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Intervention programs for children whose parents have a mental illness: a review

A n Australian epidemiological study found that 21%–23% of children have at least one parent who has a mental illness,1 with varying levels of risk exposure, depending on several child, parent, family and community variables.2 In recent years, there have been a number of programs that aim to promote the positive determinants of children’s wellbeing and reduce the risk factors associated with living with parental mental illness. As these children are at higher risk of developing mental illnesses, suicide ideation and attempts, and functional impairment than their peers,2 it is essential that appropriate early intervention programs are developed. Scoping projects conducted in 19993 and 20084 found that peer-support programs were the main form of intervention offered in Australia. However, Fraser and colleagues5 found that the evaluation methodology employed by most programs, including such peer-support programs, was weak and thus their effectiveness was uncertain.

Our review aimed to identify the range of interventions that clinicians might employ, or refer to, when working with such children. Building on previous reviews,3–5 this article presents available interventions for children, highlighting evidence data when available. Given the different needs of very young children and older children, we focused on programs that target children aged 5–18 years (although some programs also include younger or older children).

Methods

Grey (unpublished) and black (published, peer-reviewed) literature was sourced from three fields. First, we examined a review of evaluated programs by Fraser and colleagues;5 as well as Australia-wide scoping projects conducted in 19993 and 2008.4 Second, searches were conducted using PsycINFO and MEDLINE in June 2011, using key terms (list available from the authors on request) with no date limits, for papers published in English, Dutch or German. Finally, on the basis of these approaches, we identified various programs and circulated this list among our professional networks (carer and consumer groups, researchers and clinicians) to identify other programs and program types that we might have missed.

We included only those programs with a specific focus on children whose parents have a mental illness (excluding parental substance abuse). This meant that parenting programs for parents with a mental illness were excluded. Conversely, family programs were included if children were included in the intervention. Interventions targeting children with existing mental health problems were excluded. As the focus of our review was on identifying available programs, no restrictions were placed on study quality.

Results

Family-intervention programs

We identified seven family-intervention programs (Box 1).6–13 Of these, six programs target families where a parent has depression and/or anxiety.7,8,10–13 The most prominent, Family Talk, targets families where a parent is diagnosed with a major depressive disorder or bipolar disorder, with children aged between 8 and 15 years who have never been treated for an affective disorder.10,11 Family Talk employs a cognitive psychoeducational approach of between six and 10 sessions, some of which are directed to parents, some to the children and some to the whole family. Another program, Family Options,9 employs a care-coordination model tailored for individual families where a parent has a serious mental illness; however, at this point, child outcomes are not available.

