# Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Donovan, Mark O., Pickard, Judith A., Herbert, Jane S. and Barkus, Emma (2022) Mindful Parent Training for Parents of Children Aged 3–12 Years with Behavioral Problems: a Scoping Review. Mindfulness, 13 (4). pp. 801-820. ISSN 1868-8527

Published by: Springer

URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-021-01799-y <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-021-01799-y>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link: https://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/48213/

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <a href="http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html">http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html</a>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)





**Title:** Mindful parent training for parents of children aged 3-12 years with behavioral problems: Scoping review

#### Authors:

Mark O. Donovan	School of Psychology, University of Wollongong, Australia
Judy A. Pickard	School of Psychology, University of Wollongong, Australia
Jane S. Herbert	School of Psychology, University of Wollongong, Australia
Emma Barkus	Department of Psychology, Northumbria University, UK

## **Corresponding Author:**

Mark Donovan <u>mod040@uowmail.edu.au</u> +61 (0)410 239 030 Orchid: 0000-0001-6606-5518

#### **Contributions:**

MD was responsible for the conception, design of the review, extraction, analysis and interpretation of data, and drafted the manuscript. EB contributed to conception, design, data interpretation and review of manuscript. JP and JSH contributed to the data interpretation and revised the paper critically in terms of theory and argument. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript for submission.

## **Ethics declarations:**

*Ethical Approval* This article does not contain any studies with human participants performed by any of the authors.

Conflict of Interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

**Funding:** This study was supported by the University of Wollongong through an HDR scholarship to MD.

#### Abstract

**Objectives:** While mindfulness-based parenting programs (MPP) are increasingly popular for reducing child behavior problems, the evidence for the advantages of MPP over existing behavioral parent training is unclear. Existing systematic reviews have largely excluded the breadth of MPP protocols, including those that integrate behavioral skills components. Therefore a scoping review was conducted to map the nature and extent of research on MPPs for parents of children aged 3 to 12 years with behavioral problems.

**Methods:** PRISMA-ScR guidelines were used to conduct an encompassing peer literature review of cross-disciplinary databases. Studies were included if they reported mindfulness interventions for parents of children aged between 3 and 12 years with externalizing behavior problems and had an outcome measure of child behavioral problems that could be represented as an effect size. Randomised controlled trials as well as quasi-experimental, prepost studies and unpublished dissertations were included.

**Results:** Sixteen studies met the inclusion criteria (N=1362). The majority of MPPs delivered mindfulness adapted to parenting based on the Bögels' protocol within clinical settings. There was a dearth of fully integrated mindfulness and behavioral programs. MPPs generally produced pre-to-post-intervention improvements with small effect sizes across child behavior and parent style, stress, and mindfulness measures. Examining longer follow-up periods compared to pre-intervention, effects reached a moderate size across most outcome measures. **Conclusions:** MPPs continue to show promise in improving child behavior and parental mindfulness, wellbeing, and style. Further research is needed to determine how to best leverage the advantages of mindfulness in augmenting the well-established effectiveness of behavioral programs.

**Keywords**: Mindfulness – Parenting - Scoping review – Behavior – Effectiveness

# Mindful parent training for parents of children aged 3-12 years with behavioral problems: A scoping review

Despite advances in education and social healthcare over the past 50 years, one in eight children experience a mental health problem during childhood, with externalizing behavioral disorders representing the most common diagnosis for children aged 3-12 years (Pilling et al., 2013; Polanczyk et al., 2015). Without beneficial intervention roughly half of these children develop significant problems which persist into adulthood, including the associated economic and societal burden (Farrington, 2007; Fergusson, 2005; Scott et al., 2001). Behavioral parent training (BPT) has garnered overwhelming support since the 1970s as the most effective intervention for children with behavioral problems (Kaminski & Claussen, 2017; Michelson et al., 2013). Group BPT programs such as Incredible Years and Triple P have been disseminated around the globe, with reach into 26 countries across 25 languages and have over 200 randomised controlled trials to support their effectiveness (Sanders et al., 2014; Webster-Stratton & Reid, 2018). Unfortunately, parental negative attributions and mental illness often prevent engagement and perseverance with well-proven behavioral techniques, contributing to a drop-out rate of up to fifty percent (Chacko et al., 2016). For example, negative attributions such as "my child is evil" or "it's hopeless, nothing works" can make it difficult for parents to consistently implement behavioral strategies such as play, praise, limit-setting, and consequences. There is now a groundswell of evidence to highlight the need to address parents' emotional and attributional processes, including the capacity for parental self-regulation in the face of a child with a difficult temperament, particularly within a socially disadvantaged environment (Ben-Porath, 2010; Leijten et al., 2013; Lundahl et al., 2006).

Mindfulness has emerged as a helpful mechanism to moderate parents' emotions and attributions, as well as a bridge towards more sensitive, attuned, and effective parenting

under stressful circumstances (Maliken & Katz, 2013). Mindfulness is commonly defined as "awareness that arises through paying attention, on purpose, in the present moment, nonjudgmentally" (Kabat-Zinn, 2009, p.4). The history of mindfulness stretches back several millennia to Hindu, Buddhist and other religious traditions and ancient yoga practices; however, the popularity of secular Western mindfulness is often credited to the introduction of Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction programs in the late 1970s (Kabat-Zinn, 2011). Following the seminal publication of Everyday Parenting (Kabat-Zinn & Kabat-Zinn, 1997), there has been growing interest in how mindfulness can assist parents to respond to misbehavior in a regulated, intentional, and flexible manner, rather than reacting to misbehavior based on heightened emotions and thoughts (Bögels & Restifo, 2013).

Studies on mindful parenting can be divided between interventions for parents versus those that include parallel parent and child programs, as well as those that deliver pure mindfulness-based stress reduction/cognitive therapy (MBSR/MBCT), or MBSR/MBCT adapted for mindful parenting (MP), or those that integrate mindfulness and behavioral skills (MiBP). Collectively these various interventions have been described as "third wave cognitive behavioral parenting programs" or mindful parenting programs (MPPs) (Townshend et al., 2016, p.141). Broadly speaking, where BPT aims to teach skills in parentchild engagement, limit-setting and contingency management, MP assumes that parents will (re)establish helpful routines of love and limits once they can be fully present and show their child and themselves non-judgmental acceptance.

A range of models has been proposed to account for how mindfulness works. In an early paper arguing for the benefits of mindfulness-based parenting, Dumas (2005) highlighted how mindfulness helps parents to step out of *autopilot* so they can tune into their children, self-regulate, and then respond rather than react. Shapiro et al. (2006) emphasised the central role of intention (on purpose), attention (paying attention) and attitude (with openness and non-judgement) in mindfulness and how these then facilitate "reperceiving" via four key mechanisms: self-regulation, values clarification, cognitive-behavioral flexibility and exposure. Further models have been proposed by Duncan et al. (2009) and Bögels et al. (2010), each underlining variations of the above mechanisms. More recently the concept of *embodied mindfulness* has been proposed to capture the continuous interaction between mind, body, and the world, and how mindfulness involves a flexible regulation of attention and awareness of internal and external cues as well as an integration of top-down (cognitions, emotions) and bottom-up (body signals) processes (Khoury et al., 2017). These models help delineate areas for clinicians to emphasise during delivery of MPP programs, as well as mechanisms for researchers to measure. However, to date, there is no one accepted mechanism of change for parents following mindfulness-based parenting programs.

There have been four recent reviews of MPPs, although none have sufficiently captured MiBP programs. Townshend et al.'s (2016) systematic review of seven MPPs (that included a control group) for parents of children aged 0-18 years provided only tentative support for the effectiveness of MPPs, due to methodological issues. Many studies included multiple non-significant comparisons, increasing the risk of Type 1 errors, and studies with significant findings generally found small to moderate pre-post intervention effect sizes for child behavior (range d = 0.34 - 0.40). In terms of study characteristics across the seven studies, sample sizes ranged from N = 41 to 432 (average N = 140.3), with parents of children aged 2.5 to 14 years, follow-up at 7 to 52 weeks (average 22.7 weeks), and total intervention training time between 12 to 22 hours (average 14.9 hours). Notably none of the seven studies from Townshend's review would have been included in the current review due to the nature of their samples: three were based on the Tuning into Kids program which focuses on emotion coaching rather than mindfulness (Havighurst et al., 2013), two were based on the Mindfulness-enhanced Strengthening Families Program that delivers parallel sessions to

youth aged 10-14 years and their parents (Coatsworth et al., 2014), one focused on children with developmental delay (Neece, 2014), and the other reported on a youth intervention (Felver, Frank, & McEachern, 2014).

A systematic review and meta-analysis of 25 studies conducted by Burgdorf et al. (2019) explored the effectiveness of mindfulness interventions for parents on parenting stress and youth outcomes. Studies that included BPT components were excluded (i.e., MiBP). Most studies (72%) reported results from mindful parenting group protocols based on Bögels and Restifo (2013), while others used generic MBSR/MBCT-based group protocols. Twothirds delivered the intervention only to parents, with the remaining studies delivering parent and child parallel interventions. Twenty studies (80%) were for parents with children who had mental health difficulties. Only six studies (24%) utilised control groups, sample sizes ranged from 11 to 180 participants (average N = 50), group interventions ranged from 1.5 to 3 hours per session over 6 to 12 weeks, with a total training time of 9 to 27 hours, and sixteen studies included follow-up measures at two or more months. The meta-analysis found small effect size within group improvements for pre to post intervention child externalizing problems and parenting stress, and moderate improvements for pre to follow-up child externalizing problems and parenting stress. No differences were found between outcomes for parents of children versus parents of adolescents, nor clinical versus non-clinical child and adolescent samples. The addition of a child/youth intervention led to no overall improvements for parents of youth, and significantly worse outcomes for parents of children. There was also no evidence of a dose response in terms of total intervention time.

More recently, a systematic review and meta-analysis of 20 mindful parenting RCTs by Anand et al. (2021) found small to moderate effects across a range of parental outcomes, including general and parenting stress, internalizing psychological symptoms, well-being, and parenting behavior. Other parental outcomes including mindful parenting were found to be non-significant, and the study did not extract data on child outcomes. Parents of children with medical conditions were found to benefit more from mindful parenting than parents of children with psychological conditions. There was additional benefit when children as well as parents attended the intervention, although this may have been influenced by the high proportion of children with medical conditions in the sample.

