

adolescent Health: Person-to-Person Interventions to Improve Caregivers' Parenting Skills

Summary Evidence Table

Studies of Effectiveness of Caregiver-Targeted Interventions for Adolescent Health

Author & year (study period) Design suitability: design Quality of Execution (# of limitations) Evaluation setting	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary	Follow-up time
Anderson (1999) (NR) Greatest: Randomized trial (group) Fair (3) Community & School	Location: USA; Los Angeles County, CA Components: Parent Intervention: Group education (with small media); Adolescent Intervention: Group education; Parent & Adolescent Intervention: Group education Comparison: Usual care (delayed intervention)	Ethnically diverse early adolescents in grades 5-7 and their parents. N=405 participants recruited n=346 participants at BL n=251 (73%) participants at 12 month FU Group n (FU) I 185 C 66 Adolescents: I C Gender (%) Girl 58.9 62.1 Boy 41.1 37.9 Age (%) 9-11 84.3 81.8 12-14 15.7 18.2 Race/Ethnicity (%) Native American 1.6 4.5 Asian American 6.5 3.0 African American 18.4 27.3 Hispanic 47.6 40.9 Other white 15.7 4.5 Mixed/other 4.3 7.6	1) Ever been pregnant or had gotten someone pregnant (%) I C 2) Parent-child communication (Mean) I C	1.7 1.6 2.61 2.58	2.5 4.3 2.57 2.56	-1.9 pct pts (NR) (RR=-52.8) -0.01, NS	12 months

Author & year (study period) Design suitability: design Quality of Execution (# of limitations) Evaluation setting	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary	Follow- up time
Bauman (2000) (Also Bauman 2001, Bauman 2002) (1996-1999) Greatest: Randomized Trial (individual) Fair (2) Community (Home)	Location: USA Components: Parent Intervention: One- on-one education (with small media) + Referral Comparison: Usual care	Adolescents ages 12-14 living in the contiguous US and their families N=2395 estimated eligible n=1316 (54.9%) at BL Group N I 658 C 658 n=1135 (47.3%) completed 1 or both FU interviews Group N I 531 C 604 Adolescents: I C Gender (%) Male 49.0 51.2 Age (%) 12 30.6 34.2 13 35.3 33.4 14 34.1 32.4 Race (%) Non-Hispanic White 73.4 69.3 Non-Hispanic Black 12.5 14.7 Hispanic 9.2 11.7 Other 4.9 4.3	1) Lifetime cigarette use (%) I 24 C 27 2) Lifetime alcohol use (%) I 64 C 63 3) Number of days cigarettes were smoked in the past 30 days (among users) (Mean) I 8 C 10 4) Number of days participants drank alcoholic beverages in the past 30 days (among users) (Mean) I 3.4 C 3.5	BL 3 mo 36 43 72 82 12 10 2.6 3	12 mo 48 55 83 85 15 13 4.1 3.7	-5 pct pts (p=0.014) (RR=-1.8) -3 pct pts (p=0.022) (RR=-3.9) +4 (p=0.1697) +5 (p=0.4073)	12 months
Bauman (2000) (Also Bauman 2001, Bauman 2002) (1996-1999) Greatest: Randomized Trial (individual) Fair (2) Community (Home)		Parents: Mother's education (%) High School or less 36.6 45.7 Some college 33.4 29.5 College graduate 27.3 25.2					

Author & year (study period) Design suitability: design Quality of Execution (# of limitations) Evaluation setting	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary	Follow-up time
Dancy (2006) (NR) Greatest: Randomized trial (group) Fair (2) Community	Location: USA; Chicago, IL Components: Parent Intervention: Group education + One-on-one education; Parent & Adolescent Intervention: Group education Comparison: *(C1): Parent & Adolescent Intervention: Group education; (C2): Parent & Adolescent Intervention: Group education (w/out parental teachers) *Control group utilized to determine intervention effect.	Low income African American inner city adolescent females and their mothers N=262 participants (adolescents) at BL Group N I 121 C1 70 C2 97 n=238 participants at FU Group N I 103 C1 62 C2 97 Adolescents: Gender (%) Female 100 Age Range: 11-14 years M (SD): 12.4 years (1.1) Race/Ethnicity (%) African American 100	1) Had sex (%) I C1 C2 2) Self-efficacy to refuse sex (Mean) I C1 C2	4 6 4 1.62 1.54 1.66	5 14 6 1.69 1.43 1.75	-7.0 pct pts (RR=-46.4) +0.18, p<0.01	2 months
Dancy (2006) (NR) Greatest: Randomized trial (group) Fair (2) Community		Parents: Gender (%) Female 100 Age Range: 22-76 years M (SD): 40.2 years (9.8) Race/Ethnicity (%) African American 100 Marital Status (%) Married 22 Never married 45 Separated/Divorced 25 Widowed 8					