Overall, family programs focus on minimising family dysfunction and maximising children’s support networks and competencies. Family programs can range from two to 20 sessions, and more research is required to determine
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1 Family-intervention programs for children whose parents have a mental illness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program: year, country</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Intervention frequency</th>
<th>Intervention description</th>
<th>Evaluation method and results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPS: 2009, USA⁶</td>
<td>Parents with anxiety and their children aged 7–12 years</td>
<td>Six to eight weekly sessions and three monthly booster sessions; first two sessions with parents alone, others with the family</td>
<td>Children: anxiety management; cognitive restructuring, problem solving skills. Parents: anxiety management, contingency management, communication and problem-solving skills</td>
<td>Design: RCT comparing CAPS (n = 20) with waitlist control group (n = 20). Measures: ADIS Child Version, SCARED. Results: 30% of waitlist children developed an anxiety disorder at 1-year follow-up compared with no children in CAPS group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family group cognitive behavioral preventive intervention: 2011, USA⁶</td>
<td>Parents with major depressive disorder and their children aged 9–15 years</td>
<td>Eight weekly and four monthly group sessions for family groups (four families per group)</td>
<td>Clinician-facilitated cognitive behavioural skills training to parents and children. Parents provided with parenting skill training and children with adaptive coping. Group meetings also with other families</td>
<td>Design: RCT comparing family intervention (n = 56) and families receiving written information only (n = 55), at 18 and 24 months. Measures: CES-D; CBCL; K-SADS-PL. Results: children in experimental group had significantly lower anxiety/depression levels and internalising symptoms at 18 months, and significantly lower externalising symptoms at 18 and 24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Options: 2009, USA⁶</td>
<td>Parents with serious mental illness and their children aged 1.5–16 years</td>
<td>Meetings at least weekly with the family and family members over 12–18 months, depending on the need of the families (phone link also available)</td>
<td>Clinician facilitated a care plan tailored to needs of family members</td>
<td>Design: qualitative (interviews) and quantitative (within-group), pre, 6, 12 and 18 months (n = 22). Results: no children’s outcomes available yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Talk: 2003, 2007, USA¹⁰,¹¹</td>
<td>Parents with affective disorder and their children aged 8–15 years</td>
<td>Lecture delivered over two meetings with group of parents; and six to 11 clinician-led weekly sessions with parents/children/family plus follow-up at 6–9 months</td>
<td>Psychoeducational material about mood disorders, risk and resilience</td>
<td>Design: RCT comparing lecture (n = 40) and clinician-led intervention (n = 69) pre, immediately post, 1, 2.5 and 4.5 years. Measures: K-SADS-PL; YSR questionnaire and semi-structured child interview. Results: at 4.5 years after clinician-led intervention: significantly more gains in children’s understanding of parental disorder; children’s functioning increased for both groups and internalising symptoms decreased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping Families Strong: 2011, USA¹²</td>
<td>Depressed mothers and their children aged 9–16 years</td>
<td>10 sessions including parent and child multifamily groups (no more than four families in one group) and individual family group meetings</td>
<td>Clinician-facilitated cognitive behavioural sessions</td>
<td>Design: within-group pre and post (n = 16). Measures: child coping strategies checklist; coping efficacy scale; BASC; LER. Results: decreased internalising symptoms, improved coping and decreased stressful family events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let's Talk: 2010, Finland¹³</td>
<td>Parents with affective disorder and their children aged 8–16 years</td>
<td>1–2 weekly sessions</td>
<td>Clinician-facilitated psychoeducational sessions with parent/s</td>
<td>Design: RCT comparing Family Talk (n = 40) and Let's Talk (n = 44), at 4, 10 and 18 months. Measures: SDQ; SCARED. Results: both interventions effective in decreasing children’s emotional symptoms and anxiety, and in improving children’s prosocial behaviour. Family Talk more effective on emotional symptoms immediately after intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* In family programs, methodology relates to child participants only.
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### 2 Peer-support programs for children whose parents have a mental illness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program: year, country</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Intervention frequency</th>
<th>Intervention description</th>
<th>Evaluation method and results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action for Young Carers: 2008, UK(^{14})</td>
<td>11–16 year olds caring for their parents with a mental illness</td>
<td>Not time limited</td>
<td>Support and respite</td>
<td>Design: qualitative interviews (n = 10). Results: participants valued project workers and group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auryn groups: 2001, Germany(^{15})</td>
<td>7–16 year olds (split in separate age-related groups)</td>
<td>24–38 weekly sessions with children; home visit (1 week before start); four to six parent sessions; one booster session</td>
<td>Clinician-facilitated psychoeducation and support groups (children and parents)</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAMPS: 2009, Australia(^{16})</td>
<td>8–12 year olds</td>
<td>Offered as either after-school weekly program or 3–4-day holiday program</td>
<td>Structured peer support, psychoeducational groups, family participation during program, activity based</td>
<td>Design: within-group, pre, 4 weeks post (n = 69). Measures: Kids Connections, Kids Problems and Kids Coping scales; RSSE. Results: improvements in self-esteem, problem-focused coping and connections within family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group cognitive therapy prevention: 2001, USA(^{17})</td>
<td>13–18 year olds, with a parent with depression, who reported subdiagnostic levels of depressive symptoms but insufficient to meet full diagnosis of depression</td>
<td>15 1-hour sessions for groups of six to 10 young adolescents</td>
<td>Teaching of cognitive restructuring techniques to identify and challenge irrational, unrealistic or overly negative thoughts. Three separate parent sessions conducted to inform parents about the program (but not to discuss parent’s depression)</td>
<td>Design: RCT comparing usual care (n = 49) and intervention (n = 45) pre, immediately post, 12 and 24 months. Measures: K-SADS-PL to obtain diagnoses, CES-D, HAM-D, GAF. Results: Intervention group significantly less likely to report major depressive incidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids with Confidence: 2009, Australia(^{18})</td>
<td>12–18 year olds</td>
<td>Monthly meetings</td>
<td>Semistructured activities that provide respite, education, support and fun</td>
<td>Design: verbal feedback and program attendance. Results: regular attendance, reported improvements in self-esteem and confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids in Control: 2006, Canada(^{19})</td>
<td>8–13 year olds whose parent or sibling has a mental illness</td>
<td>8-week program</td>
<td>Learning about mental illness and practising coping and interpersonal skills; social support</td>
<td>Design: RCT (waitlist control), pre, post, 8 weeks (n = 33). Measures: CSEI, Kids Coping and Kids Knowledge scales. Results: higher levels of self-esteem and diminished use of maladaptive coping strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOPING Program: 2008, 2009, Australia(^{20,21})</td>
<td>12–18 year olds</td>
<td>Initial three group sessions; follow-up support</td>
<td>Peer-support groups. Ongoing support, including newsletters, email contact, drop-in group</td>
<td>Design: RCT pre, post, 8 weeks (n = 44). Measures: knowledge and awareness of parental mental illness measures; SC, RSQ, CDI, SWLS, SDQ, YCOPI. Results: increased mental health literacy, prosocial behaviour and life satisfaction. Decreased depression and emotional symptoms. No significant differences between groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATS: 2008, 2005, Australia(^{22,23})</td>
<td>12–18 year olds</td>
<td>8-week group program, 2 hours/week; activities during year</td>
<td>Peer-support groups (four to five adolescents, peer leader, health professional); reference committee; recreational activities</td>
<td>Design: Within-group, pre, post, 6 and 12 months (n = 64). Measures: MBCBS, PSSS, SPSSI, SMFQ, plus self-developed scales. Results: significant reduction in depressive symptoms, risk of homelessness and experience of stigma. No differences reported over time in substance use, social support and problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play and talk groups: Netherlands(^{24})</td>
<td>8–12 year olds</td>
<td>Eight weekly sessions (child); one parent session; one booster session</td>
<td>Clinician-facilitated psychoeducation and support groups. Activities include group conversations, role plays, games, homework assignments, leisure activities. One parent meeting</td>
<td>Design: RCT (waitlist control), pre, post, 3 months (n = 254). Measures: emotional and behavioural problems, negative cognitions, social support, competence, parent–child interaction. Results: not yet available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Connections: 2003, USA(^{25})</td>
<td>8–13 year olds</td>
<td>Three phases of two consecutive 5-week groups; 6 months of mentoring</td>
<td>Clinician-facilitated psychoeducation and support groups; mentoring through Big Brothers/Big Sisters; graduation ceremony</td>
<td>Design: Within-group, pre and post (n = 11). Measures: SEI, FAM, knowledge and coping skills measures. Results: significance not indicated; most measures showed improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
whether intensity equates to effectiveness. While current evaluation data are mostly rigorous (employing a randomised controlled trial design), programs need to be developed and evaluated for families where a parent has disorders other than, or in addition to, depression. As shown in Box 1, programs indicate positive results in terms of children’s symptoms.

