

Appendix 8

Evidence review: An analysis of the evidence for parenting interventions for parents of vulnerable children aged up to six years



June 2013

Appendix 8: Information collected regarding Healthy Start

Evidence review: An analysis of the evidence for parenting
interventions for parents of vulnerable children
aged up to six years

Prepared by:

Dr Michelle Macvean, PhD

Manager, Knowledge Synthesis, Parenting Research Centre

Dr Robyn Mildon, PhD

Director of Knowledge Exchange and Implementation, Parenting Research Centre

Prof Aron Shlonsky, PhD

Professor of Evidence Informed Practice, Department of Social Work, School of Health Sciences, University of Melbourne

Ben Devine

Research Assistant, Parenting Research Centre

Jessica Falkiner

Research Assistant, Parenting Research Centre

Dr Misel Trajanovska, PhD

Research Fellow, Parenting Research Centre

Dr Fabrizio D'Esposito, PhD

Research Fellow, Parenting Research Centre

Disclaimer

This analysis of parenting interventions was commissioned by the Families Commission of New Zealand. It was conducted between March and May 2013. Readers are advised to consider new evidence arising post the publication of this review when selecting and implementing parenting interventions.

June 2013

Parenting Research Centre
Level 5, 232 Victoria Parade
East Melbourne
Victoria 3002
Australia

p. + 61 03 8660 3500

www.parentingrc.org.au

Contents

Appendix 8: Information collected regarding Healthy Start	4
1.1 Healthy Start	7
1.2 Enhanced Healthy Start	21
References	31

Appendix 8: Information collected regarding Healthy Start

The information contained in this appendix was gathered from evaluations involving Healthy Start, including evaluations where Healthy Start was used as a comparison condition in studies testing the effectiveness of Enhance Healthy Start. We initially rated Healthy Start Supported but upon further consideration of the favourable results for Enhanced Healthy Start, we have rated Healthy Start 'Failed to Demonstrate Effect'. In the absence of follow-up data, Enhanced Healthy Start has been rated 'Pending'.

Healthy Start

Intervention components

Healthy Start is a home visiting program delivered to individual parents by paraprofessionals. Healthy Start involves population-based screening for early identification of families with newborns at risk for child abuse and neglect. The intervention is delivered via discussion with parents, active, empathic listening, modelling, role-modelling and individual service plans. Children are linked with continual paediatric primary care and families are linked into needed services, housing, income and nutritional assistance, child care, and educational and vocational training. Content conveyed during the intervention includes problem solving skills and child health and development. They also promote family use of prevention and early intervention service by offering referrals and assist with the resolution of any immediate crises.

Evaluation findings

The REA identified two RCTs that have evaluated this program in the USA. Program details varied slightly across each of these evaluations. In one RCT (Duggan, McFarlane, Windham, Rohde, Salkever, Fuddy, Rosenberg, Buchbinder, & Sia, 1999; El-Kamary, Higman, Fuddy, McFarlane, Sia, & Duggan, 2004; Duggan, Fuddy, Burrell, Higman, McFarlane, Windham, & Sia, 2004a; Duggan, Fuddy, McFarlane, Burrell, Windham, & Sia, 2004b; Duggan, McFarlane, Fuddy, Burrell, Higman, Windham, & Sia, 2004c; McFarlane, Burrell, Crowne, Cluxton-Keller, Fuddy, leaf, & Duggan, 2013; Bair-Merrit, Jennings, Chen, Burrell, McFarlane, Fuddy, & Duggan, 2010), the intervention targeted families of newborns at high risk of child abuse and it aimed to target parent-child relationships, family relationships and systems outcomes. There was an average of 13 visits over the course of 3-5 years, however there were four levels of intensity, ranging from weekly visits to quarterly. Early results for this RCT showed some promise, with some post intervention and early follow-up effects observed. The intervention group had significantly less corporal or verbal punishment and neglectful parenting than the control group (Duggan et al., 2004c). At 2-year follow-up, intervention participants had significantly fewer reports of physical assault, less partner violence resulting in injury, more use of non-violent discipline and greater efficacy, when compared to the control group (Duggan et al., 1999).

By the time the children were 7-9 years old, there were no significant impacts on any of the assessed parenting outcomes (McFarlane et al., 2013) and there were no significant differences between intervention and controls on the incidence of interpersonal violence (Bair-Merritt et al., 2010). The last measure of parental risk factors for child abuse was assessed at 3 years and no significant effects were found (Duggan et al., 2004a).