Author & year (study period) Design suitability: design Quality of Execution (# of limitations) Evaluation setting	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary	Follow- up time
DiIorio (2006) (1996-2001) Greatest: Randomized trial (group) Fair (3) Community		Mothers (FU): Group n I1 147 I2 146 C2 146 Adolescents: I1 I2 C Gender (%) Female 38.1 44.4 36.3 Age (M) 12.2 12.4 12.1 Race/Ethnicity (%) African American: 98.2 White: 1% Other: 0.8 Mothers: I1 I2 C Age (M) 37.7 39.2 38.4 Marital Status (%) Married 34.4 34.4 29.5 Educational status (%) High school graduate 86.3 93.8 86.0					

Author & year (study period) Design suitability: design Quality of Execution (# of limitations) Evaluation setting	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline		Reported effect	Value used in summary	Follow-up time
Dishion (1995) (1988-1990) Greatest: Randomized trial (individual) Fair (3) Community	Location: USA Components: *(I1) Parent Intervention: Group education (with small media) + One-on-one education; (I2) Adolescent Intervention: Group education (with small media) + Incentives (for participation); *(I3) Parent & Adolescent Intervention: Parent intervention: Group education (with small media) + One-on-one education + Adolescent intervention: Group education (with small media) + Incentives (for participation); (I4) Small media (self-directed change) Comparison: Usual care *Intervention group utilized to determine the intervention effect.	High-risk adolescents between the ages of 11-14 years N=158 families with high risk boys and girls n=83 boys n=75 girls Group n (BL) *I1 26 I2 32 I3 31 I4 29 C 39 Adolescents: I1 I2 I3 I4 C Age (M) 12.6 12.5 12.3 12.3 12.4 Parents: I1 I2 I3 I4 C Education (%) < high school graduate Mother 29.2 15.2 6.7 3.4 18.4 Father 9.1 38.9 23.5 12.5 18.2 Median income (\$) I1: 10000-14999 I2: 20000-24999 I3: 10000-14999 I4: 15000-19999 C: 10000-14999	1) Frequency in which tobacco was used over the past 3 months (Mean - Frequency (Log+1)) I1 I2 I3 I4 C 2) Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) - problem behaviors (Mean) I1 I2 I3 I4 C	BL FU1 0.91 0.61 0.81 1.15 0.95 1.24 0.75 0.68 0.88 0.60 20.48 10.39 19.75 16.38 18.42 15.45 18.85 13.87 17.46 14.25	FU2 0.63 1.66 2.09 1.16 1.19 17.28 13.65 14.45 15.21 15.10	-0.59 (p=.20) +0.83 (p>.05) -0.84 (p>.05) -1.61 (p>.05)	1 year	

Author & year (study period) Design suitability: design Quality of Execution (# of limitations) Evaluation setting	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary	Follow-up time
Li (2002) Also (Stanton, 2000) (NR) Greatest: Randomized trial (individual) Fair (3) Community (Home)	Location: USA Components: Parent & Adolescent Intervention: One-on-one education (with small media) Comparison: Parent & Adolescent Intervention: One-on-one education (with small media)	African American parent-adolescent dyads N=237 dyads (BL) n=179 (76%) dyads (FU) Adolescents: BL FU Gender (%) Males 51 49 Age (M) 13.6 14.4 Race/Ethnicity (%) African American 100 Parents: Gender (%) Female 96 (A): adolescent report (P): parental perception	1) Engaged in a fight (%) I (A) I (P) C (A) C (P) 2) Carried a weapon (%) I (A) I (P) C (A) C (P) 3) Smoked cigarette (%) I (A) I (P) C (A) C (P) 5) Drank alcohol (%) I (A) I (P) C (A) C (P)	 35 27 34 41 21 7 16 11 10 6 12 8 15 7 17 8	 26 27 27 25 19 11 22 4 13 12 16 11 26 17 21 7	-2.0 pct pts (RR=-6.5) +16 pct pts -8 pct pts (RR=-34.2) +11 pct pts -1 pct pts (RR=-2.5) +3 pct pts +7 pct pts (RR=+38.2) +11 pct pts	12 months
Li (2002) Also (Stanton, 2000) (NR) Greatest: Randomized trial (individual) Fair (3) Community (Home)			6) Used marijuana (%) I (A) I (P) C (A) C (P) 7) Had sex (ever - BL; 12 months FU) (%) I (A) I (P) C (A) C (P)	 12 6 10 9 40 33 37 23	 12 9 18 4 74 71 75 68	-8 pct pts (RR=-45.5) +8 pct pts -4.0 pct pts (RR=-8.7) -7.0 pct pts	

