residence (N=132)	
Urban	110 (83.3%)
Rural	22 (16.7%)
Marital Status (N=127)	
Married/living together	106 (83.5%)
Single/Divorced/separated/widowed	21 (16.5%)
Employment (N=108)	
Unemployed	72 (66.7%)
Employed	36 (33.3%)
Education (N=108)	
Primary	11 (10.2%)
Secondary	71 (65.7%)
Further/higher	26 (24.1%)
Child disability (N=130)	
No	40 (30.8%)
Yes	90 (68.2%)
Participant disability (N=187)	
No	86 (98.9%)
Yes	1 (1.1%)
Number of sessions attended (n=154)	
12	7 (4.5%)
13	18 (11.7%)
14 (all sessions)	129 (83.8%)

233

234

235

236 **Mental health, parenting and child outcomes**

237 Pre-post intervention comparisons (Table 2) reported significant pre-post intervention
238 reductions on maternal DASS total scores ($t(193) = 13.69, p < .001$), Depression ($t(193) =$
239 $13.29, p < .001$), Anxiety ($Z = -9.39, p < .001$) and Stress ($Z = -9.72, p < .001$) subscales . For
240 parenting hassles, PDHS Intensity and Frequency significantly reduced from pre to post
241 intervention ($t(181) = 14.30, p < .001$; $Z = -9.41, p < .001$), as did the Parenting Tasks and
242 Challenging Behaviour subscales ($t(181) = 11.38, p < .001$; $t(181) = 12.88, p < .001$). Finally,
243 QoLESS scores indicated a significant improvement in self-reported quality of life across the
244 intervention ($t(173) = -13.63, p < .001, d = 1.03$). There was also a significant decrease in child
245 behaviour (RBCL $Z = -8.98, p < .001$). Cohen's d indicated large effect sizes across all tests.
246 Due to the number of t-tests carried out, the p value was adjusted using an alpha correction
247 by calculating p value/number of t-tests resulting in a corrected p-value of $p < .005$. All tests
248 remained significant after correction.

249

250 **Table 2. Pre and post mean scores for outcome measures**

Outcome measure	Pre mean (SD)	Post mean (SD)	Cohen's d (95% CI)
DASS Total (n=194)	81.48 (28.79)	47.24 (26.07) **	0.98 (0.81 to 1.15)
Depression (n=194)	13.01 (5.58)	7.09 (4.86) **	0.95 (0.78 to 1.12)
Anxiety (n=194)	13.01 (5.24)	7.64 (4.48) **	0.86 (0.69 to 1.02)
Stress (n=194)	14.73 (4.55)	8.88 (4.44)**	0.96 (0.79 to 1.14)
PDHS Frequency (n=182)	50.47 (13.59)	39.38 (12.75**)	0.86 (0.70 to 1.03)
PDHS Intensity (n=182)	63.42 (19.57)	44.96 (17.85) **	1.06 (0.88 to 1.24)
PDHS Parenting tasks (n=182)	25.44 (8.09)	18.84 (7.81) **	0.84 (0.67 to 1.01)
PDHS Challenging behaviour (n=182)	22.93 (7.11)	16.61 (6.55) **	0.95 (0.78 to 1.13)
QoLESS (n=174)	40.17 (10.00)	50.40 (8.69) **	1.03 (0.85 to 1.22)
RPBC (n=193)	4.63 (4.38)	1.99 (2.64) **	0.76 (0.60 to 0.92)

251 Notes: ** p<0.01; DASS = Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale; PDHS = Parenting Daily
 252 Hassles Scale; QoLESS = Quality of Life, Enjoyment and Satisfaction Scale; RBCL = Richman's
 253 Behaviour Checklist; 95% CI = 95% Confidence Interval

254

255 **Relationships between baseline demographics and outcomes**

256 There were significant correlations between the child's age and both baseline PDHS
257 Intensity ($r(127) = -.208$ $p = .018$) and Challenging Behaviour ($r(129) = -.295$ $p = .001$). This
258 indicated that parents of younger children reported increased difficulties on these scales.
259 Further, there were negative correlations between child age and PDHS Frequency ($r(129) =$
260 $-.243$, $p = 0.005$) and RBCL Child behaviour scores ($r(129) = -.308$, $p < .001$). This indicated
261 that parents of younger children also reported increased difficulties on these scales. Child
262 age was not significantly correlated with maternal DASS score or Quality of life. Participant
263 age was not significantly correlated with baseline measures.