A separate RCT assessed the effectiveness of Healthy Start for families at risk of dysfunction (McCurdy, 2001). Families received a mean of 28 individual home visits for 1 year, delivered by paraprofessionals. The program specifically targeted family relationships and outcomes were

compared to treatment as usual. The only observed effect in this RCT was at 12 months where the Healthy Start group reported significantly better social support scores than the control group.

Healthy Start compared to Enhanced Healthy Start

In an RCT reported by Bugental, Ellerson, Rainey, Lin, Kokotovic, and O'Hara (2002) new parents at risk of child abuse received a mean of 17 individual home visits from a paraprofessional. The intervention targeted child behaviour and parent-child relationships. The effectiveness of standard Healthy Start was compared to Enhanced Healthy Start (standard plus a cognitive appraisal component) and also compared to treatment as usual. Home visits lasted for 1 year and the final reported assessment was taken at this point. Results favoured the Enhanced version, with significantly less harsh parenting in this group compared to both the other conditions.

Bugental and Schwartz (2009) reported the results of an RCT for children under the age of 6 who were at medical risk. Healthy Start home visits were delivered to individual families for 17 sessions over the course of 1 year and targeted safety and physical wellbeing and parent-child relationships. At post intervention, participants in the Enhanced version fared significantly better than those in both treatment as usual and standard Healthy Start, on corporal punishment and home safety.

Intervention name (description where name not available)	Country	Intervention type	Population targeted	Outcomes targeted	Mode, setting, dose and intervener	Delivery	Content	Results Outcome with significant effect favouring intervention at post or number of months/years after post
Healthy Start	USA	Program	Newborns at high risk of child abuse Predominantly Native Hawaiian or Latin American	Parent-child relationships Family relationships System outcomes	Average of 13 home-based sessions delivered to individual parents by paraprofessionals	Population based screening for early identification of families with newborns at risk for child abuse and neglect Active, empathic listening Discussion Modelling Role-modelling Individual service plans Linked child with continual paediatric primary care Link families into needed services, housing, income, nutritional assistance, child care, and educational and vocational training	Resolving any immediate crises Problem solving skills Child health and development Promoting family use of prevention and early intervention services (referrals)	Less corporal or verbal punishment and neglectful parenting– post Fewer reports of physical assault, less partner violence, more use of non-violent discipline, greater efficacy – 2 year follow-up
			Families at risk of dysfunction	Family relationships	Average of 28 home-based sessions for individual parents delivered by a paraprofessional			Better social support – post

1.1 Healthy Start

<p>Study ID (first surname + year) Bair-Merritt 2010; McFarlane 2013; Duggan 2004a; Duggan 2004b; Duggan 2004c; El-Kamary 2004; Duggan 1999</p>	<p>Initials of person extracting data BD Date 10/05/2013</p>
<p>Full citation</p> <p>Bair-Merritt, M. H., Jennings, J. M., Chen, R., Burrell, L., McFarlane, E., Fuddy, L., & Duggan, A. K. (2010). Reducing Maternal Intimate Partner Violence After the Birth of a Child: A Randomized Controlled Trial of the Hawaii Healthy Start Home Visitation Program. <i>Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine</i>, 164(1), 16-23.</p> <p>McFarlane, E., Burrell, L., Crowne, S., Cluxton-Keller, F., Fuddy, L., Leaf, P. J., & Duggan, A. (2013). Maternal Relationship Security as a Moderator of Home Visiting Impacts on Maternal Psychosocial Functioning. <i>Prevention Science</i>, 14(1), 25-39.</p> <p>Duggan, A., Fuddy, L., Burrell, L., Higman, S. M., McFarlane, E., Windham, A., & Sia, C. (2004a). Randomised trial of a statewide home visiting program to prevent child abuse: Impact in reducing parental risk factors. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect</i>, 28(6), 623-643.</p> <p>Duggan, A., Fuddy, L., McFarlane, E., Burrell, L., Windham, A., & Sia, C. (2004b). Evaluating a statewide home visiting program to prevent child abuse in at-risk families of newborns: Fathers' participation and outcomes. <i>Child Maltreatment</i>, 9(1), 3-17.</p> <p>Duggan, A., McFarlane, E., Fuddy, L., Burrell, L., Higman, S. M., Windham, A., & Sia, C. (2004c). Randomised trial of a statewide home visiting program: Impact in preventing child abuse and neglect. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect</i>, 28(6), 597-622.</p> <p>El-Kamary, S. S., Higman, S. M., Fuddy, L., McFarlane, E., Sia, C., & Duggan, A. K. (2004). Hawaii's healthy start home visiting program: Determinants and impact of rapid repeat birth. <i>Pediatrics</i>, 114(3), e317-326.</p> <p>Duggan, A. K., McFarlane, E. C., Windham, A. M., Rohde, C. A., Salkever, D. S., Fuddy, L., Rosenberg, L. A., Buchbinder, S. B., Sia, C. C. J. (1999). <i>Evaluation of Hawaii's Healthy Start Program. Future of Children</i>, 9(1), 66-90.</p>	
<p>Papers cited/referenced in this paper that relate to this intervention but are not already included in the REA</p>	
<p>Was a cluster design used? If so, clustered by schools, communities, families etc.?</p> <p>No</p>	
<p>Country in which study was conducted</p> <p>USA</p>	

