

Last reviewed: July 2016

Intervention website: <https://www.incredibleyears.com/early-intervention-programs/parents>

GUIDEBOOK INTERVENTION INFORMATION SHEET

Incredible Years Preschool

Please note that in the ‘Intervention Summary’ table below ‘child age’, ‘level of need’, and ‘race and ethnicities’ information is **as evaluated in studies**. Information in other fields describes the intervention as **offered/supported by the intervention provider**.

Intervention summary	
Description	Incredible Years Preschool is a parenting intervention for parents with concerns about the behaviour of a child between 3 and 6 years old. It is delivered by two IY certified facilitators to groups of up to 12 families for 18 to 20 weekly sessions. During these sessions, parents learn strategies for interacting positively with their child and discouraging challenging child behaviour.
Evidence rating	4+
Cost rating	2
Child outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Preventing crime, violence and antisocial behaviour<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Improved behaviour.• Enhancing school achievement and employment<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Improved reading.
Child age (population characteristic)	2 to 9 years old
Level of need (population characteristic)	Targeted Indicated

Foundations Guidebook – Intervention information sheet

Visit the Foundations Guidebook | www.foundations.org.uk/guidebook

Intervention summary	
Race and ethnicities (population characteristic)	Not reported
Type (model characteristic)	Group
Setting (model characteristic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community Centre• Early Years Setting• Schools.
Workforce (model characteristic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Parenting professional• Social worker• Psychologist.
UK available?	Yes
UK tested?	Yes

Model description

Incredible Years (IY) Preschool Basic is part of the Incredible Years series of interventions for children, parents and teachers. IY Preschool Basic is specifically for parents with concerns about the behaviour of a child aged between 3 and 6 years old.

Parents attend 18 to 20 weekly group sessions where they learn strategies for interacting positively with their child and discouraging unwanted behaviour. Two facilitators with training in the IY model lead parents in weekly two-hour group discussions of mediated video vignettes, problem-solving exercises, and structured practice activities addressing parents' personal goals.

During the sessions, parents practise child-directed play skills that build positive relationships and attachment; strengthen more nurturing parenting using social, emotion and persistence coaching methods; encourage school readiness skills and beginning problem-solving skills; establish predictable routines and rules; provide incentives for positive behaviour and reduce behaviour problems. Parental support is strengthened by weekly television calls with one of the group facilitators, parent buddy calls, and group process methods.

Foundations Guidebook – Intervention information sheet

Visit the Foundations Guidebook | www.foundations.org.uk/guidebook

Target population

Age of child	3 to 6 years old
Target population	Parents with a child aged between 3 and 6 years old who have concerns about the child's behaviour.

Please note that the information in this section on target population is as **offered/supported by the intervention provider**.



Theory of change

Why		Who	How	What		
Science-based assumption	Science-based assumption	Science-based assumption	Intervention	Short-term outcomes	Medium-term outcomes	Long-term outcomes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young children naturally exhibit challenging and non-compliant behaviours • Challenging child behaviours during preschool and primary school increase the risk of behavioural problems in adolescence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective parenting behaviours and a predictable family environment help the child to regulate their own behaviour and reduce the risk of child behavioural problems becoming entrenched • Ineffective parenting strategies occasionally increase the risk of child behavioural problems becoming entrenched. 	Higher levels of family stress and disadvantage can increase the risk of child behavioural problems	<p>Parents learn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age-appropriate expectations for their child • Strategies for establishing predictable family routines • Strategies for promoting positive parent–child interaction through non-directive play • Strategies for reinforcing positive child behaviour through labelled praise • Strategies discouraging challenge child behaviour through age-appropriate discipline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents implement effective parenting strategies in the home • Parents confidence increases • Parent–child interaction improves. 	Children’s self-regulatory capabilities and behaviour improves.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children are at less risk of antisocial behaviour in adolescence • Children are more likely to engage positively with others.



