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Examples for Evidence Based Prevention Programs
(Focus: Parents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Program name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patterson, Forgatch</td>
<td>Parenting Through Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster-Stratton</td>
<td>BASIC/Incredible Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMahon &amp; Forehand</td>
<td>Helping the Noncompliant Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyberg</td>
<td>Parent-Child Interaction Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Problems Prevention</td>
<td>„FAST TRACK – Families and Schools Together“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Group (multi-focused)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>Triple P – Positive Parenting Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Meta-Analysis (Sanders et al., 2014):

N = 101 Effectiveness Studies
Mean ES (Child SEB) = 0.48
N = 70 Studies with Follow-up
M = 7 months (2 – 36 mths)

The German Effectiveness Trials

Kurt Hahlweg & Nina Heinrichs
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Projects “Zukunft Familie I (DFG)”
(2001 - 2014)

Universal Prevention Trial in Braunschweig
Project Zukunft Familie I (DFG)

Aims:

1. Evaluate efficacy of the Triple P-group prevention program (level 4) on an universal level

2. Developmental study (control group)
   - Stability of childhood mental disorders
   - Prediction of school achievement and behavioral problems based on pre-data

Funded by German Research Foundation
DFG, HA 1400/14-1-5
DFG-Study: Recruitment (31%) and Triple P Participation Rate (77%)

- 280 Families
  - Information Randomization
    - Developmental Study (Control)
      - 94 Families
        - Accepted: N = 94 (100%)
        - Rejected: N = 0
    - Prevention Study (Triple P)
      - 186 Families
        - Accepted: N = 144 (77%)
        - Rejected: N = 42 (26%)

Heinrichs, Hahlweg et al., 2006; ZKPP

Between-Group-Effect-Sizes: Pre – 4 Years
Mothers in 2-parent families (N: TP=129; KG=90)

Heinrichs, Hahlweg et al., 2012
Longitudinal Quantile Regression for Hierarchical Data

Kliem et al., 2012

Corporal Punishment after 3 Years

The German Effectiveness Trials

Nina Heinrichs

TU Braunschweig, Institut für Psychologie

Project “Zukunft Familie II”

Aims of the “Zukunft Familie II-Study”
(Jacobs-Study)

• What factors might influence recruitment and retention of socially disadvantaged families in a preventive parenting program (Triple P)?

• Analyze the impact of recruitment strategies on outcome of selective prevention
Recruitment Results

N = 248 families enrolled (from 690 families available)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>„Setting“</th>
<th>Triple P (Group)</th>
<th>Triple P (Individual)</th>
<th>Effect Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effective Setting 32% 40% 36%

Sample Description
(N_{DFG} = 280 and N_{Jacobs} = 197 families)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DFG-study</th>
<th>Jacobs-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (mother)</td>
<td>35.2 (5.0)</td>
<td>33.5 (5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Immigrants</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Cohab.</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Live with both parents)</td>
<td>(75%)</td>
<td>(59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Education ≤ 9 Yrs.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Yrs.</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 Yrs.</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income (&lt;1500 €/month)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Social Welfare</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heinrichs et al., 2005, 2006
## Parents: Consumer Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DFG (N = 144)</th>
<th>Jacobs (N = 197)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped to handle child better</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better relationship with child</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with quality of training</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heinrichs et al., 2006

### So far, so good...

But what happens in the long-run?

**After 4, 8, 10, 20... years?**
Why Are Long-Term Studies Important?

- Stable long-term success is the ultimate goal of psychological treatments for emotional disorders
- Insights from long-term outcome should help us to optimize our treatments
- Learning and memory are time-dependent
- Increase willingness of public to fund prevention
- Practical problems, however, make long-term follow-up studies rare exceptions (personal, funding)

High/Scope Perry Preschool Study in Ypsilanti (Schweinhart et al., 2005)

- African-American families, living in poverty, children 3 – 4 years
- Beginning: 1963-1965
- RCT, matched by IQ
  - N = 58 high quality pre-school program
  - N = 65 control group
- 14 Follow-up’s at ages 3-11, 14, 15, 19, 27 und 40, Missing data: 6%!!
- Cost – benefit analysis:
  - 1 US$ invested → 17 US$ saved!
Long-term studies (≥10 years)

- **Indicated Prevention:**
  - Wolchik et al. (2013). *JCCP.* RCT of “New Beginnings Program” NBP and literature Control Group LC for divorced families (9-12 year olds), 15 year FU; N = 240
    - NBP < CG, internalizing symptoms, 15.5% vs 35%
    - Males: NBP < LC substance use d = .50
  - Boisjoli, Tremblay et al. (2007). BJ Psychiatry. Montreal Longitudinal Experimental Study, 15 year FU; N = 250 boys at risk; 2-year multicomponent intervention, total sample 895:
    - Intervention vs CG: 13% more high-school graduation
    - Intervention vs CG: 11% fewer criminal records

- **Universal Prevention:**
  - Lösel et al. (2012) Erlangen-Nueremberg Development and Prevention Study (ENDPS), Germany. N=675 Kindergarten families, 10 year FU;
  - 4 groups: a) Oregon model Parent Training, b) “I Can Problem Solve” (Shure, 1993), c) Combination, d) Control group
  - Preliminary analysis
    - Social Behavior Questionnaire SBQ: OMPT: ES = 0.19
Project „Zukunft Familie III“
10 Year Efficacy of Triple P Level 4 Group

• Total sample: 477 families at 2001
• Last assessment 2006, six assessments in total

Project „Zukunft Familie III“

Process of assessment at 10-years

- Letter, announcing telephone call
- Telephone call, date of interview
- Making of self-report questionnaires
- Home visit
  - Interview: mother and adolescent separately
  - Child CPRS
- Feedback of results
**Project „Zukunft Familie III“ 10 Year Recruitment Rate**

- **ZF I**
  - N = 280 - > N = 249 (retention rate from pre: 89%; 2006: 99%)
  - Age: 46/49 years; 14,4 years (13 - 16 years)
- **ZF II**
  - N = 197 - > N = 112 (retention rate from pre: 57%; 2006: 64%)
  - No significant differences between drop-outs and FU 10 attenders (80% of drop-out because of missing addresses)
- **ZF I**
  - Two-Parent Families N = 195 (TP = 142 / CG = 53)
  - One-Parent Families N = 35 (TP = 17 / CG = 18) = too few to analyse meaningfully
Between-Gruppen-Effectsize: Pre – 10 Years
2-Parent Mothers: Triple P = 142, CG = 53

Intra-Group-Effectsize: Pre – 10 Years
Mothers: ZF II, Jacobs-Sample; n = 87
**DFG-Study: Recruitment (31%) and Triple P Participation Rate (77%)**

- 280 Families
  - Information Randomization
    - Developmental Study (Control): 94 Families
      - Accepted: N = 94 (100%)
      - Rejected: N = 0
    - Prevention Study (Triple P): 186 Families
      - Accepted: N = 144 (77%)
      - Rejected: N = 42 (26%)

Heinrichs, Hahlweg et al., 2006; ZKPP

**Intra-Group-Effect Size for Triple P+ vs. Triple P- vs. CG (2-parent families)**
White House Early Childhood Education Summit
James J. Heckman, December, 10, 2014

- “Essential elements for successful childhoods include engaged, supporting parents and teachers ....

- We should not underestimate the role of the parent and the power that comes from providing parents with information, resources and choice. Ensuring that parents have the knowledge and resources for providing a stimulating home environment is just as important, if not more important, as anything that happens in the classroom when children enter school.”
Thank you very much for your attention!