Inclusion criteria (what are the criteria for participant inclusion in the study)?

Children:

Parents:

Families of newborns identified as at risk of child abuse and:

(1) gave birth between November 1994 and December 1995 on Oahu; (2) had an English-speaking mother; (3) were not involved with Child Protective Services; and (4) had an infant who was at high risk for maltreatment - ≥ 25 on Family Stress Checklist

Exclusion criteria (what are the criteria for participant exclusion from the study)?

Children: Not indicated

Parents: Not indicated

Participant demographics (provide family/household/school etc. details if child/parent details not given)

		Intervention	Comparison
Number assigned	Children		
	Parents	N=373	N=270
Number – final analysis	Children		
	Parents	81% completed 3rd year interview	81% completed 3rd year interview
Age (mean, SD, range)	Children	Not indicated	Not indicated
	Parents	≤18 years n = 78 19-25 years n = 178 ≥26 years = 116 Mean = 24 years	≤18 years n = 65 19-25 years n = 121 ≥26 years = 84 Mean = 24 years
Sex	Children	Not indicated	Not indicated
	Parents	F = 100%	F = 100%
Education	Parents	High school graduate = 257	High school graduate = 174
Ethnicity/indigenous	Parents	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander n = 127 Asian or Filipino n = 103 White n = 39 No primary ethnicity or other n = 104	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander n = 88 Asian or Filipino n = 75 White n = 36 No primary ethnicity or other n = 71

	Children	Not indicated	Not indicated
Notes			
Vulnerability or maltreatment issues (Reason this child/parent/family is in this intervention? Select as many as applicable.)			
	Intervention	Comparison	
	Yes/no	Yes/no	
History of maltreatment (either parents as abusers or children were abused)			
At-risk of maltreatment (no description of reason)	Yes	Yes	
Vulnerable, troubled or fragile (use these phrases but no mention of maltreatment)			
Domestic, family or intimate partner violence			
Teen parent			
Low SES/disadvantaged			
Parental substance abuse			
Parent was maltreated as a child			
Parent has a physical disability			
Parent has learning disability/difficulty or intellectual disability			
Parent has a mental illness			
Child has a disability or additional needs			
Other (please list)			
Cannot tell			
<u>Intervention and comparison conditions</u>			
What type of approach was the <u>intervention</u>? (refer to definitions)			
Approach type			Yes/no
Program			Yes
Service model			
System of care			
What type of <u>comparison</u> condition was used?			
Comparison condition			Yes/no
No treatment (no further detail required)			
Treatment as usual/usual care			
Waitlist			

Alternate treatment		Yes
Brief description of each condition being compared		
Alternate treatment – other community resources		
Intervention delivery and dose (select as many as applicable)		
		Intervention Yes/no
At what level was it delivered?	Individual parents	Yes
	Individual parent-child dyads	
	Individual children	
	Individual families	
	Groups of parents	
	Groups of parent-child dyads	
	Groups of children	
	Groups of families	
	Household	
	School	
	Community/region	
	Cannot tell	
Setting of delivery	Home	Yes
	School	
	Clinic, medical or health	
	Community	
	Other	
	Cannot tell	
Outcome domains targeted	Child development	
	Child behaviour	
	Safety and physical wellbeing	
	Basic child care	
	Parent-child relationship	Yes
	Family relationship	Yes
	Systems outcomes	Yes
Dose	Number of sessions	Mean = 13

		<p>home visits</p> <p>12 or more visits = 45%</p> <p>Level 1 = weekly sessions</p> <p>Level 2 = bi-weekly sessions</p> <p>Level 3 = monthly</p> <p>Level 4 = quarterly</p> <p>Dose delivered - n = 84 had a high dose of service in their first year of enrolment, n = 55 in their second year, and n = 42 in their third year. There were 53 families with a high dose over all 3 years combined.</p> <p>Dose definitions –</p> <p>A family was classified as receiving a high dose of service for a given year if the family met three criteria: (1) active in the program at</p>
--	--	---

