Published in final edited form as:

Autism. 2021 January ; 25(1): 58–69. doi:10.1177/1362361320943373.

For Which Younger Siblings of Children with ASD Does Parent-Mediated Intervention Work?

Paul J. Yoder¹, Wendy L. Stone², Sarah R. Edmunds^{3,4}

¹Special Education Department, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee;

²Department of Psychology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington;

³Department of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts;

⁴Department of Pediatrics, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts.

Abstract

In this second of two primary papers, we examined moderators of treatment effects for younger siblings of children with autism spectrum disorders (ASD; HR-Sibs) whose parents were taught to use a parent-implemented intervention, 'Improving Parents As Communication Teachers' (ImPACT). Investigators randomized 97 HR-Sibs and their primary parent to either the ImPACT or control group, used intent-to-treat analysis, and used assessors and coders who were blinded to group assignment. We hypothesized that a cumulative risk score (incorporating younger siblings' sex, multiplex status, and behavioral risk) would moderate the effect of ImPACT on younger siblings' proximal skills related to their continuously measured communication challenges. Pre-intervention level of parents' depressive symptoms was the proposed moderator of ImPACT on parenting-related stress and parenting efficacy. In HR-Sibs with no additional risk factors (i.e., girls with only one older sibling with ASD and who score at low risk on an ASD screen), parental receipt of ImPACT training had indirect effects on children's expressive language ability or ASD diagnosis through earlier effects on HR-Sibs' intentional communication or expressive vocabulary. ImPACT did not show moderated or total effects on parenting-related stress or parenting efficacy.

This is the second of two papers reporting primary results of a pre-registered randomized control trial using 'Improving Parents As Communication Teachers' (ImPACT) with younger siblings of children with autism spectrum disorder (i.e., high risk siblings of children with ASD: HR-Sibs) (Yoder, Stone, & Edmunds, in press). In this paper, we examine whether additional risk for social communication disorders (i.e., being male, screening at risk for autism spectrum disorder [ASD], and having more than one sibling with ASD in the home) moderates the effect of ImPACT on proximal skills related to reducing communication challenges (i.e., expressive vocabulary ability and ASD symptomology). Additionally, we examine whether ImPACT reduces parenting-related stress and increases parenting efficacy more for parents with low levels of pre-intervention depressive symptoms than parents with higher levels of these symptoms. The rationale for these aims follows.

In our first paper, we laid out evidence that a large minority of HR-Sibs are likely to meet criteria for a language delay or social communication disorder by 36 months and that one way to reduce the severity of these communication disorders in HR-Sibs may be to teach

parents to use an intervention during the period at which symptoms have not yet become sufficiently severe to warrant a diagnosis (i.e., pre-emptive intervention). We also laid out the logic supporting the assertion that effects are most likely to be seen on *continuous* measures of children's expressive language ability or social communication, as opposed to dichotomous diagnostic outcome, and that effects on expressive language ability and social communication are likely to be mediated by effects on proximal child outcomes. Before the study began, we predicted that the proximal skills likely to be associated with reducing communication challenges are generalized (a) intentional communication (Yoder, Watson, & Lambert, 2015); (b) expressive vocabulary level; (c) motor imitation (Rogers, 1999; Ingersoll & Schreibman 2006); and (d) object play (Lieberman & Yoder, 2012). Each is empirically linked to expressive language ability or ASD symptomatology (Ingersoll & Schreibman, 2006; Lieberman & Yoder, 2012; Rogers, 1999; Yoder, et al., 2015). Finally, we provided a rationale for selecting ImPACT as the parent-implemented intervention, in part, due to its targeting the above-mentioned proximal skills.

The findings presented in the first paper confirmed that ImPACT indirectly affected HR-Sibs' communication challenges by increasing parents' use of ImPACT strategies and by increasing two of the proximal outcomes: motor imitation or intentional communication (Yoder, et al., in press). However, we do not yet know whether there is a subgroup of HR-Sibs for whom ImPACT works, and if so, the characteristics of this subgroup.

Cumulative Risk as a Possible Descriptor of the Subgroup for Whom ImPACT Works

To optimize the limited resources available to support parents in acting as their children's interventionists, we need to identify the subgroup of HR-Sibs whose proximal outcomes are most likely to benefit from intervention. We chose to use a cumulative risk model, as these models tend to work better than single risk models in predicting later outcomes (Dunst & Trivette, 1994) and have been called for in the HR-Sibs literature (Yirmiya & Charman, 2010). Adding behavioral risk factors to demographic risk factors may further improve our ability to predict which HR-Sibs will benefit from parent-implemented intervention targeting proximal outcomes. For example, the probability of HR-Sibs eventually being diagnosed with ASD is higher when both sex (i.e., males) and number of siblings with ASD (i.e., more than one sibling with ASD in the family) are considered as risk factors (50%) than when sex (26% for males) or number of siblings with ASD in the family (32% for multiplex) are considered alone (Ozonoff et al., 2011). To our knowledge, no study has examined whether cumulative risk predicts the differential effect of an intervention for HR-Sibs. Herein, cumulative risk is computed from the child's sex, number of siblings with ASD in the home, and behavioral risk as derived from commonly used ASD screening questionnaires.

Before the study, we were unable to predict which cumulative risk subgroup (i.e., highest vs. lowest) would benefit more from ImPACT training due to the lack of prior research on this issue and the presence of contradictory, but arguably equally likely, logical arguments. On one hand, the highest cumulative risk HR-Sibs may be particularly likely to benefit from the intervention relative to a control group because they are in greater need of the special

teaching methods that parents learn to use. On the other hand, children with lowest cumulative risk may benefit most from parent-implemented intervention because these children may have greater internal resources that enable them to learn from the intervention. Even when we cannot confidently predict the particular level of cumulative risk that describes the children for whom an intervention works, confirming our prediction that it is cumulative risk, rather than some other variable, that describes for whom intervention works will result in greater confidence that the finding will replicate, as compared to examining multiple moderators of intervention effects (Yoder & Compton, 2004).

