

Last reviewed: September 2017

Intervention website: <http://www.incredibleyears.com>

GUIDEBOOK INTERVENTION INFORMATION SHEET

Incredible Years School Age Basic

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	Incredible Years School Age Basic is a parenting intervention for families with concerns about the behaviour of a child between 6 and 12 years old. It is delivered by two Incredible Years certified facilitators to groups of up to 12 families for 16 weeks. During these sessions, parents learn strategies for interacting positively with their child and discouraging challenging child behaviour.
Evidence rating	3+
Cost rating	2
Child outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Preventing crime, violence and antisocial behaviour<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Improved behaviour- Reduced hyperactivity.
Child age (population characteristic)	4 to 8 years old
Level of need (population characteristic)	Targeted Indicated

Foundations Guidebook – Intervention information sheet

Visit the Foundations Guidebook | www.foundations.org.uk/guidebook

Intervention summary	
Race and ethnicities (population characteristic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• White• Minoritised ethnic groups.
Type (model characteristic)	Group
Setting (model characteristic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Primary school• Community centre• Out-patient health setting.
Workforce (model characteristic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mental health practitioners• Psychologists• Nurses• Teachers• Social workers.
UK available?	Yes
UK tested?	Yes

Model description

Incredible Years School Age Basic is part of the Incredible Years series of interventions for children, parents, and teachers. IY School Age Basic is specifically for parents with concerns about the behaviour of a child aged between 6 and 12 years.

IY School Age Basic is suitable for children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), oppositional defiant disorder (ODD), conduct disorder (CD), or difficulties with peer relationships. It aims to increase the use of effective parenting strategies and ultimately reduce antisocial or criminal behaviour in children who may be at risk.

The intervention is delivered in 12 to 16 two-hour sessions by a lead and co-practitioner to groups of 8 to 12 parents. When combined with the Advanced Programme, parents attend an additional 10 to 12 sessions depending on the needs of the target group. It can also be delivered individually to families in 12 to 16 sessions lasting 1.5 to 2 hours each.

During the sessions, parents engage in group discussions guided by facilitators, sharing experiences and understanding the rationale behind the strategies. Role-plays allow parents to practice new strategies, tailoring them to specific issues faced at home. Homework encourages

Foundations Guidebook – Intervention information sheet

Visit the Foundations Guidebook | www.foundations.org.uk/guidebook

parents to implement these strategies with their children, and they return to the group to refine their approach with feedback. Weekly reading assignments offer theoretical and practical guidance, while video vignettes showcase diverse parenting scenarios, helping parents develop effective strategies tailored to their unique family situations.

Target population

Age of child	6 to 12 years old
Target population	Parents of children aged 6 to 12 years diagnosed with oppositional-defiant or conduct disorder.

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
Challenging child behaviours during primary school increase the risk of more serious behavioural problems occurring in adolescence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective parenting behaviours help the child to regulate their own behaviour and reduce the risk of child behavioural problems persisting • Ineffective parenting strategies can increase the risk of child behavioural problems persisting. 	Parents experiencing difficulties with the behaviour of a child, including a child diagnosed with ADHD, frequently benefit from further support.	<p>Parents learn how to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote positive parent–child interaction • Reinforce positive child behaviour • Discourage challenging child behaviour through age-appropriate discipline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents implement effective parenting strategies in the home • Parents' confidence increases • Parental stress reduces • Parent–child interaction improves. 	Children's self-regulatory capabilities and behaviour improves.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children are at less risk of antisocial behaviour in adolescence • Children are more cooperative and better able to engage positively with others.



