

About My Parent
Grade 7/Year 8 Update

FAST Track Project Technical Report
Cari McCarty & Suzanne Doyle
January 2001

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 SD's |
| VII. | Scale Correlations |
| VIII. | References |

Citation

Instrument

Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. (1994). About My Parent.

Report

McCarty, C.A., & Doyle, S.R. (2001). About My Parent (Technical Report) [On-line]. Available:
<http://www.fasttrackproject.org/>

Data Sources

Raw: c8ak

Scored: amp8

I. Scale Description

The **About My Parent** questionnaire, adapted from the Discipline and Positive Parenting measures of the Pittsburgh Youth Study (see Thornberry, Huizinga, & Loeber, 1995), is a 17-item measure which assesses children's perceptions of their primary caregivers' parenting responses when they engage in pleasing and displeasing behavior. The first 8 items are drawn from the Discipline measure, and are used to assess the frequency with which parents use different disciplinary strategies for the infraction of family rules. The last 9 items, drawn from the Positive Parenting measure, provide the youth's report on the frequency with which their parent provides positive praise and reinforcement when they do something that the parent approves of. All items are rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always).

II. Report Sample

This technical report is based upon Year 8, Cohort 1 data, including both high-risk control and normative samples. With missing cases excluded, the total N (including overlap) was 385, with 319 normative and 131 high-risk control youth.

78 youth (17% of cohort) were missing observations for the entire measure, including 68 normative youth (18%) and 24 high-risk youth (15%). The missing cases included 15 observations from the Durham site,

22 observations from Nashville, 17 observations from Pennsylvania, and 24 observations from Seattle. Data were missing for 31 girls and 47 boys. Ethnic breakdown for missing data was: 1 Asian, 36 Black, 5 Hispanic, 33 White, 3 Other.

III. Scaling

Two different methods for scaling will be presented. The primary scaling procedure was derived from exploratory factor analyses on the Normative and High-Risk Control (HRC) samples, conducted separately for the Discipline and Positive Parenting items in Years 5 and 6. The alternate scaling was constructed to closely parallel the algorithms used by Loeber and his colleagues in the Pittsburgh Youth Study's "Positive Parenting/Low Reinforcement" construct. It includes items from both the parent and youth versions of this measure, both combined and in separate scales. Although our alternate scale comprises the same items as their scale, our measure uses a 5-point response scale, whereas theirs utilized a 3-point response scale. Each scale score is derived from the mean of the items that compose it, with the exception of Low Reinforcement, which is the sum of the means of the parent and youth reports.

The resulting scales, associated reliability estimates and descriptive indices for the Normative and High-Risk Control samples are provided below. Three items (Items 5, 9, 17) were not used in the scales due to a conceptual difference between them and the other items, as well as lowered internal consistency when these items were retained (based on Year 5 scaling). Higher scores on the scales indicate a higher frequency of the construct label.

Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha

| | <u>Normative (n=319)</u> | <u>HRC (n =131)</u> |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------|
| PRIMARY SCALING PROCEDURE | | |
| Appropriate Discipline (Items 1, 2, 4) | .46 | .43 |
| Harsh Discipline (Items 3, 6, 7, 8) | .49 | .51 |
| Positive Attention (Items 10, 11, 12, 16) | .78 | .80 |
| Tangible Rewards (Items 13, 14, 15) | .79 | .82 |
| ALTERNATE SCALING PROCEDURE | | |
| Low Reinforcement-Youth Report (Child Items 10r-16r) | .86 | .88 |
| Low Reinforcement-Parent Report (Parent Items 9, 10r-16r) | .81 | .81 |
| Low Reinforcement-Combined (Sum of Parent & Youth Report) | .84 | .84 |

IV. Differences Between Groups

A series of independent t-tests were conducted to assess differences between the Low-Risk respondents (Normative sample excluding the overlapping High-Risk Subjects, n = 254) and the High-Risk Control sample (including overlapping Normative youth, n = 131). Results indicated that parents of High-Risk youth had lower scores on Positive Attention and higher scores on Low Reinforcement (Youth report and Combined report) compared to Low-Risk controls. Also, there was a trend for parents of High-Risk youth to score lower on the Tangible Rewards scale.

| PCC-P Scale | DF | t Value | Pr > t | Low-Risk Mean (n=254) | High-Risk Mean (n=131) |
|----------------------------|-----|---------|---------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Appropriate Discipline | 383 | -0.52 | .606 | 2.91 | 2.95 |
| Harsh Discipline | 383 | -1.38 | .169 | 1.55 | 1.63 |
| Positive Attention* | 230 | 3.03 | .003 | 3.81 | 3.50 |
| Tangible Rewards | 383 | 1.91 | .056 | 3.38 | 3.16 |
| Low Reinforcement-Youth* | 230 | -2.69 | .008 | 2.37 | 2.65 |
| Low Reinforcement-Parent | 389 | -1.20 | .231 | 2.02 | 2.10 |
| Low Reinforcement-Combined | 382 | -2.77 | .006 | 4.39 | 4.75 |

*T-test with Satterthwaite correction for degrees of freedom (df) used given statistical inequalities of variance.

V. Recommendations for Use

This measure was scaled so as to create identical scales as those generated by the parent's report on the Parenting (Primary Caregiver) measure. Note that this scaling is different from what was used in the original Technical Report written by McMahon, Jones, and Kim (1997). The current scales are preferred because they are more specific.

