

Intervention for Control Children

Grade 1/Year 2

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: O2K

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 second year of administration of the study. For the control sample, 39 were from Durham, 40 were from Nashville, 40 were from Pennsylvania, and 36 were from Washington. For the normative sample, 26 were from Durham, 40 were from Nashville, 29 were from Pennsylvania, and 28 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	
Control	155	91%	9%	95%	5%	0
Normative	387	94%	6%	96%	4%	0
Control and Normative (with overlap)	463	92%	8%	94%	6%	0

IV. Differences Between Groups

Most children in both the control and normative sample were not in classrooms where the PATHS curriculum was being given. For a number of children in the normative group (264), no response at all was noted for questions 1 and 2. In addition, 264 children from the combined control and normative sample were missing responses for both questions 1 and 2. No responses for the third question were noted for any children in any of the samples.

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.