Group-based parenting program to improve parenting and children’s behavioral problems in families using special services: A randomized controlled trial in a real-life setting
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ABSTRACT

This randomized controlled trial (RCT) evaluated the effectiveness of the Incredible Years® (IY) Parenting Program in modifying children's behavioral problems, parenting practices and parents' psychological well-being among families under child protection and using other special support services. Participants in the study were 3–7-year-old children with behavioral problems (n = 102, intervention group n = 50, control group n = 52) and their parents (n = 122). The results show that parent-reported child problem behavior as well as clinical levels of behavioral problems decreased to a greater extent in the intervention group than in the control group. The intervention also increased positive parenting practices. Changes in parental stress or parents' psychological well-being in the intervention did not differ from those in the control group over time. The results suggest some promising evidence that the IY parenting intervention may be effective in the context of child protection and other family support services in real-life conditions.

1. Introduction

Children’s behavioral problems are common, especially among families using child protection services. A recent international systematic review (Bronsard et al., 2016) reported that the prevalence of conduct disorders dealt with by child welfare services is as high as 20%, whereas in the normative population it is 5.7% (Canino, Polanczyk, Bauermeister, Rohde, & Frick, 2010). If not intervened effectively, behavioral problems may turn into conduct disorders that are difficult to treat. These problems add substantial burdens to families who already struggle with many issues, and in the worst case will lead to children being taken into custody.

Children’s problem behavior causes a considerable burden on the children themselves, their schools, and their families. Behavioral problems in childhood predict poor physical health, antisocial behavior, criminal and violent offences, education, work-related and financial difficulties, substance abuse, and mental disorders in adulthood (Rutter et al., 2010). When behavioral problems develop into conduct disorders, they can be extremely costly. By the time an individual with a conduct disorder reaches 28 years, they may cost public services, i.e. criminal justice, education, health, fostering, and residential care, and benefit services, 10 times more than those with no problems and 3.5 times more than those with only behavioral problems (Scott, Knapp, Henderson, & Maughan, 2001).

In recent years, several high-quality systematic reviews and meta-analyses have suggested that structured parenting programs based on social learning and cognitive-behavioral and attachment theories are effective in reducing children’s behavioral problems and symptoms of conduct disorder (Barth & Liggett-Crel, 2014; Dretzke et al., 2005; Furlong et al., 2012; Gardner & Leijten, 2017; Gardner, Montgomery, & Knerr, 2016; Karjalainen, Santalahti, & Sihvo, 2016; Menting, Orobio De Castro, & Matthys, 2013; Moran, Ghaite, & Merwe, 2004; NICE, 2014). However, high quality studies of these programs in families using child protection services (CPS) are scarce, and present somewhat contradictory results (Barlow, Johnston, Kendrick, Polnay, & Stewart-Brown, 2006; Montgomery, Gardner, Ramchandani, & Bjornstad, 2009).

The most recent meta-analysis of parenting programs for child
maltreatment prevention (Chen & Chan, 2016) revealed that these programs are an effective intervention for preventing child maltreatment. Also two meta-analyses of parent training interventions in families with child physical abuse and neglect show some encouraging evidence that structured group-based parenting programs can be effective in reducing the risk factors associated with physically abusive parenting (Barlow et al., 2006), and that the programs use promising approaches in handling maltreated children and their problem behavior (Montgomery et al., 2009).

Trials in the child welfare context that were not included in these meta-analysis showed that these programs reduced child problem behavior (Hurlburt, Nguyenb, Reid, Webster-Stratton, & Zhang, 2013; Kjellgren, Svedin, & Nilsson, 2013; Kleve et al., 2010; Letarte, Normandeau, & Allard, 2010; Zhou et al., 2017), increased positive parenting practices (Zhou et al., 2017), reduced harsh discipline (Kjellgren et al., 2013; Letarte et al., 2010) and physical punishment (Letarte et al., 2010), and reduced parental depression (Kjellgren et al., 2013) and stress and distress (Marcynyszyn, Maher, & Corwin, 2011). Moreover, in the same study, parents’ perception of their child being difficult decreased (Marcynyszyn et al., 2011).

Four of these child welfare-related studies (Hurlburt et al., 2013; Kleve et al., 2010; Letarte et al., 2010; Marcynyszyn et al., 2011) used the Incredible Years® (IY) Parenting Program, which is based on social learning theory (Webster-Stratton, 2011). It has been widely researched in different cultures, countries, and settings and has shown consistent reduction of child behavioral problems (Buchanan-Pascall, Gray, Gordon, & Melvin, 2018; Furlong et al., 2012; Gardner et al., 2016; Gardner & Leijten, 2017; Leijten et al., 2018; Menting et al., 2013; NICE, 2006). Letarte et al. (2010) and Marcynyszyn et al. (2011) studied the IY Parenting Program in the child welfare setting, and Letarte et al. (2010) more specifically in child protection services. Marcynyszyn et al.’s (2011) study focused on negative parenting behaviors and stress, both of which decreased after the intervention. Letarte et al.’s (2010) study showed a reduction in child problem behavior, as did Kleve et al. (2010) among families with social service contacts. Hurlburt et al.’s (2013) study of families’ self-reporting histories of child maltreatment also found a reduction in negative parenting. However, these previous studies had some major limitations. Two of them had no control group (Kleve et al., 2010; Marcynyszyn et al., 2011), and none used a randomized controlled design.

