

Post-Visit Reaction Inventory—Child Interviewer Version

Grade 9/Year 10

Fast Track Project Technical Report

Cynthia Rains

January 31, 2003

Table of Contents

- I. Scale Description
- II. Report Sample
- III. Scaling
- IV. Differences Between Groups
- V. Recommendations for Use
- VI. Item and Scale Means and SDs
- VII. Item and Scale Correlations

Citation

Instrument

Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (CPPRG). (1990). *Post-Visit Reaction Inventory* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.fasttrackproject.org/>

Report

Rains, C. (2002). *Post-Visit Reaction Inventory* (Fast Track Project Technical Report). Available from the Fast Track Project website: <http://www.fasttrackproject.org/>

Data Sources

Raw: O10D

Scored: PVIC10

I. Scale Description

The Post-Visit Reaction Inventory originally was a 60-item checklist that was completed by interviewers within 24 hours after each visit. It was developed to provide staff ratings of the family's physical environment, the child's behavior toward the parent during the visit, the mother's and father's behavior toward the child during the visit, parental behavior toward the visitors and probable validity of the data, and the child's and parents' apparent need for intervention. Parent interviewers completed this same measure (see separate technical reports for more detailed information).

During years one and two of the study, the full measure was completed by the child interviewer as well as by the parent interviewer. Starting in year 3, a modified version of the measure was completed by child interviewers. This modified version consisted of only 5 questions (see technical reports for more details).

II. Report Sample

These analyses were conducted on the first cohort on the control sample ($n = 155$) and the normative sample ($n = 387, 463$ with overlap) from the tenth year of the study. One hundred and five records were missing the complete measure. Thirty-four records were missing from the control sample (4 from Durham, 13 from Nashville, 8 from Pennsylvania, and 9 from Washington) and 91 records were missing from the normative sample (14 from Durham, 34 from Nashville, 22 from Pennsylvania, and 21 from Washington). These numbers may reflect some overlap between the two samples.

III. Scaling

For years 8 and on of the study, the measure for the child interviewers consists of only 5 items: item 51--how receptive the child was toward the visitors, item 53--the level of validity for the visit, item 55--whether the child appeared to need academic interventions, item 56--whether the child appeared to need behavioral interventions, and item 57--whether the child appeared to need social skills interventions.

Item 51 is measured on a scale of 0=can't rate, 1=hostile, 2=withdrawn, 3=average, and 4=very well behaved. Item 53 is measured on a scale of 0=can't rate, 1=probably valid, 2=child responses possibly valid, 3=parent responses possibly invalid, and 4=definitely reasons to doubt validity. Items 55-57 are measured as follows: 0=can't rate, 1=not at all, 2=probably not, 3=probably yes, and 4=definitely yes.

For any item whose choices included "Can't rate" as a response, these responses were converted to missing for the purpose of analysis.

IV. Differences Between Groups

A series of t-tests between the high-risk control sample and the normative sample (excluding the overlap) indicated significant differences for three items: whether the child needs academic intervention (O10DRV3), whether the child needs behavioral intervention (O10DRV4) and whether the child needs social skills intervention (O10DRV5).

Post-Visit Inventory—Items: Normative vs. Control

Variable	Normative Sample		Control Sample		DF	t Value	Pr > t
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev			
O10DRV1	3.50	0.74	3.41	0.74	356	-1.18	0.2401
O10DRV2	1.16	0.57	1.19	0.52	356	0.41	0.6802
O10DRV3	1.40	0.88	1.69	1.07	356	2.77	0.0060
O10DRV4	1.55	0.89	1.94	1.14	356	3.60	0.0004
O10DRV5	1.47	0.74	1.72	0.93	356	2.72	0.0068

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.

VI. Item and Subscale Means and SDs

Post-Visit Reaction Inventory—Child Interviewer Items Year 10 Normative Sample

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
O10Drv1	TCs Receptivity Toward Visitors	296	3.4797297	0.7453321	0	4.0000000
O10Drv2	Doubt Validity of Interview and Visit	296	1.1858108	0.5485896	0	4.0000000
O10Drv3	Does Child Need Academic Intervention	296	1.4459459	0.9226622	0	4.0000000
O10Drv4	Does Child Need Behavioral Intervention	296	1.6216216	0.9345018	0	4.0000000
O10Drv5	Does Child Need Social Skills Intervention	296	1.5304054	0.7805395	0	4.0000000

Post-Visit Reaction Inventory—Child Interviewer Items Year 10 Control Sample

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
O10Drv1	TCs Receptivity Toward Visitors	121	3.4049587	0.7368685	1.0000000	4.0000000
O10Drv2	Doubt Validity of Interview and Visit	121	1.1900826	0.5214411	0	4.0000000
O10Drv3	Does Child Need Academic Intervention	121	1.6942149	1.0711596	0	4.0000000
O10Drv4	Does Child Need Behavioral Intervention	121	1.9421488	1.1350295	0	4.0000000
O10Drv5	Does Child Need Social Skills Intervention	121	1.7190083	0.9329446	0	4.0000000

VI. Item and Scale Correlations

Post-Visit Reaction Inventory—Child Interviewer Items Year 10 Report Sample

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 358 Prob > r under H0: Rho=0					
	O10Drv1	O10Drv2	O10Drv3	O10Drv4	O10Drv5
O10Drv1 TCs Receptivity Toward Visitors	1.00000	-0.18555 0.0004	-0.17008 0.0012	-0.30641 <.0001	-0.30314 <.0001
O10Drv2 Doubt Validity of Interview and Visit	-0.18555 0.0004	1.00000	0.11630 0.0278	0.17165 0.0011	0.19541 0.0002
O10Drv3 Does Child Need Academic Intervention	-0.17008 0.0012	0.11630 0.0278	1.00000	0.39372 <.0001	0.35611 <.0001
O10Drv4 Does Child Need Behavioral Intervention	-0.30641 <.0001	0.17165 0.0011	0.39372 <.0001	1.00000	0.63838 <.0001
O10Drv5 Does Child Need Social Skills Intervention	-0.30314 <.0001	0.19541 0.0002	0.35611 <.0001	0.63838 <.0001	1.00000