# EARLY INTERVENTION FOUNDATION

# GUIDEBOOK

Published January 2023

Downloaded from https://guidebook.eif.org.uk/programme/home-instruction-for-parents-of-preschool-youngsters

# Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters

Reviews: Foundations for Life, July 2016; February 2018; February 2019

Note on provider involvement: This provider has agreed to EIF's terms of reference, and the assessment has been conducted and published with the full cooperation of the programme provider.

Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) is a home-visiting programme for parents with a child between the ages of three and five living in disadvantaged communities.

HIPPY helps parents prepare their child for school by improving the home-literacy environment, increasing the quality of parent-child verbal interaction and teaching parents specific skills for scaffolding their child's learning. HIPPY is delivered by para-professionals trained and supervised in the HIPPY model.

The programme consists of 30 sessions that take place over two years (a three-year curriculum is also available), spanning the transition from preschool to primary school. During each 30 to 60-minute visit, parents learn how to use the books and activity packets with their children through role play exercises. Parents also attend group meetings with other parents. During these meetings, a HIPPY paraprofessional introduces the weekly activity packet and parents share questions and concerns with each other and the HIPPY para-professional. Parents are expected to practise HIPPY activities with their child for at least 15 minutes a day.

Evidence rating: **2+** 

Cost rating: 3

# **EIF Programme Assessment**

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

# What does the evidence rating mean?

**Level 2** indicates that the programme has evidence of improving a child outcome from a study involving at least 20 participants, representing 60% of the sample, using validated instruments.

This programme does not receive a rating of 3 as its best evidence is not from a rigorously conducted RCT or QED evaluation.

## What does the plus mean?

The plus rating indicates that a programme's best available evidence is based on an evaluation that is more rigorous than a level 2 standard but does not meet the criteria for level 3.

# **Cost rating**

A rating of **3** indicates that a programme has a **medium cost** to set up and deliver, compared with other interventions reviewed by EIF. This is equivalent to an estimated unit cost of **£500–£999**.

Cost rating: 3

EIF Guidebook > Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters

# Evidence rating: **2+**

# **Child outcomes**

According to the best available evidence for this programme's impact, it can achieve the following positive outcomes for children:

Enhancing school achievement & employment	
Improved cognitive skills	
Based on study 1	
Improved classroom adaption	
Based on study 1	

Improved school readiness

Based on study 1

Improved achievement

Based on study 1

Improved maths achievement

Based on study 2

Improved expressive language skills

Based on study 3

This programme also has evidence of supporting positive outcomes for couples, parents or families that may be relevant to a commissioning decision. Please see the 'About the evidence' section for more detail.

# Key programme characteristics

#### Who is it for?

The best available evidence for this programme relates to the following age-groups:

Preschool

#### How is it delivered?

The best available evidence for this programme relates to implementation through these delivery models:

Home visiting

#### Where is it delivered?

The best available evidence for this programme relates to its implementation in these settings:

Home

The programme may also be delivered in these settings:

Home

#### How is it targeted?

The best available evidence for this programme relates to its implementation as:

Targeted selective

### Where has it been implemented?

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Canada, Germany, Israel, Liberia, New Zealand, United States

## **UK provision**

This programme has not been implemented in the UK.

#### **UK evaluation**

This programme's best evidence does not include evaluation conducted in the UK.

## **Spotlight sets**

٠

EIF does not currently include this programme within any Spotlight set.

# About the programme

## What happens during delivery?

#### How is it delivered?

HIPPY has two components – one which is delivered to individual families by home visitors, and another which is delivered to groups of approximately 20 families (though this will vary). Each component has 15 sessions – with individual component sessions lasting 1.5 hours, and group component sessions lasting between two and three hours.

The home visiting component is delivered by one home visitor para-professional; the supplementary group component is delivered by one programme coordinator.