264 **Interactions between baseline demographics and outcomes**

265 ANCOVA analyses were carried out to assess interactions between baseline scores and the
266 baseline demographics (residence, education, employment, child disability, and marital
267 status) on outcome (see Table 3).

268

Table 3. Interactions between basic demographics and post-treatment outcomes

Outcome measure	Child Disability		Education				Employment		Marital Status		Residence					
	Mean Post Score		F (η_p^2)	Mean Post Score			F (η_p^2)	Mean Post Score		F (η_p^2)	Mean Post Score		F (η_p^2)			
	Yes	No		Primary	Secondary	Further		Employed	Unemployed		Married	Other		Urban	Rural	
DASS Total	44.58	47.38	4.036* (.031)	52.96	43.70	43.95	2.89	46.63	44.74	5.58* (.052)	44.48	49.60	3.29	45.74	43.69	4.30* (.032)
Depression	6.47	7.29	8.76** (.065)	8.53	6.45	6.43	5.69* (.052)	7.08	6.66	8.92** (.081)	6.72	7.00	7.11* (.054)	6.71	6.81	7.67** (.057)
Anxiety	7.39	7.25	3.96* (.030)	7.60	7.05	7.05	2.60	7.30	7.71	5.89* (.053)	7.09	8.23	3.51	7.43	6.86	5.36* (.040)
Stress	8.41	9.18	2.23	10.27	8.34	8.57	2.10	8.39	8.57	3.49	8.45	9.50	1.63	8.75	8.08	2.36
PDHS Frequency	38.91	37.79	33.05** (.209)	33.11*	37.55 ⁺	43.27**	32.1** (.238)	40.18	36.91	32.01** (.251)	38.53	39.43	39.61** (.245)	38.33	39.00	32.80** (.205)
PDHS Intensity	41.74*	47.30*	39.83** (.246)	46.52	42.50*	48.73*	47.23** (.321)	45.18	42.00	35.64** (.267)	43.34	44.57	53.63** (.311)	42.94	44.86	46.63** (.273)
PDHS Parenting Tasks	17.87	19.74	26.63** (.179)	19.99	18.12	20.88	31.27** (.238)	18.92	18.08	20.98** (.185)	18.28	19.79	38.89** (.246)	18.11	19.47	30.84** (.199)
PDHS Challenging Behaviour	15.31*	17.31*	38.75** (.241)	17.70	15.54	17.42	38.15** (.276)	16.88	15.48	31.25** (.238)	15.82	16.43	44.73** (.273)	15.84	16.23	43.66** (.260)
QoLESS	49.52	50.63	35.67** (.252)	49.74	50.25	47.35	33.04** (.285)	50.20	50.31	34.23** (.292)	49.97	49.27	36.57** (.262)	50.03	49.90	36.84** (.254)
RPBC	2.10*	1.27*	90.72** (.419)	1.26	1.64	2.25	76.29** (.425)	2.01	1.55	80.50**	1.84	1.80	103.26** (.457)	1.92	1.33	104.55** (.450)

270 Notes: * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; Other = Single/Divorced/Widowed/Separated.

Child disability status

There was a significant interaction between pre- intervention score and disability status for post-intervention DASS total scores ($p = .047$, $\eta_p^2 = .031$), Depression ($p = .004$, $\eta_p^2 = .065$) and Anxiety ($p = .049$, $\eta_p^2 = .030$); for PDHS Frequency ($p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .209$) and Intensity ($p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .246$), Parenting Tasks ($p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .179$), Challenging Behaviour ($p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .241$), Quality of Life ($p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .252$) and child behaviour ($p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .419$). These indicated significantly lower self-reported post-intervention outcomes for parents of disabled children compared to parents whose children were not disabled, across DASS total, depression, hassle intensity, parenting tasks and challenging behaviour. In contrast, parents of children without a disability self-reported lower anxiety, hassle frequency, and problem behaviour and higher levels of quality-of-life post-intervention.

Highest education level

Significant interactions were also evident between the pre- intervention score and highest education level for post-intervention Depression F ($p = .019$, $\eta_p^2 = .052$), PDHS Frequency ($p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .238$), Intensity ($p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .321$), Parenting Tasks ($p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .238$), Challenging Behaviour ($p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .276$), Quality of Life ($p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .285$) and child behaviour ($p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .425$) outcomes. Participants with primary-level education reported the highest rates of depression on the DASS post- intervention. Those educated to further-education level reported the highest level of difficulties across the parenting scales, the challenging and problem behaviour scales and lower quality of life post-intervention compared to other groups. There were no significant interactions between highest education level and pre-intervention scores for DASS Total, Anxiety or Stress.

