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Research Programme
NCKO Research programme:

1. Develop a assessment instrument to measure quality of care in early child care centers

2. Measure the quality of early child care centers

3. Develop and evaluate training program
Children develop in interactions with their immediate environment. In child care centers these are interactions with:
Caregiver Interaction Profile (CIP) scales

1. Sensitive responsiveness
2. Respect for autonomy
3. Structure and limit setting
4. Verbal communication
5. Developmental stimulation
6. Fostering positive peer interactions

Rating scales 1-7

- Rated by trained observers from videotaped interaction episodes (8-10 min)
- Caregiver behavior towards a group of children
Sensitive responsiveness

The extent to which a caregiver recognizes children’s individual emotional and physical needs, and responds appropriately and promptly to their cues and signals.
Respect for autonomy

The extent to which a caregiver is non-intrusive but instead recognizes and respects the validity of children’s intentions and perspectives. For a high score: the caregiver also acknowledges the child as a separate person with its own perspectives and ideas.
Structuring and limit setting

Refers to the ability of a caregiver to clearly communicate expectations towards children and make sure that the children ‘stick to the plan’ during everyday activities.

A high score means that the caregiver shows a natural authority
Verbal communication

Refers to the frequency and quality of verbal interactions between caregivers and children.
Developmental stimulation

The degree to which a caregiver deliberately attempts to foster children’s development, e.g., motor skills, cognitive development and creativity.
Fostering positive peer interactions

A caregiver’s guidance (encouraging, creating and responding) of interactions between children in the childcare center.
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2008: Scores on Caregiver Interaction Profile Scales (432 caregivers)
(Mean; +/- 1 standard deviation; minimum-maximum)

- Verbal Communication
- Developmental Stimulation
- Fostering Peer Interactions
- Sensitive Responsiveness
- Respect for Autonomy
- Structure & Limits

Improvement is needed!
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Theory of change

TABLE 24.2. Components of Intentional Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowing: Understanding current information on how to interact with children in ways that promote social, behavioral, and cognitive development.</td>
<td>Knowledge of child development, knowledge of a range of effective teaching practices, knowledge of individual children’s needs, content knowledge, knowledge of self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing: Identifying effective teacher–child interactions in action—both in others’ as well as in one’s own interactions.</td>
<td>Analysis of videos of effective teachers and of self to identify when things are going well or not well in interactions with children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing: Enacting effective teacher–child interactions in the classroom.</td>
<td>Effective implementation of curricula, ability to modify plans as needed in the moment to meet specific goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflecting: Engaging in self-observation and critical analysis of teaching with goal of becoming more effective.</td>
<td>Guided reflections, coaching/mentoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hamre, Downer, Jamil, & Pianta (2012)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Individual/with colleague</th>
<th>Video episodes collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Information about procedures and general introduction</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Video feedback: sensitive responsiveness &amp; respect for autonomy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Setup training:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Read description CIP skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Caregiver rates video examples model in high, medium, low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Watch caregiver’s own video episodes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Feedback on video episodes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Caregiver fills in behavior checklist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review <em>sensitive responsiveness &amp; respect for autonomy</em></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>After session 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video feedback <em>structuring and limit setting &amp; verbal communication</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setup video feedback: see session 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Review <em>structuring and limit setting &amp; verbal communication</em></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>After session 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video feedback <em>developmental stimulation &amp; fostering positive peer interactions</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setup video feedback: see session 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Review <em>developmental stimulation &amp; fostering positive peer interactions</em></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>After session 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video feedback booster - two skills of caregiver’s own choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setup video feedback: see session 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Learn from each other - caregivers choose three to five of their own video episodes to show their fellow-caregiver</td>
<td>With colleague</td>
<td>Pretest; after session 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Checklist – example

### Checklist Sensitive responsiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>OK!</th>
<th>Work on for next time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You frequently look at the children</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You keep a close eye on the children</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You make eye contact with the children: you look at the children while talking to them or when they ask you something</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You sit at eye level with the children while talking to the children</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You look for children that are not at ease or show discomfort</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever children are unhappy, you make sure to comfort them as soon as possible or at least let them know that you have heard or seen them</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You use a warm and calm voice with the children</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You regularly praise the children</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation CIP training

Participants

- **Experimental group**
  - 69 caregivers from 35 classrooms

- **Control group**
  - 70 caregivers from 33 classrooms

  → Random assignment!

Instruments

- All 6 CIP scales

- **Pretest** – before start training

- **Posttest** – immediately after the training

- **Follow-up** – 3 months after the posttest
Evaluation CIP training

Results

- Posttest - we found a significant training effect for all six CIP skills, indicating that the training improved caregiver’s sensitive responsiveness, respect for autonomy, structuring and limit setting, developmental stimulation, and fostering positive peer interactions.

- Follow-up - caregivers in the experimental groups still scored significantly higher on sensitive responsiveness, respect for autonomy, verbal communication, and fostering positive peer interactions.
Effects sizes compared

Effects sizes (Cohen, 1988):
- $d = 0.20$ small effect
- $d = 0.50$ medium effect
- $d = 0.80$ large effect

Abstract
This meta-analysis reports on the effectiveness of targeted interventions focusing on child care professionals to improve child care quality, caregiver interaction skills, and child social-emotional development. Within randomized controlled trials, interventions are moderately effective in improving overall caregiver-child interactions ($k=19$, Hedges’ $g=0.35$) and in improving child care quality on the classroom level ($k=11$; Hedges’ $g=0.39$), the caregiver level ($k=10$; Hedges’ $g=0.44$), and the child level ($k=6$; Hedges’ $g=0.26$). Based on these findings, the implementation of evidence-based targeted interventions on a larger scale than currently exists may lead to better social-emotional development for children under the age of 5 years. There remains, however, an urgent need for more and larger randomized controlled trials with a solid design and high quality measures in order to shed more light on which child care components for which children are most critical in supporting children’s socio-emotional development.
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