Date this evidence summary was written:

August 2013

A comprehensive meta-analysis of Triple P-Positive Parenting program using hierarchal linear modeling: Evidence and implications for public health

Review on which this evidence summary is based:

Nowak, C., & Heinrichs, N.. (2008). A comprehensive meta-analysis of Triple P-Positive Parenting program using hierarchal linear modeling: Effectiveness and moderating variables. Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review. 11(3) 114-144.

Review Focus

- Parents and their children with or without identified behavior problems
- Triple-P Parenting Program (delivered as standardized by the University of Queensland or a precursor-format) with the aim to change a child's problem behavior by modifying the family environments that reinforce the problem behavior
- C Usual care
- Primary Outcomes: Categorized into the following: Parenting Skills, Child Problem Behaviors,
 Parents' Relationship Quality, and Parent/child Wellbeing

Review Quality Rating: 8 (strong) Details on the methodological quality are available here.

Considerations for Public Health Practice	
Conclusions from Health Evidence	General Implications
This methodologically strong review is based on 55 moderate quality studies.	The overall findings suggest that the Triple P Parenting Program should be implemented to improve Parenting, Child Problem Behaviors,
Triple P Parenting Program is effective in improving three outcome categories: Parenting, Child Problems, and Parental Well-Being.	Parental Well-Being and Parent Relationship Quality outcomes.
The effect was seen at post intervention and sustained at follow up for Child Problems, Parenting, Parental Well-Being and [only at follow up]) for Parent Relationship Quality.	The Triple P parenting program is likely to achieve more positive outcomes when children enter the program with elevated clinical status, when they are less than 5 years of age, and when the program is delivered at higher intensity (level 4 or 5).
The following moderators positively impact outcomes post intervention and/or at follow-up: • Clinically elevated child status (pre-intervention child scores on ECBI/CBCL/SDQ) on Child Problem Behavior	The program is less likely to achieve or maintain positive effects when fathers deliver the program, when more than 61% of participants are boys, and as time from active intervention increases.
 higher <u>intensity</u> of program delivery (level 4 or 5) on Parenting and Child Problems younger <u>age of child (less than 5.5 years) on all outcomes</u> 	Initial extent of child problem behavior or attrition rates are not likely to affect program success. At this time program delivery format (i.e. self

The following moderators negatively impact outcomes post intervention and/or at follow-up:

- <u>fathers delivering</u> the program on Parenting, Parental Well-Being and Child Problems
- greater proportion (>60.8%) of boys in the group on Parents Relationship Quality
- increasing <u>time post intervention</u> on Parenting outcomes

The following moderators demonstrate inconsistent effects:

program delivery format (i.e. self directed, individual, group, or via media)

Effects were not moderated by:

<u>initial extent of child problem behavior</u> or attrition rate

directed, individual, group, or via media) may or may not impact outcomes. If programs are implemented, program delivery format should be evaluated.

Evidence and Implications

What's the evidence?

Triple P Parenting Program (55 studies: 29 RCT, 11 CCT, 15 uncontrolled studies includes a sample of 11,797 families)

Overall effect of the program is positive for three outcome categories: Parenting, Child Problems, and Parental Well-Being (difference (d) ranges between 0.17 and 0.48 – representing a small to large effect) The effect was seen at post intervention and sustained at follow up for Child Problems, Parenting, Parental Well-Being and [only at follow up]) for Relationship Quality

Variables which positively moderate program effects:

- <u>Child status</u> classified as clinically elevated resulted in greater impact on Child Problem Behavior at follow up
- Higher <u>intensity</u> of program delivery (level 4 or 5) resulted in significantly greater effects at post intervention and follow up on Parenting and Child Problem outcomes
- Younger <u>age of child</u> resulted in more positive effects on all outcome measures

Variables which negatively moderate program effects:

Implications for practice and policy

Triple P Parenting Program should be implemented to improve Parenting, Child Problem Behaviors, Parental Well-Being and Parent Relationship Quality outcomes

- 1. Greater impact may be expected:
 - on Child Problem Behavior among children with clinically-elevated status
 - on Parenting and Child Problems when delivered at higher intensity (level 4 or 5)
 - on all outcomes when delivered for younger children (younger than 5.5 years)
- 2. Lesser impact may be expected:
 - On Parenting, Parental Well-Being and Child Problems when the program is delivered by fathers compared to mothers or teachers
 - 1.1. on Parents Relationship Quality when delivered to groups with more boys
 - 1.2. on Parenting outcomes with increasing number of months following intervention
- **3.** Program delivery format should be rigorously evaluated, however:
 - 3.1. Program may be delivered in self directed formats to improve Child Behaviour, in