		<p>the end of the year; (2) had $\geq 75\%$ of expected visits; and (3) on Level X for ≤ 3 months.</p> <p>A family was considered to have a high dose of service for the full 3 years if they met similar criteria: (1) active in or graduated from the program at the end of the third year; (2) had $\geq 75\%$ of expected visits over the full period of enrolment; and (3) on Level X for ≤ 3 months total.</p>
	Duration of sessions	Not indicated
	Total duration of program	3-5 years
Person delivering	Was it a professional? (person with qualifications, for e.g., social worker, psychologist, nurse, teacher, youth worker)	No
	Was it a non-professional? (e.g., peer, paraprofessional, person that may be trained but does not have a qualification relevant to family support/education or child welfare etc.)	Yes
	Cannot tell	

Results

Blair-Merrit et al. 2010

<u>Outcomes</u> Outcome reported in results	<u>Measures</u> How measured	<u>Effect</u> : Post intervention results. Indicate if significant and the direction by using '+' or '-'.			<u>Follow-up</u> Longest point of follow up (i.e., 6 months; 1 year)
		<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Alternative</u>	
Av Incidence Rate of IPV Events per person/year Maternal victimisation	Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS)	<i>No difference</i>			7-9 years
Av Incidence Rate of IPV Events per person/year Maternal perpetration	Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS)	<i>No difference</i>			7-9 years

McFarlane et al. 2013

<u>Outcomes</u> Outcome reported in results	<u>Measures</u> How measured	<u>Effect</u> : Post intervention results. Indicate if significant and the direction by using '+' or '-'.			<u>Follow-up</u> Longest point of follow up (i.e., 6 months; 1 year)
		<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Alternative</u>	
<p>Home visited and control mothers had nearly identical distributions across relationship classifications as assessed by the Attachment Style Questionnaire</p> <p>For both the early childhood and grade school samples, HSP and control groups were comparable at baseline on most demographic variables</p> <p>There were no significant overall impacts on any of the parenting outcomes when children were 7 to 9 years old</p>					

Duggan et al. 2004a					
<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Measures</u>	<u>Effect</u> : Post intervention results. Indicate if significant and the direction by using '+' or '-'			<u>Follow-up</u>
Outcome reported in results	How measured				Longest point of follow up (i.e., 6 months; 1 year)
		<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Alternative</u>	
This paper reported no effect significant effects for the intervention on any of the malleable parental risk factors for child abuse assessed (AT 3 YEARS)					
Duggan et al. 2004b					
<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Measures</u>	<u>Effect</u> : Post intervention results. Indicate if significant and the direction by using '+' or '-'			<u>Follow-up</u>
Outcome reported in results	How measured				Longest point of follow up (i.e., 6 months; 1 year)
		<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Alternative</u>	
Mother's satisfaction with father's role	Mother's rating of satisfaction	+ MORE likely to be satisfied with accessibility and engagement in child care		In non-violent fathers only	3 years
Mother's satisfaction with father's role	Mother's rating of satisfaction	- LESS likely to be satisfied with accessibility		In violent fathers only	3 years
For families overall, there was no apparent program impact on fathers' accessibility, engagement, or sharing of responsibility as measured by maternal report					

Duggan et al. 2004c					
<u>Outcomes</u> Outcome reported in results	<u>Measures</u> How measured	<u>Effect</u> : Post intervention results. Indicate if significant and the direction by using '+' or '-'.			<u>Follow-up</u> Longest point of follow up (i.e., 6 months; 1 year)
		<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Alternative</u>	
Common corporal/verbal punishment		+ (less compared to control)			1-3 years (longitudinal)
Neglectful parenting behaviour in past year	Conflict Tactics Scale (Revised neglect category)	+ (less compared to control)			1-3 years (longitudinal)
El-Kamary et al. 2004					
<u>Outcomes</u> Outcome reported in results	<u>Measures</u> How measured	<u>Effect</u> : Post intervention results. Indicate if significant and the direction by using '+' or '-'.			<u>Follow-up</u> Longest point of follow up (i.e., 6 months; 1 year)
		<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Alternative</u>	
Rapid repeat birth (Main outcome in paper)	Maternal self-report	<i>There was no program impact on RRB for mothers overall, after adjustment for the significant baseline differences in demographic variables</i>			3 years
Duggan et al. 1999					
<u>Outcomes</u> Outcome reported in results	<u>Measures</u> How measured	<u>Effect</u> : Post intervention results. Indicate if significant and the direction by using '+' or '-'.		<u>Follow-up</u> Longest point of follow up (i.e., 6 months; 1 year)	
		<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Control</u>		
Has a primary carer	Rates	+ (more mothers			Year 2 follow up

