Foundations
What Works Centre for Children & Families

Last reviewed: February 2019

Intervention website: www.hippy-international.org

GUIDEBOOK INTERVENTION INFORMATION SHEET

Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (Hippy)

Please note that in the 'Intervention Summary' table below 'child age', 'level of need', and 'race and ethnicities information is **as evaluated in studies**. Information in other fields describes the intervention as **offered/supported by the intervention provider**.

Intervention summary	
Description	Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) is a home visiting intervention for families living in disadvantaged communities with a child aged 3 to 5 years. HIPPY is delivered through two components: 1) 15 one-hour home visits over the two-year transition from preschool to primary school by a home visiting paraprofessional; and 2) 15 group sessions delivered by a programme coordinator to groups of up to 20 HIPPY parents. During home visits and group sessions, parents learn strategies aimed at supporting their child's school readiness by enhancing the home learning environment.
Evidence rating	2+
Cost rating	3
Child outcomes	• Enhancing school achievement & employment - Improved early learning - Improved classroom adaptation - Improved maths ability - Improved literacy
Child age (population characteristic)	3 to 5 years

Intervention summary	
Level of need (population characteristic)	Targeted Selected
Race and ethnicities (population characteristic)	• African American • Latino • White.
Type (model characteristic)	• Home visiting • Group.
Setting (model characteristic)	• Home • Children's Centre or early years setting • Community Centre.
Workforce (model characteristic)	One home-visitor para-professional (for the home visits) and one programme coordinator (for the group component)
UK available?	No
UK tested?	No

Model description

Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) is a home visiting intervention for families living in disadvantaged communities with a child aged 3 to 5 years. HIPPY aims to increase school readiness by enhancing the home learning environment and parents' ability to help their children learn.

HIPPY is delivered through two components that take place over the school term: 1) 15 one-hour home visits delivered by a home visiting paraprofessional over the two-year transition from preschool to primary school; and 2) 15 group sessions delivered by a programme coordinator to groups of up to 20 HIPPY parents.

During the home visits, practitioners use a structured lesson approach to help parents create a more enriching home learning environment. Parents learn through role-play how to use storybooks and other educational activities, which are provided by HIPPY. They are asked to read and engage

with these activities with their child every day, with the activities reinforcing language and critical thinking skills.

In the group sessions, parents are introduced to the activity pack for the coming week, as well as having time with other parents, sharing concerns and questions, receiving information about parenting and school, and taking part in enrichment activities, such as arts and crafts projects.

Target population

Age of child	3 to 5 years
Target population	Families living in disadvantaged communities

Please note that the information in this section on target population is as **offered/supported by the intervention provider**.

Theory of change

Why		Who	How		What	
Science-based assumption	**Science-based assumption**	**Science-based assumption**	**Intervention**	**Short-term outcomes**	**Medium-term outcomes**	**Long-term outcomes**
Preliteracy and communication skills are critical for school readiness and are predictive of success in primary school.	The quality of the home learning environment, including parents' ability to interact positively with their child and scaffold early literacy, predicts children's early literacy by the time they enter school.	Low family income or education level negatively impacts parents' ability to provide an enriching home environment.	• Parents learn strategies for promoting early literacy through daily book sharing and educational activities. • Parents are provided with books and other educational materials to improve the home learning environment. • Parents attend group sessions aimed at providing more support for using literacy materials, as well as parenting information.	• Parents provide their child with a more enriching home learning environment. • Parents actively support their children's early literacy. • Parents are better able to support their child's school readiness.	• Improved parental efficacy • Improved school readiness skills.	Improved child academic achievement in primary school.

Implementation requirements

Who is eligible?	Families with a child aged 3 to 5 years, living in disadvantaged communities, with low income or limited parental formal education.
How is it delivered?	HIPPY is delivered in 15 sessions of home-visiting of one hour's duration each by one practitioner, to individual families, and in 15 sessions of two to three hours' duration each by one practitioner to groups of approximately 20 families, over two years.
What happens during the intervention?	• During home visits, parents learn how to use books and educational materials with their child through role-play. • During group sessions, parents are introduced to new books and learning materials, and receive information about parenting and school. • The intervention aims to improve parents' ability to support their children's early literacy and school readiness, through improving the home learning environment.
Who can deliver it?	The practitioner who delivers this intervention is a home-visitor para-professional (home visits), and a programme coordinator (group sessions).
What are the training requirements?	The practitioners have one week of intervention training. Booster training of practitioners is recommended.
How are practitioners supervised?	It is recommended that practitioners are supervised by one host-agency supervisor, with one week of intervention training.
What are the systems for maintaining fidelity?	Intervention fidelity is maintained through the following processes: • Training manual • Other printed material • Other online material • Face-to-face training • Supervision • Accreditation or certification process • Fidelity monitoring.
Is there a licensing requirement?	Yes

Implementation requirements (Cont.)