Possible Effects of ImPACT on Parenting Stress and Efficacy

Because parents of children with ASD already have atypically high parenting stress and depressive symptoms (Ingersoll & Hambrick, 2011; Weitlauf, Vehorn, Taylor & Warren, 2014), it is important to test whether asking them to implement ImPACT affects their parenting-related stress, particularly for parents with initially high depressive symptoms. In a previous small-sample trial that used listwise deletion to address missing data, a different parent-implemented treatment resulted in producing more stress for parents with initially high depressive symptoms (Lieberman-Betz, et al., 2014). Depression tends to be associated with experiencing daily activities as burdensome, and providing intervention to their later-born children adds additional responsibilities (Lovejoy, Graczyk, O'Hare, & Neuman, 2000). The finding regarding the depression-moderated treatment effect on parenting stress became nonsignificant when multiple imputation was used to address missing data, but the trend for the finding was still present in this small trial (Lieberman-Betz, 2014). A larger sample that appropriately addresses missing data might confirm that depression moderates the effect of a parent-implemented treatment on stress. More specific to the ImPACT treatment, other previous reports have noted that parents of children with ASD have reported less parenting stress after learning to use ImPACT strategies (Wainer & Ingersoll, 2013). However, asking parents to implement ImPACT with their HR-Sibs places an additional layer of demands on top of raising a child already diagnosed with ASD. Thus, additional study is needed to test ImPACT's effect on parenting-related stress when they are asked to implement ImPACT with HR-Sibs. Additionally, we hope that giving parents tools to ameliorate the risk of communication disorder in their HR-Sibs will lead parents to experience heightened parenting efficacy. ImPACT's effect on parenting stress and efficacy may be conditional on initial level of depressive symptoms.

Research Questions

This paper tests two questions:

1. Does the indirect effect of ImPACT on communication challenges through the facilitation of proximal skills vary by cumulative risk? That is, we asked whether HR-Sibs' cumulative risk for communication disorder moderates ImPACT's facilitation of proximal skills related to the reduction of communication challenges and whether this moderated effect on proximal skills mediates ImPACT's effect on end-of-study communication challenges. This research

question requires testing a moderated mediated effect of ImPACT on communication challenges.

2. Does ImPACT reduce parenting-related stress and increase parenting efficacy more in parents with initially low depressive symptoms than in parents with initially high depressive symptoms? This research question requires testing a moderated treatment effect of ImPACT on parenting-related stress and parenting efficacy.

Methods

Participants

Ninety-seven children ($M = 14$ mos, $SD = 2$ mos) and their primary parent at two sites (Nashville, TN $n = 49$, Seattle, WA $n = 48$) participated in this study. Inclusion criteria and descriptive statistics are provided in the first paper, but descriptive information is provided in the Appendix A. Of particular note, over 90% of the families had only one child with ASD in the home prior to intervention onset. The caregivers were mothers (89%), fathers (9%), or grandmothers (1%). None of the descriptor variables differed significantly between intervention groups, p values: range = .12 - .95, mean = .70, $SD = .24$. All participants were consented, and the study was approved by the relevant institutional review boards.

Research Design

Investigators randomly assigned parent-child dyads to either ImPACT ($n = 49$) or control ($n = 48$) groups. The intervention phase lasted 3 months (Times 1 – 2). Proximal outcomes, parenting stress, and parenting efficacy variables were measured at study entry and 6 months after study entry (Times 1 and 3), and communication challenges were measured at study entry and 9 months after study entry (Times 1 and 4). Proximal skills were measured 3 months after the end of the treatment to provide time for competent use of the ImPACT methods to be manifested in children's generalized skills. A past report indicated that a parent-implemented treatment resulted in more stress 3 months after the end of the treatment phase in parents with initially more depressive symptoms (Lieberman-Betz, et al., 2014). Study assessors and coders of observational procedures were blinded to group assignment. Intent-to-treat analysis procedures were used (i.e., including all participants in primary analyses, regardless of attendance at intervention and assessment sessions). Full information maximum likelihood estimation was used to address missing values. This study was pre-registered with www.clinicaltrials.gov with clinical trials registration number 140924. The CONSORT chart is provided in the first paper. Overall and differential attrition were low.

Intervention Groups

ImPACT (Ingersoll & Dvortcsak, 2010).—This instantiation of the ImPACT intervention involved staff offering parents 24 in-home teaching sessions over 12 weeks. The staff who provided the parent teaching were either a certified ImPACT trainer or staff members trained and supervised by this trainer. Examples of the ImPACT curriculum are provided in the first paper. Staff adherence to the ImPACT protocol for teaching parents was

estimated using self-administered, session-specific checklists on at least 2 sessions per parent-child pair, and averaged 91% ($SD = 3\%$).

Control.—Staff did not restrict intervention outside of the research study for either group, including the control group. Nonproject therapy attendance per month during the intervention phase was low and almost equal between groups, ImPACT $M(SD) = 0.6(1.6)$ hours; Control $M(SD) = 0.5(1.4)$, $p > .05$.

Procedures

Administration manuals and fidelity of implementation instruments are available from the first author. The measurement procedures' interaction style, location, examiner, and materials differed from those used in the intervention sessions. Longer descriptions of the proximal outcome and communication challenge measures are available in the first paper (Yoder, et al., in press) and Appendix B. All coding manuals are available from the first author. More detailed descriptions of coding are in the first paper (Yoder, et al., in press) and Appendix B. Session-level, point-by-point agreement checks and discrepancy discussions were conducted on at least 20% of randomly selected sessions throughout the study to reduce observer drift. Interobserver reliability estimates for all variables at all measurement periods were greater than our accepted threshold of intraclass correlation coefficient $> .69$.

