

# Population-Based Prevention of Child Maltreatment: The U.S. Triple P System Population Trial

Ronald J. Prinz · Matthew R. Sanders ·  
Cheri J. Shapiro · Daniel J. Whitaker · John R. Lutzker

Published online: 22 January 2009

© The Author(s) 2009. This article is published with open access at Springerlink.com

**Abstract** The prevention of child maltreatment necessitates a public health approach. In the U.S. Triple P System Population Trial, 18 counties were randomly assigned to either dissemination of the Triple P—Positive Parenting Program system or to the services-as-usual control condition. Dissemination involved Triple P professional training for the existing workforce (over 600 service providers), as well as universal media and communication strategies. Large effect sizes were found for three independently derived population indicators: substantiated child maltreatment, child out-of-home placements, and child maltreatment injuries. This study is the first to randomize geographical areas and show preventive impact on child maltreatment at a population level using evidence-based parenting interventions.

**Keywords** Child maltreatment · Parenting · Population intervention · Dissemination

Child maltreatment (CM) is without question a significant public health problem in the U.S. and elsewhere. In 2005 there were 3.3 million referrals of alleged child abuse or neglect and approximately 899,000 child victims of substantiated child abuse or neglect in the U.S. (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services 2007). CM exacts an enormous

toll on society. CM results in costs associated with utilization of administrative services and systems (e.g., child protective services, foster care, judicial system), child treatment services (e.g., healthcare, mental health, educational systems), long-term impact (e.g., psychological and health problems in adulthood), and next generation victimization. Although there is much uncertainty about the cost of CM and its consequences, Prevent Child Abuse America estimated costs associated with child abuse and neglect in the U.S. to be over \$94 billion per year in 2001 dollars (Fromm 2001). This figure likely underestimates the cost because it is based only on official reports of child abuse and neglect and does not take into account the cost of unreported maltreatment.

The official rates of substantiated CM, and even the referral rates for alleged maltreatment, likely represent only the tip of the iceberg in terms of parenting problems and child adversity because: (a) many episodes of abusive or neglectful parenting might not get reported to or investigated by child protective services (Sedlak and Broadhurst 1996), and (b) much in the way of coercive or inadequate parenting practices may not technically rise to the level of official reports, but could very well have a detrimental impact on child development. For example, Theodore et al. (2005) found in an epidemiological study conducted in the Carolinas that maternal reports of physical abuse from anonymous telephone surveying were 40 times greater than the official child physical abuse reports. Theodore et al. also found that the rate of harsh physical discipline was not significantly different for low-versus high-income households, which flies in the face of the assumption that problematic parenting is only or predominantly associated with poverty.

Undoubtedly, CM and associated patterns of inadequate parenting constitute a serious public health problem that

---

R. J. Prinz (✉) · C. J. Shapiro  
Psychology Department, University of South Carolina,  
Columbia, SC 29208, USA  
e-mail: prinz@sc.edu

M. R. Sanders  
University of Queensland,  
Brisbane, Australia

D. J. Whitaker · J. R. Lutzker  
Georgia State University,  
Atlanta, GA, USA

warrants strong prevention measures to reduce population prevalence of problematic parenting. The CM prevention field to date has not focused for the most part on prevalence reduction. The research has consisted mainly of intervention studies aimed at treatment of child-abusing parents (Skowron and Reinemann 2005; Timmer et al. 2005), prevention of recidivism among abusing parents (Chaffin et al. 2004; Gershater-Molko et al. 2002; Harder 2005; MacMillan et al. 2005), or high-intensity service delivery to specific subsets of families at pronounced risk for abuse (Cicchetti et al. 2006; Duggan et al. 2004; Fergusson et al. 2005; Rodrigo et al. 2006). Some intervention approaches have demonstrated positive effects with specific clinical or high-risk samples of parents (Olds et al. 2007; Prinz 2007). However, to date no studies on child maltreatment have randomized communities to condition and examined population-level preventive effects of parenting interventions.

Most parents never receive any parenting help in dealing with common everyday behavior problems, and few of those who do are exposed to evidence-based parenting programs (Sanders et al. 1999), despite the strength of the evidence for social-learning based parenting interventions (McMahon 1999; Prinz and Dumas 2004; Prinz and Jones 2003; Taylor and Biglan 1998). When few families derive the benefits of receiving an evidence-based parenting program, the potential of parenting programs to reduce the prevalence of problematic outcomes for parents and children in the entire population is diminished, and the value of proven programs becomes limited (Biglan and Metzler 1998). Hence, broader strategies for reaching parents regarding empirically supported parenting information are needed (Sanders and Turner 2002).

To address the difficulties of poor population reach via evidence-based parenting programs, a public health approach to improving parenting is required. Reducing the prevalence of coercive parenting in the community requires that a large proportion of the population be reached with effective parenting strategies (Biglan 1995). Thus, a key assumption of a population-based approach is that parenting intervention strategies should be more widely accessible in the community. To achieve this aspiration, a variety of formats, delivery modalities, provider disciplines, and access points need to be invoked.

One of the few examples of a public health approach to parenting is the Triple P system developed by Sanders and colleagues (Sanders 1999; Sanders et al. 2002). The Triple P—Positive Parenting Program was designed as a comprehensive population-level system of parenting and family support. This multilevel system includes five intervention levels of increasing intensity and narrowing population reach. The system was designed to enhance parental competence, and prevent or alter dysfunctional parenting practices, thereby reducing an important set of family risk

factors both for child maltreatment and for children's behavioral and emotional problems. The Triple P system meets the standards-of-evidence criteria for dissemination promulgated by the Society for Prevention Research (2004): substantial evidence of efficacy and effectiveness; the ability to go to scale including professionally developed resource materials and a standardized training and accreditation process for service providers; clear and readily available cost information relating to program cost effectiveness (e.g., Mihalopoulos et al. 2007); availability of evaluation tools for providers; and, identification of the conditions necessary to promote program sustainability and quality assurance (e.g., Turner and Sanders 2006).

The evidence base for Triple P is extensive. Various components of the Triple P system have been subjected to a series of controlled evaluations, and have consistently shown positive effects on observed and parent-reported child behavior problems, parenting practices, and parents' adjustment across sites, investigators, family characteristics, cultures, and countries. The substantial evidence base supporting Triple P to date includes 43 controlled trials addressing efficacy, effectiveness, and dissemination, as well as 22 service-based field evaluations (e.g., Morawska and Sanders 2006; Plant and Sanders 2007; Sanders 1999; Sanders et al. 2002, 2004, 2007a, b; Turner and Sanders 2006). An integrated series of controlled outcome studies has provided considerable evidence demonstrating the benefits of the various levels of intervention and modes of delivery in a variety of populations (see Sanders 2008). This program of research has shown successful outcomes with a number of populations and problem areas, with consistent improvement in quality of parenting across studies (e.g., Bor et al. 2002; Sanders et al. 2000; Sanders and McFarland 2000). Triple P has been evaluated as a universal, whole of population strategy and shown to strengthen parenting and reduce the prevalence of conduct problems in preschool-aged children from high-risk neighborhoods (Zubrick et al. 2005), and to reduce coercive parenting practices through the implementation of multiple levels of Triple P (Sanders et al. 2008). Several effectiveness and dissemination studies have been conducted on Triple P demonstrating portability and broad utility in multiple settings (Sanders et al. 2003a, b; Turner and Sanders 2006; Zubrick et al. 2005). Additionally, several independent replications of Triple P implementation and findings in diverse cultural contexts have been conducted (Bodenmann et al. 2008; Cann et al. 2003; Crisante and Ng 2003; Dean et al. 2003; Gallart and Matthey 2005; Heinrichs et al. 2005, 2006a, b, c; Leung et al. 2003; Rogers et al. 2003; Turner et al. 2007).

The Triple P system was designed in specific ways for broad and efficient dissemination. The tiered levels of intervention matched to families' differing needs work well

with the public health principle of minimal sufficiency (i.e., the least amount of intervention to solve the problem at hand and prevent future difficulties). Use of the media as a universal tool is another public-health compatible feature. In the Triple P system, a media and communication strategy is utilized extensively in a sophisticated and strategic manner to normalize and acknowledge the difficulties of parenting experiences, to break down parental sense of social isolation regarding parenting, to de-stigmatize getting help, to impart parenting information directly to parents, and to alter the community context for parenting (Sanders 1999; Sanders and Turner 2002).

Building on the public health strategies and evidence base of Triple P, Prinz and Sanders (2007a, b) launched the U.S. Triple P System Population Trial (TPSPT) to test the extent to which implementation of the Triple P system can reduce the prevalence of CM at a population level. This trial is based on the following conceptual frame:

1. Official CM grossly underestimates the magnitude of the problem. There are many parents in the population who might be engaging in abuse-prone parenting practices, which means a broad strategy is needed for preventive interventions.
2. A preventive approach is needed that reduces the population pool of families who might contribute to substantiated and potential cases of CM.
3. Triple P offers a population-based approach to strengthening parenting. In addition to evidence supporting the effectiveness for various facets of Triple P in improving parenting and reducing children's problems, Sanders et al. (2008) recently showed how the concurrent implementation of multiple levels of Triple P in a population application can reduce coercive parenting.
4. Although the accruing evidence for Triple P provides justification, it is nonetheless new territory to determine whether a population approach to parenting intervention such as Triple P can have preventive impact on population-level indicators of child maltreatment.

This population trial randomizes geographical units (i.e., counties) to condition, matching on demographic and child-abuse variables, and evaluates the impact of implementing Triple P with the existing workforce on population indicators related to child maltreatment (i.e., rates of substantiated child maltreatment, child out-of-home placements, and child hospitalizations and emergency room visits for maltreatment injuries). In contrast to a clinical trial which examines preventive effects at the level of the individual, a population trial targets rates and aggregate dimensions for entire geographic areas. By necessity this population trial gains advantage in studying broad impact but gives up the measurement and methodological precision

inherent in clinical evaluation of individual families. However, the impact of Triple P on individual families has already been thoroughly documented in terms of many controlled efficacy and effectiveness studies.