Implementation requirements

Who is eligible?	Parents of children aged 6 to 12 years old diagnosed with oppositional-defiant or conduct disorder.
How is it delivered?	Incredible Years School Age Basic is delivered in 12 to 16 sessions of two hours' duration each by two practitioners, to groups of 8 to 12 parents.
What happens during the intervention?	<p>Group discussion and brainstorm: guided by facilitators, parents discuss new content, share their own experiences, and come to an understanding of the rationale behind the parenting strategies that are presented to them during the intervention.</p> <p>Role-plays: parents practice strategies in the parent role, and experience the new strategies from the child's point of view. Role-play is tailored to represent specific issues that families in the group are experiencing at home.</p> <p>Homework: parents take what they have discussed and practised in the group and try the new strategies at home with their own children. They come back to the group to report on what worked and what did not work, so that they can receive ideas and feedback to refine their practice.</p> <p>Parent book: parents have a reading assignment each week that provides some theory behind the strategies that they are learning, as well as practical examples of how to implement the new strategies.</p> <p>Video vignettes: parents watch vignettes of other parents who represent a diverse range of cultures, family circumstances, and child developmental level. From these vignettes, the parents develop principles of effective parenting and think about how they wish to apply these with their own children.</p>
Who can deliver it?	Practitioners with experience in a helping profession, including psychologists, nurses, teachers, or social workers.
What are the training requirements?	The practitioners have 21 hours of intervention training. Booster training of practitioners is recommended.
How are practitioners supervised?	It is recommended that practitioners are supervised by one IY School Age supervisor.
What are the systems for maintaining fidelity?	<p>Intervention fidelity is maintained through the following processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training manual • Other printed material • Video or DVD training



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face-to-face training • Fidelity monitoring • Review of therapy sessions via video <p>Skype consultation.</p>
Is there a licensing requirement?	No
*Contact details	<p>Contact person: Carolyn Webster-Stratton</p> <p>Organisation: Incredible Years</p> <p>Email address: cwebsterstratton1@icloud.com incredibleyears@incredibleyears.com</p> <p>Websites: http://www.incredibleyears.com http://www.incredibleyears.com/early-intervention-programs/child</p> <p>*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.</p>

Evidence summary

Incredible Years School Age Basic's most rigorous evidence comes from two RCTs consistent with Foundations' L3 evidence strength criteria. Evidence from at least one level 3 study, along with evidence from other studies rated 2 or better qualifies Incredible Years School Age Basic for a 3+ rating.

The first of these was conducted in the UK, observing statistically significant improvements in Incredible Years School Age Basic parents' reports of child conduct problems, oppositional behavioural and behaviour associated with ADHD in comparison to families not receiving the intervention.

The second study was conducted in the US, observing statistically significant improvements in Incredible Years School Age Basic parents' reports of their child's behaviour at home and teacher reports of IY children's behaviour at school in comparison to parents not receiving the intervention.

Incredible Years School Age Basic can be described as evidence-based: it has evidence from at least one rigorously conducted RCT or QED demonstrating a statistically significant positive impact on at least one child outcome.

Child outcomes



Outcome	Improvement index	Interpretation	Study
Reduced oppositional behaviour	+13	10-point improvement on the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (parent report) 4 months later	1
Reduced antisocial behaviour	+20	0.24-point improvement on the Parent Account of Child Symptoms measure (parent report) 4 months later	1, 3
Reduced ADHD symptoms	+17	0.21-point improvement on the Parent Account of Child Symptoms measure (parent report) 4 months later	1
Reduced oppositional defiant disorder diagnosis	+27	22-percentage point reduction in proportion of participants with oppositional defiant disorder diagnosis (measured using the oppositional defiant disorder items of the DSM-IV) 4 months later	1
Improved behaviour at home	+25	11.32-point improvement on a child conduct problems at home composite score (including the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory, the Coders Impressions Inventory for Children, and the Dyadic Parent-Child Interaction Coding System) Immediately after the intervention	2
Improved behaviour at school	+14	7.05-point improvement on child conduct problems at school composite score (including the Teacher Assessment of Social Behaviour scale, the MOOSEs classroom observation coding system) Immediately after the intervention	2



Search and review

	Number of studies
Identified in search	19
Studies reviewed	3
Meeting the L2 threshold	1
Meeting the L3 threshold	2
Contributing to the L4 threshold	0
Ineligible	16

Individual study summary: Study 1

Study 1	
Study design	RCT
Country	United Kingdom
Sample characteristics	112 parents of children aged 5 to 6 years old living in London who scored highly on a measure of antisocial behaviour.
Race, ethnicities, and nationalities	33% minority ethnic
Population risk factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants were living in an area which was among the 5% most deprived English Boroughs 40% of households earned less than £175 weekly 35% of mothers left school at 16.
Timing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline Four months post-intervention.



