No studies of The Incredible Years that fall within the scope of the Early Childhood Education Interventions for Children with Disabilities review protocol meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) evidence standards. The lack of studies meeting WWC evidence standards means that, at this time, the WWC is unable to draw any conclusions based on research about the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of The Incredible Years on preschool children with disabilities in early education settings. Additional research is needed to determine the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of this intervention.

Program Description

The Incredible Years is an intervention composed of training programs for children, parents, and teachers that is intended to reduce children's aggression and improve their social skills. The three programs (child, parent, and teacher) can be used independently or in combination.

The child program focuses on building social and emotional skills for students in preschool through early elementary school. The child program can be delivered to children referred for difficult behavior or to an entire classroom as a preventive measure. This program can be offered in either a classroom or a clinical setting. In a classroom setting, the teacher presents 20- to 30-minute lessons two to three times a week during circle time. Alternately, the child program can be conducted as a pullout program for small groups of children. Lessons cover recognizing and understanding feelings, getting along with friends, anger management, problem solving, and behavior at school. In a clinical setting, referred students complete activities during 18–20 two-hour weekly small-group meetings.

Parent training programs focus on parenting skills, including positive discipline, promoting child learning and development, and involvement in children’s life at school. The program also emphasizes parent interpersonal skills to improve communication with children and other parents.

The Incredible Years also includes two programs for teachers. The first addresses general classroom management as a means to improve student behavior and learning. The second is a training program for teachers who will deliver the child program to students in their classrooms.

Research

The WWC identified 166 studies of The Incredible Years for preschool children with disabilities in early education settings that were published or released between 1989 and 2011.

Three studies are within the scope of the Early Childhood Education Interventions for Children with Disabilities review protocol but do not meet WWC evidence standards.

- One study was a randomized controlled trial in which the combination of overall and differential attrition exceeded WWC evidence standards. The resulting analytic intervention groups were too dissimilar at baseline to be considered equivalent. Therefore, this study did not meet WWC evidence standards.
- Two studies have the delivery of the intervention as a confounding factor, which makes it impossible to attribute the observed effect solely to The Incredible Years. In one study, the author led all of the sessions for the interven-
tion group and did not lead the control group sessions. In the second study, the intervention sessions were led by the same two-person team, while the control group sessions were led by different individuals. In both of these studies, reported program effects may be attributed to the individual(s) who delivered *The Incredible Years* rather than to the intervention itself.

Seventy-two studies are out of the scope of the Early Childhood Education Interventions for Children with Disabilities review protocol because they have an ineligible study design.

Ninety-one studies are out of the scope of the Early Childhood Education Interventions for Children with Disabilities review protocol for reasons other than study design.
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Endnotes

1 The descriptive information for this program was obtained from a publicly available source: the program’s website (http://www.incredibleyears.com/, downloaded February 2011). The WWC requests developers to review the program description sections for accuracy from their perspective. The program description was provided to the developer in June 2011 and we incorporated feedback from the developer. Further verification of the accuracy of the descriptive information for this program is beyond the scope of this review. The literature search reflects documents publicly available by August 2011.

2 The studies in this report were reviewed using WWC Evidence Standards, Version 2.1, as described in protocol Version 2.0. The evidence presented in this report is based on available research. Findings and conclusions may change as new research becomes available.
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### Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attrition</strong></td>
<td>Attrition occurs when an outcome variable is not available for all participants initially assigned to the intervention and comparison groups. The WWC considers the total attrition rate and the difference in attrition rates across groups within a study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clustering adjustment</strong></td>
<td>If treatment assignment is made at a cluster level and the analysis is conducted at the student level, the WWC will adjust the statistical significance to account for this mismatch, if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confounding factor</strong></td>
<td>A confounding factor is a component of a study that is completely aligned with one of the study conditions, making it impossible to separate how much of the observed effect was due to the intervention and how much was due to the factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td>The design of a study is the method by which intervention and comparison groups were assigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain</strong></td>
<td>A domain is a group of closely related outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effect size</strong></td>
<td>The effect size is a measure of the magnitude of an effect. The WWC uses a standardized measure to facilitate comparisons between outcomes and studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligibility</strong></td>
<td>A study is eligible for review and inclusion in this report if it falls within the scope of the review protocol and uses either an experimental or matched comparison group design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equivalence</strong></td>
<td>A demonstration that the analysis sample groups are similar on observed characteristics defined in the review area protocol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extent of evidence</strong></td>
<td>An indication of how much evidence supports the findings. The criteria for the extent of evidence levels are given in the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook (version 2.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement index</strong></td>
<td>Along a percentile distribution of students, the improvement index represents the gain or loss of the average student due to the intervention. As the average student starts at the 50th percentile, the measure ranges from –50 to +50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple comparison adjustment</strong></td>
<td>When a study includes multiple outcomes or comparison groups, the WWC will adjust the statistical significance to account for the multiple comparisons, if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quasi-experimental design (QED)</strong></td>
<td>A quasi-experimental design (QED) is a research design in which subjects are assigned to treatment and comparison groups through a process that is not random.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Randomized controlled trial (RCT)</strong></td>
<td>A randomized controlled trial (RCT) is an experiment in which investigators randomly assign eligible participants into treatment and comparison groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating of effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>The WWC rates the effects of an intervention in each domain based on the quality of the research design and the magnitude, statistical significance, and consistency in findings. The criteria for the ratings of effectiveness are given in the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook (version 2.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single-case design</strong></td>
<td>A research approach in which an outcome variable is measured repeatedly within and across different conditions that are defined by the presence or absence of an intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard deviation</strong></td>
<td>The standard deviation of a measure shows how much variation exists from the average. A low standard deviation indicates that the data points tend to be very close to the mean; a high standard deviation indicates that the data points are spread out over a large range of values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statistical significance</strong></td>
<td>Statistical significance is the probability that the difference between groups is a result of chance rather than a real difference between the groups. The WWC labels a finding statistically significant if the likelihood that the difference is due to chance is less than 5% (p &lt; 0.05).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substantively important</strong></td>
<td>A substantively important finding is one that has an effect size of 0.25 or greater, regardless of statistical significance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook (version 2.1) for additional details.