Implementation requirements

Who is eligible?	Parents with a child aged between 3 and 6 years old who have concerns about the child's behaviour.
How is it delivered?	Incredible Years Preschool is delivered in 20 sessions of two hours' duration each by two Incredible Years co-leaders, to groups of around 12 families.
What happens during the intervention?	<p>During the sessions, parents practise child-directed play skills that build positive relationships and attachment; strengthen more nurturing parenting using social, emotion and persistence coaching methods; encourage school readiness skills and early problem-solving skills; establish predictable routines and rules; provide incentives for positive behaviour; and reduce behaviour problems.</p> <p>Parental social support is strengthened by weekly facilitator calls, parent–buddy calls and group process methods.</p> <p>Incredible Years Preschool can be combined with Incredible Years Advanced for families with more complex issues. Advanced is a 10 to 12-week add-on component that covers anger and depression management, building support networks, effective problem-solving for couples, and has teacher and family meetings.</p>
Who can deliver it?	Practitioners with training in the Incredible Years model, typically with a qualification and or experience in a helping profession, such as social work or psychology.
What are the training requirements?	The practitioners have 24 hours of intervention training. Booster training of practitioners is recommended.
How are practitioners supervised?	It is recommended that practitioners are supervised by one host agency supervisor and the intervention developer.
What are the systems for maintaining fidelity?	<p>Intervention fidelity is maintained through the following processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face-to-face training • Fidelity monitoring • Accreditation or certification process • Supervision.
Is there a licensing requirement?	Yes



Implementation requirements (cont.)

<p>*Contact details</p>	<p>Contact person: Carolyn Webster-Stratton</p> <p>Organisation: Incredible Years</p> <p>Email address: cwebsterstratton1@icloud.com incredibleyears@incredibleyears.com</p> <p>Website: https://www.incredibleyears.com/early-intervention-programs/parents</p> <p>Contact person: Lisa Wallace-Gloria, M.Ed</p> <p>Organisation: Incredible Years</p> <p>Email address: lisawg@incredibleyears.com</p> <p>*Please note that this information may not be up to date. In this case, please visit the listed intervention website for up to date contact details.</p>
--------------------------------	---

Evidence summary

Incredible Years Preschool's most rigorous evidence comes from three RCTs conducted in the United Kingdom, consistent with Foundations' Level 3 evidence strength criteria. One of these studies has evidence of a long-term impact and has been conducted independently of the intervention provider, meaning that Incredible Years Preschool has evidence consistent with Foundations' Level 4+ criteria.

The first study observed that Incredible Years parents were significantly more likely to report improvements in their children's behaviour and symptoms of hyperactivity (on multiple measures) immediately after the intervention in comparison to parents not receiving the intervention.

The second study replicated the first study's findings and observed that benefits persisted two years post-intervention. Specifically, IY children assessed as having fewer problematic behaviours in comparison to children whose parents did not attend the intervention when they were younger.



Child outcomes			
Outcome	Improvement index	Interpretation	Study
Improved independent play	+28	1.90-point improvement on an observed child independent play scale Immediately after the intervention	3
Improved reading ability	+16	9.18-point improvement on the Weschler Objective Reading Dimensions age-standardised score Long-term, 10 years later	2
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+35	29.19-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+21	17.8-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	3
Reduced number of behaviour problems	+26	4.99-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Problem Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced number of behaviour problems	+18	3.90-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Problem Scale) Immediately after the intervention	3
Reduced child deviance	+14	2.12-point improvement on the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Deviance Scale)	2



Child outcomes			
Outcome	Improvement index	Interpretation	Study
Improved independent play	+28	1.90-point improvement on an observed child independent play scale Immediately after the intervention	3
Improved reading ability	+16	9.18-point improvement on the Weschler Objective Reading Dimensions age-standardised score Long-term, 10 years later	2
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+35	29.19-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+21	17.8-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	3
Reduced number of behaviour problems	+26	4.99-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Problem Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
		Immediately after the intervention	
Reduced child deviance	+14	1.92-point improvement on the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Deviance Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1