A further recent systematic review and meta-analysis of 11 mindful parenting RCTs with parents of typically developing children described limitations in terms of reliability and generalisability of their findings due to the heterogeneity of measures, designs, settings, and protocols (Shorey & Ng, 2021). The authors questioned the benefits of excluding pre-post studies from future reviews. A further Cochrane review protocol for mindfulness-based parenting programs to improve psychosocial outcomes in children aged 0-18 years and their parents is reported as being prepared for publication (Shlonsky et al., 2016). While not yet available, the protocol indicates that only studies with a control group will be included, and so is narrower than the current scoping review. Previous reviews have thus far offered only modest support for MPPs. In particular, it remains unclear whether small to moderate effect size changes would be improved if MPP study protocols included empirically validated behavioral skills components.

The MPP research findings described above are largely consistent with reviews from the broader BPT literature. Moderate to large effect sizes have been demonstrated for BPT over control group for sustained improvements in parent-reported child behavior, parental stress, and parenting style (Buchanan-Pascall et al., 2018; Kazdin, 2008; van Aar et al., 2017). BPT has thus shown slightly larger effect size improvements than MPP, however there has also been considerable variability in outcomes, with effect sizes ranging from negligible to large for pre- to post-intervention (d = 0 - 1.41) (Kaminski & Claussen, 2017).

Similar to the MPP literature, a recent review and meta-analysis of BPT group interventions for children aged 4 to 12 years with behavioral problems failed to find additional benefit for including teacher and child intervention components, and no benefit from increased intervention time (Buchanan-Pascall et al., 2018). A broader review of psychosocial treatment for disruptive behaviors reported significant benefit for interventions that had behavioral components which encouraged positive parent-child interactions, improved emotional communication skills and taught time-out (Kaminski & Claussen, 2017). An earlier review identified moderate effect size impacts on BPT outcomes for low income, low education/occupation, maternal depression, more severe child behavior problems, harsh discipline, and negative parental attributions towards the child (Reyno & McGrath, 2006). Other studies have shown that the impact of social disadvantage moderators can be mitigated by program improvements to accessibility and engagement (Baydar et al., 2003). Risk factors such as parental wellbeing, parental attributions and parenting style have been acknowledged as active ingredients in BPT outcomes, and as evidenced by the popularity of MPPs, are amenable to change through mindfulness approaches (Gardner et al., 2010; Maliken & Katz, 2013). Finally, it is noted that most studies have relied on parent-report measures, however the systematic Cochrane review on BPT interventions by Furlong et al. (2013) confirmed that independent assessments also demonstrate moderate effect size improvements.

Mindfulness-based parenting interventions have emerged over the past two decades in response to the need to address parental mental health and attributional factors within traditional BPT interventions (Chacko et al., 2016; Maliken & Katz, 2013). Recent systematic reviews suggest that MPPs produce only small to moderate effect size changes in child behavior problems, in contrast to moderate to large effect size changes from wellestablished BPT programs (Burgdorf et al., 2019; Comer et al., 2013; Kaminski & Claussen, 2017). MPP protocols included in existing reviews have varied across many factors including age and complexity of children and parents, type of intervention, length of intervention and dose of mindfulness component. No clear preferred format has emerged to guide MPP practitioners. Moreover, recent reviews of mindful parenting have largely excluded studies that have included behavioral skills training components (MiBP), contrary to systematic reviews identifying benefits of behavioral over non-behavioral psychosocial interventions for children with externalizing problems (Comer et al., 2013; Kaminski & Claussen, 2017). Previous systematic reviews have identified the heterogeneity in measures, interventions, and designs, and paucity of RCTs, as limiting aspects of published mindful parenting research, often precluding meta-analyses. Accordingly, a recent review of mindfulness publications from the past twenty years categorised 51% as pre-post studies and 17% as RCTs (Lee et al., 2021). We therefore chose a scoping rather than systematic review to provide a broader picture of the still emerging literature on MPPs, and to guide future research.

This review will explore the extent and nature of mindful parenting programs, with a particular focus on: (1) the evidence for MPPs in reducing child behavior problems as well as improving parent wellbeing, style, and mindfulness; (2) types of settings, designs, samples, and interventions; (3) the integration of mindful parenting with behavioral skills training (MiBP); and (4) gaps in current research. These questions are important, as the proliferation of mindful parenting programs appears to have preceded evidence for their benefits over existing behavioral parenting programs.

#### Methods

PRISMA-ScR guidelines (Tricco et al., 2018) informed an encompassing review of the relevant literature leading to summary of findings in line with the PCC framework (population, concepts, context). The population under examination included peer-reviewed studies and unpublished dissertations between January 2000 and March 2020 of parents of children aged 3 to 12 years with behavior problems who had attended mindful parenting interventions. Concepts of interest were pre-post intervention effects in parent-reported child behavior and self-reported parent style, stress, and mindfulness. The relevant contexts included study samples, settings, countries, and types of intervention and outcome measures. The review protocol focused on within group changes so that effect sizes could be charted for pre-post as well as controlled study designs, which has since been further supported through the recommendations of Shorey and Ng (2021). Given the consistent criticisms of MPP research being prone to small samples and statistically non-significant findings, the current review charted effect sizes as the primary outcome measure, while also noting the percentage of significant findings across different outcomes measures. Parents of children with disabilities were not included due to previous research identifying different mechanisms of change and interventions for these families (Buchanan-Pascall et al., 2018; Whittingham et al., 2019). In recognition that interventions for parents of toddlers and adolescents are different from those for parents of children aged 3 to 12 years, we used mean study child age to exclude studies where samples of children were generally outside our target range.

#### **Inclusion Criteria**

Studies were included in the scoping review if they met the following criteria: (a) intervention for parents of children with behavioral problems with mean sample age between 3 and 12 years (must include parent intervention, may also include child intervention); (b) mindfulness intervention explicitly mentioned by author/s; (c) included an outcome measure of child behavioral problems that could be represented as an effect size; (d) primary focus on externalizing presentations (excluded if children presenting exclusively with autistic spectrum disorder (ASD), developmental disability (DD) or intellectual disability (ID)); and (e) studies available in English language.

#### **Search Strategy**

An encompassing search was conducted between 12<sup>th</sup> February and 10<sup>th</sup> March 2020 of peer-reviewed articles and published dissertations on the following cross-disciplinary databases: Scopus, Web of Science, APA PsychInfo, CINAHL Plus with Full text, Science Citation Index, Education Research Complete, Directory of Open Access Journals, Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection, MEDLINE, SocINDEX, ScienceDirect, Health Source: Nursing/Academic Edition, ERIC, APA PsycArticles, ProQuest Dissertation & Theses. Key search terms were: mindful\* parent\* AND effectiveness or efficacy or effective or success or outcome AND externalizing behavior or externalizing problem or behavior problem or behavior difficulties. Additional hand searches using search terms 'mindful parenting' were completed through Google Scholar and direct search of two key journals (Mindfulness and Journal of Child and Family Studies). References from full-text articles were also reviewed.

Initial literature searches by the first author identified 3,615 results, reduced to 2,304 after duplicates were removed. Studies were selected for further review based on title and where necessary abstract, leading to closer review of 207 studies. Based on the eligibility criteria above, and discussion between authors, 16 studies were selected to include in the scoping review. Fifteen were from published literature and one from the grey literature (Walling 2008). A PRISMA flowchart is provided in Figure 1. Three studies were initially included (Coatsworth et al., 2014; Dawe & Harnett, 2007; Srivastava et al., 2011), but later excluded following unsuccessful attempts to gain means and standard deviations to calculate effect sizes for the behavioral measure within the timeframe for this paper.

[Insert Figure 1: PRISMA flow diagram]

## **Quality Appraisal**

The Effective Public Health Practice Project (EPHPP) quality assessment tool was used to classify the selected studies into three categories: strong, moderate, and weak

11

(Armijo-Olivo et al., 2012). The EPHPP was preferred over other quality appraisal tools due to the mixture of randomised, quasi-experimental and pre-post studies included within the scoping review (Armijo-Olivo et al, 2012). The EPHPP measures the methodological rigour of studies in relation to six components: (1) selection bias, (2) study design, (3) confounders, (4) blinding, (5) data collection methods, and (6) withdrawal and drop-outs. Two further components in the EPHHP tool do not contribute to the overall scores (intervention integrity and analyses). Each component is assessed on a quality score of 1 to 3 (1 = *strong*; 2 = moderate; 3 = weak). Global scores for studies are calculated by collating scores across components. If there are two or more weak ratings the study scored weak; one weak rating and less than four strong ratings scored moderate; and no weak and four or more strong ratings scored strong. The first author undertook evaluation of selected studies using the EPHPP published dictionary in consultation with the other authors. This assessment tool was used for study evaluation purposes rather than for the purposes of inclusion/exclusion from the scoping review.

Overall ratings placed seven studies in the strong category, five in moderate and four in weak (see Table 1). Noticeably all studies demonstrated strong ratings for including reliable and valid data collection methods, most provided details about participant withdrawals and had representative samples, all had either strong or moderate study designs, however none achieved a strong rating for blind rating or condition, most utilising self-report measures and participants being aware of the aims of the study. Despite these shortcomings, most studies achieved a moderate rating for blinding based on published studies not providing sufficient details about blinding processes, as directed by the EPHPP dictionary. Nearly half of the studies did not report controlling for confounders. The additional assessment of intervention integrity showed that 13 of 16 studies reported treatment completion rates above 80%, only two studies provided clear fidelity checks and only two

12

studies provided clear information on possible intervention contamination. Overall, the quality ratings are positive given the broad inclusion criteria for this scoping review.

[Insert Table 1: EPHPP Quality Assessment Ratings for Included Studies]

### **Data Extraction and Synthesis**

Data were extracted by the first author using the research protocol, in consultation with other authors. Extracted data included study design, intervention, and participant characteristics (see Table 2) and outcome measures on child behavior and parent mindfulness, style, and well-being (see Table 3). Where available, within-group effect sizes were extracted and included, otherwise they were calculated based on published means and standard deviations using formulae, where necessary (sd=mean(diff)\*sqrt(N)/t) and effect size (d=2t/sqrt(N-2)) (Lenhard & Lenhard, 2016). A narrative synthesis was conducted to identify patterns within the literature and understand the nature and direction of effects.