There are very few CM-related indicators that lend themselves to population-level measurement and are available across a time period extending for several years. The population indicators chosen for this population trial met several criteria: (1) standardized across counties and delivered to a central repository; (2) measure of CM (substantiated CM cases; CM injuries) or its immediate consequence (child out-of-home placement); (3) associated with significant human and financial costs; and (4) recorded by personnel not involved in the dissemination of the preventive intervention in the population trial. Substantiated CM was chosen over reports because the former is associated with real and potentially costly sequelae beyond the initiation of an evaluation or investigation. The three population indicators chosen for the study had the added benefit of being derived from three separate systems (i.e., Child Protective Services, Foster Care System, and hospitals), which allowed for relatively independent corroboration and documentation of possible preventive effects.

## Method

### Design

The design for the U.S. TPSPT consists of the stratified random assignment of 18 medium-sized counties in a southeastern state to dissemination and control conditions, controlling for county population size, county poverty rate, and county child abuse rate. The conditions were: (1) Triple P System, which involved implementation of the core Triple P system with the existing workforce; and (2) Control, which meant services as usual without implementation of Triple P. Prevention of CM in this design is defined by three population indicators (see [Measures](#) section) evaluated after a 2-year period of intervention dissemination controlling for the pre-intervention level. The pre-post randomized design builds in a 2-year period deemed to be necessary to train a sufficient number of service providers in the participating counties and to allow a sufficient amount of time for those providers to deliver the preventive interventions to many families. Using the three control variables for stratified random assignment of counties was intended to reduce initial between-condition differences with respect to population size, which could be correlated with services available to families; poverty rate, which might make it more difficult to achieve intervention success; and child abuse rate, which is related to the outcomes of interest.

## Participants

**Counties** All of the 18 counties selected for the TPSPT had population sizes between 50,000 and 175,000, and none of the counties had any prior exposure to Triple P at the start of the population trial. Counties were not selected on the basis of community or organizational amenability to participation; and recruitment of providers and organizations did not take place until after randomization of counties. Population size was the main factor in selecting counties to arrive at units that were reasonably comparable by eliminating very small counties that would not have sufficient population to implement the preventive interventions and detect effects, and by eliminating very large counties that would individually account for too much of the overall variance. The counties ranged in demographics from rural to semi-urban. In terms of the broader context, the agencies and services in these counties had suffered significant funding cuts over several years. Although multiple disciplines and agencies served the target population (i.e., families), services often were disconnected, with inadequate referral pathways operating and providers sometimes relying on conflicting approaches. The counties appeared to have little or no prior exposure to evidence-based parenting programs of any kind.

**Families** For this trial, the referent population in the 18 counties was all families with at least one child under 8 years of age (though because this was a population-level trial, no families formally entered the trial). In the Triple P System counties, this is approximately 85,000 families in any given year. The birth to 8 years child group refers to the target age for assessing preventive effects on CM and was chosen because this is the period of greatest risk for CM selected by the funder (CDC) for the initiative. Separate from the target age for judging preventive effects, however, it should be noted that providers were trained in Triple P for a broader age range (birth to 12 years) consistent with the inherent breadth of Triple P so that providers who straddled the target age (e.g., 5–12 years) in terms of the families they served would find Triple P of greater utility in their work.

**Service providers** A key facet of the population-based dissemination of the Triple P system involves the engagement, training, and support of a broad array of service providers from several disciplines and settings including: family support services (social workers and therapists affiliated with county health centers, mental health centers, and schools), social services (family services, social workers), preschool and child-care settings (directors, teachers), elementary schools (parent educators, guidance counselors, kindergarten teachers),

non-governmental organizations (e.g., early childhood NGOs, child-abuse prevention NGOs), private-sector practitioners, health centers (primary healthcare providers), and other community entities having direct contact with parents and families. For the 2-year intervention period pertinent to this report, 649 service providers participated in Triple P professional training courses. Demographically, 91.7% of the providers were female, 57.0% European American (not Hispanic), 38.3% African American, 1.3% Hispanic, and 3.4% other ethnic/racial groups, with a mean age of 44.5 (SD=14.1). Most (81%) of the providers had already been engaged in parent consultation work for at least 5 years prior to Triple P training, and 59% had over 10 years of such experience.

## System of Parenting Interventions

The Triple P—Positive Parenting Program, developed by Sanders and colleagues at the University of Queensland, is a multi-level preventive intervention system designed for families having at least one child in the birth to 12-year-old range (the core programs). All programming levels of Triple P have intervention manuals that have been carefully developed, systematic training regimens for providers/practitioners, and coordinated resource materials for parents (videos, workbooks, and tip sheets). The five core principles of positive parenting that are invoked throughout the multi-level Triple P system to promote social competence and emotional self-regulation in children are: (1) ensuring a safe, engaging environment, (2) promoting a positive learning environment, (3) using assertive discipline, (4) maintaining reasonable expectations, and (5) taking care of oneself as a parent. The emphasis is on parents learning how to apply these skills to different behavioral, emotional and developmental issues in children, ranging from common child-rearing challenges (e.g., toiletting, mealtime behavior, bedtime, behavior in public) to more intense challenges (e.g., child aggressive behavior, fears and anxiety, ADHD difficulties). The five positive-parenting principles translate into 35 specific strategies and parenting skills that cluster into several major categories: (a) parent–child relationship enhancement, (b) encouraging desirable behavior, (c) teaching new skills and behaviors, (d) managing misbehaviors, (e) preventing problems in high-risk situations, (f) self-regulation skills, (g) parental mood management and coping skills, and (h) partner support and communication skills. Triple P provides developmentally tailored menu options that facilitate parental goal setting and self-regulation. Parents learn how to apply those techniques and strategies that are relevant to their child, the parent's goals, and the family situation.



*Universal Triple P (Level 1)* The Universal (Level One) facet of the Triple P intervention involves the implementation of media and informational strategies pertaining to positive parenting. These strategies are intended to destigmatize parenting and family support, make effective parenting strategies readily accessible to all parents, and facilitate help-seeking and self-regulation by parents who need higher intensity intervention. Universal Triple P includes use of radio, local newspapers, newsletters at schools, mass mailings to family households, presence at community events, and website information. Use of local newspapers takes three forms: (1) Positive parenting articles written by Sanders on specific topics of interest to parents; (2) local press releases on human interest stories that link with Triple P activities; and (3) stories generated by reporters with whom the publicity team has developed working relationships. The TPSPT avoided any media outlets (e.g., television) or communication strategies that overlapped with the Control counties.

*Selected Triple P (Level 2)* The Selected Triple P program has utility for many parents and is intended to normalize parenting interventions. There are two delivery formats for Selected Triple P: (1) brief and flexible consultation with individual parents; and (2) parenting seminars with large groups of parents. The brief and flexible consultation format involves one to two consultation contacts (20 min each) and is designed for parents with relatively minor and fairly discrete problem behaviors that do not require more intensive levels of intervention. However, this is also a useful and non-threatening strategy to help parents begin to address their own parenting behaviors but in the context of their asking for information or assistance about their child's behavior. The intervention can be provided in the context of well childcare, daycare and preschool settings, and in other settings where parents may have routine contact with service providers and other professionals who regularly assist families. Selected Triple P can be viewed as a form of anticipatory development guidance. The parenting seminar format of Selected Triple P, called the Triple P Seminar Series, involves three 90-min sessions designed for delivery to large groups of parents. The seminar series includes specific seminars on the following topics: The Power of Positive Parenting; Raising Confident, Competent Children; Raising Resilient Children. The three seminars are independent of each other so that parents can attend any or all of them and still benefit. Seminars are used to promote awareness of Triple P and as brief and informative sessions for any parent. Each seminar includes a presentation, a question and answer period, distribution of a parenting tip sheet, and availability of practitioners at the end of the session to deal with individual inquiries and requests for further assistance.

*Primary Care Triple P (Level 3)* The Primary Care Triple P program, like Selected Triple P, is appropriate for the management of discrete child problem behaviors that are not complicated by other major behavior management difficulties or significant family dysfunction. The key difference is that provision of advice and information alone is supported by active skills training for those parents who require it to implement the recommended parenting strategies. This program level is especially appropriate for parents of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with respect to common child behavior problems and parenting challenges. Level Three involves a series of four brief (20-min) consultations that incorporate active skills training and the selective use of parenting tip sheets covering common developmental and behavioral problems of preadolescent children. This brief and flexible consultation modality also builds in generalization enhancement strategies for teaching parents how to apply knowledge and skills gained to non-targeted behaviors and other children in the family.

*Standard and Group Triple P (Level 4)* The Level 4 program benefits indicated populations of children who have detectable problems but who may or may not yet meet diagnostic criteria for a behavioral disorder, and parents who are struggling with parenting challenges. Parents learn a variety of child management skills and how to apply these skills both at home and in the community. Level 4 combines the provision of information with active skills training and support, as well as teaching parents to apply skills to a broad range of target behaviors in both home and community settings with the target child and siblings. Two different delivery formats for Level 4 Triple P were deployed in the TPSPT: (1) Standard: a 10-session program (up to 90 min per session) with individual families that utilizes active skills training methods, as well as home visits or clinic observation sessions (40–60 min each); (2) Group: An 8-session group-administered program which employs an active skills training process; consists of five 2-h group sessions that provide opportunities for parents to learn through observation, discussion, practice and feedback; three 15–30 min follow-up telephone sessions provide additional support to parents as they put into practice what they have learned in the group sessions.

*Enhanced Triple P (Level 5)* Enhanced Triple P is an optional augmentation of Standard (Level 4) Triple P for families with additional risk factors that might need to be addressed through the intervention. Many families can receive sufficient benefit from Standard Triple P without extending programming with Enhanced Triple P. Enhanced Triple P includes optional intervention modules on partner communication, mood management and stress coping skills for parents, and additional practice sessions addressing parent–child issues.