Child outcomes			
Outcome	Improvement index	Interpretation	Study
Improved independent play	+28	1.90-point improvement on an observed child independent play scale Immediately after the intervention	3
Improved reading ability	+16	9.18-point improvement on the Weschler Objective Reading Dimensions age-standardised score Long-term, 10 years later	2
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+35	29.19-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+21	17.8-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	3
Reduced number of behaviour problems	+26	4.99-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Problem Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced externalising behaviour	+21	5.23-point improvement on the Child Behaviour Checklist (Externalising Scale) Immediately after the intervention	2
Improved behaviour	+17	9.98-point improvement on the Child Behaviour Checklist Immediately after the intervention	2



Child outcomes			
Outcome	Improvement index	Interpretation	Study
Improved independent play	+28	1.90-point improvement on an observed child independent play scale Immediately after the intervention	3
Improved reading ability	+16	9.18-point improvement on the Weschler Objective Reading Dimensions age-standardised score Long-term, 10 years later	2
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+35	29.19-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+21	17.8-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	3
Reduced number of behaviour problems	+26	4.99-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Problem Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced parent defined problems	+32	1.41-point improvement on the Parent Defined Problems Questionnaire Immediately after the intervention	2
Reduced total problems	+27	3.94-point improvement on the Parent Daily Report Immediately after the intervention	2



Child outcomes			
Outcome	Improvement index	Interpretation	Study
Improved independent play	+28	1.90-point improvement on an observed child independent play scale Immediately after the intervention	3
Improved reading ability	+16	9.18-point improvement on the Weschler Objective Reading Dimensions age-standardised score Long-term, 10 years later	2
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+35	29.19-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+21	17.8-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	3
Reduced number of behaviour problems	+26	4.99-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Problem Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced oppositional defiant disorder	N/A	0.22-point improvement on a coded observational measure of structured play Immediately after the intervention	2
Reduced oppositional defiant disorder	+33	1.61-point improvement on the Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Assessment Long-term, 10 years later	2



Child outcomes			
Outcome	Improvement index	Interpretation	Study
Improved independent play	+28	1.90-point improvement on an observed child independent play scale Immediately after the intervention	3
Improved reading ability	+16	9.18-point improvement on the Weschler Objective Reading Dimensions age-standardised score Long-term, 10 years later	2
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+35	29.19-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+21	17.8-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	3
Reduced number of behaviour problems	+26	4.99-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Problem Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced oppositional defiant symptoms	+32	1.58-point improvement on the Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Assessment Long-term, 10 years later	2
Reduced antisocial personality traits	+26	4.41-point improvement on the Antisocial Process Screening Device Long-term, 10 years later	2



Child outcomes			
Outcome	Improvement index	Interpretation	Study
Improved independent play	+28	1.90-point improvement on an observed child independent play scale Immediately after the intervention	3
Improved reading ability	+16	9.18-point improvement on the Weschler Objective Reading Dimensions age-standardised score Long-term, 10 years later	2
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+35	29.19-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+21	17.8-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	3
Reduced number of behaviour problems	+26	4.99-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Problem Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced antisocial behaviour	+29	1.79-point improvement on the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Conduct Problems Scale) Long-term, 10 years later	2
Reduced child hyperactivity	+28	4.32-point improvement on the Conners Parent Rating Scale (Parent Report) Immediately after the intervention	1



Child outcomes			
Outcome	Improvement index	Interpretation	Study
Improved independent play	+28	1.90-point improvement on an observed child independent play scale Immediately after the intervention	3
Improved reading ability	+16	9.18-point improvement on the Weschler Objective Reading Dimensions age-standardised score Long-term, 10 years later	2
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+35	29.19-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+21	17.8-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	3
Reduced number of behaviour problems	+26	4.99-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Problem Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced child hyperactivity	+18	1.07-point improvement on the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Hyperactivity Scale - Self-Report) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced child hyperactivity	+12	0.21 point-improvement on the Parent Account of Child Symptoms Interview Immediately after the intervention	2