#### What happens during the intervention?

- The core component of the intervention consists of bimonthly visits by a home visitor to individual families.
- The practitioner uses role play with the parents to demonstrate how to create a more effective home learning environment. The practitioner uses the books and activity packets to teach techniques to teach children more effectively.
- The parent then implements the techniques with the child at home using the same materials.
- Home visiting is supplemented by group meetings held every other week led by the programme coordinator. At these meetings, parents are introduced to next weeks' activities and have an opportunity to raise particular concerns and issues. Various other activities also take place in response to the particular needs of the parents.

## What are the implementation requirements?

#### Who can deliver it?

 The home visiting component is delivered by one home visitor para-professional with QCF-2 qualifications the group component is delivered by one programme coordinator with QCF-6 qualifications.

#### What are the training requirements?

• The practitioners have one week of pre-service training. Booster training of practitioners is recommended.

#### How are the practitioners supervised?

• It is recommended that the programme is supervised by one host-agency supervisor providing skills and case-management supervision with QCF-6 level qualifications and one week of pre-service training.

#### What are the systems for maintaining fidelity?

- 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, there is a licence required to run this programme.

# How does it work? (Theory of Change)

#### How does it work?

- HIPPY is based on the assumption that parental engagement and active participation in learning is important for children's early social, emotional and cognitive development.
- Parents experiencing economic and social disadvantage may have more difficulty supporting their children's early learning at home and at school
- HIPPY teaches parents a variety of strategies for supporting their children's early learning.
- In the short term parents are better able to support their children's early learning.
- In the long term, children will demonstrate greater school readiness and higher achievement in primary school.

#### **Intended outcomes**

Enhancing school achievement & employment

# **Contact details**

Dr. Miriam Westheimermwestheimer@hotmail.comhippy-international.org

# About the evidence

Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters' (HIPPY) most rigorous evidence comes from an RCT which was conducted in the US.

This study identified statistically significant positive impact on a number of child and parent outcomes.

A programme receives the same rating as its most robust study, which in this case is the Baker et al., (1999) study, and so the programme receives a Level 2+ rating overall.

Study 1	
Citation:	Baker et al (1999)
Design:	RCT (New York sample) and QED (Arkansas sample)
Country:	United States
Sample:	247 families (New York) and 226 families (Arkansas)
Timing:	Post-test; 1-year follow-up
Child outcomes	<ul> <li>Improved cognitive skills</li> <li>Improved classroom adaption</li> <li>Improved school readiness</li> <li>Improved achievement</li> </ul>

#### Other outcomes:

None measured

Study rating: 2+

Baker, A., Piotrkowski, C., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (1999). The Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY). *The Future of Children*, 9, 116-133.

Available athttps://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10414013

#### Study design and sample

The first study is an RCT.

This study involved random assignment of volunteer families to a HIPPY treatment group and a control group.

This study was conducted in the US in two different sites – New York and Arkansas. Both sites involved two cohorts. In the New York site, a sample 90 and 157 volunteer families were involved in cohorts 1 and 2, respectively. In the Arkansas site, a sample 113 volunteer families were involved in cohorts 1 and 2, respectively.

#### Measures

For the New York site, child cognitive skills were measured using the Cooperative Preschool Inventory (CPI) (direct assessment). Kindergarten and first-grade standardised achievement on Reading and Math were measured using scores on the Metropolitan Readiness Test in kindergarten (achievement test) and the Metropolitan Achievement Test in first grade (achievement test). Child classroom adaptation was measured using the Child Classroom Adaptation Index (CCAI) (teacher report).

For the Arkansas site, child cognitive skills were measured using the Cooperative Preschool Inventory (CPI) (direct assessment). Child classroom adaptation was measured using the Child Classroom Adaptation Index (CCAI) (teacher report). Standardised achievement scores were measured using the Stanford Early Achievement Test (achievement test).

#### Findings

This study identified statistically significant positive impact on a number of child outcomes.

- This includes:
  - Improved cognitive skills
     Improved classroom adaptic
  - Improved classroom adaptionImproved school readiness
  - Improved school readine
     Improved achievement

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study are limited by methodological issues pertaining to a lack of intention-to-treat analysis and a lack of clarity in terms of attrition, hence why a higher rating is not achieved.