To measure cumulative risk for communication disorders at Time 1, we used a demographic questionnaire and either the *First Year Inventory (FYI)* (Watson, Baranek, Crais, Reznick, Dykstra, & Perryman, 2007). or the *Modified Checklist for Autism in Toddlers, Revised with Follow-up (M-CHAT-R/F)* (Robins, Casagrande, Barton, Chen, Dumont-Mathieu, & Fein, 2014), depending on the age of the HR-Sib. Parents filled out the demographic form to report the HR-Sibs' binary sex and the number of siblings with ASD living in the home. If under 16 months ($n = 73$), behavioral risk was determined using the FYI social communication risk threshold (Turner-Brown, et al., 2012). If 16–18 months, behavioral risk was determined by the M-CHAT-R/F using the ASD risk threshold (Robins et al., 2014). There was no difference between intervention groups in the proportion of participants receiving the FYI vs. M-CHAT-R/F, $\chi^2(1) = .12$, $p = .82$. Thus, the consequence of functionally equating behavioral risk from different instruments is greater random measurement error and increased probability of Type II errors (Thompson & Vacha-Haase, 2000). Being male, having more than one sibling with ASD (i.e., multiplex status), and scoring above the risk threshold were equally weighted; i.e., the presence of each was coded as “1”. Behavioral risk, sex, and number of siblings with ASD were summed to compute cumulative risk for communication disorder that ranged from 0–3.

The *Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D)* (Radloff, 1991) was administered at Time 1 to assess pre-intervention levels of parents' depressive symptoms. The CES-D is a self-report on 20 symptoms, rated on four levels of frequency of occurrence in previous week. The total raw score was the metric analyzed. In another study of parents of young children with ASD, the internal consistency of the total raw score was .92 (Lieberman-Betz et al., 2014).

To measure parenting-related stress, we administered the *Parenting Stress Index, short form (PSI; Abidin, 1983)* at Times 1 and 3. The PSI short form is a 36-item self-report measure of perceived child difficulty, parent distress, and parent-child dysfunctional interactions. The total raw score was the metric analyzed to reflect parental stress. In another study of parents of children with ASD, the total raw score's internal consistency was between .93 - .95, depending on measurement period (Lieberman-Betz et al., 2014).

To measure parenting efficacy, we administered the *Maternal Efficacy Scale* at Times 1 and 3 (*MES; Teti & Gelfand, 1991*). The MES is a 10-item self-report measure designed to assess perceptions and feelings of efficacy in different childcare domains. The total raw score was the metric analyzed. The internal consistency of the total raw score was between .81 and .86 in unpublished data on parents of children with ASD associated with Lieberman-Betz et al. (2014).

The measures of motor imitation, intentional communication, object play, expressive vocabulary, expressive ability, and social communication were described in detail in the first paper (Yoder, et al., in press). Table 1 summarizes how these constructs were quantified. Appendix B also provides detailed information about the variables.

The diagnosis of ASD at Time 4 was determined by a licensed clinical psychologist on the basis of information obtained from the ADOS-2, a parent interview based on the ASD criteria in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5; American Psychiatric Association, 2013)*, and other clinical assessments (e.g., Mullen Scales) as available. This variable was used as a dependent variable in an exploratory analysis.

Data Analysis Plan

The indicator variables purported to measure each construct, indicated in the research questions and detailed in the procedures section, were examined to determine if their intercorrelation was sufficient to justify composite measures. Composite measures of constructs were selected to improve validity and reduce the number of significance tests and resulting family-wise error. Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure that the assumptions of statistical control of the baseline measures of the dependent variable were met. Controlling the baseline scores for the dependent variable improves precision of the treatment effect size estimates. Full information maximum likelihood estimation was used to estimate coefficients in the moderated, mediated models. Bias-corrected bootstrapped confidence intervals around indirect effects were estimated.

Results

Preparatory Analyses

Data reduction.—Details of the data reduction are in the first paper. To reduce the number of significance tests and to increase the construct validity of analyzed variables, equally weighted composite variables were computed. The variables selected for the analyses that follow are indicated in Table 1.

Testing the need for and assumptions of pretest covariates.—As indicated in the first paper, all pretests were nonsignificantly different between groups, except motor imitation from the Semi-Structured Imitation Scale (SSIS), $t(92) = 3.7$, $p < .001$, which was significant and positively predicted all four proximal outcomes at Time 3 and the two communication challenge variables at Time 4. Having found that the data fit the assumption of homogeneity of slopes, Time 1 motor imitation was partialled out of the child dependent variables.

Testing the convergent construct validity of the cumulative risk index.—Lower risk scores were associated with higher means on object play at Time 3 (Wald $\chi^2(3) = 12.2$, $p = .007$), intentional communication at Time 3 (Wald $\chi^2(3) = 11.4$, $p = .01$), social communication at Time 4 (Wald $\chi^2(3) = 8.4$, $p = .04$), and expressive language ability at Time 4 (Wald $\chi^2(3) = 9.2$, $p = .03$). The positive predictive value (PPV) for the cumulative risk index predicting ASD diagnosis is the proportion of participants correctly predicted to have an ASD diagnosis. The PPV that was .59, indicating that 59% of children identified as having ASD by the risk index actually received an ASD diagnosis, which is significantly higher than the actual rate of ASD diagnoses at Time 4 in the sample, 24%, $\chi^2(3) = 14.9$, $p = .002$. The false positive rate is 1-PPV. While the PPV provides evidence for the construct validity of cumulative risk, cumulative risk produced 41% false positives. Thus, the cumulative risk index is not sufficient evidence of ASD or language delay by itself. Nonsignificant differences among cumulative risk groups occurred on motor imitation at Time 3 and expressive vocabulary level at Time 3, p values $> .05$.

Conditional and unconditional intervention effects did not vary by site.—

Nonsignificant effects were found for (a) site $\times$ intervention group and (b) site $\times$ group $\times$ putative moderator (i.e., risk or depressive symptoms) predicting proximal outcomes at Time 3, or communication challenges at Time 4; p values range from .36 - .80, $M = .60$, $SD = .13$.