This type of program can be expected to affect outcomes such as child behavioral problems, negative parenting practices, parental stress, and parents’ psychological well-being since the program was designed to specifically modify child behavior and parenting practices (Webster-Stratton, 2011). A meta-analytic review of components associated with parent training program effectiveness (Kaminski, Valle, Filene, & Boyle, 2008) reported that components found in the IY Parenting Program are the ones consistently associated with larger effects on parenting behaviors and children’s externalizing behavior. Those components include increasing positive parent-child interactions and emotional communication skills, teaching parents to use time-out, and highlighting the importance of consistency in parenting and practicing new skills at home with their children. The same kinds of components (theory-based child rearing practices, family communication and interaction, regulating emotions) were also found in a recent study conducted by Temchaff, Letarte, Boutin, and Marcil (2018), which examined common components of evidence-based parenting programs for preventing maltreatment. The study also noted that long duration of the program improves effectiveness, as does the program having an explanatory manual, high educational level of practitioners delivering the program (Bachelors or Master’s degree), practitioner training, and fidelity evaluation. Moreover, a review of Core Implementation Components by Fixsen, Blase, Naoom, and Wallace (2009) suggested that if certain implementation components are in place (e.g. staff selection, in-service training, coaching, staff evaluation), the effectiveness of the intervention is likely to improve.

Since there is a lack of high-quality studies and therefore only limited evidence of the effectiveness of parent training programs among the most vulnerable children and families in real-life settings, this issue must be further explored. The aim of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of the Incredible IY Program in modifying children’s behavioral problems, parenting practices, and parents’ psychological well-being in families in child protection and other family support services in Finland.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study design

This randomized controlled trial (RCT) was conducted in seven municipalities across Finland, representatives of which were invited to participate due to their experience and knowledge of the IY parent training intervention (Webster-Stratton, 2011). Data were collected at baseline (T0), before randomization, and after the intervention (T1), and will also be collected 12 months after the intervention from the same participants. The intervention was the IY Preschool BASIC Parenting Program, with 19–20 parent group meetings and four additional home visits. The intervention was delivered in local family counselling centers, in collaboration with child protection services.

2.2. Ethics approval

The study was approved by the Intermunicipal Hospital District of Helsinki-Uusimaa Ethics Committee in February 2016, and the trial is registered in the ClinicalTrials.gov registry (NCT03239990).

2.3. Participants

The participants were 3–7-year-old children (N = 102) with behavioral problems and their parents, from seven municipalities in Finland. Families were currently clients of child protection services (CPS) (N = 72; of these 10 in preventive CPS) or clients of social services indicated to need support in parenting (N = 21 family counselling centers, N = 9 other).

In Finland, CPS include preventive CPS (e.g. strengthened in-home family help, family counselling, and parenting groups), non-institutional care (child living at home), and institutional care (emergency placement of the child or child living e.g. in foster home or children’s home). Of the families within CPS we included only families who received preventive CPS and non-institutional care in this study.

2.4. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The inclusion criteria for the participants were as follows: a) the child was aged between three and seven years when entering the study, b) the child lived at home, c) the child had behavioral problems, d) social and family workers had assessed that the parents may benefit from parenting support, and e) the parents were motivated and able to attend the intervention.

Children were excluded from the study if an acute child protection issue was unresolved (child’s basic needs and safety not met) or if the parents had a mental health or substance abuse problem that prevented them from attending the intervention.

2.5. Control group

The control group received services to which they were entitled, except for the IY Parenting Program, and were able to access the next available parent group in the community.

Fig. 1 presents the participant flowchart.
2.6. Procedure

The study was conducted from September 2015 to June 2017. The intervention groups began in fall 2016 or winter 2017.

The initial negotiations for participation in the study were conducted in 11 municipalities throughout Finland. The municipalities were chosen on the basis of their earlier experience in delivering the intervention or because they had workers who had been trained to deliver the intervention. The aim was to recruit 24 families from each municipality. One municipality left the study at an early stage. Just before the start of recruitment of families, another municipality withdrew due to personnel cut-backs. Two cities declined because they were unable to find enough eligible participants for the study. In the end, seven municipalities, mainly from southern Finland, took part. The number of families participating in the study ranged from 8 to 18 per municipality. One IY Parent Group was organized in each participating city for the research.