Study 2	
Citation:	Nievar et al (2011)
Design:	QED
Country:	United States
Sample:	108 families in urban southwestern USA
Timing:	Post-test; 5-year follow-up
Child outcome	2S:
	Improved maths achievement

Other outcomes:

Improved parental involvement and efficacy Improved home environment

#### Study rating: 2+

Nievar, M., Jacobson, A., Q., Chen, Johnson, U., & Dier, S. (2011). Impact of HIPPY on home learning environments of Latino families. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 26, 268-277. Available athttp://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0885200611000044

#### Study design and sample

The second study is a QED.

The first investigation involved mothers and children living in an urban area in the south-western US. HIPPY pupils were randomly selected from a larger group of children and compared to a randomly selected group of demographically similar wait-list children.

The second study compared the third-grade achievement test scores of a group of randomly selected low-income Latino HIPPY participants to a randomly selected group of demographically similar non-HIPPY participants.

This study was conducted in the US, with a sample of 108 children in cohort 1 and 262 children in cohort 2. In cohort 1, the average age of the children was 3 years and 11 months. All children were of Latino origin and close to a third (29.7%) of the families had a household income of less than \$15,000. In cohort 2, all children were third-graders, of Latino origin, and gualified for free or reduced lunch.

#### Measures

Child math and reading achievement were measured using the State Achievement Test (achievement test).

Parenting stress and stressors were measured using the Parenting Stress Index (parent report). Parental depression was measured using the Centre for Epidemiological studies depression scale (parent report). Parental involvement and efficacy were measured using the Parental Involvement and Efficacy scale (parent report). Home environment (Learning materials, academic stimulation, modelling, variety, warmth, acceptance, learning simulation, physical environment) was measured using the Home Observation Measurement of the Environment (HOME) (direct assessment).

#### Findings

This study identified statistically significant positive impact on a number of child and parent outcomes.

This includes improved maths achievement.

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study are limited by methodological issues pertaining to a lack of clarity around intention-to-treat analysis and a lack of clarity in terms of attrition, hence why a higher rating is not achieved.

Citation:	Necoechea, 2007
Design:	RCT
Country:	United States
Sample:	51 families, with children between 3 and 4 years old. All families in the sample were low SES and recruited from a neighbourhood with 35% child poverty rate and high school dropout rate.
Timing:	Post-test (15 weeks)

Improved expressive language skills

#### Other outcomes:

None measured

#### Study rating:

Necoechea, D. M. (2007). Children At-Risk for Poor School Readiness: The Effect of an Early Intervention Home Visiting Program on Children and Parents (Doctoral dissertation). Available at

# https://search.proquest.com/openview/0cc2dd8ee3e74980de32d676d7cbb5a8/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y Study design and sample

The third study is an RCT.

2

This study involved random assignment of children to a HIPPY treatment group and a no-treatment control group.

The study included 51 families, with children between 3 and 4 years old, where families were living in the lowest income community in inner-city San Diego. Most parents were immigrated from Mexico, and children's primary language was mainly Spanish. The neighbourhood where families were recruited had a 35% child poverty rate, with 25% of students failing to graduate from high school. Researchers went from door to door to reach these families who are classified as "hard to reach".

#### Measures

Children's receptive language skills were measured using the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (expert observation of behaviour). Children's expressive language skills were measured using the Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (expert observation of behaviour). School readiness was measured using the Developing Skills Checklist (expert observation of behaviour).

Parent involvement in the home was measured using the Parent-Home Survey (parent report). The level of parental participation in the HIPPY programme was measured using the Parent Participation Questionnaire (parent report).

#### Findings

This study identified statistically significant positive impact on one child outcome. This included improved expressive language skills.

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study are limited by methodological issues pertaining to unequivalent groups, hence why a higher rating is not achieved.

# Other studies

The following studies were identified for this programme but did not count towards the programme's overall evidence rating. A programme 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 - **This reference refers to a quasi-experimental design, conducted in New Zealand.** 

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 - This reference refers to a quasi-experimental design, conducted in Australia.

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 - This reference refers to a quasi-experimental design, conducted in the USA.