Child outcomes			
Outcome	Improvement index	Interpretation	Study
Improved independent play	+28	1.90-point improvement on an observed child independent play scale Immediately after the intervention	3
Improved reading ability	+16	9.18-point improvement on the Weschler Objective Reading Dimensions age-standardised score Long-term, 10 years later	2
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+35	29.19-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+21	17.8-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	3
Reduced number of behaviour problems	+26	4.99-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Problem Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced negative behaviour	+28	5.00-point improvement on an observed child negative behaviour scale Immediately after the intervention	3
Reduced conduct problems	+17	0.82-point improvement on the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Problems Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1



Child outcomes			
Outcome	Improvement index	Interpretation	Study
Improved independent play	+28	1.90-point improvement on an observed child independent play scale Immediately after the intervention	3
Improved reading ability	+16	9.18-point improvement on the Weschler Objective Reading Dimensions age-standardised score Long-term, 10 years later	2
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+35	29.19-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+21	17.8-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	3
Reduced number of behaviour problems	+26	4.99-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Problem Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced conduct problems	+31	0.40-point improvement on the Parent Account of Child Symptoms Interview (Parent report) Immediately after the intervention	2
Reduced conduct problems	+19	1.05-point improvement on the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Conduct Problems Scale – Self-Report) Immediately after the intervention	2



Child outcomes			
Outcome	Improvement index	Interpretation	Study
Improved independent play	+28	1.90-point improvement on an observed child independent play scale Immediately after the intervention	3
Improved reading ability	+16	9.18-point improvement on the Weschler Objective Reading Dimensions age-standardised score Long-term, 10 years later	2
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+35	29.19-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems	+21	17.8-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	3
Reduced number of behaviour problems	+26	4.99-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Problem Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1
Reduced frequency of behaviour problems in siblings	+27	21.35-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (Intensity Scale) Immediately after the intervention	1



Search and review

	Number of studies
Identified in search	3
Studies reviewed	3
Meeting the L2 threshold	0
Meeting the L3 threshold	3
Contributing to the L4 threshold	3
Ineligible	0

Individual study summary: Study 1

Study 1	
Study design	RCT
Country	United Kingdom
Sample characteristics	153 families who were attending Sure Start centres in Wales with a child aged 36 to 59 months at risk of conduct disorder.
Race, ethnicities, and nationalities	Not reported
Population risk factors	Most families were at a socioeconomic disadvantage compared with the mean valued for the UK.
Timing	Baseline and post-intervention
Child outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced number and frequency of conduct problems (parent report) Reduced child deviance (parent report) Reduced child hyperactivity (parent report)



Study 1	
	Reduced frequency of behaviour problems in siblings (parent report).
Other outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced symptoms of depression (parent self-report) Reduced levels of stress (parent self-report) Increased positive parenting (observation).
Study Rating	3
Citation	Hutchings, J., Bywater, T., Daley, D., Gardner, F., Whitaker, C., Jones, K., Eames, C. & Edwards, R. T. (2007) Parenting intervention in Sure Start services for children at risk of developing conduct disorder: Pragmatic randomised controlled trial. <i>BMJ</i> . 334, 682.

Brief summary

Population characteristics

This study involved 153 families with a child between 36 and 59 months identified with clinically significant behavioural problems living in North and Mid-Wales. Participants were selected based on clinical cut-offs on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory.

Most families were socially and economically disadvantaged: 35% of the parents were single and 77% reported a total weekly household income \leq £64/person. 65% of the families were also experiencing two or more of the following risks:

- Single parenthood
- Teenage parenthood
- Parental depression
- Family poverty
- Parental history of drug abuse
- Parental history of criminality.