The families were recruited for the study through the existing service systems, including child protection services, community-based family guidance centers, daycares, and schools. The researchers had informed the local employees of the research, the intervention, and the procedures.

The workers from different agencies in these municipalities chose families who were eligible for the study from among their clients. They informed these families of the study and the intervention, and gave them an information letter regarding the program and the aims of the study. They also asked the parents to sign a written informed consent and scheduled a time for the first round of data collection. The parents were informed of the voluntary nature of participation in the data collection, and of the option to withdraw from the study at any point.

Baseline assessments were conducted during three months prior to the intervention. The parents were randomized into intervention and control groups after this assessment. After randomization, the IY group leaders contacted the parents in the intervention group and met with them to fully explain the intervention. The researchers contacted the parents of the control group, reminding them of their right to access all the other services, the support to which they were entitled, and the possibility to participate in the next possible IY group organized in their area. The post-assessments were conducted within three months after the intervention.

For their participation in the study, the participants received after both the baseline assessment and the post-assessment a gift certificate to a swimming pool, cinema, or activity park.

2.7. Intervention

Participants attended the manualized IY Preschool BASIC Parenting Program (Webster-Stratton, 2011), which consisted of 19–20 group meetings supported by four additional, structured home visits, not usually included in the program. While the program is usually 14–16 sessions, in this longer version more time is used in building positive relationships between children and parents. In the present study we decided to use this longer version, since the parents and children were from high-risk population likely to benefit especially from the extra sessions focusing on positive relation building.

The goal of the intervention was to enhance and support parenting
skills, increase knowledge of child development, and improve children’s positive behavior and parent-child interaction. Parents are taught to use more positive, consistent strategies for reducing child misbehavior by watching DVDs, rehearsing, and having group discussions in a highly collaborative and interactive way. The goal of the home visits is to enhance IY group learning and provide additional vignettes and practice exercises at home on an individual basis. The visits were conducted in accordance with the IY Home Coaching Program.

The groups consisted of 10–12 parents who met weekly for about two hours at a time. Since in one city the number of participants would have been too low ($N = 4$), also parents from outside of this study were allowed to participate. Four 1- to 1.5-h home visits were added to the program to help parents practice new skills and to provide individual practical consultation. Home visits occurred approximately every four weeks. Weekly phone calls were also made to the parents to further support learning, as part of the normal procedure of the program.

Each group had three trained group leaders, two of whom were from family counselling services and the third was a family worker from CPS, who also conducted the family visits. All had undergone IY BASIC Group Leader and IY Home Coach training.

### 2.8. Program fidelity

The group leaders followed the structured manual and filled out self-evaluations and checklists after each group meeting to keep records of the activities of each session and to ensure that the key activities and concepts were covered. Evaluations from the parents after each group meeting were also gathered.

The group leaders received supervision and reviewed the video tapes of their group sessions with a certified IY peer coach on average every three weeks throughout the intervention. They also attended one full-day coaching session run by a certified IY trainer.

Some of the group leaders were highly experienced in leading IY parent groups, but others were leading these groups for the first time. Only one group leader was a certified IY Group Leader.

### 2.9. Program attendance

Of the 62 parents allocated to the intervention, 60 participated: for 36 children, only the mother, for 11 children, both the mother and father ($N = 22$); and in two cases, only the father. Of the participated parents, 84% attended nine or more of the 19 sessions, while 40% attended 15 sessions or more. The overall mean attendance was 12.9 sessions (SD 4.5).

### 2.10. Measures

The Family Basic Demographic questions included background information on the children, the mothers and fathers (age, marital status, education), and their family circumstances, i.e. unemployment, financial worries and major incidents affecting the family.

#### 2.10.1. Child behavior measures

We used the Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory (ECBI) to measure child problem behavior (Eyberg & Pincus, 1999). The ECBI is a widely used parent rating scale that assesses behavioral problems among children aged 2–16 years; it has good validity and reliability (Eyberg & Pincus, 1999). It consists of two scales, the Intensity Scale and the Problem scale, which elicit parents’ perceptions of 36 problem behaviors. The Intensity Scale consists of a seven-point Likert-type scale (never to always) that measures the frequency of the problem behaviors, while the Problem scale measures whether or not the parent sees the particular behavior as a problem, by eliciting a yes-no answer. Internal consistency (alpha) of the 36 items was 0.91 and 0.87 for the Intensity Scale and the Problem scale, respectively.

The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) – Parent Report Form was used to measure disruptive behavior (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2000). The CBCL is a widely used age-normed measure with good reliability and validity (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2000). It consists of 99 emotional and behavioral statements rated by parents. In this study, we used the CBCL’s 25-item Externalizing Subscale and its subscales of Attention Problems (five items) and Aggressive Behavior (20 items) for 1.5–5-year-old children. The items are rated on a three-point Likert-type scale (not true to very true/often true). Internal consistency for the 25-item Externalising Scale was 0.89.