Although Item 8 ("Tell you to get out or lock you out of the house for a while") has low variability, it was retained in the Harsh Discipline scale due to its consistency with more punitive forms of discipline.

VI. Item and Scale Means and SD's

ITEM MEANS- NORMATIVE SAMPLE

| Variable | Label | Mean | Std Dev | N |
|----------|----------------------------|-------|---------|-----|
| C8AKP1 | Take away privilege | 3.335 | 1.217 | 319 |
| C8AKP2 | Send to room/Time out | 2.288 | 1.246 | 319 |
| C8AKP3 | Yell or scold | 2.671 | 1.306 | 319 |
| C8AKP4 | Calmly discuss misbehavior | 3.100 | 1.145 | 319 |
| C8AKP5 | Ignore misbehavior | 1.806 | 1.034 | 319 |
| C8AKP6 | Spank | 1.282 | 0.724 | 319 |
| C8AKP7 | Slap or hit | 1.210 | 0.574 | 319 |
| C8AKP8 | Lock out of home | 1.157 | 0.550 | 319 |
| C8AKP9 | Ignore good behavior | 1.991 | 1.270 | 319 |
| C8AKP10 | Smile or wink | 3.608 | 1.198 | 319 |
| C8AKP11 | Praise | 4.088 | 0.999 | 319 |
| C8AKP12 | Physical affection | 3.727 | 1.240 | 319 |
| C8AKP13 | Reward | 3.395 | 1.229 | 319 |
| C8AKP14 | Give special privilege | 3.414 | 1.218 | 319 |
| C8AKP15 | Do something special | 3.100 | 1.257 | 319 |
| C8AKP16 | Tell someone | 3.509 | 1.268 | 318 |
| C8AKP17 | Ask why not always good | 2.762 | 1.353 | 319 |

ITEM MEANS-HIGH-RISK CONTROLS

| Variable | Label | Mean | Std Dev | N |
|----------|----------------------------|-------|---------|-----|
| C8AKP1 | Take away privilege | 3.336 | 1.225 | 131 |
| C8AKP2 | Send to room/Time out | 2.412 | 1.306 | 131 |
| C8AKP3 | Yell or scold | 2.695 | 1.312 | 131 |
| C8AKP4 | Calmly discuss misbehavior | 3.107 | 1.191 | 131 |
| C8AKP5 | Ignore misbehavior | 1.969 | 1.102 | 131 |
| C8AKP6 | Spank | 1.359 | 0.823 | 131 |
| C8AKP7 | Slap or hit | 1.237 | 0.593 | 131 |
| C8AKP8 | Lock out of home | 1.221 | 0.694 | 131 |
| C8AKP9 | Ignore good behavior | 2.420 | 1.414 | 131 |
| C8AKP10 | Smile or wink | 3.458 | 1.302 | 131 |
| C8AKP11 | Praise | 3.901 | 1.115 | 131 |
| C8AKP12 | Physical affection | 3.382 | 1.428 | 131 |
| C8AKP13 | Reward | 3.214 | 1.342 | 131 |
| C8AKP14 | Give special privilege | 3.405 | 1.346 | 131 |
| C8AKP15 | Do something special | 2.855 | 1.313 | 131 |
| C8AKP16 | Tell someone | 3.254 | 1.314 | 130 |
| C8AKP17 | Ask why not always good | 3.076 | 1.281 | 131 |

Scale Means

| Scale | Normative Sample (n=319) | | High- Risk Control (n=131) | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|------|----------------------------|------|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Appropriate Discipline | 2.91 | 0.84 | 2.95 | 0.85 |
| Harsh Discipline | 1.58 | 0.51 | 1.63 | 0.55 |
| Positive Attention | 3.73 | 0.91 | 3.50 | 1.04 |
| Tangible Rewards | 3.30 | 1.03 | 3.16 | 1.15 |
| Low Reinforcement-Youth | 2.45 | 0.88 | 2.65 | 0.99 |
| Low Reinforcement-Parent | 2.02 | 0.62 | 2.10 | 0.63 |
| Low Reinforcement-Combined | 4.47 | 1.22 | 4.75 | 1.28 |

VII. Scale Correlations

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, Normative Sample above diagonals (n=319), High Risk Controls below diagonals (n=131).

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | APPDIS | HARDIS | POSATN | TANREW |
| Appropriate Discipline | 1.00 | -0.01 | 0.32 | 0.34 |
| Harsh Discipline | 0.06 | 1.00 | -0.29 | -0.26 |
| Positive Attention | 0.44 | -0.23 | 1.00 | 0.68 |
| Tangible Rewards | 0.42 | -0.10 | 0.72 | 1.00 |
| | | Youth | Parent | Total |
| Low Reinforcement-Youth | | 1.00 | 0.29 | 0.87 |
| Low Reinforcement-Parent | | 0.23 | 1.00 | 0.72 |

Low Reinforcement-Combined

0.88

0.66

1.00

VII. References

McMahon, R., Jones, K., & Kim, H. (1997). About My Parent (Technical Report) [On-line]. Available: <http://www.fasttrackproject.org/>

Thornberry, T., Huizinga, D., & Loeber, R. (1995). The prevention of serious delinquency and violence: Implications from the Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency. In J. Howell, B. Krisberg, D. Hawkins, & J.D. Wilson (Eds.), Sourcebook on serious, violent and chronic juvenile offenders (pp. 213-327). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.