Study design

104 participants were randomly allocated to IY Preschool, and 49 to a wait-list control. Participants were block randomised by area and allocated on a 2:1 basis, stratified by sex and age, using a random number generator. Those in the wait-list control received no services, but were offered the IY intervention after the study was completed.

Measurement

Assessments were conducted at baseline (pre-intervention) and immediately after the intervention was completed.



- **Parent report** measures included the Eyberg Child Behaviour inventory, the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire, the Conners abbreviated parent/teacher rating scale, the Parenting Stress Index-Short Form, the Arnold Parenting Scale, and the Beck Depression Inventory.
- **Researcher-led** assessments videotaped sessions of parent–child interactions which were then coded for deviant child behaviour and positive and critical parenting via the Dyadic parent–child interaction coding system

Study retention

87% (133) of the sample completed measures post-intervention, including 83% (86) in the IY Preschool group and 96% (47) in the wait-list control.

Results

Data-analytic plan

Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to examine the differences between the intervention and control conditions taking account of area, treatment, and baseline response value. An intent-to-treat design was used and missing data was managed using a ‘last observation carried forward approach’, allowing the full original sample to be retained in the analysis.

Findings

The study observed statistically significant improvements in the IY parents’ reports of their children’s behaviour. These improvements included reductions in the frequency of reported behaviour problems, both for the child of concern and their siblings. Additionally, IY parents were more likely to report reductions in child hyperactivity.

The study also observed statistically significant reductions in IY parents’ reports of stress and depression symptoms in comparison to parents in the wait-list control. Additionally, IY parents were more likely to exhibit positive behaviours in their interactions with their child during the coded observations.

Study 1: Outcomes table

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child outcomes					
Intensity of behavioural problems	Eyberg child behaviour inventory-intensity (Parent report)	0.89	Yes	153	Post-intervention



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Frequency of behavioural problems	Eyberg child behaviour inventory-problem scale (Parent report)	0.63	Yes	153	Post-intervention
Hyperactivity	Conners abbreviated parent/teacher scale (Parent report)	0.61	Yes	153	Post-intervention
Conduct problems	Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire - (Parent report)	N/A	No	153	Post-intervention
Deviance	Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire - (Parent report)	N/A	No	153	Post-intervention
Hyperactivity	Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire – (Parent report)	0.41	Yes	153	Post-intervention
Frequency of behaviour problems in siblings	Sibling Eyberg child behaviour inventory (Parent report)	0.69	Yes	89	Post-intervention
Number of behaviour problems in siblings	Eyberg child behaviour inventory (Parent report)	N/A	No	89	Post-intervention



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child deviation	Dyadic parent-child interaction coding system (expert observation of behaviour)	N/A	No	153	Post-intervention
Parent outcomes					
Levels of stress	Parenting stress index (parent self-report)	0.66	Yes	153	Post-intervention
Depression symptoms	Beck depression inventory (parent self-report)	0.48	Yes	153	Post-intervention
Parenting competencies	Arnold parenting scale (parent self-report)	0.95	Yes	153	Post-intervention
Positive parenting	Positive parenting (observation)	0.57	Yes	153	Post-intervention
Critical parenting	Critical parenting (observation)	N/A	No	153	Post-intervention

