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FAMILY : Harmony@Home Project
• promoting **Happiness, Harmony and Health** (3Hs) in families
• Primary prevention project: **prevent family violence and dysfunctions** by enhancing parents’ conflict management ability
• not only **reduces the risk factors** that increase the likelihood of family violence, but also on **promoting protective factors** that may enhance health and wellbeing, increasing the ability to cope with everyday stresses
Hong Kong Family Welfare Society

- Clinical experience
- Connection with target groups and local parties

School of Public Health, University of Hong Kong

- Academic support
- Set up of high standard randomized controlled trial (RCT) research

Largest-scaled locally-developed RCT on promoting family functioning in HK
Project Overview

- Duration -- 12/2008 – 6/2010 (Pilot study)
  7/2010 – 2/2012 (Main study)
- District – Tuen Mun and Tseung Kwan O
- Number of Participants Recruited -- 461
- Target group: Parents of children aged 10-13 (pre-adolescent stage)
- Research Design: Three-arm RCT
- Study Outcomes:
  - Primary:
    - Decrease parent-child conflict
    - Enhance parent-child relationship
  - Secondary:
    - Raise Family Harmony & Happiness
3-Arm Randomized Controlled Trial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arm A</th>
<th>Arm B</th>
<th>Arm C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Be a Peaceful Parent)</td>
<td>(Positive Parenting Group)</td>
<td>(Control Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four 2.5-hour group sessions + one or two or at 1 or 2 or 6-months post intervention booster session</td>
<td>Four 2-hour group sessions + one or two or at 1 or 2 or 6-months post intervention booster session</td>
<td>Two 2-hour Family Health Talk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arm A
Intervention Design

- Self-affirmation
- Communication Skills Building
- Conflict Resolution Skill Building

Decrease Parent-child Conflict

Increase Family Harmony & Happiness
Content

Session 1  Enhance sense of self worth by learning self affirmation.

Session 2  Increase their locus of control & communication skills.

Session 3  Conflict resolution skills.

Session 4  Consolidation and empowerment
Key Elements

• AVP Parent version
• Four 2.5-hour sessions
• Goals:
  – Commit in seeking harmonious relationship with their children
  – Increase sense of self worth
  – Skills learning: communication and conflict resolution
• Strategies: experiential learning, voluntary participation, transforming power, mutual learning and support
Format

- Light & Lively
- Interactional exercise
Arm B
Intervention Model

**Parenting Skills**

1. Relationship Building
2. Positive Parenting
3. Anger Control
4. Negotiation

**Enhance Parent-child Relationship**

**Outcomes**

Increase Family Harmony and Happiness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Relationship building with children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>Positive control – in a misbehaving situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>Anger control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>Negotiation – preventing misbehavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Elements

• Cognitive Dissonance Approach with HAPA model
• Four 2-hour sessions
• Learning goals:
  – Relationship building
  – Positive control
  – Emotion management
  – Negotiation
• Strategies: Interactive, participant-led, social support, planning, and practice
Format

- Role play to pick errors
  - Identify errors & 3 attribution questions
- Formulate alternatives
  - New strategies & long term impact
- Facilitator models strategy
- Planning
  - Planning worksheet
  - Participants enact their role play
- Homework planning
- Golden words
Assessments

Quantitative (written – close end questions)
• Questionnaires at key points:
  – Does the Intervention change outcomes?
    • Pre Intervention (T1)
    • Post Intervention (T2)
    • 3-month post intervention (T3)
    • 6-month post intervention (T4)
    • 12-month post intervention (T5)

Qualitative (verbal- open ended questions)
• 6 post discussion groups were conducted
Arm A – Be a Peaceful Parent

Primary Outcome
• Satisfaction with relationship with child
• Satisfaction with self as parent
• Frequency of conflict
• Intensity of conflict
• Self-esteem (Arm A specific)
• Specific behavior change

Secondary Outcome
• Harmony
• Happiness
• Health
Arm B – Positive Parenting Group

Primary Outcome
• Satisfaction with relationship with child
• Satisfaction with self as parent
• Frequency of conflict
• Intensity of conflict
• Specific behavior change (Intention, Planning)

Secondary Outcome
• Harmony
• Happiness
• Health
Assessment Outcome on Relationship with Child

Figure 1 shows both Arms A and B were effective in increasing levels of Parental Satisfaction with Relationship with their Child at three months post-intervention (T3) vs. the Control group. Arm A was able to sustain these results for twelve months post intervention.

* Statistically significant at p<.05
Note 1. ES = Effect Size (Cohen's f), small = .10, medium = .25, and large = .40
Note 2. T2 = post-intervention; T3 = three months post-intervention; T4 = six months post-intervention; T5 = twelve months post-intervention
Note 3. Δ are defined as absolute magnitudes of changes in mean scores from baseline
Note 4. Arm A – FWS Arm; Arm B – HKU Arm; Arm C – Control Arm

Figure 1. Satisfaction with Relationship with Child

Satisfaction with relationship with child (Mean score)

Baseline, post-intervention, 3 months post-intervention, 6 months post-intervention, 12 months post-intervention

Arm A (N=134), Arm B (N=131), Arm C (N=118)
Assessment Outcome on Satisfaction with Self As Parent

Figure 2 shows both Arms A and B were effective in increasing levels of Parental Satisfaction with Self as parent at three months post-intervention (T3) vs. the Control group. This effect was not sustained at six months post-intervention.