## Recruitment and Training of Service Providers

After randomization of counties to condition, recruitment of service providers and organizations took place in the nine Triple P System counties. Service providers were recruited through many settings that provided services to families to participate in Triple P professional training courses. The dissemination staff identified and contacted stakeholders at both the state and local (county) levels in support services for parents of young children, including representatives from a wide range of provider systems such as education, school readiness, childcare, mental health, social services, and health. The staff introduced the Triple P system of interventions to each stakeholder group and organization and then worked with each entity to consider training needs and the ability to deliver parent consultation services (described in more detail in Shapiro, Prinz and Sanders 2008). Communications with prospective service providers and organizations included discussion of how Triple P could be incorporated into existing workplace activities to serve significant numbers of families. Providers who served families in the Triple P System counties were invited to the training courses, and providers in other counties (including the Control counties) were not permitted to undertake the training.

The Triple P system has a standardized training and quality-promotion protocol that is used worldwide and was adopted in the TPSPT. Triple P professional training courses delivered by experienced trainers involved attendance at a multi-day training program (2 or 3 days, depending on course level), intensive self-review of intervention materials, competency practice and feedback at a day-long session, and completion of accreditation requirements. The training process included didactic instruction, modeling by the trainer, video examples of discrete skills, small-group exercises for active skills practice, and group discussions of key issues. More details about the Triple P professional training process can be found elsewhere (Sanders et al. 2003a, b; Shapiro et al. 2008).

## Measures

**Public awareness of Triple P** A random telephone survey of households was conducted pre-intervention and again at post-intervention to determine relative growth in public awareness of Triple P in the two sets of counties. The surveys were based on random-dialing sampling of population databases of households where children resided. Response rates for the two administrations of the survey were 42.6% and 49.7% respectively. Respondents who identified themselves as primary caregivers for at least one child under 8 years of age were asked whether they had heard of each of a number of parenting programs including Triple P in the list

(query order of programs was rotated across respondents). The number of respondents in the Triple P System counties was 1,794 at pre-intervention and 1,854 at post-intervention, and 1,836 and 1,826 respectively in the Control counties.

**Estimated number of families participating in Triple P** Follow-up telephone interviews with Triple P trained service providers were used to estimate the number of families to whom programming was delivered. Six months after participating in Triple P professional training, providers were contacted and asked about the number of families they served with Triple P (a) in the most recent 4-week period and (b) during the time since participation in Triple P training. The responses to these two interview questions were converted to annualized figures, which provided an upper and lower estimate of the number of families whom providers indicated had participated in Triple P programming. These estimates are considered to be rough projections, which on the one hand could be overestimates because there is an assumption of constant rate of programming by any given provider, but on the other hand are likely to be underestimates because the data are extrapolated to a 12-month period even though the intervention period was actually 24 months.

**Population outcome indicators** Three population indicators related to CM served as the outcome variables for this study and were derived from independent data-collection systems deposited with a state-run statistical division. The first indicator was substantiated CM recorded by child protective services staff. These data were unduplicated such that no CM case was counted more than once in a given year. The second was child out-of-home placements recorded through the foster care system. The third was child hospitalizations and emergency-room visits due to CM injuries, which were recorded by medical staff in compliance with mandatory state reporting requirements for hospitals, regardless of whether or when Child Protective Services was involved. All three population indicators were computed as annual rates per 1,000 children in the birth to 8-year-old age range.

## Results

### Pre-intervention Demographic Characteristics of the Counties

The two sets of counties were compared with respect to pre-intervention demographic characteristics. At pre-intervention, the Triple P System counties did not differ significantly ( $\alpha=0.10$ ) from the Control counties with respect to county population, percentage of the population in poverty,

and racial composition, and were quite comparable as reflected in Table 1. Pre-intervention levels for the three outcome indicators, calculated as an average over the 5-year period prior to the study (i.e., prior to randomization) for each indicator, also did not differentiate the two sets of counties (Table 1).

### Implementation

**Triple P training of existing workforce** During the first 2 years of dissemination, a total of 649 service providers in the Triple P System counties received training across the system levels via 69 Triple P professional training courses. A breakdown by discipline and employment for Triple P trained providers is found in Table 2 and reflects wide diversity of individuals and disciplines. Table 2 also shows a breakdown of settings in which Triple P trained providers were working. With respect to level of Triple P, 63.9% were trained only in Levels 2/3 Triple P and 36.1% were trained in Level 4 Triple P or above. About a third of the latter group also received training in Levels 2/3 Triple P, which allowed them to be more flexible implementers. In terms of distribution of providers across the nine Triple P system counties, the mean per-county number of Triple P trained individuals was 38.8 providers per 50,000 population (SD=14.8), which ranged from a low of 20.9 providers per 50,000 to a high of 60.0 providers per 50,000 population. This broke down into 25.4 providers per 50,000 population (per county) for Levels 2/3 Triple P (SD=13.7) and 13.4 providers per 50,000 for Level 4+ Triple P (SD=7.9).

**Media and communications dissemination** Universal (Level 1) Triple P was disseminated widely in the Triple P System counties over the 2-year intervention period. The number of occurrences is summarized in Table 2 for each of the media and communications vehicles.

**Public awareness of Triple P** After 2 years of intervention, randomly surveyed households in the Triple P System counties showed significantly higher proportion of awareness regarding Triple P (Mean=17.1%, SD=3.5) than did those in the Control counties (Mean=5.5%, SD=2.7),  $t(16)=7.86$ ,  $p<.0001$ . Consistent with this observation, the Triple P System counties showed significant growth in proportion of Triple P awareness from a mean of 4.8% (SD=1.6) to a mean of 17.1% (SD=3.5),  $t(8)=9.24$ ,  $p<.0001$ , while Control counties did not show significant change from a mean of 4.5% (SD=1.5) to a mean of 5.5% (SD=2.7),  $t(8)=0.95$ , ns.

**Estimation of family participation** Based on follow-up telephone interviews with Triple P trained service providers, it was estimated that between 8,883 and 13,560 families participated in Triple P within the Triple P System counties (i.e., totaled across the nine counties and approximately mirroring the distribution of trained providers across the counties). Between 71% and 75% of these families were reported to have received Levels 2/3 Triple P, and the remainder Level 4 Triple P and above.

### Population Outcomes

The unit of randomization, county, was the unit of analysis for the three population outcome indicators: Substantiated CM, child out-of-home placements, and hospitalizations or emergency-room visits for CM injuries.

**Preliminary analyses** Prior to conducting the primary pre-post analyses, preliminary analyses of the three population indicators for the 5 years prior to the TPSPT were undertaken retrospectively to determine if the two clusters of counties showed any pre-study trends or differences.

**Table 1** Pre-intervention demographic characteristics of the Triple P System and Control counties

Characteristic	County cluster		t-test comparison	
	Triple P system mean (SD)	Control mean (SD)	t (df=16)	Significance
County population	96,054 (39,035)	99,216 (40,813)	0.17	NS ( $p=0.87$ )
Percentage of individuals in poverty	14.8 (2.8)	15.3 (3.0)	0.36	NS ( $p=0.73$ )
Percentage of children (birth to 17) in poverty	21.2 (4.5)	21.4 (4.1)	0.10	NS ( $p=0.92$ )
Racial composition (% African American)	31.4 (11.8)	30.8 (14.9)	0.11	NS ( $p=0.92$ )
Child maltreatment rate over 5-year pre-randomization period	10.82 (4.36)	11.40 (6.75)	0.22	NS ( $p=0.83$ )
Child out-of-home placement rate over 5-year pre-randomization period	4.02 (1.59)	3.76 (1.91)	0.30	NS ( $p=0.77$ )
Child maltreatment injuries rate over 5-year pre-randomization period	1.72 (0.66)	1.44 (0.53)	0.99	NS ( $p=0.34$ )

Notes: Rates for child maltreatment, out-of-home placement, and injuries are per 1,000 children under 8 years of age, annualized. Child maltreatment injuries are based on data reported for hospitalizations and emergency-room visits

**Table 2** Implementation variables in the U.S. Triple P System Population Trial

	Percentage	Quantity
Service providers trained in Triple P		
Type of service provider		
Counselors, therapists, guidance counselors	29.7%	
Parent educators, family literacy workers	16.3%	
Social workers	15.5%	
Childcare staff	10.5%	
Nurses, nurse practitioners	7.4%	
Administrators, managers	5.1%	
School personnel (other than parent educators)	4.6%	
Other (e.g., law enforcement, clergy, other medical)	10.9%	
Settings with Triple P providers		
Type of setting		
Education	24.9%	
Non-governmental organizations (NGO) and independent practitioners	23.5%	
Mental health and substance abuse services	19.7%	
Childcare and preschools	16.2%	
Healthcare	10.5%	
Social services	3.8%	
Other	1.4%	
Universal (Level 1) Triple P: media and communication strategies		
Media/communication vehicle		
Positive parenting newspaper articles		21
Press releases related to Triple P dissemination		185
Local newspaper stories related to Triple P dissemination		63
Newsletters to parents		26,000
Radio public service announcements distributed		37
Community events where Triple P was represented		24

Each population indicator was subjected to a County Cluster (2 clusters) by Time (5 pre-randomization years) repeated measures analysis of variance, and the County Cluster by Time interactions were of particular interest. All three interactions were clearly non-significant: substantiated CM,  $F(4, 13)=0.22$ ,  $p=0.92$ ; out-of-home placements,  $F(4, 13)=1.34$ ,  $p=0.31$ ; child CM injuries,  $F(4, 13)=1.38$ ,  $p=0.30$ .

**Primary analyses** For each of the indicators, post-intervention rates for the Triple P System and Control conditions were compared, controlling for pre-intervention rate from the year just prior to the initiation of intervention. As reflected in Table 3, differential and positive effects on the Triple P System counties were found for rates of substantiated CM, child out-of-home placements, and hospitalizations or emergency-room visits for CM injuries. The effect sizes calculated as Cohen's  $d$  ranged from 1.09 to 1.22, which are all considered to be in the large to very large range according to Cohen (1988).

**Supplementary analysis** Although not a primary population indicator in this study, CM investigation rate was examined in a supplementary analysis because some investigators have argued that substantiations and investigations should both be evaluated (Drake and Jonson-Reid 2000). A differential and positive effect for CM investigation rate was found, with a medium effect size of  $d=0.51$  (significance level notwithstanding because of so few statistical sampling units),  $t(16)=1.08$ ,  $p=0.15$  (Triple P System: pre-intervention rate 18.08, post-intervention rate 18.49; Control: pre-intervention rate 18.74, post-intervention rate 21.91).