Study 1	
Child outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced oppositional behaviour (parent report) • Reduced antisocial behaviour (parent report) • Reduced ADHD symptoms (parent report) • Reduced oppositional defiant disorder diagnosis (parent report) • Improved reading ability (child report).
Other outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved parenting warmth (parent interview) • Reduced criticism towards child (parent interview) • Increased play (parent interview) • Increased praise (parent interview) • Increased rewards (parent interview) • Increased use of time out (parent interview) • Reduced use of harsh discipline (parent interview) • Increase in positive attention (expert observation of behaviour) • Increase in seeking cooperation (expert observation of behaviour).
Study Rating	3
Citation	Scott, S., Sylva, K., Doolan, M., Price, J., Jacobs, B., Crook, C. & Landau, S. (2010) Randomised controlled trial of parent groups for child antisocial behaviour targeting multiple risk factors: The SPOKES project. <i>Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry</i> . 51 (1), 48–57.

Brief summary

Population characteristics

This study involved 112 parents of children aged 5 to 6 who scored highly on a measure of antisocial behaviour. Half of participants in the intervention and control groups were boys (68% and 73% respectively). The sample consisted of higher numbers of single parents (56%), and ethnic minorities (33%) compared to national averages. Children went to one of eight schools in Lambeth, London, which was considered among the 5% most deprived English boroughs at the time. Many families lived in public housing and 40% of households earned less than £175 weekly. No significant differences between experimental and control group participants were identified.

Study design

61 parents were randomly allocated to a combination intervention, and 51 were allocated to a low dose control group. The combination intervention included the Incredible Years School Age Basic intervention, alongside Supporting Parents On Kids Education in Schools (SPOKES), a literacy/home reading intervention. The low dose control group received a telephone helpline manned by the same staff, who advised them how best to access regular services. Participants were randomised by a statistician using a statistical analysis software (GENSTAT).



Measurement

Assessments were conducted at baseline (pre-intervention) and four months after the intervention was completed.

Parent–child interaction was measured using the Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (CPRG) observation procedure, where coders were blind to allocation status (Observer report).

Parenting was measured using a semi-structured interview (developed by Rutter and colleagues) in addition to the Parenting Practices Questionnaire (Parent report).

Expressed emotion was measured using the Camberwell Family Interview Criteria (Observer report).

Child antisocial behaviour, ADHD symptoms and emotional disorder symptoms were measured using the Parent Account of Child Symptoms (PASC) measure (Parent report).

Child antisocial behaviour was also measured using the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (ECBI) at baseline and follow-up (Parent report). Teachers also rated antisocial behaviour using the DSM-IV questionnaire (Teacher report).

Reading ability was measured using the British Ability Scale, where assessors were blind to allocation status (Observer report).

Study retention

Post-intervention

97% (109) of the study participants completed assessments post-intervention, representing 95% (58) of the IY school participants and 100% (51) of those allocated to the low dose control.

Results

Data-analytic strategy

An ANCOVA/multiple regression approach was used to examine differences between the intervention and control group. An intent-to-treat design was used and only cases with pre- and follow-up data were included within the analysis.

Findings

The study observed statistically significant improvements in Incredible Year's parents reports of their child's behaviours. These included reductions in antisocial behaviour, ADHD symptoms, and oppositional behaviours and diagnosis. There were also improvements in children's reading ability. However, child emotional symptoms and teacher-reported oppositional behaviours did not show statistically significant improvements.

For parenting outcomes, the study found significant improvements in Incredible Years parents' parenting practices, including increased use of play, positive discipline practices, appropriate use of time-outs, and reductions in harsh discipline. Parents also demonstrated increased warmth and positive attention towards their child, and reduced criticism. Additionally, improvements in



parenting practices related to seeking cooperation and giving commands were observed during expert-coded observations.

However, no statistically significant improvements were observed in the IY group in applying consequences, giving commands, appropriate and positive discipline, and harsh and inconsistent discipline.