Primary Analyses

IMPACT has effects on HR-Sibs' communication challenges through risk-moderated mediated effects on proximal outcomes.—Bias-corrected bootstrapping was used to estimate confidence intervals around moderated indirect effect coefficients (Hayes, 2017). Table 2 presents the significant moderated indirect effects of IMPACT on HR-Sibs' communication challenges through one of the proximal skills. Moderated mediated effects involving play and motor imitation were nonsignificant (i.e., confidence intervals included zero).

IMPACT teaching had an indirect effect on children's continuously-measured expressive language ability at Time 4 by increasing children's Time 3 *intentional communication*, but this indirect effect only occurred in the subgroup of HR-Sibs with no additional risk, 0.40, 95% CI [.07, .76], partially standardized effect size = .49. This indirect effect was nonsignificant in HR-Sibs with additional initial risk. Figure 1 illustrates this moderated indirect effect as an example. A similar finding occurred for children's Time 4 social communication, but became nonsignificant when cases with undue influence were deleted.

ImPACT teaching had an indirect effect on children's continuously-measured expressive ability at Time 4 through children's Time 3 *expressive vocabulary*, but again, this indirect effect occurred only in a subgroup of HR-Sibs described by no additional risk, 0.5, 95% CI [.12, .88], partially standardized effect size = .62. Again, this indirect effect was nonsignificant in HR-Sibs with additional initial risk, p values > .05. A similar, smaller effect occurred on HR-Sibs' Time 4 social communication, but it became nonsignificant when cases with undue influence were deleted.

ImPACT teaching had no effect on parents' stress or efficacy, regardless of parents' initial level of parental depressive symptoms.—The statistical interactions of initial parental depressive symptoms and intervention group predicting either parental stress or parental efficacy at Time 3 were nonsignificant, Wald's $\chi^2(1) < 1.0$, $p > .05$. Additionally, there was no main effect of ImPACT on parenting stress, $\chi^2(1) = .09$, $p = .76$, or parenting efficacy, $\chi^2(1) = .34$, $p = .56$. Thus, there is no evidence that ImPACT teaching had positive or negative effects on parents' stress or efficacy, regardless of whether parents' initial depressive symptoms are considered.

Post-hoc Analyses

Although not expected due to statistical power loss when we dichotomize outcomes, we conducted an analogous analysis predicting ASD diagnosis at Time 4. Using logistic regression, analyses indicated that ImPACT teaching had an indirect effect on children's ASD diagnosis at Time 4 by increasing children's Time 3 intentional communication, but this indirect effect only occurred in a subgroup of HR-Sibs with no additional risk, $-.08$, 95% CI $[-.18, -.004]$. This indirect effect was nonsignificant in HR-Sibs with additional initial risk. The overall moderated mediated treatment coefficient was positive and significant, $.06(.03)$, 95% CI $[.005, .13]$. The R square change for the product term of initial cumulative risk x treatment group predicting intentional communication at Time 3 was $.05$, $p < .05$.

None of the Time 1 variables both correlated with initial cumulative risk and moderated ImPACT total effects on intentional communication or expressive vocabulary at Time 3. Thus, we could find no evidence that other measured Time 1 variables better explained ImPACT teaching's conditional indirect effects on intentional communication or expressive vocabulary at Time 3 than did initial cumulative risk.

Discussion

Herein, we tested whether two characteristics describe for whom ImPACT works in a sample of HR-Sibs and their parents. We confirmed that initial cumulative risk identifies the HR-Sibs for whom ImPACT improves intentional communication and expressive vocabulary, which subsequently affects expressive language ability or ASD diagnosis. Specifically, these effects occurred in HR-Sibs who had no additional risk before the intervention phase began. Even though the conditional indirect effect of ImPACT on ASD diagnosis was not expected due to statistical power considerations when outcomes are dichotomized, this finding has potential clinical importance. Together with the confirmed predictions, we have stronger expectations for replication for the findings predicting expressive language ability than the

findings predicting ASD diagnosis. Additionally, the convergent construct validity evidence supported our prediction that sex, number of siblings with ASD, and behavioral risk are relevant for quantifying cumulative risk. But because fewer than 10% of the families had more than one sibling with diagnosed ASD in the home before intervention began, cumulative risk in this study mostly reflected sex and behavioral risk.

For parenting-related stress and parenting efficacy, we did not confirm a prediction that pre-intervention levels of parents' depressive symptoms would describe for whom ImPACT worked. Additionally, ImPACT teaching did not affect parenting-related efficacy or stress levels, regardless of initial level of depressive symptoms. About a quarter of the parents in each group scored above the clinical cut score for depression at Time 1. Thus, there was sufficient variance in depressive symptoms to detect the predicted moderated effect had it been present. Although a past report suggested that parents with initially high depressive symptoms who were assigned to a parent-implemented treatment group reported more parenting stress than similar parents assigned to a control group, this finding was nonsignificant when appropriate handling of missing data was used (Lieberman-Betz, et al., 2014). Thus, increasing the sample size and proper handling of missing data did not result in supporting the hypothesis that parents with initially high depressive symptoms experience more parenting stress when asked to implement a treatment with their HR-Sib.

Limitations and Future Research

The link between HR-Sibs' initial cumulative risk and ImPACT teaching's causal effect on proximal outcomes is correlational. Covarying pretreatment variables might explain why initial cumulative risk moderated ImPACT's effect on proximal outcomes (i.e., potential third variable explanations). Although we excluded several third variable explanations for ImPACT's risk-moderated effect, unmeasured pretreatment variables might do so.

Because we were unable to predict before the study was conducted which end of the cumulative risk continuum would describe the HR-Sibs who benefited from ImPACT, it would be most conservative to require replication prior to clinical use of the current significant findings. The current study's confirmation that cumulative risk is a moderator of ImPACT's effect on intentional communication and expressive vocabulary provides the basis of future replication studies.