## Discussion

The U.S. Triple P System Population Trial is the first study of its kind, of which we are aware, to randomize communities to condition, implement evidence-based parenting interventions as a prevention strategy, and then demonstrate positive impact

**Table 3** Child maltreatment-related population outcomes for Triple P System versus Control conditions

	Rates per 1,000 children (birth to 8 years of age)				<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Signif.	Effect size
	Triple P system counties		Control counties					
	Pre-intervention	Post-intervention	Pre-intervention	Post-intervention				
Substantiated CM cases	10.86	11.74	11.12	15.06	2.09	16	<i>p</i> <0.03	1.09
Out-of-home placements	4.27	3.75	3.10	4.46	2.60	16	<i>p</i> <0.01	1.22
Child CM injuries (hosp & ER)	1.73	1.41	1.41	1.69	2.36	16	<i>p</i> <0.02	1.14

Notes: The  $t$ -tests compared the two conditions with respect to pre-post difference scores. The effect size is Cohen's  $d$  statistic



on population indicators of CM. Preventive effects for all three population indicators (substantiated cases of CM, child out-of-home placements, and CM injuries) differentiated Triple P System from Control conditions, taking into account baseline levels.

Several design and implementation facets of this study support the proposition that observed preventive effects were attributable to the intervention manipulation. Randomization of counties to condition while controlling for county characteristics (size, poverty level, child abuse level) guarded against threats to internal validity. The two randomized sets of counties were comparable on the dependent variables over the 5-year pre-randomization period, as reflected in non-significant and negligible county cluster by time interactions. Dissemination in the Triple P System counties via professional training, well distributed across all nine counties, and media/communications strategies was extensive and well-documented. Public awareness showed significant differential growth in the Triple P System counties. Finally, follow-up telephone interviews regarding implementation of Triple P indicated that providers reported delivering Triple P to a large number of families (i.e., estimated between 8,883 and 13,560 families).

The prevention effect was fairly robust in magnitude. All three population indicators showed large effects, which were also all statistically significant despite only 18 units of randomization. Each of the three indicators was derived from an independently recorded data source, which lends further support to the robustness of the findings. Substantiated CM was recorded by child protective services workers, child out-of-home placements were recorded within the foster care system, and CM injuries were recorded by medical personnel in hospitals. Interestingly, for substantiated CM the preventive effect took the form of holding the growth of CM down in comparison to the control counties which showed substantial growth in CM, whereas for the child out-of-home placements and CM injuries, the preventive effects reflected decreases in those indicators for the Triple P System counties. However, it should also be noted that the increase in substantiated CM in the control counties mirrored similar increases across the other 28 counties in the same state that were not part of the TPSPT, suggesting that the preventive intervention disrupted the trend occurring throughout the state.

The real-world magnitude of the observed effects can be derived from the data. In a community with 100,000 children under 8 years of age, these effects would translate into 688 fewer cases of CM, 240 fewer out-of-home placements, and 60 fewer children with injuries requiring hospitalization or emergency room treatment. These types of data lend themselves to a cost–benefit analysis, which is planned for the future and will build on an article recently

published regarding the infrastructure cost associated with dissemination in this population trial (Foster et al. 2008).

The results of this study demonstrate the feasibility and benefits of implementing a large-scale parenting intervention, using a population-based approach, to prevent CM. The concurrent implementation of all levels of the Triple P system took the form of a workforce development strategy that involved training the existing service providers to use evidence-based parenting interventions, rather than hiring a large number of additional providers. The training was brief (typically 3 to 6 days depending on program level), the dissemination utilized a multidisciplinary workforce of providers who remained in their existing service settings, and many points of access for parents were created.

One question that might arise is whether there was a systematic reporting bias in one or more of the three population indicators. With respect to substantiated CM cases, which are reported in a standardized system for Child Protective Services workers, the TPSPT did not involve training of these workers who undertook CM investigations. Furthermore, less than 3% of the providers who were trained in Triple P were employed through social services, which meant that the preventive intervention did not constitute a major presence in that agency. The reporting of out-of-home placements by Foster Care System staff is a relatively concrete enterprise (i.e., either a placement was made or it was not). And finally, hospitalization and emergency room reporting of child injuries were made by medical staff who were not involved in Triple P training. It appears to be unlikely that the observed effects for all three population indicators could be accounted for by reporter bias.

The present findings need to be interpreted in light of the study's potential limitations. First, the indices used to gauge the prevalence of CM, although independent from each other, are relatively gross measures that tend to underestimate the true prevalence of harmful parenting practices. Second, it is important to determine whether effects observed following population exposure to parenting intervention are maintained over an extended time period. However, the Triple P intervention model assumes that effects will continue to the extent that parenting support continues to be available to parents in the community. The approach is not the equivalent of a parenting vaccine, where a single-shot exposure will afford continuing protection for the population. With a mobile population, parents of children at various ages are always entering a catchment area but have no prior exposure to Triple P. A third caveat is the possibility of spillover effects from intervention to control counties. Some Triple P trained providers might have moved to control counties, or families residing in a control county might have received services in an intervention county. Some of the media communications might have spilled over into control counties, although the media

vehicles were carefully selected to minimize this type of event. Most importantly, any spillover that might have occurred would have worked *against* finding an intervention effect of the Triple P system.

Additional limitations stem from the fact that this was a population trial rather than a more traditional clinical trial. A population trial in which place is randomized to condition, which is a relatively new or at least uncommon design for the field of CM prevention, is not a gigantic clinical trial. The focus was on training and dissemination on a broad scale and the impact on population-level indicators, rather than on data related to service delivery (e.g., engagement, intervention fidelity) and behavior change at the individual family level. There are practical, methodological, and conceptual reasons for not trying to collect these kinds of data. On the practical side, conducting a clinical and a population trial at the same time would have taken considerably higher resources. Methodologically, attempts to collect individual-level data might have been intrusive for organizations, providers, and families, which might have invoked reactance and possibly created obstacles to full dissemination. Finally, from a conceptual perspective, a large body of evidence on Triple P has already established effectiveness (including intervention fidelity and transportability), which provided a sound foundation on which to build the population trial. That said, there is still a big need to conduct studies on how to increase engagement of families in preventive intervention contexts.

Effect sizes are important for deriving policy implications from population trials such as the present one. It is important to note, however, that the effect sizes observed at a population level should not be confused with effect sizes for individual families or children found in more traditional trials conducted at the level of the individual. The population-level effect sizes reported here, which appropriately treated county (not individual) as the unit of analysis, should only be compared to other population-level effects reported in the literature, and not to individual-level effects. Similarly, the effects observed for individual-level trials cannot and should not be assumed to correspond to or predict population-level effects, and in fact the effect-size values from those trials might translate into smaller effect sizes when recalibrated to apply to a population rather than a selected sample. From a policy standpoint, population level effects are of primary importance (Nilsen 2005).

Population trials are new to both the parenting intervention and the CM fields. There is much to learn about how to conduct and interpret population trials, and to better understand what is needed to sustain or enhance effects on prevalence indicators. Some of the challenges discovered during this effort include: (1) the need for unobtrusive but systematic ways to track the occurrence of other programs and interventions in the communities; (2)

how to determine what levels of program penetration of the population are required to attain particular levels of impact on population indicators; (3) unobtrusive strategies for tracking density of program delivery; and (4) the need for surveillance procedures for characterizing the size of the existing workforce in a community that is serving parents and families. The latter issue is more difficult than it might appear. In the TPSPT, the dissemination drew on many different types of providers across a wide variety of settings, but there was no master list of providers. There are registries of licensed professional in a county (e.g., all licensed social workers), but this information would be misleading because many of the social workers might be serving other populations besides families of young children, such as the elderly or the terminally ill. In addition, many of the providers who can deliver Triple P work in less traditional settings and come from a broad variety of disciplines.

This trial provides an excellent opportunity to enhance the field's understanding about population dissemination. As such the trial should be viewed as the beginning of a line of population research in the prevention of CM, from which we can expect to learn much over the next several years.

All things considered, this study provides an encouraging demonstration that evidence-based parenting interventions can achieve population-level preventive impact on major social problems such as CM. Furthermore, the study's findings support the utility of blending prevention of CM and promotion of child and family well-being in a public health strategy (Carmona 2006), with the Triple P system providing an integrated model for this approach.

**Acknowledgments** The research described in this paper was supported by Grant #U17/CCU422317 to Prinz and Sanders from the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The authors wish to acknowledge the contributions of Douglas Levine and Wilma Sims to the research effort. The findings and conclusions in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

**Open Access** This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial License which permits any noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited.

## References

- Biglan, A. (1995). Translating what we know about the context of antisocial behavior into a lower prevalence of such behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 28, 479–492. doi:10.1901/jaba.1995.28-479.