Individual study summary: Study 2

Study 2	
Study design	RCT
Country	United Kingdom



Study 2	
Sample characteristics	141 families with children aged 3 to 7 who were referred to CAMHS for child behavioural problems.
Race, ethnicities, and nationalities	Not reported
Population risk factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 45% of parents were single parents • 51% of mothers had left school by age 16 • 47% living in council or housing association homes.
Timing	Baseline, post-intervention, and five- to 10-year follow-up
Child outcomes	<p><i>Post-intervention</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced oppositional behaviour (clinical assessment) • Improved behaviour (parent report) • Reduced conduct problems (parent report) • Reduced hyperactivity (parent report). <p><i>Long-term follow-up</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved reading (researcher assessment) • Reduced antisocial personality traits (parent report) • Reduced antisocial behaviour (parent report) • Reduced oppositional defiant disorder (clinical assessment).
Other outcomes	<p><i>Post-intervention</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced inappropriate commands (researcher observation). <p><i>Long-term follow-up</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warmer expressed emotion (researcher observation) • Improved supervision (clinical assessment) • Improved parent-child interaction (researcher observation).
Study Rating	3
Citations	<p>Study 2a: Scott, S., Spender, Q., Doolan, M., Jacobs, B. & Aspland, H. (2001).. Multicentre controlled trial of parenting groups for childhood antisocial behaviour in clinical practice. <i>BMJ</i>. 323, 1–7.</p> <p>Study 2b: Scott, S., Briskman, J. & O'Connor, T. (2014) Early prevention of antisocial personality: Long-term follow-up of two randomized controlled trials comparing indicated and selective approaches. <i>American Journal of Psychiatry</i>. 171, 649–657.</p>



Brief summary

Population characteristics

This study involved 141 children aged 3 to 7 years, referred with antisocial behaviour to four NHS child and adolescent mental health services in the United Kingdom. Most families were disadvantaged; 45% of parents were single parents, 51% had left school by age 16 and 46% of the families were eligible for school meals. 15% of the parents identified as being from a minoritised ethnicity, but no further information about ethnic representation was provided.

Study design

90 families were randomly allocated to IY preschool, 51 to a wait-list control, using a permuted block design, with a 2:1 ratio of intervention to control blocks, based on the date of referral.

Measurement

Assessments were conducted at baseline (pre-intervention) and after intervention completion, which was typically 6 to 7 months post-baseline. A follow-up study occurred between 5.6 and 10 years post study completion, when the child participants were in their teens.

Post-intervention

- **Parent report** measures included the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire, the Child Behaviour Checklist, a list of parent-defined problems, and the Parent Daily Report.
- **Researcher/clinician-led** assessments included the semi-structured Parent Account of Child Symptoms interview. Oppositional defiant disorder was assessed via the ICD-10 criteria. Videotaped recordings were also made of parent–child interaction during a structured play task and inappropriate parental demands were coded via a manual by researchers blind to group assignment.

Long-term follow-up

- **Youth report** measures included the Self-Report Delinquency instrument.
- **Parent report** measures included the Antisocial Process Screening Device, and the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire.
- **Teacher report** measures included the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire.
- **Researcher/clinician-led** assessments included the Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Assessment with parents to evaluate oppositional adolescent behaviour. Adolescent reading comprehension was assessed with the Weschler Objective Reading Dimensions age-standardised score. The quality of the parent–adolescent relationship was assessed during a five-minute recording of the parent and adolescent engaged in a ‘hot topics’ conversation, as well as a 20-minute observation of parent–adolescent interaction.



Study retention

Post-intervention

78% (110) of the sample completed measures at post-intervention, including 81% (73) allocated to IY Preschool and 73% (37) from the wait-list control.

Long-term follow-up

Follow-up assessments were conducted with families receiving IY preschool, combining the 73 IY families who completed post-intervention assessments in the original study with 21 who subsequently attended the wait-list control. This resulted in a pool of 94 children, 79% (74) of whom completed follow-up measures 5.6 to 10 years post-intervention completion.

Their results were compared to the assessments conducted families not receiving IY. These families were recruited from a pool of 16 families who were subsequently re-randomised from the wait-list control to usual care (individualised treatment) and combined with 10 families who were allocated to usual care at the time of the original study, resulting in a pool of 26 families. 19 families subsequently completed follow-up measures, representing 73% of those from the original sample randomly allocated to individualised treatment.

Results

Post-intervention

Data analytic plan

Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) were used to examine the differences between the intervention and control conditions taking account of age and sex. An intent-to-treat design was used. Missing data was managed using 'last observation carried forward' so that the entire sample could be retained.