#### 2.10.2. Parenting measures

We used the Parent Practices Interview (PPI) parent-rated questionnaire to assess the disciplinary style of the parent or caregiver (Webster-Stratton, Reid, & Hammond, 2004). This PPI comprises seven subscales: Appropriate Discipline, Inappropriate Discipline, Positive Verbal Discipline, Monitoring, Physical Punishment, Praise and Incentives, and Clear Expectations, and is rated on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (always). The PPI has not been validated in a Finnish sample and the measure was translated from English to Finnish for the purposes of this study. After careful inspection of each scale and its items (inter-item and item-total correlations and the internal consistencies of the scales) we made some modifications to the scales. In this study, we used the Appropriate (12 items, baseline Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.79$), Inappropriate (nine items, $\alpha = 0.75$), Harsh (six items, $\alpha = 0.78$), Inconsistent Discipline (12 items, $\alpha = 0.83$), Praise (seven items, $\alpha = 0.66$) and Incentives (eight items $\alpha = 0.63$) scales. We abandoned the Monitoring (nine items, $\alpha = 0.57$) and Clear expectations (three items, $\alpha = 0.55$) scales due to low reliability. The Physical punishment scale (six items) was excluded from the analysis due to lack of variance. These reliabilities are comparable with other international studies, reporting alphas for the subscales (e.g. harsh, inconsistent discipline and positive parenting) ranging from $\alpha = 0.66$ to 0.79 (Enebrink, Högström, Forster, & Ghadiri, 2012; Webster-Stratton et al., 2004; Webster-Stratton, Reid, & Hammond, 2001).

The Parenting Stress Index – Short Form (PSI-SF-4) is a 36-item questionnaire (Abidin, 2012) that consists of three subscales: Parental Distress, Dysfunctional Parent-Child Interactions, and Difficult Child, each with 12 items. The Total Stress Score is also calculated. Each item is rated by parents on a five-point scale and higher scores on this scale reflect greater difficulty. The PSI-SF provides clinical cut-offs for each scale. The PSI-SF was translated into Finnish for this study. The scale has good validity and reliability (Abidin, 2012). Internal consistency of the Total Stress Score in this study was good ($\alpha = 0.89$).

#### 2.10.3. Parent psychological well-being measures

The General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12) is a self-administered questionnaire for identifying minor psychiatric disturbances in the general population. It focuses on the inability to carry out normal functions and the appearance of new and distressing phenomena. It assesses the respondent’s current state and elicits whether it differs from their usual state. The GHQ-12 version is widely used and has shown to have good psychometric properties (Goldberg et al., 1997).

We used the short version of the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (SWEMWBS) to evaluate the mental well-being of parents. The WEMWBS is validated for use in populations aged 13+ years. The short version of the measure consists of seven items rated on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from never to all the time. The items are stated in a positive way. (Stewart-Brown et al., 2009).

#### 2.11. Power analysis

Before participant recruitment, we carried out a power analysis. In line with previous studies (Whitaker & Bywater, 2011), a 25-point difference in the mean score of the ECBI Intensity subscale of the groups was considered clinically significant. This corresponds to an effect size of $0.455$, assuming a standard deviation of $5.5$. Using conventional
assumptions of alpha 0.05 and power 0.80, the effect of this size can be detected when the sample size is $N = 152$. Allowing for a 20% drop-out rate, we set the targeted initial sample size to 190 participants.

2.12. Randomization

The children were allocated into an IY parent training intervention group or a wait list control group, using a sequential balancing method (Borm, Hoogendoorn, den Heijer, & Zielhuis, 2005). This method minimizes imbalances in allocation while retaining the theoretical benefits of randomization. The factors that were taken into account in the balancing were child gender, number of parents participating, and custumorphism of social services (child protection services vs. other). The allocation procedure was carried out separately for each city as soon as the baseline assessments of all participants in the city had been conducted. Randomization/treatment allocation was carried out by an independent statistician, who was not involved in the data collection. After randomization, the intervention group contained 50 children (with 62 participating parents), and the wait list control condition 52 children (with 60 participating parents).

2.13. Statistical methods

The unit of analysis was a child (or a reporting parent). If two parents participated and reported data, we used the answers of the mother.

In addition to the intent-to-treat analyses, we carried out per protocol analyses. In these, the intervention group included only the children of the parents who had attended the intervention group nine times or more.

To analyze intervention effectiveness, we used repeated measures ANOVA to determine whether the changes in study groups’ outcome measurement differed from each other. Effect sizes for the continuous outcome variables were presented using Cohen’s d, which were calculated from difference scores (pre-intervention value subtracted from the post-intervention value) in order to account for baseline differences between the study groups.