Residence

There were significant interactions between the pre- intervention score and residence for post-intervention DASS total $F(p=.040, \eta_p^2=.032)$, Depression ($p=.006, \eta_p^2=.057$), Anxiety ($p=.022, \eta_p^2=.040$), PDHS Frequency ($p<.001, \eta_p^2=.205$), Intensity ($p<.001, \eta_p^2=.273$), Parenting Tasks ($p<.001, \eta_p^2=.199$), Challenging Behaviour ($p<.001, \eta_p^2=.260$), Quality of Life ($p<.001, \eta_p^2=.254$), and child behaviour ($p<.001, \eta_p^2=.450$). Those living in urban areas reported significantly lower levels post-intervention depression, hassle frequency and intensity, parenting tasks, challenging behaviour, and higher quality-of-life compared to rural participants. Conversely, individuals in rural areas scored significantly lower than urban participants on post-intervention DASS total and Anxiety scales and reported lower levels of child problem behaviour. There was no significant interaction for DASS Stress outcomes.

Employment status

For each of the following outcomes there was a significant interaction between the pre-intervention score and employment status on post-intervention outcomes: DASS total ($p=.020, \eta_p^2=.052$), Depression $p=.004, \eta_p^2=.081$), Anxiety ($p=.018, \eta_p^2=.053$), PDHS Frequency ($p<.001, \eta_p^2=.251$), Intensity ($p<.001, \eta_p^2=.267$), Parenting Tasks ($p<.001, \eta_p^2=.185$) and Challenging Behaviour ($p<.001, \eta_p^2=.238$) Quality of life ($p<.001, \eta_p^2=.292$) and Child behaviour ($p<.001, \eta_p^2=.425$). This indicated that participants in employment reported higher rates of mental health symptoms, depression, parenting hassles and challenging/problem child behaviour compared with unemployed participants. Employed participants also reported slightly lower quality of life scores post-intervention. However, post-intervention anxiety scores were higher in unemployed participants than employed participants. There

was no significant interaction between employment status and pre-intervention scores on Stress outcomes.

Marital status

For each of the following outcomes there was a significant interaction between pre-intervention score and marital status on post-intervention scores: DASS Depression ($p=.009$, $\eta_p^2=.054$), PDHS Frequency ($p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.245$), Intensity ($p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.311$), Parenting Tasks ($p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.246$), Challenging Behaviour ($p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.273$), Quality of life ($p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.262$) and child behaviour ($p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.457$). Unmarried participants reported higher rates of post-intervention depression, parenting hassles, and challenging behaviour compared with married participants. However, post-intervention quality of life was slightly lower for unmarried participants.

Discussion

Our results represent the largest evaluation to date of a parent and infant mental health interventions in Tajikistan to date. Our findings suggest participation in Mellow Parenting was associated with significant post-intervention improvements in self-reported parental mental health capacity to manage parenting stress, reduced problematic child behaviour, and improved quality of life at the end of the intervention; with all changes consistent with large effect sizes. These findings are consistent with existing research into the effectiveness of MP (22, 23), but extend the evidence base into middle resource settings, and with consistently larger effect sizes. The mean age of children in the sample was around 5, suggesting that MP is a potentially effective intervention in the perinatal period. Further, MP was acceptable and feasible to deliver in the Tajik context, with over 80% of participants

attending all 14 group sessions, representing higher engagement than UK samples(38). Pre-intervention data suggested mean levels of depression and anxiety in the sample consistent with mild common mental disorder, which had dropped to minimal levels post-intervention.

The current study also reported improvements in child behaviour and parenting hassles, suggesting that participation in MP is associated with broad changes in both maternal mental health and parenting outcomes and may ultimately improve child-related outcomes. This is consistent with network mapping evidence from Tajikistan, indicating that availability of psychological support was linked to more positive relationships between caregivers and children(39).