- Biglan, A., & Metzler, C. (1998). A public health perspective for research on family-focused interventions. In R. S. Ashery, E. B. Robertson, & K. L. Kumpfer (Eds.), *Drug abuse prevention through family interventions*. NIDA Research Monograph 177, NIH Publication No. 994135 (pp. 430–458). Washington, DC: National Institute on Drug Abuse.
- Bodenmann, G., Cina, A., Ledermann, T., & Sanders, M. R. (2008). The efficacy of the Triple P—Positive Parenting Program in improving parenting and child behavior: A comparison of two other treatment conditions. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 46, 411–427.
- Bor, W., Sanders, M. R., & Markie-Dadds, C. (2002). The effects of the Triple P—Positive Parenting Program on preschool children with co-occurring disruptive behavior and attentional/hyperactive difficulties. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 30, 571–587. doi:10.1023/A:1020807613155.
- Cann, W., Rogers, H., & Matthews, J. (2003). Family Intervention Service program evaluation: A brief report on initial outcomes for families. *Australian e-Journal for the Advancement of Mental Health*, 2.
- Carmona, R. H. (2006). *Making prevention of child maltreatment a national priority: Implementing innovations of a public health approach*. Washington, D.C.: Surgeon General's Workshop. March 30–31 2005.
- Chaffin, M., Silovsky, J. F., Funderburk, B., Valle, L. A., Brestan, E. V., Balachova, T., et al. (2004). Parent–Child Interaction Therapy with physically abusive parents: Efficacy for reducing future abuse reports. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 72, 500–510. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.72.3.500.
- Cicchetti, D., Rogosch, F. A., & Toth, S. L. (2006). Fostering secure attachment in infants in maltreating families through preventive interventions. *Development and Psychopathology*, 18, 623–649.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Crisante, L., & Ng, S. (2003). Implementation and process issues in using Group Triple P with Chinese parents: Preliminary findings. *Australian e-Journal for the Advancement of Mental Health*, 2.
- Dean, C., Myers, K., & Evans, E. (2003). Community-wide implementation of a parenting program: The South East Sydney Positive Parenting Project. *Australian e-Journal for the Advancement of Mental Health*, 2.
- Drake, B., & Jonson-Reid, M. (2000). Substantiation and early decision points in public child welfare: A conceptual reconsideration. *Child Maltreatment*, 5, 227–235. doi:10.1177/1077559500005003003.
- Duggan, A., Fuddy, L., Burrell, L., Higman, S. M., McFarlane, E., Windham, A., et al. (2004). Randomized trial of a statewide home visiting program to prevent child abuse: Impact in reducing parental risk factors. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 28, 623–643.
- Fergusson, D. M., Grant, H., Horwood, L. J., & Ridder, E. M. (2005). Randomized trial of the Early Start program of home visitation. *Pediatrics*, 116, 803–809. doi:10.1542/peds.2005-0948.
- Foster, E. M., Prinz, R. J., Sanders, M. R., & Shapiro, C. J. (2008). The costs of a public health infrastructure for delivering parenting and family support. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 30, 493–501. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2007.11.002.
- Fromm, S. (2001). *Total estimated cost of child abuse and neglect in the United States: Statistical evidence*. Report submitted by Prevent Child Abuse America to The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation.
- Gallart, S. C., & Matthey, S. (2005). The effectiveness of Group Triple P and the impact of the four telephone contacts. *Behaviour Change*, 22, 71–80. doi:10.1375/behc.2005.22.2.71.
- Gershater-Molko, R. M., Lutzker, J. R., & Wesch, D. (2002). Using recidivism data to evaluate Project SafeCare: Teaching bonding, safety, and healthcare skills to parents. *Child Maltreatment*, 7, 277–285. doi:10.1177/1077559502007003009.
- Harder, J. (2005). Prevention of child abuse and neglect: An evaluation of a home visitation parent aide program using recidivism data. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 15, 246–256. doi:10.1177/1049731505275062.
- Heinrichs, N., Bertram, H., Kuschel, A., & Hahlweg, K. (2005). Parent recruitment and retention in a universal prevention program for child behavior and emotional problems: Barriers to research and program participation. *Prevention Science*, 6, 1–12. doi:10.1007/s1121-005-0006-1.
- Heinrichs, N., Hahlweg, K., Bertram, H., Kuschel, A., Naumann, S., & Harstick, S. (2006a). Die langfristige Wirksamkeit eines Elterntrainings zur universellen Prävention kindlicher Verhaltensstörungen: Ergebnisse aus Sicht der Mutter und Vater. *Zeitschrift fuer Klinische Psychologie und Psychotherapie*, 35, 72–86. Long term effectiveness of parenting training for universal prevention of child behavior disorders doi:10.1026/1616-3443.35.1.72.
- Heinrichs, N., Hahlweg, K., Kuschel, A., Bertram, H., Harstick, S., & Naumann, S. (2006b). Triple P aus Sicht der Eltern. *Kindheit und Entwicklung*, 15, 19–26. Triple P from the parents' perspective doi:10.1026/0942-5403.15.1.19.
- Heinrichs, N., Kruger, S., & Guse, U. (2006c). Der Einfluss von Anreizen auf die Rekrutierung von Eltern und auf die Effektivität eines präventiven Elterntrainings. *Zeitschrift fuer Klinische Psychologie und Psychotherapie*, 35, 97–108. The effects of incentives on recruitment rates of parents and the effectiveness of a preventive parent training program doi:10.1026/1616-3443.35.2.97.
- Leung, C., Sanders, M. R., Leung, S., Mak, R., & Lau, J. (2003). An outcome evaluation of the implementation of the Triple P—Positive Parenting Program in Hong Kong. *Family Process*, 42, 531–544. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.2003.00531.x.
- MacMillan, H. L., Thomas, B. H., Jamieson, E., Walsh, C. A., Boyle, M. H., Shannon, H. S., et al. (2005). Effectiveness of home visitation by public-health nurses in prevention of the recurrence of child physical abuse and neglect: A randomized controlled trial. *Lancet*, 365, 1786–1793. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(05)66388-X.
- McMahon, R. J. (1999). Parent training. In S. W. Rus, & T. H. Ollendick (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapies with children and families* (pp. 153–180). New York: Plenum.
- Mihalopoulos, C., Sanders, M. R., Turner, K. M. T., Murphy-Brennan, M., & Carter, R. (2007). Does the Triple P—Positive Parenting Program provide value for money? *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 41, 239–246. doi:10.1080/00048670601172723.
- Morawska, A., & Sanders, M. R. (2006). Self-administered behavioral family intervention for parents of toddlers: Part I—efficacy. *Journal of Clinical and Consulting Psychology*, 74, 10–19. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.74.1.10.
- Nilsen, P. (2005). Evaluation of community-based injury prevention programs—Methodological issues and challenges. *International Journal of Injury Control and Safety Promotion*, 12, 143–156.
- Olds, D. L., Sadler, L., & Kitzman, H. (2007). Programs for parents of infants and toddlers: Recent evidence from randomized trials. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, and Allied Disciplines*, 48, 355–391. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2006.01702.x.
- Plant, K. M., & Sanders, M. R. (2007). Reducing problem behavior during care-giving in families of preschool-aged children with developmental disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 28, 362–385. doi:10.1016/j.ridd.2006.02.009.
- Prinz, R. J. (2007). Parenting and the prevention of childhood injuries. In L. S. Doll, S. E. Bonzo, J. A. Mercy, & D. A. Sleet (Eds.), *Handbook of injury and violence prevention* (pp. 333–346). New York: Springer.
- Prinz, R. J., & Dumas, J. E. (2004). Prevention of oppositional-defiant disorder and conduct disorder in children and



- adolescents. In P. Barrett & T. H. Ollendick (Eds.), *Handbook of interventions that work with children and adolescents: From prevention to treatment* (pp. 475–488). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Prinz, R. J., & Jones, T. L. (2003). Family-based interventions. In C. A. Essau (Ed.), *Conduct and oppositional defiant disorders: Epidemiology, risk factors, and treatment* (pp. 279–298). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Prinz, R. J., & Sanders, M. R. (2007a). Adopting a population-level approach to parenting and family support interventions. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 27, 739–749.
- Prinz, R. J., & Sanders, M. R. (2007b). Testing effects on parenting at a broad scale: The U.S. Triple P System Population Trial. In N. Heinrichs, K. Hahlweg, & M. Doepfner (Eds.), *Strengthening families: Different evidence-based approaches to support child mental health* (pp. 485–511). Muenster, Germany: Psychotherapie Verlag.
- Rodrigo, M. J., Máiquez, M. L., Correa, A. D., Martín, J. C., & Rodríguez, G. (2006). Outcome evaluation of a community center-based program for mothers at high psychosocial risk. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 30, 1049–1064. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2006.03.004.
- Rogers, H., Cann, W., Cameron, D., Littlefield, L., & Lagioia, V. (2003). Evaluation of the Family Intervention Service for children presenting with characteristics associated with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Australian e-Journal for the Advancement of Mental Health*, 2.
- Sanders, M. R. (1999). Triple P—Positive Parenting Program: Towards an empirically validated multilevel parenting and family support strategy for the prevention of behavior and emotional problems in children. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 2, 71–90. doi:10.1023/A:1021843613840.
- Sanders, M. R. (2008). The Triple P—Positive Parenting Program—A public health approach to parenting support. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22, 506–517.
- Sanders, M. R., Bor, W., & Morawska, A. (2007a). Maintenance of treatment gains: A comparison of enhanced, standard, and self-directed Triple P—Positive Parenting Program. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 35, 983–998. doi:10.1007/s10802-007-9148-x.
- Sanders, M. R., Markie-Dadds, C., Rinaldis, M., Firman, D., & Baig, N. (2007b). Using household survey data to inform policy decisions regarding the delivery of evidence-based parenting interventions. *Child Care, Health and Development*, 33, 768–783. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2214.2006.00725.x.
- Sanders, M. R., Markie-Dadds, C., Tully, L., & Bor, W. (2000). The Triple P—Positive Parenting Program: A comparison of enhanced, standard and self-directed behavioral family interventions for parents of children with early onset conduct problems. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 68, 624–640. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.68.4.624.
- Sanders, M. R., Markie-Dadds, C., Turner, K. M. T., & Ralph, A. (2004). Using the Triple P system of intervention to prevent behavioural problems in children and adolescents. In P. Barrett & T. H. Ollendick (Eds.), *Handbook of interventions that work with children and adolescents: Prevention and treatment* (pp. 489–516). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Sanders, M. R., & McFarland, M. (2000). The treatment of depressed mothers with disruptive children: A controlled evaluation of cognitive behavioral family intervention. *Behavior Therapy*, 31, 89–112. doi:10.1016/S0005-7894(00)80006-4.
- Sanders, M. R., Murphy-Brennan, M., & McAuliffe, C. (2003a). The development, evaluation and dissemination of a training program for general practitioners in evidence-based parent consultation skills. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*, 5, 13–20.
- Sanders, M. R., Ralph, A., Sofronoff, K., Gardiner, P., Thompson, R., Dwyer, S., et al. (2008). Every Family: A population approach to reducing behavioral and emotional problems in children making the transition to school. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*. doi:10.1007/s10935-008-0139-7.
- Sanders, M. R., Tully, L. A., Baade, P. D., Lynch, M. E., Heywood, A. H., Pollard, G. E., et al. (1999). A survey of parenting practices in Queensland: Implications for mental health promotion. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia*, 9, 105–114.
- Sanders, M. R., Tully, L. A., Turner, K. M. T., Maher, C., & McAuliffe, C. (2003b). Training practitioners in parent consultation skills: An evaluation of training for the Triple P—Positive Parenting Program. *Australian Family Physician*, 32, 1–6.
- Sanders, M. R., & Turner, K. M. T. (2002). The role of the media and primary care in the dissemination of evidence-based parenting and family support interventions. *the Behavior Therapist*, 25, 156–166.
- Sanders, M. R., Turner, K. M. T., & Markie-Dadds, C. (2002). The development and dissemination of the Triple P—Positive Parenting Program: A multilevel, evidence-based system of parenting and family support. *Prevention Science*, 3, 173–189. doi:10.1023/A:1019942516231.
- Sedlak, A. J., & Broadhurst, D. D. (1996). *Executive summary of the third national incidence study of child abuse and neglect*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration of Children, Youth and Families, National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect.
- Shapiro, C. J., Prinz, R. J., & Sanders, M. R. (2008). Population-wide parenting intervention training: Initial feasibility. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*. doi:10.1007/s10826-007-9170-1.
- Skowron, E., & Reinemann, D. H. S. (2005). Effectiveness of psychological interventions for child maltreatment: A meta-analysis. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 42, 52–71.
- Society for Prevention Research. (2004). *Standards of evidence: Criteria for efficacy, effectiveness and dissemination*. Falls Church, VA: Society for Prevention Research.
- Taylor, T. K., & Biglan, A. (1998). Behavioral family interventions for improving child rearing: A review of the literature for clinicians and policy makers. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 1, 41–60. doi:10.1023/A:1021848315541.
- Theodore, A. D., Chang, J. J., Runyan, D. K., Hunter, W. M., Bangdiwala, S. I., & Agans, R. (2005). Epidemiologic features of the physical and sexual maltreatment of children in the Carolinas. *Pediatrics*, 115, 331–337. doi:10.1542/peds.2004-1033.
- Timmer, S. G., Urquiza, A. J., Zebell, N. M., & McGrath, J. M. (2005). Parent–Child Interaction Therapy: Application to maltreating parent–child dyads. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 29, 825–842.
- Turner, K. M. T., Richards, M., & Sanders, M. R. (2007). A randomized clinical trial of a group parenting education programme for Australian Indigenous families. *Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health*, 43, 243–251. doi:10.1111/j.1440-1754.2007.01053.x.
- Turner, K. M. T., & Sanders, M. R. (2006). Dissemination of evidence-based parenting and family support strategies: Learning from the Triple P—Positive Parenting Program system approach. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 11, 176–193. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2005.07.005.
- U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. (2007). *Child maltreatment 2005*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Zubrick, S. R., Ward, K. A., Silburn, S. R., Lawrence, D., Williams, A. A., Blair, E., et al. (2005). Prevention of child behavior problems through universal implementation of a group behavioral family intervention. *Prevention Science*, 6, 287–304. doi:10.1007/s11121-005-0013-2.