As we reported several outcomes, the risk of false-positive findings due to multiple testing (type I error) was increased. We therefore used an alpha level of 0.01 (instead of the conventional 0.05) for p-values to indicate a significant finding when reporting intervention effectiveness (Tables 2 and 3).

2.14. Missing data

Scale scores were excluded from the analysis if at least one-third of items were missing. If less items were missing, the missing values were replaced by the respondents’ mean value of the items present in that scale.

3. Results

The mean age of participating children was 5.3 years, and the majority were boys ($n = 65/102$) (Table 1). Almost all were Finnish speaking and slightly under one-half were from single-parent families. Of the participating mothers, 17.3% had no vocational education, and 50% were not currently employed. Both mothers and fathers were most frequently aged between 30 and 39 years. The sociodemographic characteristics of the intervention and control groups did not differ significantly at baseline.

In the total study sample at baseline, the mean on the ECBI Problem Scale was 19.3 (SD = 7.9; cut-off for clinical significance $\geq 15$) and on the ECBI Intensity Scale 148.6 (SD = 24.0; cut-off $\geq 131$). The mean on the CBCL Total Externalizing Symptoms scale was 23.1 (SD = 7.8; cut-off $\geq 32$) and the mean on the PSI-SF Total Stress scale 97.9 (SD = 18.3; cut-off $\geq 114$).

The intent-to-treat analyses of parent-reported child problem behavior in the intervention group showed a significantly larger reduction on the ECBI Problem Scale than that in the control group, the effect being in the medium to large range ($d = 0.76$) (Table 2). The ECBI Intensity Scale scores also decreased, but we found no significant difference in these between the study groups. The reduced scores on the CBCL Total Externalizing Symptoms Scale and its Aggression subscale seemed more pronounced in the intervention group than in the control group, while the differences were not statistically significant. We found no significant differences between the changes over time in the intervention and control groups on the CBCL Attention Problem subscale.

The proportion of children in the intervention group with clinical levels of behavioral problems on the ECBI Problem Scale decreased by 49.2 percentage points from baseline (77.8%, $n = 33$) to follow-up (28.6%, $n = 12$) (Table 3). In the control group, the corresponding reduction was 4.0 percentage points. The figures were of similar magnitude for the ECBI Intensity Scale, although the difference between study groups was smaller.

On the CBCL scales, the frequencies of those above the clinically relevant thresholds in the intervention group at baseline ranged from 10.2% (attention problems) to 28.6% (aggressive behavior), but these decreased by more than half in the follow-up (Table 3). Among the control group we found practically no reductions in the frequencies of those with clinical levels of behavioral problems on the CBCL scales.

Regarding self-reported parenting practices, the intervention had positive effects on reducing Harsh Discipline, and on increasing Praise and Incentives, the effect sizes ranging from 0.56 (Praise) to 0.83 (Harsh Discipline) (Table 2). On Inconsistent Discipline there was only a trend level finding in favor of the intervention group ($d = 0.45$). On the Appropriate Discipline scale the effect ($d = -0.45$) was in favor of the control group, while the result ($p = .030$) did not quite reach the chosen level for statistical significance ($p < .01$). In Inappropriate Discipline there were no differences in changes from baseline to follow-up between the groups.

The PSI-SF or measures of parent’s psychological well-being (GHQ, SWEMWBS) showed no differences between intervention and control groups’ changes over time (Table 2).

The results of the per protocol analyses remained essentially the same, whereas the effects of the intervention were (for the most part) somewhat more pronounced (Table 2).

4. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of the structured, group-based parenting program (IY) on children’s behavioral problems and parenting practices in families involved with child protection (CPS) and other family support services. The results suggest that the IY parent training intervention increased positive parenting and reduced child behavioral problems in these families with special needs.

The results regarding the effects on child externalizing behavioral problems are in line with a systematic review of interventions following physical abuse (Montgomery et al., 2009). IY intervention studies conducted in child welfare services (Letarte et al., 2010), social services (Kleve et al., 2010), families reporting a history of child maltreatment (Hurlburt et al., 2013) and families in child welfare services receiving Triple-P intervention (Zhou et al., 2017) have also all shown a reduction in children’s externalizing behavior when measured by ECBI. In a study of families with child physical abuse and receiving combined parent-child cognitive behavioral therapy, children’s externalizing behavioral problems decreased when measured by CBCL (Kjellgren et al., 2013). In this study, the children in the intervention group demonstrated significant positive changes on the ECBI Problem Scale. On the ECBI Intensity Scale and CBCL scales the changes seemed to be in favor of the intervention group, however, these changes were not statistically significant.
The parents of almost half of the children rated as having clinical levels of behavioral problems on the ECBI Problem Scale rated the children as having behavioral problems below clinical levels after the intervention. According to the CBCL’s Total Externalizing Symptoms Scale and its’ Aggression and Attention subscales, over half of the children dropped from above to below clinical level after the intervention. This result has a significant clinical value. Webster-Stratton and Shoecraft (2009) reported similar findings regarding ECBI in their Washington State Child Welfare report. At pre-assessment, 31% of mothers reported that their children were in the clinical range, compared with only 8% at post-assessment. However, there are still a considerable number of children who do not move from the clinical range to a normal range. Scott and Dadds (2009) stated in their paper that one-quarter to one-third of parents and their children do not benefit from parenting programs. Several studies have tried to find explanations for this (Gardner, Hutchings, Bywater, & Whitaker, 2010; Leijten et al., 2017; Leijten et al., 2018; Weeland et al., 2017), but thus far have been unable to do so. In line with these results, when we looked at the group of children above clinical cut-off at baseline, we did not find any baseline characteristics (intervention attendance, single parenthood, employment, education, child’s gender, child age) that would differentiate those that moved or didn’t move to normal range by the follow-up (results not shown).