Further, demographic data indicated a broad range of markers indicative of increased vulnerability within the sample including high levels of unemployment, child disability and education ending at secondary school level. Our demographic data also suggested that vulnerability and risk in mother-infant dyads may be nested within demographic vulnerabilities, consistent with the observation that maternal mental health chronicity emerges within the context of social determinants (6). For instance, those participants who were not currently married showed higher levels of mental health symptoms post-intervention. Participants in rural areas reported higher levels of depression and parenting challenges at post-intervention than those in urban areas, although rural mothers also reported lower anxiety. In addition, employment was associated with higher levels of distress and parenting challenges, perhaps signalling stress emerging from pressure to maintain livelihoods. These differential findings for specific demographic factors highlight the challenges of matching intervention delivery to need.

Given the Tajik context, these outcomes could be interpreted in terms of levels of support available to mothers. Tajikistan has moved towards developing family support and child centres which may be accessed by parents of disabled children (40). Within Tajik culture, it is also common for husbands to migrate for employment to provide and for women to live with extended family (41). Therefore, mothers who identified as “unemployed” may be receiving support from in-laws. Consequently, future evaluations should take into account the role of cultural context as both a baseline factor and a process factor in the delivery of the intervention.

In addition, pre-post intervention change on most of our secondary outcomes (parenting, child behaviour, and quality of life) were subject to significant interactions with baseline demographic characteristics. More positive parenting outcomes were associated with demographics such as having a child with a disability, living in an urban area, being unemployed and being married, and lower levels of post-intervention child behaviour problems were associated with baseline unemployment, and marriage. With the exception of unemployment, each of these interactions could represent the impact of access to wider or more organised support mechanisms (e.g. community, health and social care availability). Further, rural location was also associated with lower child behaviour problems, which could also represent availability of supports in the wider family and community. For disabled children, parents reported less challenging behaviour on the PDHS but increased behaviour problems on the RBCL. Over recent years there have been increases in the level of support available to Tajik mothers, particularly those with additional needs, including the family support centres and living with in laws (40, 41). However, more research is needed to unpick the nature of interactions between intervention and demographic factors.

In addition, we identified significant correlations between child age and parenting stress suggesting that mothers of younger children identified elevated levels of parenting stress and higher levels of behaviour problems. This could fit with the relevance of sensitive periods in child development . For instance, mothers adjusting to the parental role, particularly in the context of additional needs or existing vulnerabilities could experience increased levels of stress in the early months post-partum. Equally, mothers may be more aware of challenging/problem behaviours and accordingly more likely to report them.

Strengths of the current research

The present study builds on existing research on the effectiveness of Mellow Parenting (18, 23, 38) in improving infant and parental mental health, extending this work to a global setting, in a middle resource nation. This adds to the cross-cultural evidence base for MP. Further, the outcome measures used to collect data were all standardised questionnaires, providing high levels of reliability and enabling comparison with other MP programmes and other parenting programmes in general. In addition, the high level of engagement indicates that MP is acceptable to, and well-tolerated by Tajik participants, indicating that there is a basis for scaling up both intervention and evaluation of MP in the country. Furthermore, delivery of the intervention occurred in different sites within Tajikistan, Khuajand , Panjakent and Dushanbe, within community settings, and offered an example of positive NGO government partnership working.

That said, we acknowledge several limitations. Due to the “real world” design of the research, there was no control group, limiting comparisons with families who did not receive an intervention. Therefore, it was not clear if improvements entirely were due to

the programme or non-specific factors such as time. Further, given that the data was collected as part of routine delivery of MP in Tajikistan, demographic data was missing for many participants. Although data was collected using standardised measures, two measures (RBCL and PDHS) were administered to children outwith the intended age-group. In addition, only total scores of each measure were recorded. Therefore, it was not possible to record item-level validity. In addition, given that participants' children in the current study were 18 months and younger, the findings for parenting stress and child outcomes should be interpreted with caution. Future research should aim to use outcome measures which have been standardised for the age groups participating in the study (22). Finally, all outcomes used in the present research relied on self-report measures, reported by mothers who participated in the Mellow Babies group. Future research should therefore aim to collect observational data to accompany self-reported outcomes.

In summary, our evaluation identified that, for Tajik mothers, participation in the Mellow Babies programme was associated with improvements in parental mental health, parenting, child, and quality-of-life outcomes. Future research is required to evaluate MP using controlled trials or implementation designs, as well as examining the long-term impact of participating in Mellow Parenting. Further, our findings suggest that there is sufficient infrastructure in Tajikistan to support this work (42).