### Results

#### **Study Designs**

From the sixteen studies included in the review, six utilised randomised controlled trials, four case controlled trials, five pre-post studies and one was a single case series. Six studies utilized waitlist control groups and four used an alternate intervention comparator. Ten studies included a follow-up period of between 8 weeks and 1 year (M = 18.9 weeks, Mdn = 10 weeks). Findings are reported below and in Table 3 in terms of within group effect size changes, measured from baseline to the final week of intervention (pre-post), and from baseline to follow-up at 2-12 months following intervention (pre-follow-up).

#### Settings

Studies comprised mindful parenting programs run in Netherlands (n = 6), Hong Kong (n = 3), USA (n = 3), Canada (n = 2), Israel (n = 1) and Iran (n = 1). Settings were

spread between child and family mental health (n = 6), child community or family care (n = 8), and one study each from military families and a longitudinal cohort.

#### **Participants**

Total sample size ranged from N = 10 to 336 (total N = 1362, mean N = 85.1). The intervention group pre-intervention sample size ranged from n = 8 to 207 (total n = 979, mean n = 61.2), with post-intervention total sample N = 833 (mean N = 52.1), and follow-up sample N = 656 (mean N = 65.6). Thirteen studies included children from clinical populations, with more than half of these including predominantly children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). The total sample of children included more boys (59.5%) than girls, and were on average aged from a mean of 3.5 years to 12.1 years, with an overall mean of 7.2 years. Parents were predominantly mothers (78.8%) with mean age of 37.5 years, with average age ranging from 28.6 to 42.8 years.

Only five studies reported parent mental illness. Family composition was on average 82% two-parent families (range 48% to 100%). Thirteen studies reported the following exclusion criteria: child neuro/developmental disorder (n = 8), parental severe mental illness/psychosis (n = 7), non-primary language (n = 4), receiving alternative intervention (n = 4), parental IQ < 80 (n = 3), primary diagnosis not oppositional behavior/ADHD (n = 2), unable to attend at least 75% of sessions, child unsafe, parent not high school level education and irregular medication use (all n = 1).

#### Interventions

There was even spread between studies that relied solely on delivering mindfulness training to parents (n = 7), mindfulness training to parents and children concurrently (n = 6), and those that integrated mindfulness alongside behavioral skills training (n = 5) (see Table 2). Most studies utilized group interventions (n = 14). Six studies were reported as being real-world interventions. Intervention protocols were guided by Bögels and Restifo (2013) for ten

of the studies and involved mindfulness explicitly adapted to parenting alongside regular MBSR/MBCT practice. Only one study delivered MBSR/MBCT without adapting the content to include parenting concepts (Walling, 2008). There was no consistent behavioral skills program. MiBP protocols for two studies focused more on attachment than behavioral skills (Smit et al., 2018), two others included minimal mindfulness content within an existing BPT program (Gershy et al., 2017; Gewirtz et al., 2018), and the remaining study combined behavioral skills, mindfulness, and emotion regulation within a brief 6-week program (Lengua et al., 2018). Total intervention face-to-face contact time, including child and booster sessions where relevant, ranged from 9 hours to 32 hours (M = 18.4 hours), conducted across 6 to 14 sessions with 8 weeks for most (n = 9) protocols. Booster sessions were employed by a third of intervention protocols, whereby parents attended a follow-up session to review progress and consolidate key principles. Groups comprising 3 to 15 participants generally ran for 1.5 to 3 hours per week for parents, and one hour per week for children. These intervention characteristics are comparable with previous reviews on MPP (Burgdorf et al., 2019; Townshend et al., 2016). The online MP was notably less intense, with only eight sessions of 35 to 50 minutes each across 10 weeks, and an average of only 17 minutes meditation per week (Potharst et al., 2019). Most MP protocols included in-session mindfulness practice and up to one hour per day of meditation home practice. However, a study that tracked homework completion found that most parents only meditated once or twice per week (Potharst et al., 2020), and Potharst and colleagues (2019, 2020) found no association between meditation time and any of the child or parent outcome measures. The mindfulness integrated behavioral programs (MiBP) had notably lower doses of mindful practice.

[Insert Table 2: Study Characteristics]

### Outcomes

A broad range of outcome measures were used across studies, although most relied on parent report or self-report (see Table 2). Six studies included independent, third-party ratings alongside parent ratings, although four of these were child executive functioning tests associated with monitoring ADHD symptoms. Only two studies (Gewirtz et al., 2018; Lengua et al., 2018) incorporated play-based parent-child observational measures and so observational data were not charted for the current review. Among parent report measures, there was most frequent use of the Child Behavior Checklist (50%) for child behavior, Parenting Scale (50%) for parent style, Parenting Stress Index (86%) for parent stress and Interpersonal Mindfulness for Parents (100%) for parent mindfulness. The review charted effect sizes within Table 3 and percentage of significant findings in Table 4. The review's broad scope included an unpublished dissertation, and it was evident that the effect sizes for this 6-week MBSR study were much larger (e.g., d = 2.26). For this reason, the results for this paper are discussed separately below.

#### **Primary Outcome Measure**

Similar to other MPP reviews, pre-post effect sizes for parent-reported child behavior varied from d = 0.03 to 0.85 for peer-reviewed studies, with one unpublished study reporting an effect size of d = 2.26 (see Table 3). Ten studies reported small effects, two moderate, one large, and two studies found nil to negligible effects. Effect sizes were higher at follow-up than post-intervention for six out of nine peer-reviewed studies, with a range of d = 0.03 to 1.00. The lowest effect size was from a real-world 6-week group MiBP for families who were higher in single-parent, income support and ethnic minority characteristics (Lengua et al., 2018). Aside from the unpublished study, the largest effect size was from an individually delivered MiBP for parents who were largely from two-parent families (Gershy et al., 2017). *Secondary Outcome Measures* 

Three quarters of selected studies included a self-report measure of parenting style, of which most found small effects at pre-post and moderate effects at pre-follow-up (see Table 3). One study found a slight worsening of parenting style (Zhang et al., 2017), and others had effect size improvements between d = 0.26 and 0.68 at pre-post and between d = 0.35 and 0.85 at pre-follow-up, indicating that most parents rated themselves as less hostile and more consistent following MPP attendance. Parenting style ratings improved further at follow-up compared with post-intervention for all seven studies which included follow-up measures.

Eleven studies included measures of parenting stress (see Table 3). Effect sizes ranged overall from d = -0.18 to d = 0.52 at pre-post and d = 0.16 to d = 0.63 at pre-follow-up for peer-reviewed studies, and were again much larger for the unpublished study. Parenting stress ratings improved further at pre-follow-up for six of seven studies.

Over half of the selected studies included a measure of mindful parenting, and nearly a third included a measure of general trait mindfulness (see Table 3). Across all studies, effect sizes ranged from small to large across both types of mindfulness measures. Three studies reported minimal or negative change in parent mindfulness, all of which included Hong Kong Chinese parent samples.

[Insert Table 3: Study Characteristics, Global Quality Assessment and Outcome Measure Effect Size Changes]

From the subset of outcome measures relevant to the current review, 53 from 88 produced statistically significant findings (60.2%), and 66 from 88 reported effect sizes classified as small, moderate or large (75%) (see Table 4). Measures of parenting stress produced the highest rate of statistically significant findings (87.5%), and mindful parenting produced the lowest rate (46.7%). This latter finding may have been influenced by the three studies with participants from Hong Kong which found nil to negative changes in mindful parenting.

[Insert Table 4: Percentage of Studies Reporting Significant Effects Across Outcome Measures]

#### Discussion

This scoping review aimed to systematically map the current research on MPPs in reducing behavioral problems in children aged 3-12 years and improving parent wellbeing, style, and mindfulness. In addition to exploring study characteristics and outcomes, there was a particular focus on whether the integration of behavioral skills in MPPs (MiBP) produced effect size changes in child and parent outcome measures commensurate with outcomes from behavioral parent training. The study also sought to identify gaps in the literature.

The current review included data from nearly a thousand parents who had attended MPP interventions across six countries, five languages, and was representative of families that would benefit from intervention with 87% being from clinical settings and mostly mothers (79%) of male children (59%). Encouragingly, retention was high with 85% of 979 parents completing post-intervention measures, and 76% completing 8 to 52 week follow-up measures, suggesting good engagement and perseverance in mindful parenting programs. Furthermore, nearly 40% of studies were based on real-world studies, adding strength in terms of generalisability. Of the family structure indicators, only two-parent family status was commonly reported across studies, showing 81% overall which is comparable to an average of the countries represented.

Findings were consistent with previous reviews in identifying mostly small effect size improvements from pre- to post-intervention for MPPs across both child and parent outcome measures, with variability across studies from nil to large effects (Burgdorf et al., 2019; Townshend et al., 2016). Effects sizes generally improved further at pre to follow-up. Greater improvement at follow-up compared with post-intervention was also found by Kiminski and Claussen (2017) in their review of BPT studies. This suggests parents continue to apply

principles following parenting interventions and that behavioral change is gradual. Three quarters of outcome measures extracted for this review reported effect sizes in the small to large range, and two-thirds were also statistically significant. Taken together these findings demonstrate that families often experience meaningful change in a positive direction from attending MPPs.

The mindful parenting program of Susan Bögels and Kathleen Restifo (2013) was identified by this and previous reviews as the most prevalent approach, and could provide a benchmark for new and existing MPP intervention protocols. Within their protocol, MP is divided evenly each 2-3 hour session between a range of formal meditation practices and mindful parenting principles, including: understanding the impact of parental reactivity and automacy, responding to children and self with open-awareness and non-judgement, reducing parental stress, and self-care (see Bögels & Restifo, 2013, for more detail).

The review specifically sought to map the evidence from protocols that have integrated behavioral skills and mindfulness components (MiBP). As noted above, only the SEACAP protocol by Lengua et al. (2018) represented a complete integration of BPT with MPP, as the other four MiBP protocols contained either minimal behavioral components or one-off mindfulness sessions. Notably, the 6-week SEACAP program found no change in child behavior or general mindfulness, and only small improvements in parent style. These outcomes could be attributed to the length of program being insufficient for the higher-need sample, rather than to the effects of integrating mindfulness and behavioral skills per se. Indeed, the peer-reviewed study with largest effects on child behavior was also a MiBP program, which in this case was delivered individually to socially advantaged parents (Gershy et al., 2017). The fit between family need and dose of intervention appears important (Kazdin & Whitley, 2006). Kazdin (2007) has previously argued against trying to integrate additional components within group programs due to concerns about redundancy for many

parents and lack of sufficient dose for parents in need. However, we suggest that mindfulness and behavioral skills components are inter-related and have the potential to amplify the benefits of each other. Mindfulness provides a process (the 'how') for the delivery of behavioral content (the 'what'). A values-guided parent who can self-regulate and be present with their child is more likely to deliver behavioral components with integrity and potency, and the ensuing well-proven increase in child cooperation could promote greater parent-child closeness and co-regulation.