The intervention increased positive parenting practices. Use of harsh and inconsistent discipline declined in the intervention group after attending the IY Parenting Program. Parents in the intervention group used more praise, incentives and consistent discipline than parents in the control group after the intervention. This finding is consistent with other studies in the child welfare context (Kjellgren et al., 2013; Letarte et al., 2010; Zhou et al., 2017). An earlier study in families with neglectful parenting revealed that the program had a positive impact on parenting practices (harsh discipline, physical punishment, praise/incentives, appropriate discipline, and positive verbal discipline) (Letarte et al., 2010). A reduction in harsh discipline also occurred in studies of parents involved with child welfare services (Letarte et al., 2010) and parents with a reported history of prior maltreatment (Hurlburt et al., 2013). In the latter study, nurturing/supportive parenting practices and discipline competence also increased (Hurlburt et al., 2013). The study by Letarte et al. (2010) showed a reduction of physical punishment in the intervention group, although spanking did not decrease. A Cochrane Review by Barlow et al. (2006) of individual and group-based programs for the treatment of physical child abuse and neglect concluded that the group-based parenting program “appears to have a role in treating outcomes that are associated with abusive parenting”.

In our study, we did not note changes in some of the parenting practices, and in appropriate discipline the results (while not significant) suggest that the control group actually seemed to benefit more

### Table 1

Socio-demographic characteristics of participants at baseline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total (N = 102)</th>
<th>Intervention (N = 50)</th>
<th>Control (N = 52)</th>
<th>p1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child’s age (years) (M, SD)</td>
<td>5 1.2</td>
<td>5 1.2</td>
<td>5 1.3</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>65 63.7</td>
<td>32 64.0</td>
<td>33 62.5</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish speaking</td>
<td>99 97.1</td>
<td>47 94.0</td>
<td>52 100.0</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent</td>
<td>47 46.1</td>
<td>27 54.0</td>
<td>20 38.5</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodianship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS clients</td>
<td>72 70.6</td>
<td>37 74.0</td>
<td>35 67.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-CPS clients</td>
<td>30 29.4</td>
<td>13 26.0</td>
<td>17 32.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to cover expenses with current income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>15 14.7</td>
<td>9 18.4</td>
<td>6 11.8</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>64 62.7</td>
<td>26 53.1</td>
<td>38 74.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>21 20.6</td>
<td>14 28.6</td>
<td>7 13.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life events (&gt; 2)</td>
<td>31 30.4</td>
<td>16 32.0</td>
<td>15 28.8</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother (N = 98)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29</td>
<td>27 27.6</td>
<td>11 22.9</td>
<td>16 32.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>48 49.0</td>
<td>28 58.3</td>
<td>20 40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–74</td>
<td>23 23.5</td>
<td>9 18.8</td>
<td>14 28.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No professional training</td>
<td>17 17.3</td>
<td>5 10.4</td>
<td>12 24.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate vocational</td>
<td>56 57.1</td>
<td>31 64.6</td>
<td>25 50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of applied sciences or higher</td>
<td>25 25.5</td>
<td>12 25.0</td>
<td>13 26.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment, mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>49 50.0</td>
<td>23 48.9</td>
<td>26 53.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>21 21.4</td>
<td>13 27.1</td>
<td>8 16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home</td>
<td>20 20.4</td>
<td>10 20.8</td>
<td>10 20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8 8.2</td>
<td>2 4.2</td>
<td>2 4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father (N = 24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29</td>
<td>3 12.5</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>3 27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>11 45.8</td>
<td>8 61.5</td>
<td>3 27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–74</td>
<td>10 41.7</td>
<td>5 38.5</td>
<td>5 45.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No professional training</td>
<td>2 8.3</td>
<td>2 16.7</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate vocational</td>
<td>17 70.8</td>
<td>6 50.0</td>
<td>10 90.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of applied sciences or higher</td>
<td>5 20.8</td>
<td>4 33.3</td>
<td>1 9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment, mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>19 79.2</td>
<td>12 92.3</td>
<td>7 63.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>3 12.5</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>3 27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home</td>
<td>1 4.2</td>
<td>1 7.7</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 4.2</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Test for differences between intervention and control groups; t-test for continuous measures and Chi-square test for categorical measures.
than the intervention group. We found no good explanation to this, but one possibility could be that the parents in the intervention group became more aware of their parenting practices and therefore rated their own use of appropriate discipline practices more critically.