who knows family's concerns about child	provider's level of knowledge as indicated by mothers during interview	agreed with this) compared to control		
Any incidence of physical assault	Conflict Tactics Scales	+ (fewer report) compared to control IN ONE AGENCY ONLY		Year 2 follow up
Partner violence resulting in injury	Conflict Tactics Scales	+ (fewer reports of violence) compared to control		Year 2 follow up
Frequent use of non-violent discipline	Conflict Tactics Scale	+ (more common) compared to control		Year 2 follow up
Parenting efficacy	Parenting Sense of Competence Scale	+ (greater) compared to control		Year 2 follow up

Study ID (first surname + year) McCurdy 2001	Initials of person extracting data BD Date 10/05/2013
Full citation McCurdy, K. (2001). Can home visitation enhance maternal social support? <i>American Journal of Community Psychology</i> , 29, 97-112.	
Papers cited/referenced in this paper that relate to this intervention but are not already included in the REA	
Was a cluster design used? If so, clustered by schools, communities, families etc.? No	
Country in which study was conducted USA	
Inclusion criteria (what are the criteria for participant inclusion in the study)? Children: Parents: Families at risk of parental dysfunction based on a review of hospital records. Families	

with a mother or father with a score ≥ 25 on the family stress index

Exclusion criteria (what are the criteria for participant exclusion from the study)?

Children:

Parents:

Participant demographics (provide family/household/school etc. details if child/parent details not given)

		Intervention	Comparison
Number assigned	Children		
	Parents	N=108	N=104
Age (mean, SD, range)	Children		
	Parents	Mean f = 23.2 years Mean m = 27.2 years	Mean f = 23.8 years Mean m = 26.8 years
Sex	Children		
	Parents	Not indicated	Not indicated
Education	Parents	No High school diploma = 35 High school diploma = 49 More than high school = 15 Unknown = 1	No High school diploma = 21 High school diploma = 55 More than high school = 24 Unknown = 0
Ethnicity/indigenous	Parents	Caucasian = 15 Filipina = 24 Hawaiian = 26 Japanese = 6 Puerto Rican/Hispanic = 6 Samoan = 9 Other = 15	Caucasian = 12 Filipina = 29 Hawaiian = 31 Japanese = 7 Puerto Rican/Hispanic = 4 Samoan = 4 Other = 14
	Children		

Notes

Vulnerability or maltreatment issues (Reason this child/parent/family is in this intervention? Select as many as applicable.)

	Intervention Yes/no	Comparison Yes/no
History of maltreatment (either parents as abusers or children were abused)		
At-risk of maltreatment (no description of reason)		
Vulnerable, troubled or fragile (use these phrases but no mention of maltreatment)		
Domestic, family or intimate partner violence		
Teen parent		
Low SES/disadvantaged	Yes	Yes
Parental substance abuse		
Parent was maltreated as a child		
Parent has a physical disability		
Parent has learning disability/difficultly or intellectual disability		
Parent has a mental illness		
Child has a disability or additional needs		
Other (please list)		
Cannot tell		

Intervention and comparison conditions

What type of approach was the intervention? (refer to definitions)

Approach type	Yes/no
Program	Yes
Service model	
System of care	

What type of comparison condition was used?

Comparison condition	Yes/no
No treatment (no further detail required)	
Treatment as usual/usual care	Yes
Waitlist	
Alternate treatment	

Brief description of each condition being compared

Comparison group – Usual care. Referral services were provided as necessary.

Intervention delivery and dose (select as many as applicable)

		Intervention Yes/no
At what level was it delivered?	Individual parents	Yes
	Individual parent-child dyads	
	Individual children	
	Individual families	
	Groups of parents	
	Groups of parent-child dyads	
	Groups of children	
	Groups of families	
	Household	
	School	
	Community/region	
	Cannot tell	
Setting of delivery	Home	Yes
	School	
	Clinic, medical or health	
	Community	
	Other	
	Cannot tell	
Outcome domains targeted	Child development	
	Child behaviour	
	Safety and physical wellbeing	
	Basic child care	
	Parent-child relationship	
	Family relationship	Yes
	Systems outcomes	
Dose	Number of sessions	Mean delivered = 28, range = 1-55
	Duration of sessions	Not indicated

	Total duration of program	1 year
Person delivering	Was it a professional? (person with qualifications, for e.g., social worker, psychologist, nurse, teacher, youth worker)	
	Was it a non-professional? (e.g., peer, paraprofessional, person that may be trained but does not have a qualification relevant to family support/education or child welfare etc.)	paraprofessionals
	Cannot tell	