References

1. Carson C, Kelly Y, Kurinczuk JJ, Sacker A, Redshaw M, Quigley M. Effect of pregnancy planning and fertility treatment on cognitive outcomes in children at ages 3 and 5: longitudinal cohort study. *Bmj*. 2011;343.
2. Mughal MK, Giallo R, Arnold PD, Kehler H, Bright K, Benzie K, et al. Trajectories of maternal distress and risk of child developmental delays: Findings from the All Our Families (AOF) pregnancy cohort. *Journal of affective disorders*. 2019;248:1-12.
3. Walker SP, Wachs TD, Grantham-McGregor S, Black MM, Nelson CA, Huffman SL, et al. Inequality in early childhood: risk and protective factors for early child development. *The lancet*. 2011;378(9799):1325-38.
4. MacBeth A, Christie H, Golds L, Morales F, Raouna A, Sawrikar V, et al. Thinking about the next generation: The case for a mentalization-informed approach to perinatal and intergenerational mental health. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*. 2023:1-15.
5. Madigan S, Wade M, Plamondon A, Jenkins JM. Trajectories of maternal depressive symptoms in the early childhood period and family-wide clustering of risk. *Journal of affective disorders*. 2017;215:49-55.
6. Morales MF, Girard L-C, Raouna A, MacBeth A. The association of different presentations of maternal depression with children's socio-emotional development: A systematic review. *PLOS Global Public Health*. 2023;3(2):e0001649.
7. Netsi E, Pearson RM, Murray L, Cooper P, Craske MG, Stein A. Association of persistent and severe postnatal depression with child outcomes. *JAMA psychiatry*. 2018;75(3):247-53.
8. Psychogiou L, Russell G, Owens M. Parents' postnatal depressive symptoms and their children's academic attainment at 16 years: pathways of risk transmission. *British Journal of Psychology*. 2020;111(1):1-16.
9. Meaney MJ. Perinatal maternal depressive symptoms as an issue for population health. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2018;175(11):1084-93.
10. Leis JA, Heron J, Stuart EA, Mendelson T. Associations between maternal mental health and child emotional and behavioral problems: does prenatal mental health matter? *Journal of abnormal child psychology*. 2014;42:161-71.
11. Hackman DA, Farah MJ, Meaney MJ. Socioeconomic status and the brain: mechanistic insights from human and animal research. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*. 2010;11(9):651-9.
12. Evans GW, De France K. Childhood poverty and psychological well-being: The mediating role of cumulative risk exposure. *Development and psychopathology*. 2022;34(3):911-21.
13. Smith TA, Kievit RA, Astle DE. Maternal mental health mediates links between socioeconomic status and child development. *Current Psychology*. 2023;42(25):21967-78.
14. Radey M, McWey LM. Safety nets, maternal mental health, and child mental health outcomes among mothers living in poverty. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*. 2021;30:687-98.