Study 1: Outcomes table

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child outcomes					
Antisocial behaviour	Parent Account of Child Symptoms measure (parent report)	$d = .52$	Yes	109	Post-intervention
ADHD symptoms	Parent Account of Child Symptoms measure (parent report)	$d = .44$	Yes	105	Post-intervention
Emotional symptoms	Parent Account of Child Symptoms measure (parent report)	$d = .10$	No	105	Post-intervention
Oppositional defiant disorder diagnosis	DSM-IV oppositional defiant disorder items (Parent interview)	N/A	Yes	109	Post-intervention
Reading ability	British Ability Scales (achievement test)	$d = .36$	Yes	101	Post-intervention



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Oppositional behaviours	Eyberg Chil Behaviour Inventory (parent report)	d=.34	Yes	96	Post-intervention
Oppositional behaviours	DSM-IV oppositional defiant disorder items (teacher report)	d = 0.3	No	112	Post-intervention
Parent outcomes					
Parenting: Play	Semi-structured interview (parent interview)	d=.31	Yes	105	Post-intervention
Parenting: Praise	Semi-structured interview (parent interview)	d=.59	Yes	88	Post-intervention
Parenting: Rewards	Semi-structured interview (parent interview)	d=.41	Yes	89	Post-intervention
Parenting: Consequences	Semi-structured interview (parent interview)	d = 0.3	No	90	Post-intervention
Parenting: Time out	Semi-structured interview (parent interview)	d=.38	Yes	85	Post-intervention
Parenting: Harsh discipline	Semi-structured interview (parent interview)	d=.48	Yes	85	Post-intervention



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Parenting: Warmth	Camberwell Family Interview criteria (parent interview)	d=.63	Yes	99	Post-intervention
Parenting: Criticism	Camberwell Family Interview criteria (parent interview)	d=.51	Yes	99	Post-intervention
Parenting: Positive attention	Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group Parenting Observation procedure (expert observation of behaviour)	d=.54	Yes	91	Post-intervention
Parenting: Seek cooperation	Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group Parenting Observation procedure (expert observation of behaviour)	d=.35	Yes	99	Post-intervention
Parenting: Give commands	Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group Parenting Observation procedure (expert observation of behaviour)	d = .14	No	91	Post-intervention
Parenting: Appropriate and positive discipline	Parenting Practices questionnaire (parent report)	d = .23	No	83	Post-intervention



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Parenting: Harsh and inconsistent discipline	Parenting Practices questionnaire (parent report)	$d = .28$	No	83	Post-intervention

Individual study summary: Study 2

Study 2	
Study design	RCT
Country	United States
Sample characteristics	159 families with children in preschool or elementary aged 4 to 8 years old who met the DSM-IV criteria for oppressive-defiant disorder
Race, ethnicities, and nationalities	79% White European
Population risk factors	25.8% of participants were single mothers
Timing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline • Post-intervention.
Child outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved behaviour at home (composite score) • Improved behaviour at school (composite score).
Other outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced negative parenting (composite score) • Improved positive parenting (composite score).
Study Rating	3
Citation	Webster-Stratton, C., Reid, M. J. & Hammond, M. (2004) Treating children with early-onset conduct problems: Intervention outcomes for parent, child, and teacher training. <i>Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology</i> . 33 (1), 105–124.



Brief summary

Population characteristics

This study involved 159 families with children aged four to eight years diagnosed with oppositional defiant disorder (ODD). Approximately 90% of the children were boys, with a mean age of 70.99 months and 79% were White European. 25.8% of the families were single mothers, with a mix of socioeconomic backgrounds. No significant differences were identified between treatment conditions according to demographic variables or outcome measures.

Study design

Participants were randomly assigned to one of six groups: 1) 31 to Parent training (Incredible Years Preschool BASIC+ADVANCE), 2) 24 to parent plus teacher training, 3) 30 to child training (incredible years dinosaur school), 4) 23 to child plus teacher training, 5) 25 to parent, child, and teacher training, and 6) 26 to a wait-list control group, by drawing names at random. The control group received no treatment from the parenting clinic and had no contact with a therapist during the waiting period.

Measurement

Assessments were conducted at baseline (pre-intervention) and post-intervention. The same measures were completed at all assessment points.

