

Citation

Riikka Kotanen, Sylvia Walby, Sally McManus, Elizabeth Cook, Alexandria Innes, Jessica Corsi, Estella Barbosa. Changes in statutory child protection service interventions in response to parental physical violence against children, 1990 to 2021: a systematic review. PROSPERO 2021 CRD42021267470 Available from: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospERO/display_record.php?ID=CRD42021267470

Review question

Main question: How have statutory child protection services responded to parental physical violence against children, and how has this changed between 1990 and 2021? This includes:

- (I) What are the intended outcomes of the statutory child protection service interventions to parental physical violence against children? (E.g. Change in levels of violence, parent-to-child communication skills, child or parent wellbeing.)
- (II) What are the theoretical assumptions underpinning these interventions? (E.g. How is physical violence/abuse defined, perceived, and/or approached? Are the interventions targeting physical violence alone or as a part of a cluster of problems?)
- (III) What are the statutory bases for interventions that address parental violence against children? (E.g. Are they based on civil law and/or criminal law)

Searches

This review will utilize a three-step search strategy:

(I) Electronic database searches. The following databases will be searched: SocINDEX Criminal Justice Abstracts, Social Policy and Practice, MEDLINE, and Web of Science. These databases will be searched for quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods studies examining interventions that address parental physical violence against children that are conducted in, or commissioned by, or in co-operation with, statutory child protection services.

Search terms are organised in five clusters: search terms for (i) 'violent acts' (forms of physical violence), (ii) 'child' (victim of violence), (iii) 'adult' (perpetrator of violence), (iv) 'child protection' (context of intervention), and (v) 'intervention' (intervention tools, models, services, and approaches). Search terms will include some of the following terms: (i) violence, abuse, punish*, discipli*, hitting, (ii) child, baby, toddler, adolescent, (iii) parent, mother, father, (iv) child protection, social work, child welfare, (v) intervention, model, evaluation*, trial, etc.

(II) Backwards and forwards citation tracking. This will include reference list screening and forward citation tracking of references (via Google Scholar and Web of Science) of (i) included studies and (ii) key references.

(III) Consultations with external networks and advisory boards. The review will be supplemented by additional eligible studies identified with guidance from an advisory board and expert recommendations.

Search dates: 1 January 1990 – Present (Inclusive)

Re-runs: Searches will be re-run prior to final analyses to ensure any further studies are identified.

Grey literature: Grey literature will not be included.

Unpublished studies: Unpublished studies will not be included.

Types of study to be included [1 change]

Inclusion criteria:

Types of studies:

- Peer-reviewed journal articles.
- Based on empirical data (qualitative, quantitative, mixed).

- Published between 1990-2021 (inclusive).
- Full text available and accessible in English.
- If two papers report on the same study providing no additional, relevant information to each other, the study providing the most detailed information regarding the intervention and outcomes will be included.

Types of participants:

See above, Section 19.

Types of outcome measures:

All outcomes of statutory child protection interventions in non-institutional settings due to parental physical violence or physical parental violence among other concerns related to child welfare and/or parent-child relationship.

Exclusion criteria:

Types of studies:

- Not based on empirical data.
- Limited to conference paper, comment, letter, or editorial.
- Analysing historical interventions methods in child protection.

Types of participants:

See above, Section 19.

Types of outcome measures:

- Outcomes of statutory child protection interventions in institutional settings.
- Outcomes related to interventions on forms of violence other than parental physical violence.

Condition or domain being studied

This study will systematically locate and review research that studies parental physical violence interventions that are conducted in non-institutional settings by statutory child protection services (provided by public authority), or in non-statutory (e.g., non-governmental organisations) child protection services provided on behalf of, or purchased by, or in co-operation with, public authorities with statutory child protection responsibilities.

Participants/population

Inclusion: (I) Children under the age of 18 and/or (II) parents involved in child protection services intervention due to parental physical violence, and/or (III) child protection professionals conducting such intervention(s) in statutory child protection services in non-institutional settings.

Exclusion: Children, parents, and/or professionals (I) involved solely in statutory social work other than statutory child protection, and/or (II) involved in interventions which do not concern parental physical violence (e.g. sexual violence, emotional violence); and/or (III) involved in child protection interventions conducted solely in institutional settings, and/or (IV) studies examining removal of a child into state care (e.g., permanent out-of-home placement) as the primary or sole intervention method.

Intervention(s), exposure(s)

Interventions in non-institutional settings focusing on (I) physical parental violence specifically and/or (II) physical parental violence among other concerns related to child welfare and/or parent-child relationship, including all forms of provision of support (e.g., education programmes for parents, support programmes for children or adults, training programmes for child protection professionals, new tool kits, or working methods) implemented in non-institutional care. Thus, for example, studies examining removal of a child into state's care (e.g., permanent out-of-home placement) or adoption as a sole intervention measure are excluded from the review.

Comparator(s)/control

Not applicable

Context

(I) Statutory child protection services in non-institutional care provided by public authorities; and/or (II) non-

statutory child protection services (e.g., non-governmental organisations) that are either (a) delivering services with, or on behalf of, public authorities providing statutory child protection services or (b) commissioned child protection services to the public authorities in non-institutional care.