ADDENDUM

## Addendum to “Population-Based Prevention of Child Maltreatment: The U.S. Triple P System Population Trial”

Ronald J. Prinz<sup>1</sup> · Matthew R. Sanders<sup>2</sup> · Cheri J. Shapiro<sup>3</sup> · Daniel J. Whitaker<sup>4</sup> · John R. Lutzker<sup>4</sup>

Published online: 16 January 2016  
© Society for Prevention Research 2016

**Abstract** A previous article published several years ago (Prinz et al. *Prevention Science*, 10, 1–12, 2009) described the main results of a place-randomized-design study focused on the prevention of child-maltreatment-related outcomes at a population level through the implementation of a multilevel system of parenting and family support (the Triple P—Positive Parenting Program). The current report, prepared at the encouragement of the journal, provides additional details about procedures, measures, and design-related decisions, presents an additional analysis of the main outcome variables, and poses questions about the study and its implications. We also offer guidance about how the field can move forward to build on this line of research. From the outset, the three designated primary child maltreatment outcomes were county-wide rates for substantiated child maltreatment cases, out-of-home placements, and hospital-treated child maltreatment injuries, derived from independent data sources available through administrative archival records. Baseline equivalence between the two intervention conditions was reaffirmed. The additional analysis, which made use of a 5-year baseline (replacing a 1-year baseline) and ANCOVA, yielded large effect

sizes for all three outcomes that converged with those from the original analyses. Overall, the study underscored the potential for community-wide parenting and family support to produce population-level preventive impact on child maltreatment. Issues addressed included (1) the need for replication of population-oriented maltreatment prevention strategies like the one tested in this randomized experiment, (2) the need to demonstrate that a parenting-based population approach to maltreatment prevention can also impact children’s adjustment apart from child abuse, and (3) the role of implementation science for achieving greater population reach and maintenance over time.

**Keywords** Child maltreatment · Prevention · Archival records · Place randomization · Implementation science

This comment refers to the article available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11121-009-0123-3>.

✉ Ronald J. Prinz  
[prinz@sc.edu](mailto:prinz@sc.edu)

<sup>1</sup> Psychology Department, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208, USA

<sup>2</sup> University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

<sup>3</sup> Institute for Families in Society, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, USA

<sup>4</sup> Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, USA

Seven years ago, we published an article (Prinz et al. 2009) reporting the main results of a place-randomized-design study focused on the prevention of child-maltreatment-related outcomes at a population level. As with any trial, some questions have been raised regarding the procedures and the robustness of the findings, and as a result, we were asked by the journal to write an article addressing several questions about the trial related to design, methods, analysis, and results. The current report furnishes additional details about procedures used and design-related decisions, presents an additional analysis of the main findings, and poses questions about the study that provide clues as to how the field can move forward to build on this line of population-level research.

Place randomization studies are rare in the social and behavioral sciences, and to our knowledge, the previous article (Prinz et al. 2009) described the first place randomization outcome study in the area of child maltreatment (CM) prevention. The intervention involved the community-wide

implementation of the Triple P—Positive Parenting System (Sanders 2012). Thus, with this innovative effort, there were few precedents in the field and we recognized that much was still to be learned about this emerging approach. We identified some of these issues in the discussion section of the 2009 article, where we acknowledged that, “There is much to learn about how to conduct and interpret population trials...” and that this “trial should be viewed as the beginning of a line of population research in the prevention of CM...” (p.10). The focus of our 2009 article was on CM indicators derived from archival data systematically and routinely collected and reported to the state data repository by hospitals, the foster care system, and the child protective services system. The critical consideration for this measurement strategy was that these data were full and complete for every county, with the same reporting methods used in each of the counties in the study. With respect to the independent variable, namely, training of a wide range of practitioners from different agencies and service sectors to deliver the program, we provided specific data on assessment of reach, which was assessed by independent follow-up interviews of almost all of the practitioners who had been trained.

### Measurement, Design Details, and Procedural Considerations

We have been asked to provide additional information about the measurement plan, design details, and procedures pertinent to our 2009 article. By way of background, an earlier article (Prinz and Sanders 2007) described the nature, rationale, and empirical foundation for a population-level approach to parenting and family support intervention and provided an introduction to the intervention project. However, that article was not written as a study protocol for the randomized trial, but rather as a conceptual description of the goals of the study as an illustrative example. Decisions about necessary procedural adjustments to the study at various stages were made in consultation with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) scientists who were members of the research team, as the study was funded as a cooperative agreement.

One question to address pertains to what outcomes were targeted from the outset of the study and what adjustments if any were made to the plan during implementation. The main thrust of the study was to test the impact of the parenting-based intervention on child maltreatment prevention, as assessed by archival-administrative data records. A second goal was to examine the impact of the same intervention on general parenting and child behavior population-wide, as assessed by random household telephone surveys. This second measurement domain, which was not included in the previous article (Prinz et al. 2009), is discussed later in this paper.

The previous article (Prinz et al. 2009) focused exclusively on the archival-administrative data records and CM prevention. We were asked to clarify what CM-related outcomes were intended when the study was launched, and whether outcome variables were added or dropped. From the outset, three primary outcomes for CM were targeted, each derived from an independent source:

1. Substantiated child maltreatment cases. This indicator, which was generated by Child Protective Services (CPS) in each county and reported to a central data repository, included cases of substantiated (founded) CM for any child under age 8 years during the given year. A case could involve one or more than one type of maltreatment (e.g., physical abuse and neglect) but regardless of the number of maltreatment types/categories and the number of substantiation opportunities, no child was counted more than once in a calendar year; that is, the data were unduplicated.
2. Out-of-home placements. This indicator, which was generated by the Foster Care System in each county and reported to a central data repository, was a count of children under age 8 years placed into foster care during the given year. No child was counted more than once in a calendar year.
3. CM injuries (hospital treated). This indicator, which was generated by hospitals in each county and reported to a central data repository, included any hospital-treated injury or other medical condition that received an ICD code linked to possible CM and pertained to a child under age 8 years. Such cases came from both emergency room treatment and inpatient hospitalization. No child was counted twice in the same calendar year.

Clarification is provided here regarding another variable, namely, reports of suspected CM, and how this variable was handled within the prevention study. By definition, reports of suspected CM include both unfounded and substantiated/founded cases. Because substantiated CM cases were entirely subsumed within reports, and further because these data (i.e., reports and substantiated cases) were derived from the same single source (i.e., CPS), it was felt that only one category should be a designated or primary outcome. While the maltreatment field has generally embraced reports over substantiations, there were specific reasons why substantiated CM was selected as the targeted outcome for this study: (1) The supervisor for data management within the state department of social services, as well as programmers at the state data repository, advised that CM reports included some cases containing inaccurate maltreatment categorization, incorrect ages which would make age filtering less reliable, and key missing information that would make unduplication of records less accurate. (2) Only medium to large counties (i.e., population

greater than 50,000) were included in the design, which mitigated the concern that reports are preferred over substantiations to overcome low base rates. (3) Substantiated CM cases invoke many costs and burdens associated with casework, treatment and other services, the legal system, and foster care, whereas a subset of reports, namely, the unsubstantiated cases, do not result in these costs, which makes substantiated CM a better choice for indexing societal impact.