Child conduct problems at home were assessed using three measures. Parents completed the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (ECBI) (parent report), while observer reports were gathered using the Coder Impressions Inventory – Parenting Style (CII–Parenting Style) (observer report) and the Dyadic Parent-Child Interaction Coding System (DPICS–R) (observer report). For all observer reports, assessors were blind to allocation condition.

Parenting styles and skills were evaluated through both parent and observer reports. Parents provided information via the Parenting Practices Interview (Parent report) and the Parent Daily Discipline Inventory (Parent report) while observer assessments were conducted using the Dyadic Parent-Child Interaction Coding System (DPICS–R) (Observer report) and the Coder Impressions Inventory – Parenting Style (CII–Parenting Style) (Observer report).

Child conduct problems at school were measured using teacher and observer reports. Teachers completed the Teacher Assessment of School Behavior (TASB) (Teacher report) and the Teacher Rating Scales of Perceived Competence Scale for Young Children (PCSC) (Teacher report) which assessed behaviour conduct scores. In addition, two summary scores from classroom observations were included: the MOOSES Classroom Observation (Observer report), which recorded the frequency of negative behaviours with teachers and peers, and the Social Health Profile (SHP) (Observer report), which provided a coder rating of poor authority acceptance.

Study retention

97.5% (155) of the sample completed measures post-intervention. There were no significant differences in drop-out rate by treatment condition.



Results

Data-analytic strategy

Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with pretest scores as covariates were used to examine the differences between each treatment condition. Planned comparisons contrasting each treatment condition with the control condition were also conducted. A per-protocol analysis was used. Participants were excluded from the analysis if more than 60% of the data for a given item was missing, or if the composite score was missing at one of the timepoints.

Findings

The study observed statistically significant improvements in children’s conduct problems at home, as reported by both mothers and fathers. These improvements were based on composite scores incorporating parent reports and expert observations. Additionally, there were statistically significant reductions in children’s conduct problems at school, as reported by teachers and assessed through expert observations. However, no statistically significant improvements were observed in children’s social competence with peers’ post-intervention.

The study also reported statistically significant reductions in negative parenting behaviours for both mothers and fathers. These reductions included decreased harsh and inappropriate discipline practices as measured by observational and self-report methods. Furthermore, statistically significant improvements were noted in positive parenting behaviours for both mothers and fathers.

Study 2: Outcomes table

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child outcomes					



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child conduct problems at home – mother	A composite score consisting of the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (parent report), the Dyadic Parent-Child Interaction Coding System (expert observation of behaviour), and the CII-Parenting Style (expert observation of behaviour)	$d = 0.67$	Yes	57	Post-intervention
Child conduct problems at home – father	A composite score consisting of the Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory (parent report), the Dyadic Parent-Child Interaction Coding System (expert observation of behaviour), and the CII-Parenting Style (expert observation of behaviour)	$d = 0.63$	Yes	45	Post-intervention



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child social competence with peers	A composite score consisting of the Teacher Assessment of School Behaviour (teacher report), Social Health Profile (expert observation of behaviour), and the Dyadic Peer Interaction scale (expert observation of behaviour)	N/A	No	56	Post-intervention
Child conduct problems at school	A composite score consisting of the Teacher Assessment of School Behaviour (teacher report), the Perceived Competence Scale for Young Children (teacher report), MOOSSES classroom observation system (expert observation of behaviour), Social Health Profile (expert observation of behaviour), and the Dyadic Peer Interaction scale (expert observation of behaviour)	$d = 0.35$	Yes	56	Post-intervention



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Parent outcomes					
Negative parenting - mother	Composite score including one scale from the Parenting Practices Interview (harsh–inappropriate discipline), two observational variables from the Coder Impressions Inventory for parents (CII; harsh–critical and family needs intervention), one variable from the DPICS–R (total number of critical statements made by the parent to the child), and one variable from mother telephone reports on the Daily Discipline Inventory	d = 0.81	Yes	57	Post-intervention



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Negative parenting – father	Composite score including one scale from the Parenting Practices Interview (harsh–inappropriate discipline), two observational variables from the Coder Impressions Inventory for parents (CII; harsh–critical and family needs intervention), one variable from the DPICS–R (total number of critical statements made by the parent to the child), and one variable from mother telephone reports on the Daily Discipline Inventory	$d = 0.51$	Yes	45	Post-intervention
Positive parenting–Mother	Composite score including one scale from the Parenting Practices Interview (supportive parenting), one summary score from DPICS–R (positive parenting), and one from the CII (nurturing–supportive parenting)	$d = 0.51$	Yes	56	Post-intervention



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Positive parenting – Father	Composite score including one scale from the Parenting Practices Interview (supportive parenting), one summary score from DPICS–R (positive parenting), and one from the CII (nurturing–supportive parenting)	$d = 0.35$	Yes	46	Post-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.