Although the unexpected absence of ImPACT's effect on parenting stress is consistent with a conclusion that ImPACT is relatively safe for parents of children with ASD, nonsignificant findings are always subject to misinterpretation because weaknesses in measurement can sometimes explain null findings. For example, it is possible that we did not have a sufficiently sensitive measure of the type of parenting stress affected by ImPACT teaching. Future investigation using more sensitive measures of parenting stress is needed.

Additionally, future research that examines the add-on effects of mindfulness training on parenting-related stress and parenting efficacy might enhance the degree to which parents use ImPACT strategies, which might in turn affect the extent to which ImPACT reduces HR-Sibs' communication challenges. Initial investigations are encouraging (Singh, 2019).

ImPACT's effect on children may have been cumulative and gradual, which may make it difficult for parents to attribute their children's skill increase to parents' use of ImPACT strategies. Logically, feelings of efficacy may increase in response to immediate evidence that taught strategies elicit children's use of new or infrequently used behaviors. Future research is needed to better understand which interventions affect parents' perception of their efficacy.

Strengths

This study's internally-valid design and multi-method measurement approach strengthen confidence in the replicability of the current significant findings. Additionally, the use of a moderated mediated model, instead of separate models, to confirm that cumulative risk moderates ImPACT's effects on communication challenges through proximal outcomes reduces the number of significance tests and improves the probability of replication.

Relation of Current Findings to Extant Literature

The current paper adds to our previous findings regarding proximal outcomes that affect later communication challenges in HR-Sibs by specifying whether initial cumulative risk describes for whom the proximal outcomes indirectly reduce the severity of communication challenges. Our previous study found that ImPACT increased intentional communication and motor imitation through parents' use of ImPACT strategies, and each of these proximal outcomes were related to reducing children's communication challenges (Yoder, et al., in press). The current paper's findings indicate that ImPACT's effect on intentional communication occurs only in HR-Sibs with no additional initial cumulative risk. Additionally, the current study findings indicate that cumulative risk is *not* a descriptor of the children for whom motor imitation is a proximal outcome associated with reduction of communication challenges (i.e., a pivotal skill). We have not yet identified for whom motor imitation is a pivotal skill. The current paper's finding that expressive vocabulary is a pivotal skill in HR-Sibs with no additional risk is new to the literature. The current findings indicated that children with no additional risk had better communication and play skills than children with additional risk factors. We speculate that relatively good communication and play skills may make it easier or more rewarding to implement ImPACT techniques well, frequently, and consistently and children with relatively high communication and play skills may have greater capacity to learn from the ImPACT strategies.

Conclusions

The current study supports using ImPACT as a pre-emptive intervention to enhance expressive language ability and reduce the probability of an ASD diagnosis in HR-Sibs by indicating that intentional communication or expressive vocabulary are proximal outcomes for girls who do *not* score in the behavioral risk range on a screening instrument. Together with an earlier report showing that indirect effects of ImPACT occurred through improving motor imitation, regardless of initial cumulative risk level, the results suggest that motor imitation is also a pivotal skill for reducing communication challenges. Taken together, the results of these two papers do *not* support treating only those HR-Sibs who score in the "risk" range on screening instruments, as this group of children appears to benefit from ImPACT regardless of their screening status.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by a grant to the lead author from NIDCD (R01DC013767), to the parent institution by the National Institute for Child Health and Disorders (NICHD; P30HD15052), and to S.E. from NIDCD (F31DC015696), but it does not necessarily express the views of employees of these agencies. We are grateful to the skillful and conscientious work of our staff: Catherine Bush, Elizabeth Gardner, Cassandra Newsom, Amy Nicholson, Jessica Buenahora, Heather Redix, Katherine Ragsdale, Kathryn Coddington, Danielle Trzil, Sonja Kottke, Karen Bearss, Courtney Froehlig, Veronica Kang, Shanni Geller, Allycen Kurup, Hailee Hannah, Rachel Hantman, Colleen Harker, Elizabeth Karp, & Catherine Dick. We are also grateful to the families who participated in this research.

Appendix A

Preintervention Participant Characteristics by Group for Categorical Variables

Variable	Levels	ImPACT	Control	Between-group effect size ^a
		Percentage of group	Percentage of group	
Sex	Male	55%	58%	0.07
Race	African American	2%	7%	0.07
	Asian	8%	8%	
	White	79%	76%	
	Mixed	10%	11%	
Formal education of primary parent	12 years or GED	6%	9%	0.07
	1 – 2 years of college or technical school	16%	13%	
	3–4 years of college or technical school	39%	49%	
	1 –2 years of graduate or professional school	16%	13%	
	3 or more years of graduate or professional school	22%	17%	
Number of children with ASD in home	1	92%	94%	0.07
Primary parent	Mother	88%	92%	0.08
	Father	10%	8%	
	Other	2%		

^aEffect size is Cramer's V ($\sqrt{\text{chi square}/(n \cdot df)}$). All between-group contrasts were nonsignificant.

Appendix B

Derivation of the Child Outcomes

Procedures

To measure motor imitation at Times 1 and 3, the Semi-Structured Imitation Scale (SSIS) and Adapted Legerstee Imitation Task (ALIT) were administered. The SSIS is an examiner-child session consisting of 10 modeled actions with no accompanying verbal instructions. It is a shortened version of a procedure designed for use with toddlers and preschoolers with

ASD to measure spontaneous motor imitation in a playful context (Ingersoll & Meyer, 2011), as this type of motor imitation correlates most strongly with social reciprocity in children with ASD (McDuffie et al., 2007). The ALIT is a structured task adapted from work with 10-month-olds (Legerstee & Markova, 2008) and involves 4 items. The examiner models putting an object in or taking an object out of a container, giving the object or container to the child, and waiting for child to imitate without verbal instructions. The simple actions, structured format, and prior use with infants supported the use of this procedure to prevent a floor effect for motor imitation measurement.

