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Overview

- Triple P
  - Core features
- Adherence to evidence-based programs
  - How is it measured?
  - What do we know so far?
  - Adherence to both content and process
  - Multi-method tools
- Future directions
- Questions and discussion
What is Triple P?

Parenting program that promotes the principles of

1) Ensuring a safe and engaging environment
2) Creating a positive learning environment
3) Using assertive discipline
4) Having realistic expectations (for a child’s behaviour given his or her developmental stage)
5) Parental self-care

(Sanders, 1999)
Core features of Triple P

- Minimal sufficiency
- Promotion of self-regulation
What is Adherence?

Delivering an efficacious program in a manner that respects its core elements.
How is adherence measured?

- Self report
- Observation
Previous research on adherence in parenting interventions

- Few practitioners deliver the program exactly as it was designed

- More experienced practitioners report being able to manage exercise and homework better than newer practitioners (Taylor et al. 2015)
But isn’t some flexibility necessary?

- Low risk modifications
- High risk modifications
Adherence to Content and Process

Content
What are the session activities?

Process
How are they presented? Do they promote self-regulation?
Multi-method Measurement of Adherence

**Self-report:** Practitioners complete a new 12-14 item measure of adherence after each session, the *Triple P Service Provider Session Reflection Tool* (SRT; Sheshko, Lee, & Gagné, 2015) to assess:

- **Content** of each session
- Engagement in the self-regulation model (**process**)

**Observational coding:** We currently **coding audio-recordings** of Triple P sessions by completing the

- **Adherence Measure for Process Quality in Triple P** (AMPQ; Kirby & Sanders, 2014): extent to which practitioners engage in the self-regulation model
- **Triple P Service Provider Session Reflection Tool:** coding content variations and self-regulation
Development of the Self-report

PART I: Reflection on Content

Part I of the SPSR focuses upon adherence to content:

- Asks the practitioner to reflect on his or her session and determine if each of the session’s components was
  - (i) completed as described in the manual or if
  - (ii) modified:
if modified:

How

- I added elements…
- I removed elements…
- I adapted…
- I replaced an element…
- I dropped this activity…

Why

- Not enough time in session
- Have found that the activity did not help parents in the past
- I did not think it fit my client’s culture
- (… total of 12 options)

Describe

- Please describe how [you added/changed]…
PART II: Reflection on Process

Part I of the SPSR focuses upon adherence to process:

- Asks the practitioner to reflect on 8 questions exploring the degree to which he or she utilized self-regulation:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please pick the response that best describes the way you worked with the parents during this session</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little bit</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I invited the parents to develop their own <strong>parenting goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I invited the parents to <strong>monitor</strong> their own behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I invited the parents to <strong>monitor</strong> the behaviour of their <strong>children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I invited the parents to select the <strong>strategies</strong> they want to employ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When discussing parenting strategies employed by the parents, I invited them to identify <strong>what went well</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When difficulties were noted in using the parenting strategies, I invited the parents to identify what they could <strong>do differently</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I invited the parents to recognize the <strong>gains</strong> they have made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I invited the parents to use the parenting practices I introduced across <strong>different contexts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Items based on Sanders & Mazzucchelli’s (2013) discussion: guiding parents in learning self-management tools to promote self-regulation*
Observational Coding: Measure

Adherence Measure for Process Quality in Triple P
(Kirby & Sanders, 2014)

- 15 items: Assess process quality in the implementation of a Triple P session, scored 1 (not present) to 4 (fully present)
  - Items 1 – 10 examine specific components (e.g., provided rationales for introducing content)
  - Items 11 – 15 assess overall delivery (e.g., checked that the parent understood or assessed whether the parent was able to carry out content discussed)
Observational Coding: Measure Translation

Translation of the AMPQ from English to French: clarified nuances of each item’s intended meaning, for example:

- **Item 2**: "provided rationales for introducing content (e.g., reasons for observations …) and gained a mandate from the parent."

- **Item 5**: "'set up different types of observations, or demonstration of skills in an appropriate manner (e.g., modelled skill)"

Item 2 is about **why**, the underpinning reason behind a course of action, whereas item 5 is **how** the practitioner set up the skill's demonstration.

- We worked with the measure’s developers to improve our French translation and refine our understanding of the constructs.
Observational Coding: Development of Coding Protocol

Completed preliminary coding of audio-recordings

- Discussed and resolved coding discrepancies; developed examples to add to our manual

Coding team trained Spring, 2016; currently coding audio

- When listening to audio, coder completes the SRT (to compare with practitioner self-report) assessing each session component
- Following the audio, coder completes the AMPQ as a global measure
Implications for Practitioners and Researchers

- Developed project to offer a multi-method examination of adherence to both the program’s content and processes:
  - Aim is to develop a **low-cost and user-friendly** self-report tool that can be used by practitioners in daily practice

- It is our hope that the Service Provider Session Reflection Tool will serve as a **resource to practitioners** to:
  - **Track** implementation of Triple P
  - **Reflect** upon modifications and practice
  - Serve as a **tool in peer supervision**
Acknowledgments

- This research was supported by a SSHRC partnership grant awarded to the Chaire de partenariat en prévention de la maltraitance, Principal Investigator: Marie-Hélène Gagné, PhD.
- We are grateful to the practitioners who agreed to participate and the families who gave permission for recordings to be used.
- Thanks to the coders Danijela Maras and Robert Hunsley
Questions and comments?