Author & year (study period) Design suitability: design Quality of Execution (# of limitations) Evaluation setting	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary	Follow-up time
Park (2000) (1993-1996) Greatest: Randomized trial (individual) Fair (3) Community	Location: USA; Midwestern state Components: Parent Intervention: Group education; Parent & Adolescent Intervention: Group education + Incentives (for participation) Comparison: Small media + Incentives (for participation)	Families of 6th graders enrolled at 33 rural schools in 19 contiguous, economically stressed counties N=11 school (intervention group) N=11 schools (additional intervention) N=11 schools (control group) N=833 all families with 6th grade children n=424 (48%) families participated Group n (BL) I 217 C 207 n=362 (85%) post-test n=310 (73%) 1-yr FU n=285 (67%) 2-yr FU n=295 (70%) 3.5 yr FU Group n (FU) I 144 C 151 Adolescents: Age (M) 11.3 years Parents: Age (M) Mothers 36.9 Fathers 39.6 Race virtually all families were of Caucasian-American ethnicity Married 82%	1) Alcohol use (Mean) (log transformations) I C 2) Refusal skills (Mean) (log transformations) I C 3) Family conflict (Mean) (log transformations) I C 4) Family management (Mean) (log transformations) I C 5) Parental norms (Mean) (log transformations) I C BL: Baseline T2: Post-test T3: 1 yr FU T4: 2 yr FU T5: 3.5 yr FU	BL T2 T3 0.17 0.15 0.39 0.16 0.14 0.36 3.81 3.80 3.55 3.83 3.70 3.50 1.52 1.53 1.58 1.50 1.52 1.52 4.01 4.11 4.07 3.99 4.01 4.00 4.45 4.69 4.68 4.47 4.63 4.59	T4 T5 0.56 0.85 0.70 1.01 3.32 3.31 1.57 1.55 4.03 3.96 4.66 4.58	-0.17 +0.03 0.0 +0.05 +0.1	3.5 years

Author & year (study period) Design suitability: design Quality of Execution (# of limitations) Evaluation setting	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary	Follow-up time
Postrado (1992) (1985-1988) Greatest: Other Design with Concurrent Comparison Group Fair (4) Community	Location: USA Components: *I1: Parent Intervention: Group education; Parent & Adolescent Intervention: Group education; I2: Adolescent Intervention: Group education Comparison: Usual care (non-participants) *Intervention group used to determine the effectiveness of the intervention. (NOTE: I2 data is not reported here. The intervention is not applicable to the review.)	Adolescent girls ages 12-14 who reported never having sexual intercourse N=412 participants Group n *I1 84 I2 257 C 117 n=46 participated in both intervention groups Adolescents: I C Gender (%) Female 100 100 Age (M) 12.2 12.4^ Race/Ethnicity (%) Black 54.8 79.6^ White 33.3^^ 9.9 Hispanic/Others 11.9 11.1 Parents: Educational status (%) > high school (Mother) 35.4 43.2 Job as source of income (%) 91.6 93.2 ^p<0.05 ^^p<0.01	1) Sexual onset (%) I C		7.1 14.6	-7.5 pct pts, p=0.054 (RR=-51.4)	1 year

Author & year (study period) Design suitability: design Quality of Execution (# of limitations) Evaluation setting	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary	Follow-up time
Simons-Morton (2004) (NR) Greatest: Other Design with Concurrent Comparison Group Fair (2) Community	Location: USA; Maryland Components: (I) Parent: One-on-one education (with small media) Comparison: Usual care	Families with adolescents 16 years of age and successfully tested for a provisional license N=756 eligible parent-adolescent dyads Time n BL 658 FU 579 Group n (FU) I 283 C 296 Adolescents: Gender (%) Male 49.5 Female 50.5 Age (%): 16 years 100 Race/Ethnicity (%) White 81 Asian 8 Hispanic 4 African American 5 Parents: Age (%) >=45 years 72 Race/Ethnicity (%) White 83 Asian 7 Hispanic 4 African American 4 Marital Status (%) Married 88	1) Teen passengers (Mean score) I C 2) Weekday night restrictions (Mean score) I C 3) Weekend night restrictions (Mean score) I C 4) Parent-teen communication (parental report) Driving rules (Mean score) I C Driving discussion (Mean score) I C	2.8 2.4 2.0 1.6 1.7 1.0 9.70 9.52 NR NR	+0.4, p<.001 +0.4, p<.001 +0.7, p<.001 +0.18, p<0.05 p>.05	1 month	