To measure intentional communication at Times 1 and 3, the *Communication and Symbolic Behavior Scales*-behavior sample (CSBS) and *Brief Observation of Social Communication Change* (BOSCC) were administered. The CSBS (Wetherby & Prizant, 2003) is a structured, interactive measure of communication, early language, and play for children with communication ages between 6–24 months; the 15-minute behavior sample portion was used. The BOSCC (also 15 minutes) was developed to measure change in communication over time in minimally verbal children with ASD (Grzadinski et al., 2016) and includes a standard set of materials and procedures administered by an examiner.

To measure object play at times 1 and 3, the CSBS (above) and the *Developmental Play Assessment* (DPA) were administered. The DPA is a prompt-free, play-based interaction using a standardized set of toys that was designed to measure exploratory to multi-schema symbolic play in children with ASD from 6–36 months (Lifter, 1988).

To measure expressive vocabulary level at Times 1 and 3, the CSBS (above), BOSCC (above), and *MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventory* (MCDI; Fenson et al., 2006) were administered. The raw score from the MCDI expressive vocabulary checklist was used. The infant version of the MCDI was used for Time 1, and the toddler version was used for Time 3.

To derive a continuous measure of expressive language ability at Times 1 and 4, the percentile ranking from the vocabulary checklist on the MCDI (above) was used, and the *Mullen Scales of Early Learning* (MSEL; Mullen, 1995) were also administered. The MSEL is a commonly used cognitive assessment for children between birth and 68 months. It was administered by licensed psychologists or trained research staff under the psychologists' supervision. At Time 1, the age equivalencies and standard scores for all MSEL subscales except the gross motor scale were used to describe children's mental ages and cognitive delays.

To measure social communication at Times 1 and 4, the CSBS (above) was used at both periods and the *Autism Diagnostic Observation Scale*, version 2; (ADOS-2) was used at Time 4. The ADOS-2 (Lord et al., 2015) is a semi-structured measure designed to inform the diagnosis of ASD. Research-reliable licensed psychologists and supervised staff administered the ADOS-2. In the current study, either the Toddler Module or Module 1 was administered to all but one participant, who received Module 2. The social affect calibrated severity score was used to provide an interpretable index of symptom severity that is comparable across modules (Hus, Gotham, & Lord, 2014; Esler et al., 2015). For the

preparatory and primary analyses, the calibrated severity score was reverse scored so that higher scores would convey more adaptive functioning.

The diagnosis of ASD at Time 4 was determined by a licensed clinical psychologist on the basis of information obtained from the ADOS-2, a parent interview based on the ASD criteria in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-5; American Psychiatric Association, 2013), and other clinical assessments (e.g., Mullen Scales) as available. This variable was used as a dependent variable in an exploratory analysis.

Coding, Coded Variables, and their Interobserver Reliability

Overview.

All coding manuals are available from the first author. Session-level, point-by-point agreement checks were conducted on at least 20% of randomly selected sessions throughout the study to reduce observer drift. Primary coders did not know which sessions would be double coded. Interobserver reliability was estimated using intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs), a method in which errors on unitizing and classifying are reflected in the same reliability estimate. Reliability estimates for all variables at all time points were greater than our accepted threshold of ICC > .69, with the exception of communicative temptations at Time 1, which was .60. Thus, communicative temptations was not used to measure parents' use of ImPACT strategies at Time 1.

Intentional communication and expressive vocabulary level.

Two variables were derived from the CSBS and BOSCC procedures to measure intentional communication and expressive vocabulary levels. Each communication act was classified as non-symbolic (i.e., imitated words or phrases, non-word vocalizations, and gestures; for a weight of 1 point), single non-imitated word utterances (2 points), or multiple non-imitated word utterances (3 points). The weighted sum of instances of intentional communication was the metric used to quantify maturity of the form and frequency of communication, which we referred to as *weighted frequency of intentional communication*. When a communication act was judged to include a non-imitated word approximation, the word was orthographically transcribed. *Systematic Analysis of Language Transcripts* (SALT; Miller & Chapman, 1985) software was used to count unique word roots (e.g., “ball” and “balls” are considered the same word root). The number of different word roots was a measure of expressive vocabulary.

Motor imitation.

Motor imitation was coded at Times 1 and 3. For the SSIS and ALIT, coders rated the presence and extent to which the child accurately imitated the adult's action on a 0–2 scale. The total raw score was the metric used for each motor imitation variable.

Object play.

Object play was coded at Times 1 and 3. Using the event behavior sampling method, observers coded play behaviors from the CSBS using the instructions in the CSBS manual for the play subscale (Wetherby & Prizant, 2003). On the DPA, timed event sampling was

used to code the number of different toys touched and the number of unique differentiated play actions.

Social communication.

The social communication behaviors coded were those that tend to be most difficult for children with ASD (Wetherby et al., 2004). Trained observers identified the instances of four non-mutually-exclusive categories using a timed event sampling method from the CSBS at Times 1 and 4: (a) coordinated cues (the combined use of at least 3 of the following behaviors: smiles, word/vocalization, gesture, and eye gaze within 3 seconds); (b) positive affect sharing (i.e., smile with a gaze); (c) showing or pointing; and (d) sharing interest (use of gesture or vocalization for apparent declarative pragmatic function).

