Videotape Intervention

Table E-107. Videotape intervention, study characteristics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **First Author, Year** | **State, Country** | **Source (s) of Funding** | **Study Design**  | **KQ**  | **Research Objective**  | **Comparison Groups**  | **Baseline N** | **Study Duration**  | **Inclusion Criteria** | **Exclusion Criteria** |
| Jinich, 199952 | San Diego, California | Foundation/ non-profit (National Center on Child Abuse & Neglect) | Rando-mized controlled trial | 1 | To develop a videotape intervention that sought to enhance supportive behaviors in mothers of children who were being examined because of suspected molestation, and to evaluate the relationship between mothers’ reported responses to & beliefs about the molestation, and children’s perceptions of support | G1: Treatment videotapeG2: Control videotape | ParentsG1: 32G2: 32ChildrenG1: 15G2:15 | Post Intervention: Once immediately after videotape viewing Follow-up:Once, 1 week following the videotape viewing | Mothers who chose or were referred to a child sexual abuse evaluation clinic to have their child assessed for suspected sexual abuse;Children needed to be: Aged 4 to 12 years old;English-speaking; Nondevelopmentally disabled;Probable victims of sexual molestation | Mothers who did not speak English;Children who: Were severely physically or developmentally disabled;if the child did not go home with parents following assessment |