Main outcome(s) [1 change]

All outcomes of statutory child protection interventions in non-institutional settings due to parental physical violence or such violence among other concerns related to child welfare and/or parent-child relationship are relevant to this review.

The main outcome purpose of this study is to produce (I) a typology of interventions on that designed to address physical parental violence against children by, and are delivered and/or commissioned by statutory child protection services, and (II) a conceptual map of the development of statutory child protection interventions on physical parental violence between 1990 and 2021.

The value of this qualitative review to health and social care practitioners is in identifying the range of intervention outcomes that the commissioners and deliverers of interventions prioritise. Understanding what outcomes are prioritised is necessary so that future research can (a) evaluate whether these outcomes are also valued by service users, and (b) to inform future quantitative systematic reviews, so that those reviews examine intended and/or prioritised outcomes.

Additional outcome(s)

Not applicable

Data extraction (selection and coding) [2 changes]

Data selection: Electronic databases (e.g. SocINDEX) will be searched. The returned citations will be downloaded into reference management software (e.g. EndNote) to remove the duplicates. De-duplicated sources will be transferred to a collaborative systematic review software (e.g. Rayyan).

The titles and abstracts will be screened independently by the first reviewer against the inclusion/exclusion criteria. A second reviewer checks either 20% or a minimum of 250 records of the title and abstracts for consistency with an expectation that reviewers agree a minimum of 95%. If discrepancies arise, the study is included at this stage.

The included sources are downloaded for full-text screening by the first reviewer against the inclusion/exclusion criteria. A second reviewer checks 20% or a minimum of 250 records of the full-text sources for consistency with an expectation that reviewers agree a minimum of 95%. If discrepancies arise, the reviewers will discuss the criteria and their application. If the disagreement remains unresolved, a third reviewer moderates.

Included studies will be supplemented by eligible sources identified in search strategy steps 2-3.

Data extraction: Structured data will be extracted from all eligible sources using a standardised extraction form. The free-text of papers reporting on intervention bases, and intended outcomes are imported into qualitative analysis software (e.g. Atlas.TI, NVivo) for analysis and synthesis. The second reviewer checks a sample of the extracted data. If discrepancies arise, these are resolved through discussion, or a third reviewer moderating. There are three main categories of data to be extracted: (I) information regarding characteristics of examined intervention types and their intended outcomes, theoretical and/or statutory bases, (II) main population characteristics, and (III) study characteristics (author, year of publication, method, type of data, population/sample size, missing data, reference). If necessary, authors/owners of eligible sources will be contacted for additional information to aid data extraction.

Risk of bias (quality) assessment

The studies will be assessed using Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) standardised quality

assessment tools for both quantitative and qualitative studies. It is acknowledged that focusing only on studies written in English can potentially create bias.

Strategy for data synthesis

The risk of bias will be assessed using Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) standardised quality assessment tools for both quantitative and qualitative studies. The risk of bias assessment process will be discussed within the review team in the data extraction phase, and the results of the assessment will be incorporated into the findings and limitations sections.

A thematic synthesis will be conducted on the extracted data as follows: (I) familiarization of the extracted data, (II) formation of inceptive codes for themes, (III) coding and organising the data into thematic categories via qualitative analysis software (e.g. Atlas.TI, NVivo), (IV) assessing and revising thematic categories, and (IV) defining and naming the resulting thematic categories. The resulting categories will be further analysed to form the typology of interventions and conceptual mapping of the development of the interventions.

Analysis of subgroups or subsets

Potential subgroups are (I) children, (II) parent(s) of children who are clients of child protection, and (III) child protection professionals.

Contact details for further information

Dr Riikka Kotanen
riikka.kotanen@city.ac.uk

Organisational affiliation of the review

City, University of London
<https://www.city.ac.uk/>

Review team members and their organisational affiliations

Dr Riikka Kotanen. City, University of London
Professor Sylvia Walby. City, University of London
Ms Sally McManus. City, University of London
Dr Elizabeth Cook. City, University of London
Dr Alexandria Innes. City, University of London
Dr Jessica Corsi. City, University of London
Dr Estella Barbosa. City, University of London

Collaborators

Dr Sian Oram. King's College London

Type and method of review

Systematic review

Anticipated or actual start date

01 August 2021

Anticipated completion date

01 August 2022

Funding sources/sponsors

None

Grant number(s)

State the funder, grant or award number and the date of award

Conflicts of interest

Language

English

Country

England

Stage of review

Review Ongoing

Subject index terms status

Subject indexing assigned by CRD

Subject index terms

Child; Child Abuse; Humans; Parents; Physical Abuse

Date of registration in PROSPERO

27 August 2021

Date of first submission

13 July 2021

Stage of review at time of this submission

Stage	Started	Completed
Preliminary searches	Yes	No
Piloting of the study selection process	No	No
Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria	No	No
Data extraction	No	No
Risk of bias (quality) assessment	No	No
Data analysis	No	No

The record owner confirms that the information they have supplied for this submission is accurate and complete and they understand that deliberate provision of inaccurate information or omission of data may be construed as scientific misconduct.

The record owner confirms that they will update the status of the review when it is completed and will add publication details in due course.

Versions

27 August 2021