Applying the idea of mutual benefit from mindfulness combined with behavioral components to Shapiro et al.'s (2006) model of mindfulness, we could expect that a parent who brings *intention, attention and attitude* to how they deliver a clear instruction is likely to invite cooperation from their child. A parent who delivers a vague, mindless instruction may inadvertently invite resistance or at least non-cooperation, which invites further escalation in the parent-child relationship (Patterson, 1982). It is proposed that a real test of MiBP would therefore involve mindfulness and behavioral components being integrated throughout each week of the intervention in terms of both how the program is delivered (process) and what is delivered (content), and where the dose of intervention is matched to the needs of the target audience. Although not for an externalizing sample, a recent RCT with 195 mothers of children with ASD found significant benefits for the integrated protocol over either mindfulness or behavioral alone (Singh et al., 2021).

In terms of active intervention ingredients, Emerson et al. (2019) identified changes to parental reactivity rather than mindful parenting as a significant predictor of improved child behavior. Furthermore, three studies from the current review found small effect size improvements to child behavior despite nil to negative effect size changes for parent mindfulness (Lo et al., 2019; Lo et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2017). Such findings have been replicated by other researchers (Mah et al., 2020), and raise questions about underlying mechanisms of change. It is possible that; (1) parents from the studies reviewed improved their parenting style, and that this led to changes in child behavior, regardless of changes in parental mindfulness; (2) the Chinese version of the IM-P used by the three studies above is not culturally sensitive, and changes in parental reactivity and mindfulness correlate highly, as found by previous studies (Brown & Ryan, 2003); and/or, (3) there are multiple pathways to change involved in MPPs. Notably, factors such as parental stress, over-reactivity, experiential avoidance, psychological flexibility, self-compassion, and mindfulness have been implicated by some studies and not by others in mediating improvements in adaptive parenting or child behavior or both (Brassell et al., 2016; Cheron et al., 2009; Emerson et al., 2019; Ferraioli & Harris, 2013; Gardner et al., 2010). The multiple pathway position is more appealing as a coherent explanation. This is consistent with existing theoretical accounts of mindfulness, which include multiple active mechanisms. For example, adopting the model proposed by Shapiro et al. (2006), some parents may gain most from improved selfregulation, where others gain more from values clarification, or cognitive-behavioral flexibility or willingness to approach rather than avoid under stress (exposure), and some may benefit from a combination of these mechanisms. Multiple pathways also fits with the mechanism of *flexible regulation of attention and awareness* depicted by the concept of embodied mindfulness (Khoury et al., 2017). Moreover, parenting challenges are different for a child with a disability versus a child with an oppositional temperament, as evidenced by different mediating factors and outcomes being shown for MPPs with different clinical presentations (Anand et al., 2021; Whittingham et al., 2019). Namely, increased selfregulation may be the most potent mechanism in interrupting coercive parent-child cycles associated with externalizing behavior presentations, and improvements to valuesclarification and flexibility may assist a parent supporting a child with a lifelong disability.

Most studies in this review utilised traditional face-to-face programmes. Looking towards the future, Potharst et al. (2019) were able to demonstrate small effect size improvements in child behavior and parent style through a self-directed, low-intensity online mindfulness intervention delivered to socially advantaged mothers from a longitudinal cohort study. Online parenting interventions have promise (Boekhorst et al., 2021), including equal efficacy to face-to-face delivery for parents of young children with ADHD (DuPaul et al., 2017). However, concerns have been raised about acceptability of online delivery, and particularly for socially disadvantaged families in terms of engagement, user costs, privacy, and scheduling where there is synchronous delivery (Boekhorst et al., 2021; Wilkerson et al., 2020). The importance of creating effective and engaging online parenting programs has been underscored by the shift to online service-provision across the globe since COVID-19 (Cluver et al., 2020).

### **Limitations and Future Research**

Concerns raised in previous reviews regarding the quality of MPP research were again notable. Most studies relied on parent report or self-report measures, many were underpowered potentially contributing to non-significant results and possible Type 1 errors, and only a minority utilized randomised controlled trials. That said, RCTs represented 37.5% of studies in the current review compared with 24% in an earlier review on MPPs (Burgdorf et al., 2019), which is consistent with the broader increase in RCTs in mindfulness research (Lee et al., 2021). Most samples included socially advantaged parents, and most often from two-parent families. While the current review had the advantage of drawing from a range of programs, delivered across various cultural groups throughout the world, there was a predominance of children with ADHD within the overall sample. Previous BPT studies have demonstrated attenuated effects for children with ADHD compared with those with oppositional behavior (Furlong et al., 2013), and this may have reduced the effect sizes

22

within the current review. The heterogeneity among rating scales across studies limits our ability to draw broader conclusions, including where different authors have utilized shortforms or variations for scoring of subscales. For example, although the CBCL was used by half of the included studies, some of these studies utilized certain CBCL subscales and seven studies used other behavioral outcome measures. There may also be cultural factors to consider. The three studies from the current review that failed to find improvements in mindful parenting following MPP attendance (Lo et al., 2019; Lo et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2017), used a 23-item Chinese adaptation of the IM-P which includes four of the five original subscales, and has demonstrated adequate reliability ( $\alpha = .87$ ) and validity (Lo et al., 2018). However, this 23-item version of the IM-P may have been less sensitive to change within traditional Chinese family values (Ho & Bond, 1986). Interestingly, Han et al. (2021) used a 31-item Chinese version of the IM-P based on five subscales, and found a positive relationship between parent mindfulness, positive parenting and reduced child behavioral problems.

Efforts to control for subjectivity and bias in this review were managed through close adherence to PRISMA-ScR guidelines (Tricco et al., 2018), use of the EPHPP (Armijo-Olivo et al., 2012), and regular review of the research protocol between authors. Nonetheless some papers may have been missed, including by the chosen search terms. The review also focused on effect sizes from selected outcome measures and some innovative independent assessment methods were not extracted and reported. More broadly, the scope of the current study on externalizing behavior problems as the primary outcome measure excluded several emerging MPPs that focussed on internalizing problems, or that did not include a measure of child behavior. There are also many MPP studies addressing the needs of families who have children with developmental or intellectual disabilities that were excluded from this review,

23

although these have been investigated by other reviews (Anand et al., 2021; Jones et al., 2018; Singh et al., 2019).

The increased uptake of MPPs across the globe has preceded clear evidence of benefit over existing BPT programs. Active treatment components and mechanisms of change remain uncertain. MPPs without any behavioral skills components delivered solely to parents, have been shown to improve parent style and child behavior, although not to the same extent as BPT programs, and mostly for parents from relatively advantaged social contexts.

Further replication of MPPs for families with more complex needs is suggested, as well as exploring stepped-care approaches and online delivery, matched for clinical need and context. For socially disadvantaged parents who may have experienced negative parenting role-models, it seems unlikely that mindfulness alone will help create parenting practices that strike the right balance between love and limits. MiBP interventions can reduce parental reactivity and stress, whilst providing a scaffold for the tried and tested behavioral parenting skills that may not previously have been developed (Lengua et al., 2018). Contrary to this position, from the two studies within the current review that recruited higher-risk families, the mindful parenting study showed small effect size improvements for child behavior and parent stress, and no change in parent mindfulness (Lo et al., 2019), whereas the MiBT study showed no change in child behavior and mindfulness alongside improved parental reactivity (Lengua et al., 2018). It was noted above that the 23-item Chinese version of the IM-P may not have been sensitive to change, and that the brief intervention (6 weeks) within Lengua's MiBT protocol may not have been adequate in addressing the needs of their families. There are only a handful of MiBT studies in the published literature, and most suffer from the limitations described above in terms of limited integration of mindfulness and behavioral components and small samples. Thoroughly integrated MiBT studies with larger high-risk

24

samples are needed to test whether protocols that blend mindfulness with behavioral skills lead to larger effect sizes than either protocol alone.

This review raised questions about mechanisms of change, which would be a valuable focus for future studies. The current picture suggests that MPPs bring about improvements in child behavior through a plethora of treatment components and underlying mechanisms, which vary based on the individual needs of each family. Our current understanding could be elucidated further through fine-grained analysis of the components of leading MP programs (e.g., Mindful Parenting) and MiBPs, alongside exploration of multiple mediators and moderators. For example, a recent study distinguished between parents use of informal moment-to-moment mindfulness in their parenting (open monitoring) versus formal meditation practice (focused attention) (Mah et al., 2020). Consistent with previous research, they found that although parents used informal mindfulness more regularly, it was increased use of formal meditational practice during the program that was associated with greater reductions in harsh parenting (Carmody & Baer, 2008). Likewise, mediational analysis could test the extent to which improvements in parental style, stress or mindfulness predict reductions in child behavior problems within blended mindfulness and behavioral interventions. As described by Kazdin (2007), mechanisms of change are uncovered through a series of studies similar to sequential, strategic moves on a chessboard. The current review is one of many moves.

**Funding** This study was supported by the University of Wollongong through an HDR scholarship to MD.

#### **Ethics Declarations**

**Ethical Approval** This article does not contain any studies with human participants performed by any of the authors.

Conflict of Interest The authors declare no competing interests.

## **Author Information**

#### Affiliations

### School of Psychology, University of Wollongong, NSW, Australia

Mark O. Donovan, Judy A. Pickard, & Jane S. Herbert

## Department of Psychology, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

Emma Barkus

### Corresponding Author Mark Donovan

## **Author Contributions**

MD: designed and executed the review, extracted and analysed the data, and wrote the paper. JP: collaborated with data analysis and writing of the paper. JH: collaborated with data analysis and writing. EB: collaborated with the design, data analysis, and writing. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript for submission.