* Statistically significant at $p<.05$

Note 1. ES = Effect Size (Cohen's $f$), small = .10, medium = .25, and large = .40

Note 2. T2 = post-intervention; T3 = three months post-intervention; T4 = six months post-intervention; T5 = twelve months post-intervention

Note 3. Δ are defined as absolute magnitudes of changes in mean scores from baseline

Note 4. Arm A – FWS Arm; Arm B – HKU Arm; Arm C – Control Arm

Figure 2. Satisfaction with Self as Parent

[Graph showing changes in satisfaction with self as parent over five assessment timepoints for Arms A, B, and C, with statistically significant differences marked with asterisks.]
Assessment Outcome on Frequency and Intensity of Conflict

Figure 3 shows Arm A showed significant declines in Frequency of Conflict at three and six months post-intervention (T3), but not intensity of conflict.

Figure 3. Frequency of Conflict

* Statistically significant at p<.05
Note 1. ES = Effect Size (Cohen’s d), small = .10, medium = .25, and large = .40
Note 2. T2 = post-intervention; T3 = three months post-intervention; T4 = six months post-intervention; T5 = twelve months post-intervention
Note 3. Δ are defined as absolute magnitudes of changes in mean scores from baseline
Note 4. Arm A – FWS Arm; Arm B – HKU Arm; Arm C – Control Arm

* T3: ΔA >ΔC, ES = .16
* T4: ΔA >ΔC, ES = .17
Assessment Outcome on Frequency and Intensity of Conflict

Figure 4 shows although Arm B showed declines in Intensity of Conflict, they were not significantly different from the Control group at any of the assessed time points.

**Figure 4. Intensity of Conflict**

* Statistically significant at $p<.05$

Note 1. ES = Effect Size (Cohen’s $f$), small = .10, medium = .25, and large = .40

Note 2. T2 = post-intervention; T3 = three months post-intervention; T4 = six months post-intervention; T5 = twelve months post-intervention

Note 3. $\Delta$ are defined as absolute magnitudes of changes in mean scores from baseline

Note 4. Arm A – FWS Arm; Arm B – HKU Arm; Arm C – Control Arm
Assessment Outcome on Happiness （4-item scale）

Figure 5 shows Arm B was effective in increasing levels of Happiness (4 item scale) vs. the Control group, immediately post-intervention (T2), three-months post-intervention (T3) and through twelve months post-intervention (T4 & T5), although Arm A was not effective at the same time points vs. the Control group.

* Statistically significant at p<.05
Note 1. ES = Effect Size (Cohen’s d), small = .10, medium = .25, and large = .40
Note 2. T2 = post-intervention; T3 = three months post-intervention; T4 = six months post-intervention; T5 = twelve months post-intervention
Note 3. Δ are defined as absolute magnitudes of changes in mean scores from baseline
Note 4. Arm A – FWS Arm; Arm B – HKU Arm; Arm C – Control Arm

Figure 5. Subjective Happiness (4-item)
Assessment Outcome on Harmony

Figure 6 shows neither Arms A nor Arm B were effective in increasing levels of Harmony vs. the Control group at the assessed time points.

Figure 6. Harmony

* Statistically significant at $p<.05$

Note 1. ES = Effect Size (Cohen’s $f$), small = .10, medium = .25, and large = .40

Note 2. T2 = post-intervention; T3 = three months post-intervention; T4 = six months post-intervention; T5 = twelve months post-intervention

Note 3. Δ are defined as absolute magnitudes of changes in mean scores from baseline

Note 4. Arm A – FWS Arm; Arm B – HKU Arm; Arm C – Control Arm
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Assessment Outcome on Self-esteem

Figure 7 shows Arm A was effective in increasing levels of Self-esteem at all time periods: immediately post-intervention (T2), three-month post-intervention (T3) and through six months post-intervention (T4 & T5) vs. the Control group.

* Statistically significant at $p<.05$

Note 1. ES = Effect Size (Cohen's $f$), small = .10, medium = .25, and large = .40

Note 2. T2 = post-intervention; T3 = three months post-intervention; T4 = six months post-intervention; T5 = twelve months post-intervention

Note 3. $\Delta$ are defined as absolute magnitudes of changes in mean scores from baseline

Note 4. Arm A – FWS Arm; Arm B – HKU Arm; Arm C – Control Arm
Qualitative Result

I listened to my child more. In the past, I used to point out his fault and lectured him when I spotted his “misbehavior”, now I would try to ask and listen to his explanation first.

I used to lose temper and regretted afterwards. Now, I would be more conscious when I started feeling angry and tried to stop the anger from escalating. Besides, the programme also taught skills like how to stop children from over using the computer, like talk to them about the consequences, I found the situation improved a lot.
Learning on Conducting Research

1. Unifying dosage of intervention
2. Beware of reverse question
3. Monitoring data phase by phase
4. Back translation to keep tracking the exact meaning after translation.
Inspiration on Social Service

1. Conducting in-depth evaluation on programmes for improving service quality purpose and enhance social workers understanding on service user’s feedback on the service

2. Change current “practice” in conducting high-quality research
Thank You