

## Intervention for Control Children

Grade 6/Year 7

### **Fast Track Project Technical Report**

**Cynthia Rains**

**September 13, 2002**

#### **Table of Contents**

- I. Scale Description
- II. Report Sample
- III. Scaling
- IV. Differences Between Groups
- V. Recommendations for Use

#### **Citation**

##### *Instrument*

Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (CPPRG). (1992). *Intervention for Control Children* [On-line]. Available from <http://www.fasttrackproject.org/>

##### *References*

Kusche, C.A., & Greenberg, M.T. (1994). *The PATHS curriculum*. Seattle, WA: Developmental Research and Programs.

##### *Report*

Rains, C. (2002). *Intervention for Control Children (Fast Track Project Technical Report)* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.fasttrackproject.org/>

#### **Data Sources**

*Raw:* 07K

*Scored:* NA

#### **I. Scale Description**

The Intervention for Control Children measure consists of 3 items that are completed by an observer. The first question asks whether the child is participating in a classroom where PATHS is being given. The PATHS curriculum, Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies, (Kusche & Greenberg, 1994) is an elementary-based program that emphasizes teaching students to identify, understand, and self-regulate their emotions. The second question asks whether the child is participating in a classroom that includes peer pairing. The responses for these first two questions are: don't know, not applicable, no, and, yes. The third and final question asks whether the child is involved in any other interventions. These other interventions are listed as follows: 1) behavioral management, 2) child middle school transition program, 3) friendship group/social club, 4) home visiting, 5) mentoring group, 6) parent group, 7) parent middle school transition program, and 8) other.

#### **II. Report Sample**

These exploratory analyses were conducted on the high-risk control (n=155) and the normative sample (n=387, n=463 including overlap) from the seventh year of administration of the study. For the control sample, 39 were from Durham, 40 were from Nashville, 40 were from Pennsylvania, and 3 were from Washington. For the normative sample, 21 were from Durham, 36 were from Nashville, 23 were from Pennsylvania, and 12 were from Washington.

### III. Scaling

Responses for this measure are recorded on a nominal scale. As such, no scaling program is used. Only the number of responses per question was calculated.

	N	PATHS given?		In class with peer pairing?		Other interventions?
		No	Yes	No	Yes	
<b>Control</b>	155	89%	11%	100%	0%	0
<b>Normative</b>	387	90%	10%	100%	0%	0
<b>Control and Normative (with overlap)</b>	463	89%	11%	100%	0%	0

### IV. Differences Between Groups

Analysts should note that there were a very large number of missing responses for this year of the measure. For the control sample, 33 children were missing responses for question 1 and 78 were missing responses for question 2. For the normative sample, 295 children were missing responses for question 1 and 323 were missing responses for question 2. For the combined control and normative sample, 313 children were missing responses for question 1 and 367 children were missing responses for question 2.

It should also be noted that, as compared to previous years, Washington had a much lower participation rate. In previous years of the study, Washington had 36 control students and 28 normative students. In this year, Washington had only 3 control students and 12 normative students.

### V. Recommendations for Use

This measure was specifically designed for the gathering of general data for use with the Fast Track project. It was not meant for widespread use.