References

- Abidin R (1983). Parent stress index, manual. Charlottesville, VA: Pediatric Psychology Press.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed). Arlington, VA: Author.
- Cohen J (1988). Statistical power analysis for the social sciences. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dunst C, & Trivette C (1994). Methodological considerations and strategies for studying the long-term effects of early intervention In Friedman S & Haywood H (Eds.), Developmental follow-up: Concepts, domains, and methods. 277–313. San Diego, CA: Academic Press. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-267855-4.50018-0
- Esler AN, Bal VH, Guthrie W, Wetherby A, Weismer SE, & Lord C (2015). The autism diagnostic observation schedule, toddler module: Standardized severity scores. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 45(9), 2704–2720. doi: 10.1007/s10803-015-2432-7 [PubMed: 25832801]
- Fenson L, Marchman V, Thal D, Dale P, Reznick S & Bates E (2006). The MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventories, User's Guide and Technical Manual, Second Edition, Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing Group.
- Hayes AF (2017). Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach. Guilford Publications.
- Hus V, Gotham K, & Lord C (2014). Standardizing ADOS domain scores: Separating severity of social affect and restricted and repetitive behaviors. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 44(10), 2400–2412. doi: 10.1007/s10803-012-1719-1 [PubMed: 23143131]
- Ingersoll B (2012). Brief report: Effect of a focused imitation intervention on social functioning in children with autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 42(8), 1768–1773. doi: 10.1007/s10803-011-1423-6 [PubMed: 22146934]
- Ingersoll B, & Dvortcsak A (2010). Teaching social communication to children with autism: A practitioner's guide to parent training and a manual for parents. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Ingersoll B, & Hambrick DZ (2011). The relationship between the broader autism phenotype, child severity, and stress and depression in parents of children with autism spectrum disorders. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 5, 337–344. doi: 10.1016/j.rasd.2010.04.017
- Ingersoll B, & Meyer K (2011). Examination of correlates of different imitative functions in young children with autism spectrum disorders. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders* 5(3): 1078–1085. doi: 10.1016/j.rasd.2010.12.001
- Ingersoll B, & Schreibman L (2006). Teaching reciprocal imitation skills to young children with autism using a naturalistic behavioral approach: Effects on language, pretend play, and joint attention. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders* 36: 487–505. doi: 10.1007/s10803-006-0089-y [PubMed: 16568355]

- Ingersoll B, & Wainer A (2013). Initial efficacy of Project ImPACT: A parent-mediated social communication intervention for young children with ASD. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 43(12), 2943–2952. doi: 10.1007/s10803-013-1840-9 [PubMed: 23689760]
- Kitzerow J, Teufel K, Wilker C, & Freitag CM (2016). Using the brief observation of social communication change (BOSCC) to measure autism-specific development. *Autism Research*, 9(9), 940–950. doi: 10.1002/aur.1588 [PubMed: 26643669]
- Koegel LK, Koegel RL, & Carter CM (1998). Pivotal responses and the natural language teaching paradigm. *Seminars in Speech and Language*, 19(4), 355–372. doi: 10.1055/s-2008-1064054 [PubMed: 9857392]
- Legerstee M & Markova G (2008). Variations in 10-month-old infant imitation of people and things. *Infant Behavior and Development* 31(1): 81–91. doi: 10.1016/j.infbeh.2007.07.006 [PubMed: 17719646]
- Lieberman RG, & Yoder PJ (2012). Play and communication in children with autism spectrum disorder: A framework for early intervention. *Journal of Early Intervention* 34(2): 82–103. doi: 10.1177/1053815112453766
- Lieberman-Betz RG, Yoder P, Stone WL, Nahmias AS, Carter AS, Celimli-Aksoy S, & Messinger DS (2014). An illustration of using multiple imputation versus listwise deletion analyses: The effect of Hanen's "more than words" on parenting stress. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 119(5), 472–486. doi: 10.1352/1944-7558-119.5.472 [PubMed: 25148059]
- Lifter K (1988). *Developmental Play Assessment*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University.
- Lord C, Rutter M, DiLavore PC, Risi S, Gotham K, Bishop SL, & Schedule AADO (2015). *ADOS-2. Manual (Part I): Modules, 1–4*.
- Lovejoy MC, Graczyk PA, O'Hare E, & Neuman G (2000). Maternal depression and parenting behavior: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 20(5), 561–592. doi: 10.1016/S0272-7358(98)00100-7 [PubMed: 10860167]
- Messinger D, Young GS, Ozonoff S, Dobkins K, Carter A, Zwaigenbaum L, ... & Sigman M (2013). Beyond autism: A Baby Sibling Research Consortium study of high-risk children at three years of age. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 52(3), 300–308. doi: 10.1016/j.jaac.2012.12.011 [PubMed: 23452686]
- Mullen EM (1995). *Mullen Scales of Early Learning*. . Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service Inc.
- Ozonoff S, Young GS, Carter A, Messinger D, Yirmiya N, Zwaigenbaum L, ... & Hutman T (2011). Recurrence risk for autism spectrum disorders: A Baby Siblings Research Consortium study. *Pediatrics*, 128(3), e488–e495. doi: 10.1542/peds.2010-2825 [PubMed: 21844053]
- Ozonoff S, Young GS, Landa RJ, Brian J, Bryson S, Charman T, Chawarska K, Macari SL, Messinger D, Stone WL, Zwaigenbaum, & Iosif A (2015). Diagnostic stability in young children at risk for autism spectrum disorder: A Baby Siblings Research Consortium study. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 56, 988–998. PMID: 25921776. doi:10.1111/jcpp.12421 [PubMed: 25921776]
- Radloff LS (1991). The use of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale in adolescents and young adults. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 20(2): 149–166. doi: 10.1007/bf01537606 [PubMed: 24265004]
- Robins DL, Casagrande K, Barton ML, Chen C, Dumont-Mathieu T, & Fein D (2014). Validation of the Modified Checklist for Autism in Toddlers-Revised with Follow-Up (M-CHAT-R/F). *Pediatrics*, 133(1), 37–45. doi: 10.1542/peds.2013-1813 [PubMed: 24366990]
- Rogers SJ (1999). An examination of the imitation deficit in autism In Nadel J and Butterworth G (Eds.), *Imitation in infancy*, 254–283. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Singh NN (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. [PubMed: 30894823]
- Teti DM, & Gelfand DM (1991). Behavioral competence among mothers of infants in the first year: The mediational role of maternal self-efficacy. *Child Development* 62(5): 918–929. doi: 10.2307/1131143 [PubMed: 1756667]