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 - This reference refers to a quasi-experimental design, conducted in the USA.

Brown, A. L. 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 - **This reference refers to a quasi-experimental design, conducted in the USA.** 

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,

1476718X15577006. Brown, A., & 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 - This reference refers to a quasi-experimental design, conducted in the USA.

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, (May). Honors Thesis: Stanford University - **This reference refers to a quasi-experimental design, conducted in the USA.** 

Dosmukhambetova, D. & Ridling, J. (2016, prior to submission). HIPPY: Literacy and Numeracy Outcomes for NZ Children. Great Potentials

Eldering, L., & Vedder, P. (1999). The Dutch experience with the home intervention program for preschool youngsters (HIPPY). Effective Early Education: Cross-Cultural Perspectives (New York: Falmer, 1999), 259–285.

Gilley, T. (2003). Early days much promise: an evaluation of the Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) in Australia. (Victoria University)- **This reference refers to a quasi-experimental design, conducted in Australia.** 

Godfrey, C. (2006). Responses to an early childhood educational intervention with disadvantaged families: an exploratory study (Doctoral dissertation, Victoria University) - **This reference refers to a pre-post study**, **conducted in Australia.** 

Goldstein, K. and 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) - This reference refers to a pre-post study, conducted in Australia

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 - This reference refers to a quasi-experimental design, conducted in the USA.

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 - This reference refers to a pre-post study, conducted in Turkey.

Liddell, M., Barnett, T., Hughes, J., and 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 - **This reference refers to a pre-post study, conducted in Australia.** 

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 - **This reference refers to a quasi-experimental design, conducted in Australia.** 

Palladino, D.K. Evaluation off the 2015-16 Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) Program. Department of Evaluation and Assessment. Dallas Independent School District - **This reference** refers to a guasi-experimental design, conducted in the USA.

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 - **This reference refers to a quasi-experimental design, conducted in the Netherlands.** 

Van Tuijl, Paul P. M. Leseman, Jan, 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 - This reference refers to a quasi-experimental design, conducted in the Netherlands.

## Guidebook

The EIF Guidebook provides information about early intervention programmes that have at least preliminary evidence of achieving positive outcomes for children. It provides information based on EIF's assessment of the strength of evidence for a programme's effectiveness, and on detail about programmes shared with us by those who design, run and deliver them.

The Guidebook serves an important starting point for commissioners to find out more about effective early interventions, and for programme providers to find out more about what good evidence of impact looks like and how it can be captured. As just one of our key resources for commissioners and practitioners, the Guidebook is an essential part of EIF's work to support the development of and investment in effective early intervention programmes.

Our assessment of the evidence for a programme's effectiveness can inform and support certain parts of a commissioning decision, but it is not a substitute for professional judgment. Evidence about what has worked in the past offers no guarantee that an approach will work in all circumstances. Crucially, the Guidebook is not a market comparison website: ratings and other information should not be interpreted as a specific recommendation, kite mark or endorsement for any programme.

How to read the Guidebook

EIF evidence standards

About the EIF Guidebook

## EIF

The Early Intervention Foundation (EIF) is an independent charity and a member of the What Works network. We support the use of effective early intervention for children, young people and their families: identifying signals of risk, and responding with effective interventions to improve outcomes, reduce hardship and save the public money in the long term.

We work by generating evidence and knowledge of what works in our field, putting this information in the hands of commissioners, practitioners and policymakers, and supporting the adoption of the evidence in local areas and relevant sectors.

www.EIF.org.uk | @TheEIFoundation

10 Salamanca Place, London SE1 7HB | +44 (0)20 3542 2481

# Disclaimer

The EIF Guidebook is designed for the purposes of making available general information in relation to the matters discussed in the documents. Use of this document signifies acceptance of our legal disclaimers which set out the extent of our liability and which are incorporated herein by reference. To access our legal disclaimers regarding our website, documents and their contents, please visit eif.org.uk/terms-conditions/. You can request a copy of the legal disclaimers by emailing info@eif.org.uk or writing to us at Early Intervention Foundation, 10 Salamanca Place, London SE1 7HB.