Findings

The study observed statistically significant improvements in parent reports of problematic child behaviours during the clinical interviews and the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire. Statistically significant improvements were also observed in IY Preschool parents' use of inappropriate commands during the structured play task in comparison to parents in the control condition.

Long-term follow-up

Data-analytic plan

Generalised estimating equations (GEE) were used to examine differences between the intervention and control groups, accounting for clustering effects and baseline covariates such as antisocial behaviour, age, and sex. An intent-to-treat design was employed, and missing data were managed using multiple imputation techniques. Interaction effects were tested to compare outcomes between intervention types.



Findings

The study observed statistically significant reductions in children's oppositional symptoms, antisocial personality traits, antisocial behaviour, and reading scores favouring the IY Preschool families. Additionally, IY parents were observed to provide better supervision, expressed emotion, and positive interaction with their children when compared to the families not receiving IY.

Study 2: Outcomes table

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child outcomes					
Conduct problems	Parent Account of Child Symptoms interview (Parent report)	0.89	Yes	141	Post-intervention
Hyperactivity	Parent Account of Child Symptoms interview (Parent report)	0.31	Yes	141	Post-intervention
Conduct problems	Strengths and difficulties questionnaire (SDQ) (Parent report)	0.51	Yes	141	Post-intervention
Total deviance	Strengths and difficulties questionnaire (SDQ) (Parent report)	0.37	Yes	141	Post-intervention
Externalising problems	Child Behaviour Checklist (Parent report)	0.55	Yes	141	Post-intervention



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Total problems	Child Behaviour Checklist (Parent report)	0.44	Yes	141	Post-intervention
Parent defined problems	Parent defined problems questionnaire (Parent report)	0.92	Yes	141	Post-intervention
Total problems	Parent Daily Report (Parent report)	0.75	Yes	141	Post-intervention
Oppositional defiant disorder diagnosis	ICD-10 research criteria (interview)	N/A	Yes	141	Post-intervention
Oppositional symptoms	Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Assessment	0.91	Yes	93	Long-term follow-up
Antisocial personality traits	Antisocial Process Screening Device (Parent report)	0.70	Yes	93	Long-term follow-up
Antisocial behaviour	Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire – conduct scale (Parent report)	N/A	Yes	93	Long-term follow-up



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Reading ability	Wechsler Objective Reading Dimensions (researcher assessment)	0.42	Yes	93	Long-term follow-up
Parent outcomes					
Inappropriate commands	Observation of structured play task (researcher observation)	d=0.76	Yes	141	Post-intervention
Expressed emotion	Five-Minute Speech Sample (researcher observation)	N/A	Yes	74–90	Long-term follow-up
Parental supervision	Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Assessment interview (clinical assessment)	N/A	Yes	74–90	Long-term follow-up
Interaction quality with child	Direct observation of 20 minutes of parent-adolescent interactions (researcher observation)	N/A	No	74–90	Long-term follow-up



Individual study summary: Study 3

Study 3	
Study design	RCT
Country	United Kingdom
Sample characteristics	76 primarily low-income families with a child referred for conduct problems aged between 2 and 9 years old.
Race, ethnicities, and nationalities	Not reported
Population risk factors	Participants were primarily low-income families, who tended to live in conditions of social disadvantage; three sites were in housing estates, which were classified as the 10–20% most-deprived UK wards
Timing	Baseline, post-intervention, and 18-month follow-up
Child outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved independent play (observation) Reduced number of behaviour problems (parent report) Reduced frequency of behaviour problems (parent report) Reduced negative behaviour (observation).
Other outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased sense of competence (self-report) Increased positive parenting strategies (self-report) Decreased negative parenting strategies (self-report).
Study Rating	3
Citation	Gardner, F., Burton, J. & Klimes, I. (2006) Randomised controlled trial of a parenting intervention in the voluntary sector for reducing child conduct problems: Outcomes and mechanisms of change. <i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</i> . 47, 1123–1132.