15. Pedroso J, Buccini G, Venancio SI, Pérez-Escamilla R, Gubert MB. Maternal mental health modifies the association of food insecurity and early child development. *Maternal & child nutrition*. 2020;16(4):e12997.
16. Crandall A, Miller JR, Cheung A, Novilla LK, Glade R, Novilla MLB, et al. ACEs and counter-ACEs: How positive and negative childhood experiences influence adult health. *Child abuse & neglect*. 2019;96:104089.
17. Hambrick EP, Brawner TW, Perry BD, Brandt K, Hofmeister C, Collins JO. Beyond the ACE score: Examining relationships between timing of developmental adversity, relational health and developmental outcomes in children. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*. 2019;33(3):238-47.
18. MacBeth A, Law J, McGowan I, Norrie J, Thompson L, Wilson P. Mellow Parenting: systematic review and meta-analysis of an intervention to promote sensitive parenting. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*. 2015;57(12):1119-28.
19. Michelson D, Davenport C, Dretzke J, Barlow J, Day C. Do evidence-based interventions work when tested in the “real world?” A systematic review and meta-analysis of parent management training for the treatment of child disruptive behavior. *Clinical child and family psychology review*. 2013;16:18-34.
20. Wilson P, Rush R, Hussey S, Puckering C, Sim F, Allely CS, et al. How evidence-based is an 'evidence-based parenting program'? A PRISMA systematic review and meta-analysis of Triple P. *BMC medicine*. 2012;10:130.
21. Pedersen GA, Smallegange E, Coetzee A, Hartog K, Turner J, Jordans MJ, et al. A systematic review of the evidence for family and parenting interventions in low-and middle-income countries: child and youth mental health outcomes. *Journal of child and family studies*. 2019;28:2036-55.
22. Levi D, Ibrahim R, Malcolm R, MacBeth A. Mellow Babies and Mellow Toddlers: Effects on maternal mental health of a group-based parenting intervention for at-risk families with young children. *Journal of affective disorders*. 2019;246:820-7.
23. Raouna A, Malcolm R, Ibrahim R, MacBeth A. Promoting sensitive parenting in 'at-risk' mothers and fathers: A UK outcome study of Mellow Babies, a group-based early intervention program for parents and their babies. *PloS one*. 2021;16(2):e0245226.
24. MacBeth A, Law J, McGowan I, Norrie J, Thompson L, Wilson P. Mellow Parenting: systematic review and meta-analysis of an intervention to promote sensitive parenting. *Developmental medicine and child neurology*. 2015;57(12):1119-28.
25. Watkins J, Muhamedjonova N, Holding PA. Realising distributed leadership through measurement for change. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2023;11.
26. Milligan I. Putting Families First—the Tajikistan 'Baby Homes' transformation process: Year 1 Evaluation Report. 2018.
27. Bank W. The World Bank in Tajikistan. 2022 [Available from: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/tajikistan/overview>].
28. Shimizutani S, Yamada E. Transformation of international migrants in head wind: Evidence from Tajikistan in the 2010s. *Review of Development Economics*. 2023;27(1):525-49.
29. Pirova G, Weine S, Miller A, Yahyokhodjaeva M. Multilevel determinants of common mental disorders in migrant and non-migrant wives in Tajikistan. *International journal of culture and mental health*. 2018;11(4):490-7.

30. Mastonshoeva S, Shonasimova S, Gulyamova P, Jewkes R, Shai N, Chirwa E, et al. Quantitative evaluation of Zindagii Shoista (Living with Dignity) intervention to prevent violence against women in Tajikistan. *Global health action*. 2022;15(1):2122994.
31. Vinnakota D, Parsa AD, Sivasubramanian M, Mahmud I, Sathian B, Kabir R. Intimate partner violence and pregnancy termination among Tajikistan women: evidence from nationally representative data. *Women*. 2022;2(2):102-14.
32. Unicef. Study Of Prevalence And Dynamics Of Suicide Among Children And Young People (12-24 Years Of Age) In Sughd Region, Tajikistan. Dushanbe: United Nations Children's Fund. 2013.
33. Lovibond PF, Lovibond SH. The structure of negative emotional states: Comparison of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) with the Beck Depression and Anxiety Inventories. *Behaviour research and therapy*. 1995;33(3):335-43.
34. Oei TP, Sawang S, Goh YW, Mukhtar F. Using the depression anxiety stress scale 21 (DASS-21) across cultures. *International Journal of Psychology*. 2013;48(6):1018-29.
35. Crnic KA, Greenberg MT. Minor parenting stresses with young children. *Child development*. 1990;61(5):1628-37.
36. Stevanovic D. Quality of Life Enjoyment and Satisfaction Questionnaire—short form for quality of life assessments in clinical practice: A psychometric study. *Journal of psychiatric and mental health nursing*. 2011;18(8):744-50.
37. Richman N. Is a behaviour checklist for preschool children useful. *Epidemiological approaches to child psychiatry*. 1977:125-36.
38. Levi D, Ibrahim R, Malcolm R, MacBeth A. Mellow Babies and Mellow Toddlers: Effects on maternal mental health of a group-based parenting intervention for at-risk families with young children. *Journal of affective disorders*. 2019;246:820-7.
39. Muhamedjonova NR, Watkins J, Nazarova SI, Holding P. Cementing partnerships: applying a network-mapping tool in Tajikistan. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2021;9:585806.
40. Unicef. The state of the world's children. 2022.
41. Olimova S, Bosc I. Labour migration from Tajikistan: Mission of the Internat. Organization for Migration; 2003.
42. Raouna A, Muhamedjonova N, Ergasheva U, Tainsh R, Watkins J, MacBeth A. Resilience on the Silk Road: A Report on “First 1000 Days” Provision for Parent-Infant Mental Health in Tajikistan. 2022.

Figure 1: Flow diagram of participant data in study