***Contact details**	Organisation: HIPPY International Email address: info@hippy-international.org Website: www.hippy-international.org *Please note that this information may not be up to date. In this case, please visit the listed intervention website for up to date contact details.

Evidence summary

HIPPY's most rigorous evidence comes from two studies conducted in the United States consistent with Foundations' Level 2+ evidence strength criteria.

The first study observed statistically significant improvements in HIPPY children's performance on a standardised achievement test and classroom adaptation compared to children not receiving the intervention.

The second study observed statistically significant improvements in HIPPY children's performance on a maths achievement test four years post-intervention in comparison to children not receiving the intervention. Additionally, HIPPY mothers reported more involvement in their children's learning and were observed to provide greater stimulation, modelling, and variety in the home learning environment immediately after the intervention in comparison to families who did not receive the intervention. Interestingly, however, the second study observed that mothers in the comparison were significantly more likely to provide a more physically enriching home learning environment in comparison to the mothers receiving the intervention.

Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters has preliminary evidence of improving a child outcome, but we cannot be confident that the intervention caused the improvement.

Search and review

	Number of studies
Identified in search	26
Studies reviewed	5
Meeting the L2 threshold	1

	Number of studies
Meeting the L2 + threshold	2
Meeting the L3 threshold	0
Contributing to the L4 threshold	0
Ineligible	2

Individual study summary: Study 1

Study 1	
Study design	RCT and QED
Country	United States
Sample characteristics	247 families with children in kindergarten in the RCT study, and 226 in the QED study, including at-risk families with low parental education
Race, ethnicities, and nationalities	In the RCT: • African American – 25% of children • Latino – 31% of children • White – 24% of children. In the QED: • African American – 93% of children • White – 6% of children • Other – 0.05% of children.
Population risk factors	• 25% of parents in the RCT study and 37% in the QED study had less than high school education. • 29% of families in the RCT study and 42% in the QED study used public assistance as primary source of income.
Timing	• Baseline • Post-intervention • One-year follow-up.

Study 1	
Child outcomes	• Improved cognitive skills • Improved reading skills • Improved classroom adaptation • Improved school achievement.
Other outcomes	None
Study Rating	2+
Citation	Baker, A. J., Piotrkowski, C. S. & Brooks-Gunn, J. (1999) The home instruction program for preschool youngsters (HIPPY). *Future Child*. 9 (1), 116–33.

Brief summary

Population characteristics

This study involved an RCT with 247 families living in New York State, USA, with a child 4 to 5 years old. Of these, 182 families are included in the report in Study 1. 54% of the children were boys, with an average age of 56 months at baseline.

The families were recruited in two cohorts, with 90 randomised in the first cohort (69 reported in the study), and 157 randomised in the second cohort (113 reported in the study). All families enrolled in the prekindergarten of the agency sponsoring the HIPPY intervention were invited to participate.

The sample included the following ethnicities:

- African American – 25% of children
- Latino – 31% of children
- White – 24% of children.

In addition, 25% of parents had less than high school education, and 29% of families used public assistance as primary source of income. 35% of parents did not speak English as their primary language.

This study also reported a QED with 226 families living in Arkansas, USA, with a child 4 to 5 years old. 49% of the children were boys, with an average ag of 56 months at baseline. The families were recruited in two cohorts, with 113 in each cohort.

The sample included the following ethnicities:

- African American – 93% of children
- White – 6% of children

- Other – 0.05% of children.

In addition, 37% of parents had less than high school education, and 42% of families used public assistance as primary source of income.