Brief summary

Population characteristics

This study involved 76 families with children aged between 2 and 9 years old referred for conduct problems, living in housing estates classified as the 10–20% most-deprived UK wards. 47% of the parents were single, 68% had left fulltime education before the age of 16, and 63% were receiving welfare benefits. Additionally, 43% reported symptoms of moderate to severe depression. Ethnic representation was not reported.

Study design

44 participants were randomly allocated to IY Preschool and 32 to a wait-list control group. Randomisation was carried out by a researcher independent of the study team and was informed by computer-generated list. Participants in the wait-list control group received no parenting intervention until the study was completed.

Measurement

Assessments were conducted at baseline (pre-intervention) and post-intervention (six months later). Families in the IY Preschool group completed further measures at an 18-month follow-up. The same measures were completed at all assessment points.

- **Parent report** measures included the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory for both the child of interest and problematic siblings, the Parenting Scale, the Parenting Sense of Competence Scale, and the Beck Depression Inventory.
- **Researcher-led assessments** included coded observations of parent–child interaction during six structured sessions videotaped in the family home.

Study retention

Post-intervention

93% (71) of the study participants completed assessments post-intervention, representing 89% (39) of the IY Preschool participant and 100% (32) of those allocated to the wait-list control.

18-month follow-up

86% (38) of the IY Preschool group participated in the 18-month follow-up assessment.

Results

Data-analytic plan

Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to examine the differences between the intervention and control conditions, taking account of baseline response values. For skewed variables, Mann–Whitney tests on change scores were used. Paired samples t-tests and the equivalent nonparametric tests for skewed variables were also used to explore the changes from post-intervention to 18-month follow-up for the intervention group only. An intent-to-treat design was



used for all analyses, although the extent to which this included imputation for missing values is not reported.

Findings

Statistically significant reductions were observed in IY parents' reports of the number and intensity of conduct problems in comparison to those reported by the parents in the wait-list control. These findings were corroborated by statistically significant improvements in the coded observations of IY children's negative behaviour and independent play.

Statistically significant improvements were also observed in IY parents' self-reports of discipline style and sense of competence. These reports were supported by the coded observations which also observed improvements in positive and negative parenting strategies. No statistically significant changes were observed in the parent reports of depression symptoms, however.

At 18 months follow-up, the post-intervention effects on all child and parent measures were maintained for the intervention group.

Study 3: Outcomes table

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child outcomes					
Conduct problems – problem	Eyberg child behaviour inventory-problems (Parent report)	d=0.48	Yes	71	Post-intervention
Conduct problems – intensity	Eyberg child behaviour inventory-intensity scale (Parent report)	d=0.55	Yes	71	Post-intervention
Independent play	Coded observations of videotape recordings (observation)	d=0.77	Yes	71	Post-intervention



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Negative behaviour	Coded observations of videotape recordings (observation)	d=0.78	Yes	71	Post-intervention
Parent outcomes					
Sense of competence	Parenting Sense of Competence Scale (parent self-report)	d=0.40	Yes	71	Post-intervention
Parenting discipline style	Parenting Scale Total (parent self-report)	d=0.65	Yes	71	Post-intervention
Depression symptoms	Becks Depression Total (parent self-report)	N/A	No	71	Post-intervention
Positive parenting strategies	Coded observations of videotape recordings (observation)	d=0.38	Yes	71	Post-intervention
Negative parenting strategies	Coded observations of videotape recordings (observation)	d=0.74	Yes	71	Post-intervention

Other studies

Additional studies are available at <http://www.incredibleyears.com/research-library/all-articles>

–

Note on provider involvement: This provider has agreed to Foundations' terms of reference (or the Early Intervention Foundation's terms of reference), and the assessment has been conducted and published with the full cooperation of the intervention provider.