#### References

- Anand, L., Sadowski, I., Per, M., & Khoury, B. (2021). Mindful parenting: A meta-analytic review of intrapersonal and interpersonal parental outcomes. *Current Psychology*, 1-17. https://doi:10.1007/s12144-021-02111-w
- Armijo-Olivo, S., Stiles, C. R., Biondo, P. D., Hagen, N. A., & Cummings, G. G. (2012).
  Assessment of study quality for systematic reviews: A comparison of the Cochrane
  Collaboration Risk of Bias Tool and the Effective Public Health Practice Project
  Quality Assessment Tool: Methodological research. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice, 18*(1), 12-18. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2753.2010.01516.x
- Baydar, N., Reid, M. J., & Webster-Stratton, C. (2003). The role of mental health factors and program engagement in the effectiveness of a preventive parenting program for Head Start mothers. *Child Development*, 74(5), 1433-1453. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00616
- Behbahani, M., Zargar, F., Assarian, F., & Akbari, H. (2018). Effects of mindful parenting training on clinical symptoms in children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and parenting stress: Randomized controlled trial. *Iranian Journal of Medical Sciences*, 43(6), 596-604.
- Ben-Porath, D. D. (2010). Dialectical behavior therapy applied to parent skills training:
   Adjunctive treatment for parents with difficulties in affect regulation. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 17(4), 458-465. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpra.2009.07.005
- Boekhorst, M. G., Hulsbosch, L. P., Nyklíček, I., Spek, V., Kastelein, A., Bögels, S., Pop, V.,
  & Potharst, E. S. (2021). An online mindful parenting training for mothers raising toddlers: Assessment of acceptability, effectiveness, and personal goals. *Mindfulness, 12*(2), 519-531. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-020-01542-z

- Bögels, S., & Restifo, K. (2013). *Mindful parenting: A guide for mental health practitioners*. Springer.
- Bögels, S. M., Lehtonen, A., & Restifo, K. (2010). Mindful parenting in mental health care. *Mindfulness, 1*(2), 107-120. http://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-010-0014-5
- Bögels, S. M., Hellemans, J., van Deursen, S., Römer, M., & van der Meulen, R. (2014).
  Mindful parenting in mental health care: Effects on parental and child psychopathology, parental stress, parenting, coparenting, and marital functioning. *Mindfulness, 5*(5), 536-551. https://doi:10.1007/s12671-013-0209-7
- Brassell, A. A., Rosenberg, E., Parent, J., Rough, J. N., Fondacaro, K., & Seehuus, M. (2016). Parent's psychological flexibility: Associations with parenting and child psychosocial well-being. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*, 5(2), 111-120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2016.03.001
- Buchanan-Pascall, S., Gray, K. M., Gordon, M., & Melvin, G. A. (2018). Systematic review and meta-analysis of parent group interventions for primary school children aged 4-12 years with externalizing and/or internalizing problems. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 49(2), 244-267. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-017-0745-9
- Burgdorf, V., Szabo, M., & Abbott, M. J. (2019). The effect of mindfulness interventions for parents on parenting stress and youth psychological outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1336. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01336
- Carmody, J., & Baer, R. A. (2008). Relationships between mindfulness practice and levels of mindfulness, medical and psychological symptoms and well-being in a mindfulnessbased stress reduction program. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 31(1), 23-33. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-007-9130-7

Chacko, A., Jensen, S. A., Lowry, L. S., Cornwell, M., Chimklis, A., Chan, E., Lee, D. & Pulgarin, B. (2016). Engagement in behavioral parent training: Review of the literature and implications for practice. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 19(3), 204-215. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-016-0205-2

- Cheron, D. M., Ehrenreich, J. T., & Pincus, D. B. (2009). Assessment of parental experiential avoidance in a clinical sample of children with anxiety disorders. *Child Psychiatry* and Human Development, 40(3), 383-403. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-009-0135-z
- Cluver, L., Lachman, J., Sherr, L., Wessels, I., Krug, E., Rakotomalala, S., Blight, S., Hills,
  S., Bachman, G., Green, O. & McDonald, K. (2020). Parenting in a time of COVID19. *The Lancet, 395*(10231). https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30736-4
- Coatsworth, J., Duncan, L. G., Berrena, E., Bamberger, K. T., Loeschinger, D., Greenberg, M. T., & Nix, R. L. (2014). The mindfulness-enhanced strengthening families program: Integrating brief mindfulness activities and parent training within an evidence-based prevention program. *New Directions for Youth Development, 2014*(142), 45-58. https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.20096
- Comer, J. S., Chow, C., Chan, P. T., Cooper-Vince, C., & Wilson, L. A. (2013). Psychosocial treatment efficacy for disruptive behavior problems in very young children: A metaanalytic examination. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 52(1), 26-36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2012.10.001
- Dawe, S., & Harnett, P. (2007). Reducing potential for child abuse among methadonemaintained parents: Results from a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 32(4), 381-390. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2006.10.003
- Dumas, J. E. (2005). Mindfulness-based parent training: Strategies to lessen the grip of automaticity in families with disruptive children. *Journal of Clinical Child and*

https://doi.org/10.1207/s15374424jccp3404 20

- Duncan, L. G., Coatsworth, J. D., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). A model of mindful parenting: Implications for parent-child relationships and prevention research. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, *12*(3), 255-270. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-009-0046-3
- DuPaul, G., Kern, L., Belk, G., Custer, B., Daffner, M., Hatfield, A., & Peek, D. (2017).
  Face-to-face versus online behavioral parent training for young children at risk for
  ADHD: Treatment engagement and outcomes. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 47, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2017.1342544
- Emerson, L. M., Aktar, E., de Bruin, E., Potharst, E., & Bögels, S. (2019). Mindful parenting in secondary child mental health: Key parenting predictors of treatment effects. *Mindfulness*, 10(1), 1-15. https://doi.org.10.1007/s12671-019-01176-w
- Farrington, D. P. (2007). Childhood risk factors and risk-focused prevention. *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology, 4*, 602-640.

https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195304091.003.0018

- Felver, J. C., Frank, J. L., & McEachern, A. D. (2014). Effectiveness, acceptability, and feasibility of the soles of the feet mindfulness-based intervention with elementary school students. *Mindfulness*, 5(5), 589-597. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-013-0238-2
- Fergusson, H. R. (2005). Show me the child at seven: The consequences of conduct problems in childhood for psychosocial functioning in adulthood. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 46(8), 837-849. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.00387.x
- Ferraioli, S. J., & Harris, S. L. (2013). Comparative effects of mindfulness and skills-based parent training programs for parents of children with autism: Feasibility and

preliminary outcome data. *Mindfulness*, 4(2), 89-101. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-012-0099-0

- Furlong, M., McGilloway, S., Bywater, T., Hutchings, J., Smith, S. M., & Donnelly, M. (2013). Cochrane review: Behavioural and cognitive-behavioural group-based parenting programmes for early-onset conduct problems in children aged 3 to 12 years. *Evidence-Based Child Health: A Cochrane Review Journal, 8*(2), 318-692. https://doi.org/10.1002/ebch.1905
- Gardner, F., Hutchings, J., Bywater, T., & Whitaker, C. (2010). Who benefits and how does it work? Moderators and mediators of outcome in an effectiveness trial of a parenting intervention. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, *39*(4), 568-580. https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2010.486315
- Gershy, N., Meehan, K., Omer, H., Papouchis, N., & Schorr Sapir, I. (2017). Randomized clinical trial of mindfulness skills augmentation in parent training. *Child and Youth Care Forum, 46*(6), 783-803. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-017-9411-4
- Gewirtz, A. H., DeGarmo, D. S., & Zamir, O. (2018). After deployment, adaptive parenting tools: 1-year outcomes of an evidence-based parenting program for military families following deployment. *Prevention Science*, 19(4), 589-599. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-017-0839-4
- Han, Z. R., Ahemaitijiang, N., Yan, J., Hu, X., Parent, J., Dale, C., DiMarzio, K. & Singh, N.
  N. (2021). Parent mindfulness, parenting, and child psychopathology in China. *Mindfulness*, 12(2), 334-343. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-019-01111-z
- Havighurst, S., Wilson, K., Harley, A., Kehoe, C., Efron, D., & Prior, M. (2013). 'Tuning into kids': Reducing young children's behavior problems using an emotion coaching parenting program. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 44*(2), 247-264. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-012-0322-1

Ho, D., & Bond, M. (1986). The psychology of the Chinese people. Oxford University Press.

- Jones, L., Gold, E., Totsika, V., Hastings, R. P., Jones, M., Griffiths, A., & Silverton, S. (2018). A mindfulness parent well-being course: Evaluation of outcomes for parents of children with autism and related disabilities recruited through special schools. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 33(1), 16-30. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2017.1297571
- Kabat-Zinn, J. (2009). Wherever you go, there you are: Mindfulness meditation in everyday *life*. Hachette Books.
- Kabat-Zinn, J. (2011). Some reflections on the origins of MBSR, skillful means, and the trouble with maps. *Contemporary Buddhism*, 12(1), 281-306. https://doi:10.1080/14639947.2011.564844
- Kabat-Zinn, M., & Kabat-Zinn, J. (1997). Everyday blessings: The inner work of mindful parenting. Hyperion.
- Kaminski, J. W., & Claussen, A. H. (2017). Evidence base update for psychosocial treatments for disruptive behaviors in children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 46(4), 477-499.

https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2017.1310044

- Kazdin, A. E. (2007). Mediators and mechanisms of change in psychotherapy research.
   *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 3, 1-27.
   https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.3.022806.091432
- Kazdin, A. E. (2008). Parent management training: Treatment for oppositional, aggressive, and antisocial behavior in children and adolescents. Oxford University Press.
- Kazdin, A. E., & Whitley, M. K. (2006). Pretreatment social relations, therapeutic alliance, and improvements in parenting practices in parent management training. *Journal of*

*Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *74*(2), 246. https://doi:10.1037/0022-006X.74.2.346

- Khoury, B., Knäuper, B., Pagnini, F., Trent, N., Chiesa, A., & Carrière, K. (2017). Embodied mindfulness. *Mindfulness*, 8(5), 1160-1171. https://doi:10.1007/s12671-017-0700-7
- Lee, J., Kim, K. H., Webster, C. S., & Henning, M. A. (2021). The evolution of mindfulness from 1916 to 2019. *Mindfulness*, 12(8), 1849-1859. https://doi:10.1007/s12671-021-01603-x
- Leijten, P., Raaijmakers, M. A., de Castro, B. O., & Matthys, W. (2013). Does socioeconomic status matter? A meta-analysis on parent training effectiveness for disruptive child behavior. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 42(3), 384-392. https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2013.769169
- Lengua, L. J., Ruberry, E. J., McEntire, C., Klein, M., & Jones, B. (2018). Preliminary evaluation of an innovative, brief parenting program designed to promote selfregulation in parents and children. *Mindfulness*, 9(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-018-1016-y
- Lenhard, W., & Lenhard, A. (2016). Calculation of effect sizes. *Psychometrica*. Retrieved July 4, 2020, from https://www.psychometrica.de/effect\_size.html
- Lo, H. H. M., Wong, J. Y. H., Wong, S. W. L., Wong, S. Y. S., Choi, C. W., Rainbow, T. H., Ho, R., Fong, R. W., & Snel, E. (2019). Applying mindfulness to benefit economically disadvantaged families: A randomized controlled trial. *Research on Social Work Practice, 29*(7), 753-765. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731518817142
- Lo, H. H. M., Wong, S. W. L., Wong, J. Y. H., Yeung, J. W. K., Snel, E., & Wong, S. Y. S. (2020). The effects of family-based mindfulness intervention on ADHD symptomology in young children and their parents: A randomized control trial.