Study design

In the RCT conducted in New York State, 247 families were assigned to either the HIPPY intervention (n=122) or a control group (n=125) across two cohorts. The first cohort included 52 HIPPY participants and 38 controls, while the second cohort included 70 HIPPY participants and 87 controls. The first cohort started the intervention in 1990, and the second in 1991. However, by the time the intervention began, 113 families remained in Cohort II (47 in HIPPY, 66 in the control group), resulting in a final total of 182 families included in the study. During the first year, children in both groups attended a high-quality full-day preschool intervention, followed by kindergarten in the second year. The control group received business as usual services.

In the QED in Arkansas, 226 families were assigned to the HIPPY group (n=121) or a control group (n=105). The first cohort included 55 HIPPY participants and X controls, while the second cohort included 50 HIPPY participants and X controls. Unlike in the study in New York State, none of the children in either group participated in any other preschool intervention during the first year of the study, though most attended kindergarten during the second year. The Arkansas site observed no baseline differences between the HIPPY and comparison groups, with the exception that Cohort II HIPPY children scored significantly higher than Cohort II comparison children on the Cooperative Preschool Inventory.

Measurement

At baseline and post-intervention:

- Children's cognitive skills were measured using the Cooperative Preschool Inventory (CPI) (Direct assessment).

At post-intervention and one-year follow-up:

- Children's classroom adaptation was measured using the Child Classroom Adaptation Index (CCAI) (Teacher report).
- Kindergarten and first-grade standardised achievement on Reading and Math was measured using administrative records on scores from the Metropolitan Readiness Test and the Metropolitan Achievement Test (Administrative data).
- In the QED Arkansas study, standardised achievement was measured using the Stanford Early School Achievement Test (Direct assessment)

Study retention

Baseline

For the RCT in New York State, between randomisation and baseline measurement as reported in the study, 71% (37 families) were retained in the HIPPY group and 84% (32 families) in the control group in cohort 1. In cohort 2, 67% (47 families) were retained in the HIPPY group, and 76% (66

families) in the control group. There was no information about retention and attrition for the QED in Arkansas.

Post-intervention and one-year follow-up

No further information was reported on the number of families retained at post-intervention and one-year follow-up.

Results

Data-analytic strategy

ANCOVA analyses were conducted for each cohort separately, controlling for child age, parents' level of education and ethnicity, family structure, source of family income, and children's baseline scores on the CPI. It appears that the analysis is not intent-to-treat and there is no information on how missing data was handled.

Findings

In the RCT in New York State, in Cohort 1 only, there were statistically significant differences favouring the HIPPY group at post-intervention in cognitive skills and classroom adaptation, and at one-year follow-up in reading skills and classroom adaptation, in comparison to the control group. There were no significant findings in Cohort 2.

In the QED in Arkansas, in Cohort 1, there were statistically significant differences favouring the HIPPY group at one-year follow-up in classroom adaptation, but no other outcomes were significant. In Cohort 2, there were statistically significant differences favouring the HIPPY group at post-intervention in school achievement. There were no other significant findings.

Limitations

The findings from this study are limited by a lack of intent-to-treat analysis, and lack of information about the number of participants retained in the study.

Study 1: Outcomes table

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child outcomes – RCT in New York State					
Cognitive Skills	Cooperative Preschool Inventory (CPI) (Direct assessment)	D = 0.63	Yes	Not reported	Post-intervention Cohort 1

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
School readiness	Metropolitan Readiness Test (Administrative data)	d =0.21	No	Not reported	Post-intervention Cohort 2
Reading skills	Metropolitan Achievement Test (Administrative data)	d = 0.28	No	Not reported	Post-intervention Cohort 1
Reading skills	Metropolitan Achievement Test (Administrative data)	d = 0.09	No	Not reported	Post-intervention Cohort 2
Reading skills	Metropolitan Achievement Test (Administrative data)	d = 0.75	Yes	Not reported	1-year follow-up Cohort 1
Reading skills	Metropolitan Achievement Test (Administrative data)	d = 0.07	No	Not reported	1-year follow-up Cohort 2
Maths skills	Metropolitan Achievement Test (Administrative data)	d = 0.34	No	Not reported	Post-intervention Cohort 1
Maths skills	Metropolitan Achievement Test (Administrative data)	d = 0.22	No	Not reported	Post-intervention Cohort 2