Results

<u>Outcomes</u> Outcome reported in results	<u>Measures</u> How measured	<u>Effect</u> : Post intervention results. Indicate if significant and the direction by using '+' or '-'.			<u>Follow-up</u> Longest point of follow up (i.e., 6 months; 1 year)
		<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Alternative</u>	
Satisfaction with an adult other than a partner	Maternal social support Index	+ (Greater satisfaction)			12 months

Although they looked at all kind of supports, the satisfaction with an adult other than the partner was the only one that was significantly different. Overall the hypothesis that home visiting would significantly enhance social support was not supported with these data.

This study didn't report on effects of the intervention on neglect.

1.2 Enhanced Healthy Start

Study ID (first surname + year) Bugental et al. 2002		Initials of person extracting data BD		
Date 03/05/2013				
Full citation Bugental, D. B., Ellerson, P. C., Rainey, B., Lin, E. K., Kokotovic, A., & O'Hara, N. (2002). A cognitive approach to child abuse prevention. <i>Journal of Family Psychology</i> , 16(3), 243-258				
Papers cited/referenced in this paper that relate to this intervention but are not already included in the REA				
Was a cluster design used? If so, clustered by schools, communities, families etc? No				
Country in which study was conducted USA				
Inclusion criteria (what are the criteria for participant inclusion in the study)? Children: Parents: All families expecting the birth of a child (or having recently given birth to a child) who were identified as at moderate risk to become abusive were eligible to participate.				
Exclusion criteria (what are the criteria for participant exclusion from the study)? Children: Parents:				
Participant demographics (provide family/household/school etc. details if child/parent details not given)				
		Intervention	Comparison 1	Control
Number assigned	Children			
	Parents	96 Families (across all three conditions)	96 Families	96 Families
Age (mean, SD, range)	Children			
	Parents	26.49 years	25.02 years	23.74 years

		(mothers)	(mothers)	(mothers)
Sex	Children	F = 41%	F = 47%	F = 66%
	Parents	F = 100% (father present = 50%)	F = 100% % (father present = 61%)	F = 100% % (father present = 44%)
Education	Parents	Mean = 8 years	Mean = 7.5 years	Mean = 7.5 years
Ethnicity/indigenous	Parents	97% Latino	97% Latino	97% Latino
	Children			
Note - 96 families were recruited and divided into the three groups (specific group numbers not given). Program was completed by 73 families (76%). Although fathers were involved statistics only included mothers.				

Vulnerability or maltreatment issues (Reason this child/parent/family is in this intervention? Select as many as applicable.)

	Intervention Yes/no	Comparison Yes/no
History of maltreatment (either parents as abusers or children were abused)		
At-risk of maltreatment (no description of reason)		
Vulnerable, troubled or fragile (use these phrases but no mention of maltreatment)		
Domestic, family or intimate partner violence		
Teen parent		
Low SES/disadvantaged		
Parental substance abuse		
Parent was maltreated as a child	Yes (50% of intervention sample had been abused)	
Parent has a physical disability		
Parent has learning disability/difficultly or intellectual disability		
Parent has a mental illness		
Child has a disability or additional needs		
Other (please list)	Identified as at risk by a moderate score on the Family	

	Stress Checklist. (This includes many items including past abuse, unemployment, crises, substance abuse.)	
Cannot tell		

Intervention and comparison conditions

What type of approach was the intervention? (refer to definitions)

Approach type	Yes/no
Program	Yes
Service model	
System of care	

What type of comparison condition was used?

Comparison condition	Yes/no
No treatment (no further detail required)	Yes (Comparison group 2)
Treatment as usual/usual care	
Waitlist	
Alternate treatment	Yes (Comparison group 1)

Brief description of each condition being compared

Comparison group 1 - Parents in the unenhanced home visitation condition received home visitation consistent with the Healthy Start program, supplemented with information regarding existing services available in the community

Comparison group 2- Parents in the control condition received no direct services but were provided information regarding existing services available in the community

(Note – intervention received home visitation plus an extra cognitive based appraisal component)