Journal of Attention Disorders, 24(5), 667-680. https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054717743330

- Lo, H. H. M., Yeung, J. W. K., Duncan, L. G., Ma, Y., Siu, A. F. Y., Chan, S. K. C., Choi, C. W., Szeto, M. P., Chow, K. K., & Ng, S. M. (2018). Validating of the interpersonal mindfulness in parenting scale in Hong Kong Chinese. *Mindfulness, 9*(5), 1390-1401. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-017-0879-7
- Lundahl, B., Risser, H. J., & Lovejoy, M. C. (2006). A meta-analysis of parent training: Moderators and follow-up effects. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 26(1), 86-104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2005.07.004
- Mah, J. W. T., Murray, C., Locke, J., & Carbert, N. (2020). Mindfulness-enhanced behavioral parent training for clinic-referred families of children with ADHD: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Attention Disorders*, 25(12), 1765-1777. https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054720925882
- Maliken, A. C., & Katz, L. F. (2013). Exploring the impact of parental psychopathology and emotion regulation on evidence-based parenting interventions: A transdiagnostic approach to improving treatment effectiveness. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 16(2), 173-186. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-013-0132-4
- Michelson, D., Davenport, C., Dretzke, J., Barlow, J., & Day, C. (2013). Do evidence-based interventions work when tested in the 'real world?' A systematic review and meta-analysis of parent management training for the treatment of child disruptive behavior. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 16*(1), 18-34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-013-0128-0
- Neece, C. L. (2014). Mindfulness-based stress reduction for parents of young children with developmental delays: Implications for parental mental health and child behavior

problems. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, *27*(2), 174-186. https://doi.org/10.1111/jar.12064

Patterson, G. R. (1982). Coercive family process (Vol. 3). Castalia Publishing Company.

- Pilling, S., Gould, N., Whittington, C., Taylor, C., & Scott, S. (2013). Recognition, intervention, and management of antisocial behaviour and conduct disorders in children and young people: Summary of NICE-SCIE guidance. *Bmj*, 346. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.f1298
- Polanczyk, G. V., Salum, G. A., Sugaya, L. S., Caye, A., & Rohde, L. A. (2015). Annual research review: A meta-analysis of the worldwide prevalence of mental disorders in children and adolescents. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 56(3), 345-365. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12381
- Potharst, E. S., Baartmans, J. M. D., & Bögels, S. M. (2020). Mindful parenting training in a clinical versus non-clinical setting: An explorative study. *Mindfulness*, 11(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-018-1021-1
- Potharst, E. S., Boekhorst, M. G. B. M., Cuijlits, I., van Broekhoven, K. E. M., Jacobs, A., Spek, V., Nyklíček, I., Bögels, S. M., & Pop, V. J. M. (2019). A randomized control trial evaluating an online mindful parenting training for mothers with elevated parental stress. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1550. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01550

Reyno, S. M., & McGrath, P. J. (2006). Predictors of parent training efficacy for child externalizing behavior problems: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 47(1), 99-111. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2005.01544.x

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*(4), 337-357. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2014.04.003

Scott, S., Knapp, M., Henderson, J., & Maughan, B. (2001). Financial cost of social exclusion: Follow up study of antisocial children into adulthood. *Bmj*, 323(7306), 191. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.323.7306.191

Shapiro, S. L., Carlson, L. E., Astin, J. A., & Freedman, B. (2006). Mechanisms of mindfulness. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 62(3), 373-386. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20237

- Shlonsky, A., Dennis, J. A., Devine, B., Tufford, L., Barlow, J., & Bjørndal, A. (2016).
  Mindfulness-based parenting programmes for improving psychosocial outcomes in children from birth to age 18 and their parents. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 11*. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012445
- Singh, N., N., Lancioni, G., E., Karazsia, B., T., Myers, R. E., Hwang, Y.-S., & Anālayo,
  B. (2019). Effects of mindfulness-based positive behavior support (MBPBS) training are equally beneficial for mothers and their children with autism spectrum disorder or with intellectual disabilities. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 385. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00385
- Singh, N. N., Lancioni, G. E., Medvedev, O. N., Hwang, Y.-S., & Myers, R. E. (2021). A component analysis of the mindfulness-based positive behavior support (MBPBS) program for mindful parenting by mothers of children with autism spectrum disorder. *Mindfulness*, *12*(2), 463-475. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-020-01376-9
- Smit, S., Mikami, A. Y., Martens, C., & Ackland, P. (2018). Combining attachment and mindfulness to improve family functioning: Pilot of an attachment-based mindfulness program. *Journal of Family Psychotherapy*, 29(4), 336-358. https://doi.org/10.1080/08975353.2018.1487247

- Srivastava, M., Gupta, A., Talukdar, U., Kalra, B. P., & Lahan, V. (2011). Effect of parental training in managing the behavioral problems of early childhood. *Indian Journal Of Pediatrics*, 78(8), 973-978. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12098-011-0401-5
- Shorey, S., & Ng, E. D. (2021). The efficacy of mindful parenting interventions: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2021.103996
- Townshend, K., Jordan, Z., Stephenson, M., & Tsey, K. (2016). The effectiveness of mindful parenting programs in promoting parents' and children's wellbeing: A systematic review. *JBI Evidence Synthesis*, 14(3), 139-180. https://doi.org/10.11124/JBISRIR-2016-2314
- Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters, M.D., Horsley, T., & Weeks, L. (2018). PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 169(7), 467-473. https://doi.org/10.7326/m18-0850
- van Aar, J., Leijten, P., de Castro, B. O., & Overbeek, G. (2017). Sustained, fade-out or sleeper effects? A systematic review and meta-analysis of parenting interventions for disruptive child behavior. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *51*, 153-163. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2016.11.006
- Walling, C. (2008). Evaluation of mindfulness-based stress reduction for parents of children with externalizing behavior problems. [Doctoral dissertation, Hofstra University].
- Webster-Stratton, C., & Reid, M. J. (2018). The Incredible Years parents, teachers, and children training series: A multifaceted treatment approach for young children with conduct problems. In J. R. Weisz & A. E. Kazdin (Eds.), *Evidence-based Psychotherapies for Children and Adolescents* (p. 122–141). The Guilford Press.

Whittingham, K., Sanders, M. R., McKinlay, L., & Boyd, R. N. (2019). Parenting intervention combined with acceptance and commitment therapy: Processes of change. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *28*(6), 1673-1680. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-019-01386-9

- Wilkerson, D. A., Gregory Jr., V. L., & Kim, H.-W. (2020). Online psychoeducation with parent management training: Examining the contribution of peer support. *Child and Family Social Work, 25*(2), 448-459. https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12701
- Zhang, D., Chan, S. K. C., Lo, H. H. M., Chan, C. Y. H., Chan, J. C. Y., Ting, K. T., Gao, T. T., Lai, K.Y., Bögels, S. M., & Wong, S. Y. S. (2017). Mindfulness-based intervention for Chinese children with ADHD and their parents: A pilot mixed-method study. *Mindfulness*, 8(4), 859-872. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-016-0660-

# Table 1

# EPHPP Quality Assessment Ratings for Included Studies

Study	Selection Bias	Study Design	Confounders	Blinding	Data Collection Methods	Withdrawals & Drop-outs	Overall Study Rating
Behbahani et al. (2018)	Strong	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Strong	Strong
Bogels et al. (2014)	Moderate	Moderate	Weak	Moderate	Strong	Strong	Moderate
Emerson et al. (2019)	Moderate	Moderate	Weak	Moderate	Strong	Moderate	Moderate
Gershy et al. (2017)	Weak	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Weak	Weak
Gewirtz et al. (2018)	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Moderate	Strong	Strong	Strong
Lengua et al. (2018)	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Strong	Strong
Lo et al. (2019)	Strong	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Strong	Strong
Lo et al. (2020)	Strong	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Strong	Strong
Meppelink et al. (2016)	Strong	Moderate	Weak	Weak	Strong	Strong	Weak
Pothharst et al. (2019)	Strong	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Strong	Strong
Pothharst et al. (2020)	Moderate	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Strong	Strong
Smit et al. (2018a)	Moderate	Moderate	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Strong	Moderate
Smit et al. (2018b)	Moderate	Moderate	Weak	Moderate	Strong	Weak	Weak
van der Oord et al. (2012)	Moderate	Strong	Weak	Moderate	Strong	Strong	Moderate
Walling (2008)	Moderate	Moderate	Weak	Weak	Strong	Strong	Weak
Zhang et al. (2017)	Moderate	Moderate	Weak	Moderate	Strong	Strong	Moderate

# Table 2

# Study Characteristics

Study	Type of Intervention <sup>f</sup>	Design (Comparator)	Sample Size	Sample MPP (Pre & Post)	Follow -up, sample size	Settings	Participants	Child	Outcome Measures Extracted <sup>5</sup>
Behbahani et al. (2018)	MP (Kabat- Zinn/Bogels); 1.5h x 8wk + 1.5h booster + CD for home practice + medication	RCT, 2- armed Medication only	60	30 & 30	8wk, N = 26	Iran; academic MH clinic in hospital; real-world	Parents of child with ADHD referred by diagnosing psychiatrist; 50% mothers; 100% two- parent families	66% male; aged 7-12y, <i>M</i> = 8.7, SD = 1.6y; diagnosis ADHD (100%)	SNAP-IV <sup>1</sup> (Iranian version – 18 items); PSI-SF <sup>3</sup> (Iranian version - 36 items) (not extracted independent: SNAP- IV teacher form)
Bogels et al. (2014)	MP; 3h x 8wk + 3h booster + 1h daily meditation home practice; 8- 14 per group	CCT, 2- armed Waitlist (5 weeks)	86	85 & 85	8wk, N = 85	Netherlands; outpatient child & youth MH care	Parents of outpatient MH; 90% mothers; aged 28- 64y, M = 45y, sd=6.6y; 63% two- parent families, 24% separated/divorced; 58% diagnosed with parent-child relationship problem, 31% parent psychopathology	60% male; aged 2-21y, $M = 10.7y$ , SD = 4.6y; diagnoses 47% ADHD, 26% ASD/DD, 12% internalising, 5% externalising	CBCL <sup>1</sup> ; RBI <sup>2</sup> ; PSI <sup>3</sup> (Dutch - 15 items)