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Maths skills	Metropolitan Achievement Test (Administrative data)	d =0.39	No	Not reported	1-year follow-up Cohort 1
Maths skills	Metropolitan Achievement Test (Administrative data)	d = 0.10	No	Not reported	1-year follow-up Cohort 2
Classroom adaptation	Child Classroom Adaptation Index (Teacher report)	d = 0.69	Yes	Not reported	Post-intervention Cohort 1
Classroom adaptation	Child Classroom Adaptation Index (Teacher report)	d = 0.22	No	Not reported	Post-intervention Cohort 2
Classroom adaptation	Child Classroom Adaptation Index (Teacher report)	d =0.68	Yes	Not reported	1-year follow-up Cohort 1
Classroom adaptation	Child Classroom Adaptation Index (Teacher report)	d = 0.12	No	Not reported	1-year follow-up Cohort 2
Child outcomes – QED in Arkansas					
Cognitive Skills	Cooperative Preschool Inventory (CPI) (Teacher report)	d = 0.10	No	Not reported	Post-intervention Cohort 1

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
School readiness	Metropolitan Readiness Test (Administrative data)	d =0.47	No	Not reported	Post-intervention Cohort 2
School achievement	Standardised Achievement Test (Administrative data)	N/A	No	Not reported	Post-intervention Cohort 1
School achievement	Standardised Achievement Test (Administrative data)	d = 0.63	Yes	Not reported	Post-intervention Cohort 2
Classroom adaptation	Child Classroom Adaptation Index (Teacher report)	d = 0.42	No	Not reported	Post-intervention Cohort 1
Classroom adaptation	Child Classroom Adaptation Index (Teacher report)	d = 0.22	No	Not reported	Post-intervention Cohort 2
School achievement	Standardised Achievement Test (Administrative data)	d = 0.12	No	Not reported	1-year follow-up Cohort 1
School achievement	Standardised Achievement Test (Administrative data)	d = 0.07	No	Not reported	1-year follow-up Cohort 2

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Classroom adaptation	Child Classroom Adaptation Index (Teacher report)	d = 0.59	Yes	Not reported	1-year follow-up Cohort 1
Classroom adaptation	Child Classroom Adaptation Index (Teacher report)	d = 0.13	No	Not reported	1-year follow-up Cohort 2

Individual study summary: Study 2

Study 2	
Study design	QED
Country	United States
Sample characteristics	• 108 families with preschool children living in southwestern USA (cohort 1) • 262 children in third grade living in southwestern USA (cohort 2)
Race, ethnicities, and nationalities	Latino – 100% of the sample
Population risk factors	• The intervention site served low-income, Spanish-speaking families; 34.3% of mothers had not graduated from high school (cohort 1) • Children qualified for free or reduced lunch (cohort 2)
Timing	• Post-intervention (after 6 months of intervention) • 4-year-follow-up
Child outcomes	Improved maths achievement
Other outcomes	• Improved parental involvement and efficacy • Improved home environment.
Study Rating	2+

Study 2	
Citation	Nievar, M. A., Jacobson, A., Chen, Q., Johnson, U. & Dier, S. (2011) Impact of HIPPY on home learning environments of Latino families. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*. 26 (3), 268–277.

Brief summary

Population characteristics

This study involved two cohorts of families and children. In cohort 1, the study involved 108 families either participating in HIPPY (54 families) or on a wait-list control group for HIPPY (54 families), with a child aged 3 to 4 years, living in a diverse urban district in the southwestern United States. The average age of children was 3 years 11 months. All participants were Latino. The average age of mothers was 30.8 years, and 34.3% of mothers had not graduated from high school.

In cohort 2, the study involved 262 families who either had participated in HIPPY and whose child was now in the third grade (131 families), and, in a comparison group, 131 families who had not participated in HIPPY and whose child was now in the third grade, with similar demographic characteristics. Families were living in the same diverse urban district in the southwestern United States as cohort 1, were Latino, and qualified for free or reduced lunch.

Study design

In cohort 1, families in the HIPPY group were randomly selected from families enrolled in HIPPY, and families in the comparison group were randomly selected from those families on the wait-list for HIPPY. 29% of those randomly selected in the HIPPY group and 36% of those on the wait-list could not be contacted, leaving 108 families. There were no significant differences between groups on the number of adults in the home, number of children in the home, education level of the mother, education level of the father, income, and age of mothers.