- <u>Fathers delivering</u> the program resulted in lower (but still positive) improvements in Parenting, Parental Well-Being and Child Problems compared to delivery by mothers or teachers
- When more boys were in the program (>61%),
 Parents Relationship Quality was lower
- Positive improvements in Parenting outcomes declined as months passed post intervention

Variables which inconsistently moderate effects:

- <u>Delivery Method. Program delivery format (i.e self directed, individual, group, or via media) resulted</u> in inconsistent effects on various outcomes:
 - group delivery resulted in smaller positive effects for Child Problems at post intervention and follow up compared to self-directed, individual or media/ information campaign formats
 - self directed formats yielded smaller short term effects for Parenting compared to all other formats and yielded reduced long term effect sizes on Parental Relationship Quality
 - self-directed and group formats resulted in greater **Parental Well-Being** compared to individual sessions
 - self administered formats do not affect child behavior but are comparable in effectiveness to individual and group sessions for improving parent outcomes
- <u>Country of study</u> had no effect on Child Behaviour Problems and Parenting outcomes; significantly better outcomes for Parental Well-Being and Relationship Quality were found in studies done outside Australia

Variables which did not moderate program effects:

- <u>Initial extent of child problem behavior</u> on Parenting outcomes
- Attrition rate had no impact on any outcomes

self-directed, individual or group sessions to improve parent measures, in self-directed, individual or media/ information campaign rather than group formats to improve Child Problems, and in self-directed and group formats compared to individual sessions to improve Parental Well-Being, and in self directed formats compared to all other formats to improve Parenting in the short term and Parental Relationship Quality in the long term

4. Initial extent of child problem behavior or attrition rates are not likely to affect program success.

Legend: Population; I – Intervention; C – Comparison group; O – Outcomes; CI – Confidence Interval; OR – Odds Ratio; RR – Relative Risk; ECB – Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory; CBCL - Child Behavior Checklist; SDQ - Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

** for definitions please see the healthevidence.org glossary of terms http://www.healthevidence.org/qlossary.aspx

Why this issue is of interest to public health in Canada

It is well established that the first years of a child's life are crucial in forming a strong foundation for healthy growth and development, and parent-infant interactions impact a child's developmental outcomes. Early childhood experiences have long lasting effects on health, wellbeing and competence which are shown to be linked to an adult's sense of identity and ability to cope with stress and problems. Children learn how to

communicate, cope with stress, have healthy relationships, develop learning skills and a sense of self in the first five years of life. Parents who are engaged nd interactive with their child and provide positive, consistent parenting at an early age may face fewer problems with adolescent mental health. However, parental stress and mental wellbeing may affect parent-child interactions and learning outcomes. Children exposed to chaotic, violent and insecure environments may secrete excessive stress hormones when faced with stress as an adult. Support for parenting programs with the aim of reducing parental stress, anxiety and depressive symptoms aligns with Health Canada's prioritization of interventions targeting the early years.

- 1. Health Canada. (2011). Healthy Living: Parenting. Retrieved from http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/hl-vs/child-enfant/parent/index-eng.php#start
- 2. Magill-Evans, J. & Harrison, M. (2010). Parent-child interactions, parenting stress and developmental outcomes at 4 years. *Children's Health Care*. 30(2) 135-150. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15326888CHC3002 4
- 3. Public Health Agency of Canada. (2011). Can experiences in early childhood affect a person's health during adulthood? Retrieved from http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/hp-ps/dca-dea/parent/support/welcome-bienvenu/experience-eng.php

Other quality reviews on this topic are available on www.healthevidence.org

Suggested citation

Greco, L., Workentine, S., & Dobbins, M. (2012). A comprehensive meta-analysis of Triple P-Positive Parenting program using hierarchal linear modeling: Effectiveness and moderating variables: Evidence and implications for public health. Hamilton, ON: McMaster University. Retrieved from http://www.healthevidence.org/documents/byid/18444/Nowak2008_EvidenceSummary_EN.pdf

This evidence summary was written to condense the work of the authors of the review referenced on page one. The intent of this summary is to provide an overview of the findings and implications of the full review. For more information on individual studies included in the review, please see the review itself.

The opinion and ideas contained in this document are those of the evidence summary author(s) and healthevidence.org. They do not necessarily reflect or represent the views of the author's employer or other contracting organizations. Links from this site to other sites are presented as a convenience to healthevidence.org internet users. Healthevidence.org does not endorse nor accept any responsibility for the content found at these sites.

Production of this evidence summary has been made possible through a financial contribution from Health Canada to the Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse (CCSA). The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the views of Health Canada or CCSA