Study	Type of Intervention <sup>f</sup>	Design (Comparator)	Sample Size	Sample MPP (Pre & Post)	Follow -up, sample size	Settings	Participants	Child	Outcome Measures Extracted <sup>5</sup>
Emerson et al. (2019)	MP; 3h x 8wk + 3h booster + 1h daily meditation home practice	Pre-post- follow-up	89	89 & 75	8wk & 1y, N = 68 & 15	Netherlands; outpatient child & youth MH care	Parents of child & youth MH; 77% mothers; aged $M =$ 43.5y, $SD =$ 7.7y; 75% two-parent families; 59% employed	65% male; aged 1.5-18y, <i>M</i> = 10.2y, <i>SD</i> = 3.9y; diagnoses 29% ADHD, 24% ASD/DD, 11% internalising, 1% externalising	CBCL <sup>1</sup> (externalising scale, child & infant); PS <sup>2</sup> (10 item over- reactivity scale); PSI <sup>3</sup> (15 item competence scale); IM-P <sup>4</sup> ; FFMQ <sup>4</sup> (24 items)
Gershy et al. (2017)	MiBP (individual); NVR + mindfulness module wk3 (Linehan DBT) + home practice; 1h x 10-12 sessions	RCT, 2- armed Standard NVR program (non-violent- responding); 10-12 individual sessions	79	23 & 19	-	Israel; outpatient MH clinic in children's hospital; real-world	Parents enrolling in parent training; 52% mothers; 88% two- parent families, 7.6% separated/divorced, 5% single-parent	82% male; aged 6-15y, $M$ = 9.6y, SD = 2.5y); diagnosed with ADHD or behavioural difficulties	CBCL <sup>1</sup> (Hebrew version, externalising scale); EQ <sup>2</sup> (21 items)
Gewirtz et al. (2018)	MiBP; ADAPT program (PMT Oregon model) 2h x 14wk; low dose weekly mindfulness, emotion coaching, behavioural skills, homework; 6-15 per group	RCT, 2- armed Web & print resources	336	207 & 175	1y, <i>N</i> = 172	USA; post- deployment military families	52% mothers; aged M = 36.7y, SD = 6.2y; 88% two- parent, 8% separated/divorced, 3% single-parent; 67% employed FT	Not stated	BASC-2 <sup>1</sup> ; Coercive discipline <sup>2</sup> (based on coded Family Interaction Tasks) (not extracted independent: adaptive skills – teacher)

Study	Type of Intervention <sup>f</sup>	Design (Comparator)	Sample Size	Sample MPP (Pre &	Follow -up, sample	Settings	Participants	Child	Outcome Measures Extracted <sup>5</sup>
Lengua et al. (2018)	MiBP; SEACAP mindfulness, emotion coaching, behavioural skills; 2h x 6wk; 3-7 per group; 70% parents attended 5-6/6 sessions, average 4.8/6 sessions	Pre-post- followup	50	Post) 50 & 45	$\frac{\text{size}}{12\text{wk}},$ $N = 28$	USA; Early learning kindergarten & Headstart community college; real-world	Parents of pre- schoolers; 96% mothers; aged $M =$ 28.6y, $SD =$ 7.2y; 77% income support, 52% single-parent; 64% ethnic/racial minority	Aged 2-6y, <i>M</i> = 3.8y, <i>SD</i> = 1y	SSRS <sup>1</sup> (7 items, externalising scale) CRPBI <sup>2</sup> (rejection scale); FFMQ <sup>4</sup> (not extracted independent: coded videotape of play, child executive function)
Lo et al. (2019)	Mindfulness (parent & child); based on Bogels & Restifo 2013 and Coatsworth et al 2010; 1.5h x 6wk; 1h x 8wk for child; some joint sessions wk4&6	RCT, 2- armed Waitlist	102	51 & 49	12wk, N = 51	Hong Kong; primary school or family service centres (low income population)	Parents on social security benefits of 5-7y children; 93% mothers; aged $M =$ 38.6y, $SD = 6.9y$ ; 82% two-parent families, 17% separated/divorced, 0% single-parent	56% male; aged 5-7y ( $M = 6.5y$ , SD = 0.8y); excluded neurodevelopment al	CBCL <sup>1</sup> (67-item HK Chinese version); PSI-SF <sup>3</sup> ; IM-P <sup>4</sup> (23 item Chinese version) (not extracted independent: child executive function)
Lo et al. (2020)	Mindfulness (parent & child); based on Bogels & Restifo 2013 and Coatsworth et al 2010; 1.5h x 6wk; 1h x 8wk for child; some joint sessions wk4&6	RCT, 2- armed Waitlist	100	50 & 48	-	Hong Kong; family service centres ( <i>n</i> = 3)	Parents of children 5-7y with ADHD; 88% mothers; aged M = 39.2y, $SD =5.7y; 91% two-parent families, 6%separated/divorced,3% single-parent$	83% male; aged 5-7y ( <i>M</i> = 6.2y, <i>SD</i> = 0.9y); 100% diagnosis ADHD	CBCL <sup>1</sup> (67-item HK Chinese version); PSI-SF <sup>3</sup> ; IM-P <sup>4</sup> (not extracted independent: Parent HRV, child executive function)

Study	Type of Intervention <sup>f</sup>	Design (Comparator)	Sample Size	Sample MPP (Pre & Post)	Follow -up, sample size	Settings	Participants	Child	Outcome Measures Extracted <sup>5</sup>
Meppelink et al. (2016)	MP; 3h x 8wk + 3h booster + 1h daily meditation home practice, 2h focus MBSR, 1h mindful parenting; 4-13 per group	Pre-post- followup	70	70 & 64	8wk, N = 61	Netherlands; outpatient child & youth MH clinic ( <i>n</i> = 3); real- world	Parents of children with psychopathology; 93% mothers; aged M = 42y, $SD = 7.2y$ ; 19% unemployed, 30% FT employed	57% male; aged M = 8.7y, SD = 3.4y; diagnosis 29% ASD, 24% ADHD, 3% internalising; 1% externalising, 26% V code parent-child problem	CBCL <sup>1</sup> (child & infant); IM-P <sup>4</sup> (short 10 items); FFMQ <sup>4</sup> (24 items)
Potharst et al. (2019)	MP (online); self- directed mindfulness + mindful parenting each week; 8 x 10wk (35-50min per session)	RCT, 2- armed Waitlist	76	76 & 58	10wk, N = 37	Netherlands; longitudinal cohort study mothers of toddlers	100% mothers invited by email following high scores on PSQ (n=209); aged 26- 45y, M = 36.2y, SD = 3.9y; 98% two- parent families; 87% employed	44% male; aged 3-4.7y, <i>M</i> = 3.5y, <i>SD</i> = 0.3y	CBCL <sup>1</sup> (Dutch infant; aggressive, emotionally reactive scales); $PS^2$ (over-reactivity subscale); $PSQ^3$ (parent-child relationship, parenting, parental role-restriction scales); IM-P <sup>4</sup> (10- item) poor alpha (a = 0.49) so excluded
Potharst et al. (2020)	MP (clinical) - 3h x 8wk + 3h booster + 15- 45min daily meditation; MP (non-clinical) - 2h x 8wk + 10-	CCT, 2- armed Waitlist (7 weeks)	247	186 & 129	8wk, N= 118	Netherlands; outpatient MH clinic (Clinical) & child health centre (Non- clinical)	Clinical - referred by GP/psychologist, 80% mothers; aged M = 43.8y, $SD =6.1y; 53% two-parent families,27% single-parentNon-clinical -$	Clinical - aged 1- 35.3y, m=8.9y, sd=5.4y; diagnosis 31% ADHD, 23% ASD, 23% other Non-clinical - aged 2.6-25.4y, <i>M</i>	SDQ <sup>1</sup> ; PS <sup>2</sup> (10 item over- reactivity subscale); OBVL <sup>3</sup> (35 items); IM-P <sup>4</sup> (10 items)

Study	Type of Intervention <sup>f</sup>	Design (Comparator)	Sample Size	Sample MPP (Pre & Post)	Follow -up, sample size	Settings	Participants	Child	Outcome Measures Extracted <sup>5</sup>
	20mins daily meditation						parents experiencing stress; 82% mothers; aged M = 42.4y, $SD =6.9y$ ; $67%$ two- parent families, 19% single-parent	= 11.7y, <i>SD</i> = 4.4y	
Smit et al. (2018a)	Mindfulness & attachment (parent & child); ABM based on Siegel & Hartzell 2003 & Duncan et al 2009; teaching, discussion, skill development, journaling practice); parent group 2h x 8wk (+ child therapy: self regulation 1h x 8 sessions);	CCT, 2- armed ABM v Psycho- education	13	8 & 7	-	Canada; community agency; real- world	Parents of children with behaviour problem; 92% mothers; aged $M =$ 32.8y, $SD = 5y$ ; 77% two-parent families; 85% employed; 54% insecure on RQ (average 40% Hazan & Shaver, 1997)	56% male; aged 3-5y, $M = 4.1y$ , SD = 0.8y; T- score on CBCL > 60	CBCL <sup>1</sup> (infant); PRQ-P <sup>2</sup> (discipline, relational frustration scales); PSI <sup>3</sup> ; IM-P <sup>4</sup> (10 items)
Smit et al. (2018b)	Mindfulness & attachment (parent & child); ABM as above except included self-regulation & psychoeducation; parent group 2h x	Pre-post	11	11	-	Canada; community agency; real- world	Parents of children with behaviour problem; 100% mothers; aged $M =$ 32.2y, $SD =$ 7.1y; 64% two-parent families; 73% insecure on	27% male; aged 3-5y, <i>M</i> = 3.6, <i>SD</i> = 0.7y; T-score on CBCL > 60	CBCL <sup>1</sup> (infant); PRQ-P <sup>2</sup> (discipline, relational frustration scales) ; PSI <sup>3</sup> ; IM-P <sup>4</sup> (10 items)