Author & year (study period) Design suitability: design Quality of Execution (# of limitations) Evaluation setting	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary	Follow-up time
Simons-Morton (2004) (NR) Greatest: Other Design with Concurrent Comparison Group Fair (2) Community			Driving consequences (Mean score) I C		NR NR	p>.05	1 month
Toumbourou (2002) (NR) Greatest: Other Design with Concurrent Comparison Group Fair (4) School	Location: Australia Components: Parent Intervention: Group education with small media Comparison: Usual care	Parents of 8th grade students N=28 school campuses n=14 intervention schools n=14 control schools n=577 participants (BL) Group n I 305 C 272 n=446 participants (FU) Group n I 229 C 217 Parents: I C Age (%) <40 years 44 33* Non-Australian born (%) 20 32* Education (%) <10th grade 9 12 Marital status (%) Single/divorced/separated 17 14 *p<0.05	Adolescent Behaviors: 1) Substance use (last 60 days) (%) I 31 C 32 2) Multiple substance use (past year) (%) I 13 C 15 3) Delinquency (last 60 days) (%) I 9 C 10 4) Self-harm (last 60 days) (%) I 6 C 7 5) Suicidal behavior (last 60 days) (%) I 3 C 3		33 46 13 21 5 16 5 8 3 4	-11 pct pts (RR=-23.7) -6 pct pts (RR=-29.0) -10 pct pts (RR=-65.6) -2 pct pts (RR=-28.8) -1 pct pts (RR=-28.8)	3 months

Author & year (study period) Design suitability: design Quality of Execution (# of limitations) Evaluation setting	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary	Follow-up time
Toumbourou (2002) (NR) Greatest: Other Design with Concurrent Comparison Group Fair (4) School			Family Measures: 7) Parent-adolescent conflict (last 30 days) (%) I 49 C 50 8) High maternal care (last 30 days) (%) I 33 C 31 9) High paternal care (last 30 days) (%) I 14 C 12 10) Moderate maternal control (last 30 days) (%) I 71 C 66 11) Moderate paternal control (last 30 days) (%) I 71 C 71			-13 pct pts +9 pct pts 0 pct pts -6 pct pts -5 pct pts	

Author & year (study period) Design suitability: design Quality of Execution (# of limitations) Evaluation setting	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary	Follow-up time
Wu (2003) (Also Stanton, 2004) (1999-2000) Greatest: Randomized trial (group) Fair (3) Community	Location: USA; Baltimore, MD Components: Parent & Adolescent Intervention: One-on-one education (with small media) + Incentives (for participation) Comparison: Adolescent Intervention: Group education (with small media)	Adolescents in and around 35 housing developments, community centers, and recreation centers N=817 participants enrolled Group n (FU) I 295 C 199 Adolescents: I C Gender (%) Male 40 45 Female 60 55 Age (%) 13 37 39 14 24 21 15 22 23 16 16 18 Educational Status (%) Middle 45 46 High 55 53 Other 0 1	1) Engaged in sexual intercourse (only the sexually active) (%) I C 2) Engaged in anal sex (%) I C 3) Smoked cigarette (%) I C 4) Drank alcoholic beverages (%) I C 5) Used marijuana (%) I C 6) Used other illicit drugs (%) I C		24 mo 44 41 5.2 10.1 12.5 22.7 26.3 27.3 18.3 26.8 1.4 5.6	+3 pct pts (RR=+8.3) -4.9 pct pts (RR=-48.5) -10.2 pct pts (RR=-44.9) -1 pct pts (RR=-3.7) -8.5 pct pts (RR=-31.7) -4.2 pct pts (RR=-75.0)	24 months

Author & year (study period) Design suitability: design Quality of Execution (# of limitations) Evaluation setting	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary	Follow- up time
Wu (2003) (Also Stanton, 2004) (1999-2000) Greatest: Randomized trial (group) Fair (3) Community			8) Carried a knife or razor (%) I C 9) Carried a bat or stick (%) I C 10) Fought (%) I C 11) Been pregnant or gotten a girl pregnant (%) I C 12) Talked with family or other adults about AIDS or HIV (%) I C		<u>24 mo</u> 12.5 14.6 4.1 9.6 11.4 13.1 9.6 16.7 48.2 42.1	-2.1 pct pts (RR=- 14.4) -5.5 pct pts (RR=- 57.3) -1.7 pct pts (RR=- 13.0) -7.1 pct pts (RR=- 42.5) +6.1 pct pts (RR=+14.5)	