In addition to evaluating intervention impact on CM, the population trial sought to gauge potential impact on general parenting and child behavior problems using random household telephone survey methodology. We explain here why this data source could not be used in the outcome evaluation presented in the article of Prinz et al. (2009). Serious obstacles were encountered that invalidated the telephone survey as a means of reliably assessing county-level outcome effects, a conclusion reached by the research team in consultation with additional CDC scientists. Specifically, several issues undermined the utility of the telephone survey for precise measurement at the county level. First, the unanticipated, sudden, and steady rise in the percentages of adults and children living in households with only mobile phone service occurred at the time the study started. This phenomenon was highest among adults living in poverty or near poverty and produced substantial coverage bias (Blumberg and Luke 2007). Second, there was a concomitant increase in households with both mobile and landline phone service where the landline was virtually ignored, adding to survey non-response (e.g., average county response rate was 11.4 %). Third, efforts to adequately sample lower socioeconomic households, the very households most likely to be involved in CM incidents, as well as to yield adequate representation of African American parents, were unsuccessful in a number of the counties. All of the aforementioned factors adversely affected the telephone survey and representativeness. For example, the telephone surveys for all 18 counties substantially underrepresented lower SES families, but this was most pronounced for 9 of the counties which underrepresented by over two thirds the proportion of families with annual household incomes below \$30,000. Similarly, the telephone surveys unrepresented African American families in all 18 counties and especially in 5 counties where the surveys achieved representation of less than a third of the proportion of African Americans residing in those counties. Consequently, the random household telephone survey method was not considered valid for reliable county-level assessment of the dependent variables (i.e., outcomes) necessary to conduct outcome analysis for this domain.

However, it was possible to make use of the household telephone survey to provide relevant data about one aspect of the independent variable. That is, the telephone survey could assess whether or not the media programming facet of the independent variable, in the form of awareness of the

intervention program, had increased in the intervention counties collectively. The program awareness data were presented in Prinz et al. (2009), but the caveat not discussed was that the verification of media exposure could not be evaluated with respect to either reach into lower SES households or analysis at the individual-county level.

More information is provided here regarding the design, method of county random assignment, and procedural sequence. As described in Prinz et al. (2009), the 18 selected counties were randomly assigned to intervention or comparison conditions. Matched random assignment was planned from the beginning and implemented as planned, use of the term “block randomization” in the 2009 article notwithstanding. According to Keele, “The matched pairs design is simply a form of a block design where each block contains only two units” (Keele et al. 2008). Matched random assignment consistent with recommendations by Graham et al. (1984) was employed to reduce the likelihood of “unhappy randomization” (i.e., important chance differences at baseline). Matching took into account three variables: county population size, county poverty rate, and county CM rate (per 1000 children birth to 17 years). Nine pairs of counties were then randomized to condition. The 5-year period from 1999 to 2003 provided the backdrop for gauging subsequent hypothesized effects on the three archival outcome indicators. Triple P training of service providers in the nine intervention counties began midway through 2003. The whole 2005 calendar year was designated as the period of outcome to gauge the impact of population exposure from 2 years of program implementation. In 2006, Triple P practitioner training was initiated in the comparison counties consistent with the original grant plan, marking the end of the randomized study.

### Additional Analysis

The outcome analyses in our 2009 article made use of the 1-year baseline period. We were asked to consider whether using the 5-year baseline period (i.e., an average of the five baseline years) would have been preferable. An argument can be made that the 5-year period provides a more stable estimate of baseline. Consequently, we undertook this additional analysis and have reported the results here.

A preliminary issue was baseline equivalence. Using the 5-year baseline, the two sets of counties were compared using *t* tests, which yielded no significant baseline differences for the 5-year averages: substantiated CM cases,  $t(16)=0.22$ ,  $p=.83$ ; out-of-home placements,  $t(16)=0.30$ ,  $p=.77$ ; and CM injuries,  $t(16)=0.99$ ,  $p=.34$ . The means and standard deviations for the baseline 5-year averages are found in Table 1 in the original Prinz et al. (2009) article. Baseline equivalence, then, was clearly established for all three outcome variables. Additionally, it was already reported that the two sets of

**Table 1** Pre-post means and standard deviations on the primary outcomes for intervention and control counties

Outcome variables	Triple P System counties ( <i>n</i> = 9)		Control counties ( <i>n</i> = 9)	
	Pre-intervention(5-year avg)	Post-intervention	Pre-intervention (5-year avg)	Post-intervention
Substantiated CM cases	10.82 (4.36)	10.86 (3.79)	11.40 (6.75)	16.30 (9.13)
Out-of-home placements	4.02 (1.59)	3.90 (2.11)	3.76 (1.91)	4.64 (2.02)
CM injuries (hosp & ER)	1.72 (0.66)	1.54 (0.84)	1.44 (0.53)	1.78 (0.99)

Each mean is a county rate of the respective occurrence per 1000 children. The source of the data was the South Carolina central data repository for the Child Protective Services system, the Foster Care System, and hospitals, respectively

counties were comparable on the matching variables with *t* test *p* values ranging from .73 to .87 (see Table 1 in the original 2009 article). The randomization procedure avoided unhappy randomization but more importantly yielded two sets of counties that were comparable on both the matching variables and the baselines for all three outcome variables.

In undertaking the additional analysis using the 5-year baseline, we also faced the issue of whether or not to retain the pre-post difference score approach used in Prinz et al. (2009). Although legitimate, the use of pre-post difference scores in randomized designs is somewhat controversial and not without its disadvantages (Rogosa 1988; Senn 2006). There is also asymmetry in creating a difference score where the pre-score is a 5-year average and the post-score is a single year. Consequently, for the present analysis, the difference score approach was replaced by analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) for each of the three outcome variables, controlling for the corresponding (5-year) baseline for each variable. ANCOVA is an appropriate analytic approach when randomization has taken place and baseline equivalence has been established (Cohen et al. 2002). Furthermore, ANCOVA can be used either as an alternative or a complement to matched random assignment (Shadish et al. 2002).

We were asked to clarify what significance level and direction were hypothesized, and why, with respect to the outcome analyses in Prinz et al. (2009). Regarding the analyses undertaken for Prinz et al. (2009) and for this paper, of greatest importance was the magnitude or strength of effect (i.e., effect size), in the predicted direction of course. This is consistent with what many researchers/methodologists (e.g., Cook and Campbell 1979; Cohen et al. 2002; Kazdin 2003; McCartney and Rosenthal 2000) have advocated, namely, an emphasis on effect size over *p* values. We felt going into this population-focused study that practical significance, which could only be confirmed by large effects, was of utmost importance. Effect size considerations notwithstanding, a one-tailed significance level (with an alpha of .05) was chosen a priori for testing of the three outcomes in the 2009 article and this paper for a number of reasons. We were conducting what was essentially the first place randomization study on prevention of CM. We clearly had directional hypotheses for all three outcomes and did not want to miss any potential effects in this crucial area.

For feasibility and resource reasons, there could only be 18 units (counties) for the design, which heightened risk for a type II error. It is acknowledged that a one-tailed approach did not take into account the possibility of an iatrogenic effect, but there was no basis on which to expect such effects in this study because evidence-based parent/family interventions such as the Family Check-Up, Parent–child Interaction Therapy, SafeCare, The Incredible Years, and Triple P across many outcome studies have *not* shown iatrogenic effects, so there was no basis on which to expect such effects in this study. Finally, there is precedence in other community-level trials for the use of one-tailed tests (e.g., Spoth et al. 2011). However, *p* values for both one-tailed and two-tailed significance are reported in the analyses presented here.

ANCOVA was conducted for each of the three outcome variables, controlling for baseline on the respective outcome variable (5-year average for baseline period). Means and standard deviations as a function of intervention condition and pre-post measurement time are found in Table 1 in the current article for the three outcome variables. For substantiated CM cases, the ANCOVA result was as follows: overall model *F* (2, 15) = 21.77, *p* < .001, coefficient  $B_{\text{cond}} = -4.836$  (*S.E.* 1.866), *t* (16) = -2.592, one-tailed *p* = .02 (two-tailed *p* = .04), effect size = 1.30 (Cohen's *d*). For out-of-home placements, the ANCOVA result was as follows: overall model *F* (2, 15) = 16.95, *p* < .001, coefficient  $B_{\text{cond}} = -0.990$  (*S.E.* 0.569), *t* (16) = -1.741, one-tailed *p* = .05 (two-tailed *p* = .10), effect size = .87 (Cohen's *d*). For CM injuries (hosp & ER), the ANCOVA result was as follows: overall model *F* (2, 15) = 11.96, *p* < .002, coefficient  $B_{\text{cond}} = -0.581$  (*S.E.* 0.289), *t* (16) = -2.014, one-tailed *p* = .03 (two-tailed *p* = .06), effect size = 1.01 (Cohen's *d*).

The effect sizes found in the additional analyses are large for all three outcome variables. The magnitude of these effects converges with what was reported in the previous article (Prinz et al. 2009) on all three outcomes. The observed *p* values reflect the relatively small number of units (i.e., 18 counties) rather than small effects. Even though the three outcomes were all significant using one-tailed tests, there is still the possibility that the observed large effects happened by chance. For this and other reasons, replication of the findings



and associated prevention strategy is critically important to increase confidence in the conclusion.

When a study employs a large number of statistical tests and perhaps also includes post hoc comparisons, statistical methods are used to control the potential for chance findings. With respect to the results reported here and in Prinz et al. (2009), for which no statistical adjustments were made, it should be kept in mind that (a) only three outcome tests were conducted, with all three outcome variables derived from independent data sources (i.e., CPS, foster care system, and hospitals), and (b) results for all three outcomes reflect quite large effect sizes.