Intervention delivery and dose (select as many as applicable)		
		Intervention Yes/no
At what level was it delivered?	Individual parents	
	Individual parent-child dyads	
	Individual children	
	Individual families	Yes
	Groups of parents	
	Groups of parent-child dyads	
	Groups of children	
	Groups of families	
	Household	
	School	
	Community/region	
	Cannot tell	
Setting of delivery	Home	Yes
	School	
	Clinic, medical or health	
	Community	
	Other	
	Cannot tell	
Outcome domains targeted	Child development	
	Child behaviour	Yes
	Safety and physical wellbeing	
	Basic child care	
	Parent-child relationship	Yes
	Family relationship	
	Systems outcomes	
Dose	Number of sessions	20 , mean delivered = 17
	Duration of sessions	Not indicated
	Total duration of program	1 year
Person delivering	Was it a professional? (person with qualifications, for e.g., social worker, psychologist, nurse, teacher,	No

	youth worker)	
	Was it a non-professional? (e.g., peer, paraprofessional, person that may be trained but does not have a qualification relevant to family support/education or child welfare etc.)	Paraprofessional
	Cannot tell	

Results

<u>Outcomes</u> Outcome reported in results	<u>Measures</u> How measured	<u>Effect</u> : Post intervention results. Indicate if significant and the direction by using '+' or '-'.			<u>Follow-up</u> Longest point of follow up (i.e., 6 months; 1 year)
		<u>Treatment 1</u> (Healthy Start)	<u>Treatment 2</u> (Enhanced Health Start)	<u>Control</u>	
Frequency of Harsh Parenting	Conflict Tactics Scale		+ (Less harsh parenting than Treatment 1 and Control)		1 YEAR
Prevalence of Harsh Parenting	Conflict Tactics Scale		+ (Less harsh parenting than Treatment 1 and Control)		1 YEAR

Study ID (first surname + year) Bugental et al. 2009		Initials of person extracting data BD Date 3/05/2013	
Full citation Bugental, D. B., & Schwartz, A. (2009). A Cognitive Approach to Child Mistreatment Prevention Among Medically At-Risk Infants. <i>Developmental Psychology</i> , 45(1), 284-288.			
Papers cited/referenced in this paper that relate to this intervention but are not already included in the REA			
Was a cluster design used? If so, clustered by schools, communities, families etc.? No			
Country in which study was conducted USA			
Inclusion criteria (what are the criteria for participant inclusion in the study)? Children: Child referral (by obstetricians and paediatricians) was based on the presence of a medical risk factor; 48 were referred primarily on the basis of preterm status (less than 36 weeks gestational age), 59 referred primarily on the basis of a medical problem (e.g., respiratory problems, cardiac problems), and 40 referred primarily for other reasons (e.g., cesarean delivery). Parental risk (e.g., poverty or history of abuse) was not considered in the referral. Families were eligible for inclusion for children up to 6 months of age. Parents:			
Exclusion criteria (what are the criteria for participant exclusion from the study)? Children: Parents:			
Participant demographics (Provide family/household/school etc. details if child/parent details not given)			
		Intervention	Comparison
Number assigned	Children		
	Parents	N = 51 (45 completed program)	N = 59 (57 completed program)
Age (mean, SD, range)	Children		
	Parents	Mean = 27.1 years	Mean = 27.3 years
Sex	Children	F=43%	F=41%

	Parents	F=100%	F=100%
Education	Parents	F = 10.2 years	F = 9.5 years
Ethnicity/indigenous	Parents	83% Latino	91% Latino
	Children		
Notes			

Vulnerability or maltreatment issues (Reason this child/parent/family is in this intervention? Select as many as applicable.)

	Intervention Yes/no	Comparison Yes/no
History of maltreatment (either parents as abusers or children were abused)		
At-risk of maltreatment (no description of reason)		
Vulnerable, troubled or fragile (use these phrases but no mention of maltreatment)		
Domestic, family or intimate partner violence		
Teen parent		
Low SES/disadvantaged		
Parental substance abuse		
Parent was maltreated as a child		
Parent has a physical disability		
Parent has learning disability/difficulty or intellectual disability		
Parent has a mental illness		
Child has a disability or additional needs		
Other (please list)	Preterm babies (<36 weeks), babies with medical problems eg respiratory/cardiac, other reason (eg caeserian).	
Cannot tell		

Intervention and comparison conditions

What type of approach was the intervention? (refer to definitions)

Approach type	Yes/no
Program	Yes
Service model	
System of care	

What type of comparison condition was used?

Comparison condition	Yes/no
No treatment (no further detail required)	
Treatment as usual/usual care	
Waitlist	
Alternate treatment	Yes

Brief description of each condition being compared

Control group received Health Start home visitation. (Note – intervention received this plus a cognitively based extension.)

