Lecture 21: Finish Program Evaluation
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- Mean = .50
- Median = .47
- sd = .29
- N = 502
General Conclusions

- Across studies there is evidence that well-developed programs seem to have some positive effects.
- "We thus believe that a strongly favorable conclusion about the efficacy of well-developed psychological treatment is justified by the results of meta-analytic investigation" (Lipsey & Wilson, 1993, p. 2000)
Surefire Paths to Success (p. 428)

- What to do if you want to see that your program works? Some ideas…rely on testimonials and capitalize on regression artifacts
- "Human courtesy and gratitude being what it is, the most dependable means of assuring a favorable evaluation is to use voluntary testimonials for those who have had the treatment" (p. 426)

Regression Toward the Mean

- Extreme Scores at one time are not likely to be as extreme on a second testing.
- "Regression to the mean is as inevitable as death and taxes.
- Why? Two sets of scores are never perfectly correlated.
- Take the 32 people who scored 60 or worse on Exam 1. What was their average gain from Exam 1 to Exam 2? 10.55 points! What about those 37 people who scored 87 or better? What was their average difference? A loss of 4.39 points.

Psychological Treatments that Cause Harm

Lilienfeld (2007)
# A Selected List of Potentially Harmful Therapies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Potential Harm</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Incident Stress Debriefing (CISD)</td>
<td>Heightened Risk for PTSD</td>
<td>Randomized Control Trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared Straight Interventions</td>
<td>Exacerbation of Conduct Problems</td>
<td>Randomized Control Trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARE</td>
<td>Increased ATOD Use</td>
<td>Randomized Control Trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot-camp Interventions</td>
<td>Exacerbation of Conduct Problems</td>
<td>Meta-Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Critical Incident Stress Debriefing

- An intense “therapy” session 24 to 72 hrs after a traumatic event. Usually in a group setting.
- Effect size: $d = -0.11$ for PTSD symptoms (Control Group Lower!)

## Scared Straight Programs (Petrosino et al. 2003)

- Controlled Random Trial in 1982 showed that participants in experimental group were more likely to be arrested (Finckenauer, 1982)
- Meta-analysis revealed that intervention increased odds of offending about 1.7:1
Drug Abuse and Resistance Education

- General Features: Uniformed Police teach school kids about risks of drug use and teach social skills.
- Many null-effects reported in the literature
- Some studies have shown that these programs may actually increase alcohol and other drug use (Werch & Owen, 2002)

Bootcamp Interventions

- A meta-analysis showed little overall effects (9 positive, 8 iatrogenic, and 12 null effects)
- Several highly publicized deaths which seem to be a consequence of violence or physical restraint

When Interventions Harm…

See Dishion, McCord, & Poulin (1999)
Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study
(McCord, 1978)

- Richard Clark Cabot started the project in 1935.
- Matched pairs where one boy was randomly assigned to treatment. (N = 506)
- Treatment began in 1939 when the boys were between 5 and 13.
- A short-term follow-up yielded no evidence for treatment effects (Powers & Witmer, 1951)
- Between 1975 and 1976, McCord was able to follow-up 480 men (but 48 of those were dead). She mailed questionnaires to participants and received 54% back from the Treatment Group and 60% back from the Control Group.
- She also obtained official records

Subjective Evaluations....
(McCord, 1978, p. 287)

- In what ways (if any) was the Cambridge-Somerville project helpful to you?
  - 11 failed to comment and 13 said it had not been helpful. Two thirds said it was helpful. (n = 113)
  - “Helped me have faith and trust in other people”
  - “Helped prepare me for manhood”
  - “Better insight on life in general”
  - “I probably would be in jail”
  - “My life would have gone the other way”

Were There Differences in Adult Criminal Behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Record</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential iatrogenic Effects. Men who had been in treatment....
(McCord, 1978, p. 288)
• Were more likely to commit (at least) a second crime.
• Were more likely to show signs of alcoholism.
• Were more likely to show signs of serious mental illness.
• Tended to have occupations with lower prestige.
• Tended to report that their work was not satisfying.
• Important: The side effects that seem to have resulted from treatment were subtle (p. 288).

Dishion et al. (1999) – Adolescent Transitions Program
• Parent Focus: Parenting Skills
• Teen Focus: Prosocial Goals and Self-Regulation using peer reinforcement
• Both lasted 12 weeks
• Randomly assigned 119 high risk youth to four conditions:
  – Parent Focus
  – Teen Focus
  – Both Parent and Teen "Hypothesized as Optimal"
  – Attention Placebo Group
• Also recruited a control group (n = 38)

Dishion et al., 1999, p. 757
• “The combined parent and teen focus intervention programs did not reduce risk for substance use and delinquency, as hypothesized.”
• “Unfortunately, more complete long-term analysis revealed that negative effects were associated with the teen focus curriculum.”
Dishion et al.

- “In short, aggregating peers, under some circumstances, can produce short- and long-term iatrogenic effects on problem behavior.”
- Caveat: Such effect may not generalize to treatments for depressed youth (pure cases).
- “Early adolescence is an especially vulnerable time for peer effects on social development, at least for children at high risk for delinquency.”
Post-Script – Meta-Analysis

- Weiss et al. (2005) conducted a meta-analysis of 18 studies on the group treatment of antisocial youth
- They found little evidence that group-based approaches are associated with iatrogenic effects. This is an OVERALL EFFECT.
- The possible exception might be programs of interventions geared to early adolescents (Lilienfeld, 2007)