Even though families in child protection and special support services have multiple problems and can be difficult to influence and work with, it seems that structured parenting intervention can change parenting habits. The positive effect likely arises from the parents setting individual goals to work towards, the collaborative nature of working with other parents in the group, highlighting and celebrating successes, rehearsing new ways of dealing with children’s problem behavior, and support for rehearsing new skills at home. Moreover, the long duration of the program ensures that parents not only learn what they should do, but have a chance to practice and change their ways of parenting.

The effectiveness of the intervention is likely to be associated with the context of the intervention. As Kaminski et al. (2008) suggested in their meta-analysis of components associated with parent training program effectiveness, programs that require parents to practice learned skills with their own children teach the parents emotional communication skills (active listening, reduced negative communication, etc.) and positive interaction and consistent discipline with their children. They also reported larger effects on parenting outcomes and

Table 2
Means of child and parent outcomes pre- and post-intervention by study group and intervention effectiveness tests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Intent-to-treat analysis</th>
<th>Intervention group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total n pre/post</td>
<td>Intervention group</td>
<td>Control group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECBI</td>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>97/96</td>
<td>145.0 (24.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>85/83</td>
<td>19.1 (7.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBCL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Externalizing total</td>
<td>98/96</td>
<td>22.6 (8.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attention problems</td>
<td>98/96</td>
<td>4.1 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressive behavior</td>
<td>98/96</td>
<td>18.0 (6.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate Discipline</td>
<td>97/96</td>
<td>5.1 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate Discipline</td>
<td>97/96</td>
<td>1.8 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harsh Discipline</td>
<td>97/96</td>
<td>4.3 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistent Discipline</td>
<td>97/96</td>
<td>2.7 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>97/96</td>
<td>5.1 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>97/96</td>
<td>3.4 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI-SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental Distress</td>
<td>98/96</td>
<td>31.5 (8.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent-Child Dysfunctional Interaction</td>
<td>98/96</td>
<td>30.2 (7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult Child</td>
<td>98/95</td>
<td>35.7 (6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Stress</td>
<td>98/96</td>
<td>97.5 (19.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GHQ-12</td>
<td>101/96</td>
<td>17.3 (4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWEMWBS</td>
<td>101/96</td>
<td>24.3 (4.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Note: ECBI = Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory, CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist, PPI = Parenting Practices Scale, PSI-SF = Parenting Stress Index – Short Form, GHQ-12 = General Health Questionnaire with 12 items, SWEMWBS = Warwick Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale, Short Form. Effect sizes (Cohen’s d) 0.2 = small, 0.5 = medium, 0.8 = large effect.
* Statistically significant (p < .01) result.

Table 3
Frequencies of children with clinically significant levels of behavioral problems pre- and post-intervention by study group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold of clinical significance</th>
<th>Intervention group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre % (n)</td>
<td>post % (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECBI Intensity</td>
<td>≥ 131</td>
<td>73.5 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>≥ 15</td>
<td>73.3 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBCL Externalizing total</td>
<td>≥ 32</td>
<td>18.4 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention problems</td>
<td>≥ 7</td>
<td>10.2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive behavior</td>
<td>≥ 25</td>
<td>28.6 (14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* Statistical significance from logistic regression analysis of treatment group predicting dichotomized outcome (post) adjusting for the same dichotomized variable at baseline.
* Statistically significant (p < 0.01) result.
children's externalizing behaviors with these programs than without them. Since the IY Parenting Program contains the above mentioned components, this might be one reason that it is also effective among the child welfare population.

Although many studies have presented convincing proof that parenting programs effectively influence parental mental health (Barlow, Smailagic, Huband, Roloff, & Bennett, 2014; Furlong et al., 2012; Hutchings et al., 2007; Hutchings, Bywater, Williams, Lane, & Whittaker, 2012), some recent studies have failed to confirm this effect. For example, a meta-analysis by NICE (2006) reported a statistically non-significant result in relation to parental mental health. Another very recent meta-analysis of 14 RCTs also suggested that the IY Parenting Program did not improve parental mental health (Leijten et al., 2017). Chen and Chan (2016) came to the same conclusion in their meta-analysis of parenting programs for prevention of child maltreatment. Several moderators might affect these results, including the level of mental health scores at baseline. For example, in the Leijten et al. (2017) meta-analysis, there was a large variance between studies in baseline depression rates and quite a few reported only small numbers of mental health problems.