Intervention delivery and dose (select as many as applicable)

		Intervention Yes/no
At what level was it delivered?	Individual parents	Yes
	Individual parent-child dyads	
	Individual children	
	Individual families	
	Groups of parents	
	Groups of parent-child dyads	
	Groups of children	
	Groups of families	
	Household	
	School	
	Community/region	
	Cannot tell	
Setting of delivery	Home	Yes
	School	

	Clinic, medical or health	
	Community	
	Other	
	Cannot tell	
Outcome domains targeted	Child development	
	Child behaviour	
	Safety and physical wellbeing	Yes
	Basic child care	
	Parent-child relationship	Yes
	Family relationship	
	Systems outcomes	
Dose	Number of sessions	17
	Duration of sessions	Not indicated
	Total duration of program	1 year
Person delivering	Was it a professional? (person with qualifications, for e.g., social worker, psychologist, nurse, teacher, youth worker)	Not indicated
	Was it a non-professional? (e.g., peer, paraprofessional, person that may be trained but does not have a qualification relevant to family support/education or child welfare etc.)	
	Cannot tell	

Results

<u>Outcomes</u> Outcome reported in results	<u>Measures</u> How measured	<u>Effect</u> : Post intervention results. Indicate if significant and the direction by using '+' or '-':			<u>Follow-up</u> Longest point of follow up (i.e., 6 months; 1 year)
		Treatment 1 (Healthy Start)	Treatment 2 (Enhanced Health Start)	Control	
Corporal punishment	Conflict Tactics Scale		+ Lower use of punishment (ANOVA)		1 YEAR

Safety maintenance in the home	Framingham Safety Survey		+ Greater safety (ANOVA)		1 YEAR
	Child Injury Survey		+ Fewer injuries (ANOVA)		

References

- Bair-Merritt, M. H., Jennings, J. M., Chen, R., Burrell, L., McFarlane, E., Fuddy, L., & Duggan, A. K. (2010). Reducing maternal intimate partner violence after the birth of a child: A randomized controlled trial of the Hawaii Healthy Start Home Visitation Program. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 164(1), 16-23. doi:10.1001/archpediatrics.2009.237.
- Bugental, D. B., & Schwartz, A. (2009). A cognitive approach to child mistreatment prevention among medically at-risk infants. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(1), 284. doi: 10.1037/a0014031
- Bugental, D. B., Ellerson, P. C., Rainey, B., Lin, E. K., Kokotovic, A., & O'Hara, N. (2002). A cognitive approach to child abuse prevention. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 16(3), 243-258.
- Duggan, A. K., McFarlane, E. C., Windham, A. M., Rohde, C. A., Salkever, D. S., Fuddy, L., Rosenberg, L. A., Buchbinder, S. B., & Sia, C. C. J. (1999). Evaluation of Hawaii's Healthy Start Program. *Future of Children*, 9(1), 66-90.
- Duggan, A., Fuddy, L., Burrell, L., Higman, S. M., McFarlane, E., Windham, A., & Sia, C. (2004a). Randomized trial of a statewide home visiting program to prevent child abuse: impact in reducing parental risk factors. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 28(6), 623-643.
- Duggan, A., Fuddy, L., McFarlane, E., Burrell, L., Windham, A., & Sia, C. (2004b). Evaluating a statewide home visiting program to prevent child abuse in at-risk families of newborns: Fathers' participation and outcomes. *Child Maltreatment*, 9(1), 3-17. doi: 10.1177/10775595503261336
- Duggan, A., McFarlane, E., Fuddy, L., Burrell, L., Higman, S. M., Windham, A., & Sia, C. (2004c). Randomised trial of a statewide home visiting program: Impact in preventing child abuse and neglect. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 28(6), 597-622.
- El-Kamary, S. S., Higman, S. M., Fuddy, L., McFarlane, E., Sia, C., & Duggan, A. K. (2004). Hawaii's healthy start home visiting program: Determinants and impact of rapid repeat birth. *Pediatrics*, 114(3), e317-326. doi: 10.1542/peds.2004-0618
- McCurdy, K. (2001). Can home visitation enhance maternal social support? *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 29(1), 97-112. doi: 10.1023/A:1005201530070\
- McFarlane, E., Burrell, L., Crowne, S., Cluxton-Keller, F., Fuddy, L., Leaf, P. J., & Duggan, A. (2013). Maternal relationship security as a moderator of home visiting impacts on maternal psychosocial functioning. *Prevention Science*, 14(1), 25-39. DOI 10.1007/s11121-012-0297-y

Parenting Research Centre
Level 5, 232 Victoria Parade
East Melbourne, Victoria, Australia 3002
E info@parentingrc.org.au
P +61 3 8660 3500
F +61 3 8660 3599
www.parentingrc.org.au