

3 Classification of interventions



A total of 32 interventions were determined to meet our criteria for selection. They are listed below, along with the country and year(s) of operation. Interventions with a cost-benefit component are highlighted with an asterisk (*).

Selected interventions

1. *Perry Preschool Project*, Ypsilanti, US 1962-1967.*
2. *Elmira Prenatal/Early Infancy Project*, Elmira, US 1978-1982.*
3. *Head Start*, multiple sites, US 1965-current.
4. *Early Head Start*, multiple sites, US 1995-current.
5. *Carolina Abecedarian Project*, Carolina, US 1972-1985.*
6. *Infant Health and Development Project*, 8 sites, US 1985-2000.
7. *Chicago Child-Parent Center*, Chicago, US 1967-current.*
8. *Syracuse Family Development Research Program*, Syracuse, US 1969-1975.
9. *High/Scope Preschool Curriculum Study*, Ypsilanti, US 1967-1970.
10. *New Hope Project*, Milwaukee, US 1994-1998.
11. *Parent-Child Development Centers*, multiple sites, US 1970-1980.
12. *Starting Early Starting Smart*, 12 sites, US 1997-2001.*
13. *Better Beginnings, Better Futures*, Canada 1991-current.
14. *Sure Start*, multiple sites, United Kingdom 1999-current.
15. *Positive Parenting Program*, multiple sites, Australia, ongoing.*
16. *Support at Home for Early Language and Literacy*, NSW, Australia 1997-current.
17. *Baby Happiness, Understanding, Giving and Sharing Program*, Australia, current.
18. *Parents as Teachers*, Massachusetts, US 1984-current.
19. *Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters Program*, multiple sites, international, ongoing.
20. *New Parent Infant Network*, United Kingdom 1980-current.
21. *Project 12-Ways*, Southern Illinois, US 1979-1985.
22. *Even Start*, multiple sites, US 1989-current.
23. *Comprehensive Child Development Program*, multiple sites, US 1990-1995.
24. *Hawaii Healthy Start Program*, Hawaii, US 1985-1988.
25. *Florida Family Transition Program*, Florida, US 1994-2000.*
26. *Teenage Parent Demonstration Program*, 3 sites, US 1986-1998.
27. *Cuyahoga County Early Childhood Initiative*, Ohio, US 2000-2002.
28. *Saginaw Prekindergarten Program*, Michigan, US 1960-current.
29. *Bolivia Integrated Child Development Project*, Bolivia, ongoing.*
30. *Early Enrichment Project*, Turkey 1982-1986.
31. *Incredible Years*, US and United Kingdom 1982-current.
32. *Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program*, Washington, US 1985-current.

These 32 early childhood interventions selected for further evaluation (referred as the interventions from this point) are more fully documented in Appendix 2. Interventions are documented by name of the intervention, where the program was located (for example, country), target population, sample size, intervention strategy, where the intervention took place (for example, home

visitation, community centre), anticipated outcomes/benefits, time frame for anticipated benefits and details of the intervention evaluation, including findings related to the impact of the intervention on outcomes and whether a cost-benefit analysis had been conducted.

The interventions were grouped to allow for ease of reporting and interpretation. Interventions have been classified in a number of ways in the early intervention/prevention literature (for example, Mrazek and Brown 2002; Brooks-Gunn 2003). They have been classified according to location, target, timing, intensity, extensiveness and curriculum. The EECI project attempted to incorporate some of these approaches, resulting in interventions being classified in terms of four key intervention components:

- *Type of intervention*: universal, targeted or indicated.
- *Foci/benefit*: child outcome, parent/family outcome or child and parent/family/community outcomes (multi-level programs).
- *Intervention location*: home visit, clinic-based or child care centre/preschool.
- *Focal age of children*: prenatal, infancy, toddler, pre-school or early school aged.

Intervention “clusters”

The interventions were examined in terms of the four key intervention components described above and determined to fall into one of five intervention types or “clusters”. These groupings are described below.

Cluster 1: targeted, child focused, centre based, preschool age

Interventions grouped in “cluster 1” are targeted interventions that aim to improve child development directly – that is, through interventions involving children as participants. The target population is primarily pre-school aged children from low-income or “at-risk” neighbourhoods. These programs are most likely to be delivered in a child care or pre-school facility. The six interventions included in this cluster are:

- Perry Preschool Project (Perry)*
- Head Start
- High/Scope Preschool Curriculum Comparison Study (High/Scope)
- Saginaw Pre-Kindergarten Project (Saginaw)
- Bolivia Integrated Child Development Program (PIDI)*
- Chicago Child-Parent Center (CPC)*

Cluster 2: targeted, parent focused, home visits, all ages

Interventions that are grouped in “cluster 2” are targeted interventions usually aimed at improving parent outcomes, such as parenting skills or social support. The target population receiving the interventions are parents with children across the early childhood age range from low-income backgrounds, or parents associated with some other risk factor (for example, depression, parent of a low birth-weight baby). The interventions typically include a strong home-visitation component. The eight interventions included in this cluster are:

- Elmira Pre-natal and Early Infancy Project (PEIP)*
- Houston Parent-Child Development Centre (PCDC)
- Home Instruction for Parents of Pre-school Youngsters (HIPPIY)
- Hawaii’s Healthy Start Program (Healthy Start)
- Early Enrichment Project (EEP)
- Support at Home for Early Language and Literacy (SHELLS)
- Baby Happiness, Understanding, Giving and Sharing Program (Baby HUGS)
- Project 12-ways

Cluster 3: targeted, family economic/welfare focused, all ages

Interventions that are grouped in “cluster 3” are targeted interventions aimed at improving familial economic self-sufficiency or parental employment. The target population is parents of children across the early childhood age range from poor backgrounds or welfare recipients. These interventions include case management components, financial aid and additional services. The three interventions included in this cluster are:

- New Hope Child and Family Study (New Hope)
- Florida Family Transition Project (FTP)*
- Teenage Parent Demonstration Project (TPDP)

Cluster 4: targeted, holistic, various locations, all ages

Interventions that are grouped in “cluster 4” are targeted interventions. They are holistic interventions, that is, they aim to improve outcomes for both children across the early childhood age range and their parents. Thus, the intervention is targeted at both parents and children. These programs typically involve parent skills training and a child education component, and are delivered in various locations. The twelve interventions included in this cluster are:

- Early Head Start
- Carolina Abecedarian Project (Abecedarian)*
- Infant Health and Development Project (IHDP)
- Syracuse Family Development Research Program (Syracuse)
- Starting Early Starting Smart (SESS)*
- Even Start
- Comprehensive Child Development Program (CCDP)
- Incredible Years
- Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP)
- Better Beginnings Better Futures (BBBF)
- Sure Start
- New Parent Infant Network (NEWPIN)

Cluster 5: universal, various foci, various locations, all ages

Interventions that are grouped in “cluster 5” are universal interventions. They are focused variously at children only, parents only or children and their parents, and apply to children across the early childhood age range. The intervention strategy and program location vary. The three interventions included in this cluster are:

- Positive Parenting Program (Triple P) *
- Parents as Teachers (PAT)
- Cuyahoga County Early Childhood Initiative (Cuyahoga)