We found no effect of the intervention on parental mental health in our study. This might be due to fairly good initial levels in both the intervention and control groups, and the control group had access to all the social and health services to which they were entitled during the study. Adult mental health services in Finland are of high quality and fairly accessible. However, other studies carried out in the child welfare or child protection context have shown parent management training to reduce parental stress (Marcynyszyn et al., 2011), depression (Kjellgren et al., 2013), distress (Marcynyszyn et al., 2011), and self-efficacy (Letarte et al., 2010). In one study, parental perception of their child as being difficult also diminished (Marcynyszyn et al., 2011).

4.1. Strengths and limitations

Our study has several strengths. It is an RCT and also one of the first conducted among families involved with child protection services focusing on children living at home. Another strength is that we were able to reach almost all of the participants in both the intervention and control groups at post-measurement. Third, we used reliable, validated, or internationally widely used measures in the field. Fourth, the study was conducted in a real-life setting in a multicenter environment. The retention rate of participants (96.1%) was good, indicating that this kind of study is possible to carry out in this context.

A limitation of the study was the sample size, which was smaller than planned. The loss of power affected our ability to find significant differences, however, those found indicate relatively strong effects. The reduced number of participants was due to the fact that some agencies were unable to find eligible participants for the study. The child protection service agencies in two cities claimed that they had no clients with preschool-aged children exhibiting behavioral problems, although they had clients with school-aged children with these problems. This raises many questions: How well do workers in these agencies recognize behavioral problem issues and the effect they have on families and children? How well do they know the services available for different problems in families? Is the information on certain problems (i.e. behavior) efficiently shared between different agencies (e.g. between daycare and social services)? Does the Finnish daycare system support children with behavioral problems so well that these problems only emerge when the child goes to school, i.e. when there is less personnel per group of children?

Other limitations of the study are that parents were the only informants and no observational evaluation of parenting practices and children behavior was reported. Parents’ reports are not blind to condition and may be biased. On the other hand, effect sizes in, for example, The Dyadic Parent-Child Interaction Coding System (DPICS), an observational measure of parent-child social interactions, have been found to be slightly higher than those in PPI, suggesting that parental reports could produce relatively reliable and unbiased estimates of true effects (Rosanbalm & Christopoulos, 2011).

In Finland, the quality of services is good. For this reason, parents in the wait list control condition received good care and services from health and social services for their various problems during the study period. This means that any further interventions in addition to normal services should have specific, strong effects if significant differences are to be found between intervention and control groups. Furthermore, some of the workers who worked with the families in the control group were also trained IY Group Leaders. In a survey carried out among Finnish IY Group Leaders (Karjalainen et al., 2016), 90% of the workers stated that their whole way of working had changed after IY group leader training. It became more empathic and client-focused, and they were able to support parenting more broadly and concretely. Despite the high-quality of care in the wait list control condition, this study indicated that structured parenting interventions can reduce child problem behavior and improve parenting skills.

The study sample was heterogeneous, including also non-CPS clients. This warrants caution when comparing our results to studies with exclusively CPS clients. However, when we compared CPS and non-CPS clients we found no differences regarding primary outcome measures (ECBI, CBCL) at baseline (results not shown).

Implementation fidelity also affects results. Some evidence shows that higher levels of implementation fidelity can achieve more positive results (Furlong et al., 2012; Menting et al., 2013). We did not have any data to analyze the level of fidelity. However, the group leaders in this study were all trained and followed the protocols and filled in process check-lists from each session. They also received supervision and consultation, but not as much as recommended by the program developer. However, considering that the intervention was done in real-life context, the level of supervision can be regarded quite good. Also, in conflict with the developer's firm recommendation to have accredited group leaders conducting studies to ensure high fidelity of implementation, we were only able to have one accredited group leader and for some this was their first time running a group.

5. Conclusion

In many countries, policymakers have acknowledged the dilemma of using programs in child welfare that lack evidence of efficacy. National and international guidelines that promote evidence-based parenting programs and their use for preventing and reducing violence and maltreatment of children have been published, increasing the use of evidence-based practices (Axford, Elliot, & Little, 2012; Berliner et al., 2015; Luke, Sinclair, Woolgar, & Sebba, 2014; United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2009; Wessels, Mtkon, Ward, Kilbane, & Alves, 2013; World Health Organization, 2010).

This RCT study on the IY Parenting Program in the context of child protection services showed significant result in treating child externalizing behavioral problems: it was able to reduce child's behavior perceived as problematic by the parents. Out of six studied parenting practices, the program showed significant results in three: compared to the waiting list control condition the use of praise and incentives increased, and the use of harsh discipline decreased in the intervention group. The intervention did not affect parent’s stress of parenting nor parent’s psychological well-being. No significant adverse effects were found.

All in all, the results give some promising support for using these types of evidence-based parenting interventions in CPS.
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