The pattern of intervention effects for both out-of-home placements and hospital-treated CM injuries was reflected in lower rates in the intervention counties relative to control counties as well as baseline. For substantiated CM cases, the mean rate for the intervention counties was held constant relative to baseline, while the control counties showed a rate increase during the same period. Randomization (including equivalence at baseline) supported a conclusion of preventive impact on substantiated CM cases. Additionally, however, it was noted in Prinz et al.'s (2009) discussion section that the increase “in the control counties mirrored similar increases across the other 28 counties.” Data for the non-study counties came from the same central repository used for the study counties. More precisely, the 28 non-study counties in the state showed an increase of 37 % in mean rate of substantiated CM cases (from 9.79 to 13.40) during the same period (baseline 5-year average to post-intervention), compared to that found in Table 1 (in this current paper) with an increase of 43 % for the control counties and only 0.4 % for the intervention counties. It was the case that substantiated CM rates for the intervention counties did not decrease from baseline. However, given randomization, equivalence at baseline, and a general pattern of increase for the control and non-study counties during the intervention time period, one would expect a similar increase in the intervention counties had the intervention not taken place, which all taken together supports the conclusion of a true preventive effect on substantiated CM. Furthermore, the intervention counties showed a decrease in variance for substantiated CM rates from pre to post, compared with a variance increase for the control counties (see SDs in Table 1 in the current paper).

The robustness of scientific findings is ultimately determined by replication (Valentine et al. 2011). Since the publication of Prinz et al. (2009), independent studies have emerged further supporting the promise and viability of a population approach to CM prevention. For example, a four- to seven-session universal postnatal nurse home visiting program in Durham County (NC) has shown promise for impact on CM cases and emergency room treatment (Dodge et al. 2014). In another study, with 15-year follow-up using case-linked administrative data in a quasi-experimental design,

Smith (2015) found that implementation of Level 4 Group Triple P delivered when children were pre-schoolers significantly reduced the rate of hospital emergency department visits over childhood and adolescence.

The previous study (Prinz et al. 2009) was not able to determine the impact of the Triple P system on general parenting practices and child behavioral problems. Recently, however, a number of investigators have been examining this issue (Fives et al. 2014; Frantz et al. 2015). For example, an evaluation of the Triple P system in Ireland, reported by Fives et al. (2014), found population-level effects on children's emotional and behavioral problems and on a range of parenting variables. This study overcame the aforementioned challenges of using a random-dial telephone survey—by employing face-to-face interviews with parents in randomly selected households. Newer studies such as Fives et al. (2014) provide clues as to potential mediators for population impact beyond what Prinz et al. (2009) was able to address. Further to the matter of replication, the core foundational elements of the intervention system used in Prinz et al. (2009) have undergone extensive replication in numerous studies across applications, settings, and investigators (with and without developer involvement), and have demonstrated robust effects (see Sanders et al. 2014).

The Prinz et al.'s (2009) place-randomization study provided evidence that community-wide implementation of parenting and family support can positively impact child-maltreatment-related indicators in a preventive manner. These outcomes might have resulted due to (a) effects on coercive parenting in families accessing the intervention; (b) effects resulting from mobilization of a social contagion via media as well as conversations among parents and practitioners, such as described in Fives et al. (2014); (c) broader impact from training many practitioners serving high-risk segments of the population; or (d) some combination of all of these factors. These putative mediators provide cogent hypotheses for much needed future studies.

Although Prinz et al. (2009) provided initial evidence for proof of concept relative to prevention of CM, this early investigation did not include or address strategies to optimize penetration and impact, nor cogent procedures for sustaining program utilization. Since the undertaking of this study, the field has seen the rapid development of implementation science, which now offers indispensable guidance (Fixsen et al. 2013). In retrospect, some of the recommended practices that the Prinz et al. (2009) study might have instituted include the following: (1) extended preparatory planning with supervisors and managers prior to training, (2) building of supportive organizational climate and structural environment, (3) institutionalizing quality assurance processes (e.g., fidelity assessment and promotion, peer support networks, and active evaluation process with feedback loops), and (4) initiating multiple action steps to achieve sustainability. However, more

recent large-scale deployments of the Triple P system have paid close attention to optimizing implementation processes through the use of a structured implementation framework in working with partner organizations (e.g., Fives et al. 2014).

Since the publication of Prinz et al. (2009) which demonstrated viability and efficacy, work has emerged that underscores both the promise of a population-level approach to family-based prevention and the need for future research in several areas articulated in this report. Refinement and expansion of the population, public health strategies associated with this line of work are critical to realizing society's aspirations for child well-being (Biglan 2015; National Research Council and Institute of Medicine 2009).

**Compliance with Ethical Standards** All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. The Institutional Review Board at the University of South Carolina granted an exemption for the research protocol.

**Conflict of Interest** The Triple P—Positive Parenting Program is owned by The University of Queensland. The University, through its technology transfer company Uniquist Pty Ltd., has licensed Triple P International Pty Ltd. to disseminate the program worldwide. Royalties stemming from this dissemination work are paid to UniQuest, which distributes payments to the University of Queensland Faculty of Health and Behavioural Sciences, School of Psychology, Parenting and Family Support Centre, and contributory authors in accordance with the University's intellectual property policy. No author has any share or ownership in Triple P International. Matthew Sanders is the founder and lead author of the Triple P—Positive Parenting Program and is a consultant to Triple P International. Ronald Prinz is a consultant to Triple P International. Cheri Shapiro is a consultant to Triple P America. Daniel Whitaker and John Lutzker have no competing interests. The University of South Carolina's Office of Research Compliance in conjunction with the CDC assisted the investigators with protection of the integrity of the research on which the original article was based.

**Funding** The research on which this article was based was support by Grant #U17/CCU422317 from the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for the Disease Control and Prevention. The findings and conclusions in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

## References

- Biglan, A. (2015). *The nurture effect: How the science of human behavior can improve our lives and our world*. Oakland: New Harbinger.
- Blumberg, S. J., & Luke, J. V. (2007). Coverage bias in traditional telephone surveys of low-income and young adults. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 71, 734–749. doi:10.1093/poq/nfm047.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2002). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah: Erlbaum.
- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: design and analysis issues for field settings*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Council, N. R., & Institute of Medicine. (2009). Preventing mental, emotional, and behavioral disorders among young people: progress and possibilities. In M. E. O'Connell, T. Boat, & K. E. Warner (Eds.), *Board on children, youth, and families, division of behavioral and social sciences and education*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Dodge, K. A., Goodman, W. B., Murphy, R. A., O'Donnell, K., Sato, J., & Guptill, S. (2014). Implementation and randomized controlled trial evaluation of universal postnatal nurse home visiting. *American Journal of Public Health*, 104, s136–s143. doi:10.2105/ajph.2013.301361.
- Fives, A., Purcell, L., Heary, C., Nic Gabhainn, S., & Canavan, J. (2014). *Parenting support for every parent: a population-level evaluation of Triple P in Longford Westmeath. Final Report*. Athlone: Longford Westmeath Parenting Partnership.
- Fixsen, D., Blasé, K., Metz, A., & VanDyke, M. (2013). Statewide implementation of evidence-based programs. *Exceptional Children*, 79, 213–230. doi:10.1177/001440291307900206.
- Frantz, I., Stemmler, M., Hahlweg, K., Pluck, J., & Heinrichs, N. (2015). Experiences in disseminating evidence-based prevention programs in a real-world setting. *Prevention Science*, 16, 789–800. doi: 10.1007/s11121-015-0554-y.
- Graham, J. W., Flay, B. R., Johnson, C. A., Hansen, W. B., & Collins, L. M. (1984). Group comparability: a multiattribute utility measurement approach to the use of random assignment with small numbers of aggregated units. *Evaluation Review*, 8, 247–260. doi:10.1177/0193841X8400800206.
- Kazdin, A. E. (2003). *Research design in clinical psychology* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Keele, L., McConaughy, C., & White, I. (2008). Matching in randomized experiments. *Society for Political Methodology Conference*, University of Michigan.
- McCartney, K., & Rosenthal, R. (2000). Effect size, practical importance, and social policy for children. *Child Development*, 71, 173–180. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00131.
- Prinz, R. J., & Sanders, M. R. (2007). Adopting a population-level approach to parenting and family support interventions. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 27, 739–749. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2007.01.005.
- Prinz, R. J., Sanders, M. R., Shapiro, C. J., Whitaker, D. J., & Lutzker, J. R. (2009). Population-based prevention of child maltreatment: the U.S. Triple P System Population Trial. *Prevention Science*, 10, 1–12. doi:10.1007/s11121-009-0123-3.
- Rogosa, D. R. (1988). Myths about longitudinal research. In K. W. Schaie, R. T. Campbell, W. M. Meredith, & S. C. Rawlings (Eds.), *Methodological issues in aging research* (pp. 171–209). New York: Springer.
- Sanders, M. R. (2012). Development, evaluation, and multinational dissemination of the Triple P—Positive Parenting Program. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 8, 1–35. doi:10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032511-143104.
- Sanders, M. R., Kirby, J. N., Tellegen, C. L., & Day, J. J. (2014). The triple P—positive parenting program: a systematic review and meta-analysis of a multi-level system of parenting support. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 34, 337–357. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2014.04003.
- Senn, S. (2006). Change from baseline and analysis of covariance revisited. *Statistics in Medicine*, 25, 4334–4344. doi:10.1002/sim.2682.
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Belmont: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Smith, G. (2015). *15-year follow-up of WA Triple P trial, collaboration for applied research and evaluation*. Western Australia: Telethon

- Institute for Child Health Research under contract with the Department of Health.
- Spoth, R., Redmond, C., Clair, S., Shin, C., Greenberg, M., & Feinberg, M. (2011). Preventing substance misuse through community-university partnerships: randomized controlled trial outcomes 4 ½ years past baseline. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 40, 440–447. doi:[10.1016/j.amepre.2010.12.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2010.12.012).
- Valentine, J. C., Biglan, A., Boruch, R. F., Castro, F. G., Collins, L. M., Flay, B. R., et al. (2011). Replication in prevention science. *Prevention Science*, 12, 103–117. doi:[10.1007/s11121-011-0217-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-011-0217-6).