**Peer-support programs**

We identified 12 peer-support programs, offered as school holiday programs, after-school programs, or camps (see Box 2).14-27 Peer-support programs target children aged 7–18 years, and aim to increase children’s knowledge about mental illness, develop peer relationships and enhance children’s adaptive coping skills. Programs commonly adopt a group, strengths-based, preventive approach. One program is facilitated by a peer leader who is also the child of a parent with a mental illness, thereby providing opportunities for the development of leadership skills.22,23

Potential risks associated with peer-support programs include exposing children to unsettling information about mental illness and limiting peer-support networks to those in the program.22 In one program, prosocial behaviour (measured by parents’ scores on the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire) decreased as children began to ask more questions about mental illness.35 Five of the 12 programs have been, or are currently, offered in Australia. Although a number of peer-support programs have been evaluated, many have not used valid outcome measures and have not employed waitlist or control groups. Longitudinal data are often not available, so long-term outcomes remain unclear. Overall, it would be appear that the evidence base for peer-support programs is emerging.

**Online interventions**

We identified two online interventions targeting older children and young adults (12–25-year-olds) (Box 3).28-30 Websites provide easy access at all times of the day and the option of remaining anonymous when studying information and/or sharing experiences. Potentially, young people might misunderstand a message in the absence of non-verbal cues, and websites do not necessarily provide the opportunity for immediate clarification. Additionally, staff must be trained in computing skills. Future evaluation needs to focus specifically on child outcomes. We did not find any online interventions that were designed for Australian young people.

**Bibliotherapy**

Bibliotherapy presents children with literature involving characters who are in similar positions to themselves. This enables children to normalise their situation, gain insight into the problem-solving techniques of those characters, and apply this learning to their own lives. Tussing and Valentine31 advocate employing bibliotherapy with children whose parents have a mental illness, in conjunction with discussions about the material with a trained professional. In Australia, the Children of Parents with a Mental Illness national initiative identifies various books, DVDs and consumer stories (many of which are Australian) that might be employed in this approach (http://www.copmi.net.au/jsp/resources/resource_index.jsp). Bibliotherapy might consolidate other forms of psychoeducation, and could be useful for rural/remote populations and those on waiting lists. However, it requires a certain level of literacy and has the potential to be misinterpreted. There is no evidence for the efficacy of bibliotherapy in children affected by parental mental illness, although Marrs32 found that it was useful for adults, in conjunction with other forms of treatment.

**Summary**

The common component across programs is the provision of psychosocial education about mental illness to families and children. This suggests that it is important to provide age-appropriate information about mental illness to children whose parents have a mental illness, although further research is required to test this assumption. More evaluation is required to specifically examine the comparative efficacy of different approaches, to determine what interventions work, for whom, and how. With the exception of peer-support programs, most interventions are located in either Europe or North America. These interventions typically focus on children living with...
3 Online interventions for children and young adults whose parents have a mental illness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Intervention frequency</th>
<th>Intervention description</th>
<th>Evaluation method and results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survivalkid: year, country</td>
<td>12–25-year-olds</td>
<td>Anonymous access at all times; weekly monitored chat sessions (90 min)</td>
<td>Secluded virtual platform with personalised feedback, psychosocial education, message board, blog facility, monitored chat groups, and opportunities for private chats and email correspondence with a professional</td>
<td>Design: Usage statistics and satisfaction questionnaire. Results: increased access to information and support; peer support appreciated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parenital depression and/or anxiety. Although some programs have been evaluated in randomised controlled trials, further evaluation is required. Program evaluation needs to incorporate validated outcome measures and rigorous evaluation designs, compatible with the community settings in which many programs are delivered, and sensitive to the heterogeneous nature of the target group — children whose parents have depression and/or anxiety, as well as other disorders.
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