In cohort 2, children who had participated in HIPPY and who were now in third grade formed the HIPPY group, and children who had not participated in the HIPPY intervention but who were eligible were randomly selected for the comparison group. None of the children also attended Head Start; some of the children in the HIPPY group had also attended another intervention, a pre-kindergarten school-based intervention serving low-income families.

Measurement

For cohort 1, measures were collected after six months of participation in HIPPY only:

- Parenting stress was measured using the Parent Stress Index-Short Form (Parent report).
- Parental involvement and efficacy were measured using the Parental Involvement and Efficacy questionnaire (Parent report).

- Maternal depression was measured using the Center for Epidemiological Survey-Depression (CES-D) (Parent report).
- Home environment was measured using the Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment (HOME) (Observer report).

For cohort 2, administrative records were used at four-year follow-up:

- Administrative records included state school achievement tests in reading and maths in third grade.

Study retention

Post-intervention

For cohort 1, it appears that 97% of the sample, representing 105 families, were retained at post-intervention.

Four-year-follow-up

For cohort 2, 88% of the sample, representing 230 children, were retained.

Results

Data-analytic strategy

For cohort 1, a MANOVA was conducted to analyse difference between groups on several outcome measures (maternal depression, parenting efficacy, parenting stress and HOME subscales); follow-up univariate analyses (ANOVAs) were then conducted on individual measures to assess the difference between groups. In addition, multiple regression analyses were conducted to assess the effect of HIPPY controlling for parental income and education.

For cohort 2, the HIPPY and comparison group were compared using a t-test, and with a regression analysis controlling for family income.

For both cohorts, there was no information about whether an intent-to-treat approach was used. In regression analyses, missing data was handled with full information maximum likelihood.

Findings

In cohort 1, the study showed positive significant effects favouring the HIPPY group for a number of parenting outcomes: the HIPPY group had more positive scores than the comparison group for parental involvement and efficacy, and for aspects of the home environment. Conversely, the wait-list comparison group had a more favourable physical environment than those in the HIPPY group.

In cohort 2, the study showed a positive significant effect favouring the HIPPY group for maths scores in third grade, compared to the comparison group.

Limitations

The study lacked information about retention of participants and intent-to-treat approach.

Study 2: Outcomes table

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child outcomes					
Reading achievement	Third-grade state achievement test (Administrative data)	N/A	No	232	4-year follow-up
Maths achievement	Third-grade state achievement test (Administrative data)	d = 0.43	Yes	230	4-year follow-up
Parent outcomes					
Parenting stress	Parenting stress index (PSI) (Parent-report)	N/A	No		Post-intervention
Parental involvement and efficacy	Parental Involvement and Efficacy (Parent-report)	D = 0.66	Yes	105	Post-intervention
Parental depression	Cener for Epidemiological Survey-Depression (CES-D) (Parent-report)	N/A	No	Not reported	Post-intervention
Home environment	HOME – learning materials (Observer report)	d = 0.82	Yes	105	Post-intervention

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Home environment	HOME – language stimulation (Observer report)	N/A	No	Not reported	Post-intervention
Home environment	HOME – responsivity (Observer report)	N/A	No	Not reported	Post-intervention
Home environment	HOME – academic stimulation (Observer report)	d = 0.73	Yes	105	Post-intervention
Home environment	HOME – modelling (Observer report)	d = 0.41	Yes	105	Post-intervention
Home environment	HOME – variety (Observer report)	d = 1.30	Yes	105	Post-intervention
Home environment	HOME – acceptance (Observer report)	N/A	No	Not reported	Post-intervention
Home environment	HOME – physical environment (Observer report)	D = 0.66	Yes favouring comparison group*	105	Post-intervention

* This outcome was significant but favoured the comparison group, i.e. a negative effect of the HIPPY intervention.

Other studies

The following studies were identified for this intervention but did not count towards the intervention's overall evidence rating. An intervention receives the same rating as its most robust study or studies.

Barhava-Monteith, G., Harre, N. & Field, J. (1999).A promising start: An evaluation of the HIPPY program in New Zealand. *Early Child Development and Care*. 159 (1), 145–157.

Barnett, T., Roost, F. D. & McEachran, J. (2012) Evaluating the effectiveness of the Home Interaction Program for Parents and Youngsters (HIPPY). *Family Matters*. 91 (1), 27–37.