Study	Type of Intervention <sup>f</sup>	Design (Comparator)	Sample Size	Sample MPP (Pre & Post)	Follow -up, sample size	Settings	Participants	Child	Outcome Measures Extracted <sup>5</sup>
	12wk (+ child therapy: self regulation 1h x 8 sessions);						Relationship Questionnaire (average 40% Hazan & Shaver, 1997)		
van der Oord et al. (2012)	MP (parent & child); 1.5h x 8wk (some joint sessions); CD for home practice; 4- 6 per group; manualised; weekly supervision for integrity.	CCT, 2- armed Waitlist	22	22 & 18	-	Netherlands; academic clinic in outpatient MH	Parents of children with ADHD; 95% mothers; 73% high- education	73% male; aged 8-12y, $M = 9.6y$ , SD = 1.3y; diagnosis 100% ADHD, 27% on medication	DBDRS <sup>1</sup> (ODD scale); PS <sup>2</sup> (30-items); PSI <sup>3</sup> (25 items); MAAS <sup>4</sup> (15 items)
Walling (2008 <sup>7</sup> )	MBSR adapted to parents (parent only); 1.5h x 6wk; 3-4 per group; audiotape for home practice.	Pre-post	10	10 & 10	10	US; university clinic	Mothers of children with behavioral problems; aged $M =$ 38.6y, SD = 5.6y; 80% two-parent families, $10\%$ divorced;	90% male; aged 3-6y, $M = 4.5y$ , SD = 1.1y; diagnosis 20% ADHD, 10% ASD, 20% disability	ECBI <sup>1</sup> (intensity scale); PSI <sup>3</sup> (36-items); IM-P <sup>4</sup> :KIMS

Study	Type of Intervention <sup>f</sup>	Design (Comparator)	Sample Size	Sample MPP (Pre &	Follow -up, sample	Settings	Participants	Child	Outcome Measures Extracted <sup>5</sup>
				Post)	size				
Zhang et	MP (parent &	Pre-post	11	11 & 10	-	Hong Kong;	Parents of children	73% male; aged	ECBI <sup>1</sup> (problem
al. (2017)	child); MYmind,					child &	8-12y with ADHD;	8-12y, M = 9.5y,	scale);
	based on					youth NGO	64% mothers; aged	SD = 1.4y;	$PS^2$ (30 items); $PSI^3$
	MBSR/MBCT;						M = 42.4y, $SD$	diagnosis 100%	$(36-items); IM-P^4$
	1.5h x 8wks;						=4.1y; 82% two-	ADHD, 91% on	
	training by						parent families,	medication	(not extracted
	Bogels						18%		independent:
	2						separated/divorced;		child executive
							80% employed		function)

<sup>1</sup>Child Behavior measure; <sup>2</sup>Parent Style measure<sup>3</sup>; Parent Stress/Wellbeing measure; <sup>4</sup>Mindfulness measure

<sup>5</sup> BASC = Behavioral Assessment Scale for Children; CBCL = Child Behavioral Checklist; CRPBI = Child Report of Parenting Behavior Inventory; DBDRS = Disruptive Behavior Disorder Rating Scale; ECBI = Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory; EQ = Escalation Questionnaire; FFMQ = Five Facets Mindfulness Questionnaire; IM-P = Interpersonal Mindfulness in Parenting; KIMS = Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness Skills; MAAS = Mindful Attention & Awareness Scale; OBVL/PSQ = Opvoedingsbelastingvragenlijst/Parenting Stress Questionnaire; PRQ = Parenting Relationship Questionnaire – Preschool; PS = Parenting Scale; PSI/PSI-SF = Parenting Stress Index-Short Form; RBI = Rearing Behavior Inventory; SDQ = Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire; SNAP-IV = Swanson, Nolan and Pelham – Parent; SSRS = Social Skills Rating System

<sup>6</sup> ABM = Attachment Based Mindfulness; ADAPT = After Deployment, Adaptive Parenting Tools; CD = compact disc; DBT = Dialectical Behavioral Therapy; MBCT = Mindfulness Based Cognitive Therapy; MBSR = Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction; MP = Mindful Parenting; NVR = Non-violent resistance; SEACAP = Social, Emotional, and Academic Competence for Children and Parents; <sup>7</sup>Unpublished dissertation

# Table 3

# Study Characteristics, Global Quality Assessment and Outcome Measure Effect Size Changes

Study ( <i>n</i> )	Type of Intervention <sup>a</sup> Total hours	Quality Assessment	Child B	Behaviour	Parent Style		Parent Stress		Parent Mindfulness		General Mindfulness	
			Pre-Post	Pre-F/up	Pre- Post	Pre- F/up	Pre- Post	Pre- F/up	Pre- Post	Pre- F/up	Pre-Post	Pre- F/up
Behbahani et al.	MP (parent only)	Strong	0.36	1.00	0.56	0.76	-	-	-	-	-	-
(2018) (n = 60)	13.5 hrs											
Bogels et al	MP (parent only)	Moderate	0.31	0.37	0.33	0.35	0.44	0.47	-	-	-	-
(2014) (n = 86)	27 hrs											
Emerson et al.	MP (parent only)	Moderate	0.17	0.26	0.50	0.65	0.43	0.48	0.77	1.04	0.7	0.91
(2019) (n = 89)	27 hrs											
Gershy et al.	<sup>b</sup> MiBT (parent only)	Weak	0.85	-	0.40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
(2017) (n = 79)	12 hrs											
Gewirtz et al.	<sup>b</sup> MiBT (parent only)	Strong	0.12	-	0.26	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
(2018) ( <i>n</i> = 336)	28 hrs											
Lengua et al.	MiBT (parent only)	Strong	0.03	0.03	0.35	0.37	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.01
(2018) (n = 50)	12 hrs											
Lo et al. (2019)	MP (parent & child)	Strong	0.36	0.38	-	-	0.26	0.24	0.05	-0.02	-	-
( <i>n</i> = 102)	17 hrs											
Lo et al. (2020)	MP (parent & child)	Strong	0.29	-	-	-	0.19	-	-0.05	-	-	-
( <i>n</i> = 100)	17hrs											
Meppelink et al.	MP (parent only)	Weak	0.22	0.37	-	-	-	-	0.78	1.04	0.73	1.02
(2016) (n = 70)	24 hrs											

Study ( <i>n</i> )	Type of Intervention <sup>a</sup> Total hours	Quality Assessment	Child B	ehaviour	Parent Style		Parent Stress		Parent Mindfulness		General Mindfulness	
			Pre-Post	Pre-F/up	Pre- Post	Pre- F/up	Pre- Post	Pre- F/up	Pre- Post	Pre- F/up	Pre-Post	Pre- F/up
Pothharst et al.	MP Online (parent	Strong	0.33	0.38	0.26	0.37	0.02	0.16	-	-	-	-
(2019) (n = 76)	only) 8 hrs											
Pothharst et al.	MP (parent only)	Strong	0.61	0.41	0.68	0.71	0.37	0.63	0.72	0.63	-	-
(2020) (n = 247)	27 hrs											
Smit et al.	MiBT (parent &	Moderate	0.67	-	0.65	-	0.52	-	0.84	-	-	-
(2018a) (n = 13)	child) 24 hrs											
Smit et al.	MiBT (parent &	Weak	0.24	-	0.38	-	0.06		0.75	-	-	-
(2018b) (n = 11)	child) 32 hrs											
van der Oord et	MP (parent & child)	Moderate	0.26	0.22	0.40	0.85	0.49	0.57	-	-	0.28	0.11
al. (2012) ( <i>n</i> = 22)	12 hrs											
Walling (2008°)	MBSR (parent only)	Weak	2.26	1.89	-	-	0.91	1.26	1.21	1.31	1.01	0.88
(n=10)	9 hrs											
Zhang et al.	MP (parent & child)	Moderate	0.36	-	-0.12	-	-0.18	-	-0.17	-	-	-
(2017) ( <i>n</i> = 11)	12 hrs											
Studies ( <i>n</i> )	-	-	15	9	12	7	11	7	9	6	5	5

<sup>a</sup>MP = Mindful parenting, MiBT = Mindfulness integrated Behavioral Training, MBSR = Mindfulness-based Stress Reduction, MPP = Mindful parenting program (includes all types); <sup>b</sup>Individual interventions; <sup>c</sup>Unpublished dissertation

## Table 4

Construct (& Measures)	Percentage of Studies Reporting Significant Results (Proportion of Total Number)					
	Pre-Post	Pre-Follow-up				
Child externalising behavior (BASC, CBCL, DBDRS, ECBI, PBQ, SDQ)	56.3% (9/16)	70% (7/10)				
Parenting style/approach (CRPBI, EQ, PS, PSQ, RBI, SSRS, observational)	58.3 (7/12)	57.1 (4/7)				
Parenting stress/well-being (OBVLQ, PRQ, PSI, PSI-SF)	81.8% (9/11)	71.4% (5/7)				
Mindful Parenting (IM-P)	44.4% (4/9)	50% (3/6)				
Mindfulness (FFMQ, MAAS, KIMS)	60% (3/5)	40% (2/5)				

Percentage of Studies Reporting Significant Effects Across Outcome Measures

BASC = Behavioral Assessment Scale for Children; CBCL = Child Behavioral Checklist; CRPBI = Child Report of Parenting Behavior Inventory; DBDRS = Disruptive Behavior Disorder Rating Scale; ECBI = Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory; EQ = Escalation Questionnaire; FFMQ = Five Facets Mindfulness Questionnaire; IM-P = Interpersonal Mindfulness in Parenting; KIMS = Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness Skills; MAAS = Mindful Attention & Awareness Scale; OBVL/PSQ = Opvoedingsbelastingvragenlijst/Parenting Stress Questionnaire; PRQ = Parenting Relationship Questionnaire – Preschool; PS = Parenting Scale; PSI/PSI-SF = Parenting Stress Index-Short Form; RBI = Rearing Behavior Inventory; SDQ = Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire; SNAP-IV = Swanson, Nolan and Pelham – Parent; SSRS = Social Skills Rating System

# Figure 1

PRISMA Flow Diagram