Beckett, C., Beecham, J., Doolan, M., Ford, T., Kallitsoglou, A., Scott, S. & Sylva, K. (2012) *Which type of parenting programme best improves child behaviour and reading? The Helping Children Achieve trial*. Unpublished report.

Cullen, S. M. (2010) *The Parenting Early Intervention Programme, 2006-2010: Parents' perceptions of parenting courses as an educative process leading to changes in family life*. Unpublished report.

Hutchings, J., Bywater, T., Williams, M. E., Shakespeare, M. K. & Whitaker, C. (2009) *Evidence for the extended school aged Incredible Years parent programme with parents of high-risk eight to 16 year olds*. Unpublished manuscript.

Hutchings, J., Bywater, T., Williams, M. E., Whitaker, C., Lane, E. & Shakespeare, K. (2011) The extended school aged Incredible Years parent programme. *Child Adolescent Mental Health*. 16 (3), 136–143.

Javier, J. R., Coffey, D. M., Schragar, S. M., Palinkas, L. A. & Miranda, J. (2016) Parenting intervention for prevention of behavioral problems in elementary school-age Filipino-American children: A pilot study in churches. *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics*. 37 (9), 737–745.



Lau, A. S., Fung, J. J., Ho, L. Y., Liu, L. L. & Gudiño, O. G. (2011) Parent training with high-risk immigrant Chinese families: A pilot group randomized trial yielding practice-based evidence. *Behavior Therapy*. 42 (3), 413–426.

Lees, D. G. & Ronan, K. R. (2008) Engagement and effectiveness of parent management training (Incredible Years) for solo high-risk mothers: A multiple baseline evaluation. *Behaviour Change*. 25 (2), 109–128.

Letarte, M. J., Normandeau, S. & Allard, J. (2010) Effectiveness of a parent training program ‘Incredible Years’ in a child protection service. *Child Abuse and Neglect*. 34, 253–261.

Linares, L. O. et al. (2006) A promising parent intervention in foster care. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 74 (1), 32–41.

Lindsay, G. (2008) *Parenting early intervention pathfinder evaluation: Final report*. Unpublished report.

Lindsay, G., Totsika, V. & Law, J. (2011) *Parenting Early Intervention Programme evaluation* (Research Report DFE-RR121 (a)). Department for Education.

Lindsay, G. & Cullen, M. A. (2011) *Evaluation of the Parenting Early Intervention Programme: A short report to inform local commissioning processes*. (Research Report DFE-RR121 (b)). Department for Education.

Lindsay, G. & Strand, S. (2013) Evaluation of the national roll-out of parenting programmes across England: The Parenting Early Intervention Programme (PEIP). *BMC Public Health*. 13 (1), 972.

Nilsen, W. (2007) Fostering futures: A preventive intervention program for school-age children in foster care. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. 12 (1), 45–63.

Reid, M. J., Webster-Stratton, C. H. & Hammond, M. (2007) Enhancing classroom social competence by offering parent training to families of moderate- to high-risk elementary school children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*. 36 (4), 605–620.

Scott, S., Sylva, K., Kallitsoglou, A. & Ford, T. (2014) *Which type of parenting programme best improves child behaviour and reading? Follow up of The Helping Children Achieve trial. Final report to Nuffield Foundation*. Unpublished report.

Trillingsgaard, T., Trillingsgaard, A. & Webster-Stratton, C. (2014) Assessing the effectiveness of the ‘Incredible Years® parent training’ to parents of young children with ADHD symptoms: A preliminary report. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*. 55 (6), 538–545.

—

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.