Bradley, R. H. & Gilkey, B. (2002) The impact of the Home Instructional Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) on school performance in 3rd and 6th grades. *Early Education and Development*. 13 (3), 301–312.

Brown, A. L. (2013) The impact of early intervention on the school readiness of children born to teenage mothers. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*. 13 (2), 181–195.

Brown, A. L. (n.d.). *The effects of the Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) program on school performance in 3rd, 5th, 7th and 9th grades*. 17th International Roundtable on School, Family, and Community Partnerships, Vancouver, Canada.

Brown, A. L. & Lee, J. (2014) School performance in elementary, middle, and high school: A comparison of children based on HIPPY participation during the preschool years. *School Community Journal*. 24 (2), 83–106.

Brown, A. L. & Lee, J. (2015) Evaluating the efficacy of children participating in Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters and Head Start. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*. 15 (1).

Chatterji, S. (2014) *The long-term effect of the Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) program on academic achievement: Evidence from a school district in Texas*. Honors Thesis, Stanford University.

Dosmukhambetova, D. & Ridling, J. (2016) HIPPY: Literacy and numeracy outcomes for NZ children. Great Potentials. (Prior to submission).

Eldering, L. & Vedder, P. (1999) The Dutch experience with the Home Intervention Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY). In *Effective early education: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 259–285). Routledge.

Gilley, T. (2003) *Early days, much promise: An evaluation of the Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) in Australia*. Victoria University.

Godfrey, C. (2006. *Responses to an early childhood educational intervention with disadvantaged families: An exploratory study*. Doctoral dissertation, Victoria University.

Goldstein, K. & Karasik, S. (2015) *Support for parents with preschool children: Effects of program participation on education and involvement*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Green, J. (2008) *Challenging disadvantage: The social outcomes of an early educational intervention within the family*. Doctoral dissertation, Victoria University.

Gumpel, T. P. (1999) Use of item response theory to develop a measure of first-grade readiness. *Psychology in the Schools*. 36 (4), 285–293.

Johnson, U. Y., Martinez-Cantu, V., Jacobson, A. L. & Weir, C.-M. (2012) The Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters Program's relationship with mother and school outcomes. *Early Education & Development*. 23 (5), 713–727.

Kagitcibasi, C., Sunar, D. & Bekman, S. (2001) Long-term effects of early intervention: Turkish low-income mothers and children. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*. 22 (4), 333–361.

Kagitcibasi, C., Sunar, D., Bekman, S., Baydar, N. & Cemalcilar, Z. (2009) Continuing effects of early enrichment in adult life: The Turkish Early Enrichment Project 22 years later. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*. 30 (6), 764–779.

Liddell, M., Barnett, T., Hughes, J. & Diallo Roost, F. (2009) *The home learning environment and readiness for school: A 12-month evaluation of the Home Interaction Program for Parents and Youngsters (HIPPY) in Victoria and Tasmania*. Brotherhood of St Laurence.

Liddell, M., Barnett, T., Roost, F. D. & McEachran, J. (2011) *Investing in our future: An evaluation of the national rollout of the Home Interaction Program for Parents and Youngsters (HIPPY)*. Final report to the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.

Mani-Aiken, I. (2004) הפעלת תכנית האתגר ותפוקותיה מזרח ירושלים תשסב-תשסג. NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel, School of Education.

Palladino, D. K. (n.d.) *Evaluation of the 2015-16 Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) Program*. Department of Evaluation and Assessment, Dallas Independent School District.

Prairie Research Associates (PRA) Inc. (2015) *Evaluation of the Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) Program*. HIPPY Canada.

Van Tuijl, C. & Leseman, P. P. M. (2004) Improving mother-child interaction in low-income Turkish-Dutch families: A study of mechanisms mediating improvements resulting from participating in a home-based preschool intervention program. *Infant and Child Development*. 13 (4), 323–340.

Van Tuijl, P. P. M. & Leseman, J. C. (2001) Efficacy of an intensive home-based educational intervention programme for 4- to 6-year-old ethnic minority children in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*. 25 (2), 148–159.

–

Note on provider involvement: This provider has agreed to Foundations' terms of reference (or the Early Intervention Foundation's terms of reference), and the assessment has been conducted and published with the full cooperation of the intervention provider