- Thompson B, & Vache-Haase T (2000). Psychometrics is datametrics: The test is not reliable. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60, 174–195. doi:10.1177/00131640021970448
- Towle PO, & Patrick PA (2016). Autism spectrum disorder screening instruments for very young children: A systematic review. *Autism Research and Treatment*, 2016, 1–29. doi: 10.1155/2016/4624829
- Turner-Brown LM, et al. (2012). The First Year Inventory: a longitudinal follow-up of 12-month-old to 3-year-old children. *Autism*, 17(5), 527–540. doi: 10.1177/1362361312439633 [PubMed: 22781058]
- Wainer AL, & Ingersoll BR (2013). Disseminating ASD interventions: A pilot study of a distance learning program for parents and professionals. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 43(1), 11–24. doi: 10.1007/s10803-012-1538-4 [PubMed: 22547028]
- Watson LR, Baranek GT, Crais ER, Reznick JS, Dykstra J, & Perryman T (2007). The First Year inventory: Retrospective parent responses to a questionnaire designed to identify one-year-olds at risk for autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders* 37(1): 49–61. doi: 10.1007/s10803-006-0334-4 [PubMed: 17219058]
- Weitlauf AS, Vehorn AC, Taylor JL, & Warren ZE (2014). Relationship satisfaction, parenting stress, and depression in mothers of children with autism. *Autism*, 18(2), 194–198. doi: 10.1177/1362361312458039 [PubMed: 22987895]
- Wetherby AM, & Prizant BM (2003). *Communication and Symbolic Behavior Scales Developmental Profile*, First Normed edition Baltimore, MD: Brookes. doi: 10.1037/t11529-000
- Yirmiya N, & Charman T (2010). The prodrome of autism: Early behavioral and biological signs, regression, peri-and post-natal development and genetics. *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry* 51(5): 432–458. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2010.02214.x [PubMed: 20085609]
- Yoder P, & Compton D (2004). Identifying predictors of treatment response. *Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities Research Reviews*, 10(3), 162–168. doi: 10.1002/mrdd.20013 [PubMed: 15611985]
- Yoder PJ, Stone W, & Edmunds S (in press, 2020). Parent utilization of ImPACT intervention strategies is a mediator of proximal then distal social communication outcomes in younger siblings of children with ASD. *Autism*.
- Yoder P, Watson LR, & Lambert W (2015). Value-added predictors of expressive and receptive language growth in initially nonverbal preschoolers with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 45(5), 1254–1270. doi: 10.1007/s10803-014-2286-4 [PubMed: 25344152]

Figure 1.

Path diagram of the ImPACT teaching's risk-moderated indirect effect on expressive language ability at Time 4 through HR-Sibs' intentional communication at Time 3. Unstandardized coefficients (and their standard errors) are the values; $*p < .05$, $***p < .001$.

Table 1

Constructs, Procedures, Measurement Periods, and Variables

Constructs	Procedures	Measurement Periods	Variables
Cumulative risk	Demographic questionnaire, MCHAT or FYI	1	Sum of risk factors
Parental depressive symptoms	CES-D	1	Total raw score
Intentional communication	CSBS, BOSCC	1, 3	Composite weighted frequency of intentional communication across procedures
Expressive vocabulary level	CSBS, BOSCC, MCDI-infant scale at T1, - toddler scale at T3	1, 3	Composite number of difference words said across procedures
Motor imitation	SSIS	1, 3	Sum of ratings across 10 items
Object Play	DPA	1, 3	Composite number of different toys and number of unique differentiated play actions
Parenting-related stress	PSI	1, 3	Total raw score
Parenting efficacy	MES	1, 3	Total raw score
Expressive language ability	MCDI-infant scale at T1, - toddler scale at T4 MSEL expressive	1, 4	Composite of percentile rankings across procedures
Social communication	CSBS	1	2 nd order composite of two 1 st order composites: (a) sharing interests and show and pointing counts and (b) coordinating cues and positive affect sharing counts
Social communication	CSBS ADOS-2	4	2 nd order composite of two 1 st order composites: (a) sharing interests, showing and pointing counts, and the reflected social affect calibrated severity score and (b) coordinating cues and positive affect sharing counts
ASD diagnosis	ADOS-2 MSEL Parent interview ^a	4	Presence/absence of ASD diagnosis

MCHAT-R = *Modified Checklist for Autism in Toddlers*. FYI = *First Year Inventory*. CES-D = *Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale*. CSBS = *Communication and Symbolic Behavior Scale*; BOSCC = *Brief Observation of Social Communication Change*; MCDI = *MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventory*; SSIS = *Semi-structured imitation scale*; DPA = *Developmental Play Assessment*; PSI = *Parent Stress Index*; MES = *Maternal Efficacy Scale*; MSEL = *Mullen Scales of Early Learning*; and ADOS-2 = *Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule*-version 2.

^aThe parent interview was based on the ASD criteria in the DSM-5.

Table 2

ImPACT's Statistically Significant Risk-moderated Indirect Effects on Children's Communication Challenges

M^a	W predicting M	Outcome^a	Unstandardized coefficient for the moderated mediated effect [95% CI]	Partially standardized coefficient for moderated mediated effect
Children's expressive vocabulary at Time 3	Risk at Time 1	Expressive language ability at Time 4	-.30 [-.56, -.05]	-.33
Children's expressive vocabulary at Time 3	Risk at Time 1	Social communication at Time 4 ^b	-.10 [-.31, -.004]	-.14
Children's intentional communication at Time 3	Risk at Time 1	Expressive language ability at Time 4	-.28 [-.53, -.07]	-.31
Children's intentional communication at Time 3	Risk at Time 1	Social communication at Time 4 ^b	-.11 [-.29, -.02]	-.15

M = mediator; W = moderator;

^aControlling for Time 1 interactive motor imitation.^bAfter deleting cases with undue influence, these effects become nonsignificant.