

Coder Impressions Inventory—Original

Grade 1/Year 2

Fast Track Project Technical Report

Cynthia Rains

February 14, 2006

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. Subscale Correlations

Appendix

SAS scoring program

Citation

Instrument

Capaldi, D., & Patterson, G. R. (1989). *Psychometric properties of fourteen latent constructs from the Oregon Youth Study*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Oregon Social Learning Center. (1990). *Impressions*. Unpublished scale.

Reports

Rains, C. (2006). *Coder Impressions Inventory—Original* (Fast Track Project Technical Report). Available from the Fast Track Project website: <http://www.fasttrackproject.org/>

Rains, C. (2003). *Coder Impressions Inventory—Original and Addendum* (Fast Track Project Technical Report). Available from the Fast Track Project website: <http://www.fasttrackproject.org/>

McMahon, R., Lengua, L., Kim, H., & Jones, K. (1997). *Self-Construction for the Coder Impressions Inventory* (Fast Track Project Technical Report). Seattle, Washington: University of Washington.

Data Sources

Raw: O2G, O2H

Scored: CII2

I. Scale Description

The Coder Impressions Inventory (CII) is an adaptation of several impression scales from the Oregon Social Learning Center, including the Observer Impressions Inventory (Capaldi & Patterson, 1989). The CII is completed as a component of the Parent-Child Interaction Task (PCIT), which occurs in the home during the summer interview. Once the PCIT is completed, the interviewer then completes the Behavioral Coding System and the Interaction Rating Scales before beginning the CII. The CII is based on the observer's overall impressions of the parent, child and their interactions. The CII is designed to collect information on the family, which may be missed by strictly defined microanalytic observational procedures or by global ratings. The measure consists of 59 items and a 6-item addendum, both of which are completed at the same time. The measure was not collected in year 1 for cohort 1 but was added in the second year of the study.

II. Report Sample

These analyses were conducted on the first cohort on the high-risk control sample (n = 155) and the normative sample (n = 387, 463 with overlap) from the second year of the study. Thirty-two records were missing the complete measure. Eight records were missing from the control sample (4 from Durham and 4 from Washington) and 25 records were missing from the normative sample (3 from Durham, 7 from Nashville, 3 from Pennsylvania, and 12 from Washington). These numbers may reflect some overlap between the two samples.

III. Scaling

Questions 2 through 32 of the measure focus on describing the interactions between the mother and the child during the visit (i.e. the child did not comply with at least one parental request/command, the parent used time-out, the child was physically affectionate with the mother). Questions 35 through 58 ask the interviewer to describe the parent or family (i.e. mother is a positive and reinforcing parent, the mother uses nagging to get compliance, the parent relates to the child as a peer). These questions are generally scored on a response scale of 1 to 3, where 1=did not occur, 2=one example, and 3=multiple examples.

The questions that come from the addendum, H1-H6, are completed after the main inventory is completed. These six questions summarize the parent's behavior with the child. The first 5 questions discuss whether the parent used any of the following in an appropriate manner: labeled praise, praise for child compliance, clear instruction (alpha commands), "when-then" rules, and standing rules. The last question asks whether the parent used physical punishment (regardless of appropriateness). All six questions use the same response scale as with the main inventory for coder impressions, where 0=no basis, 1=did not occur, 2=one example, and 3=multiple examples.

Questions 1, 33, 34, and 59 are summary type questions. Item 1 asks for an overall summary of the child's conduct during the observation (on a scale of 0 to 6, with 0=spectacular and 6=awful), items 33 and 34 ask for percentages of time (on a scale of 0%-100%) the mother (33) and child (34) were misbehaving, and item 59 asks whether the family looked like they needed intervention (on a scale of 0 to 4, with 0=definitely and 4=not at all). Items 1, 33, and 34 are rescaled so that the items are on the same scale as the other items in the measure. Item 33 is also reverse-scored.

Twelve questions offer the interviewer an additional choice for response. Interviewers have the option of choosing 0 (no basis) for these questions, as well as the 1 to 3 response scale used on the rest of the measure. These questions include 5 (the parent threatened punishment for a transgression and followed through), 9 (the parent tried to pleasantly tease the child out of a sour mood), 10 (the parent clearly pinpointed the misbehavior when disciplining), 11 (the parent labeled the misbehavior but no follow-through), 13 (the child did something clearly prosocial and the parent ignored it), 22 (the parent ignored the child's inappropriate behavior), 36 (the mother encourage aggressive or antisocial behavior), 37 (the child seemed to enjoy the parent's verbal rewards), 47 (the parent expressed anger/hostility while disciplining), 49 (the parent seemed tentative when disciplining the child), and 50 (the parent seemed to discipline the child well). Interviewers were instructed to choose 0 as a response only if there was no information that he/she saw to form the basis of a judgment.

One other scoring note is that a number of items are reverse-scored. These items are 6 (the parent made unreasonable requests), 7 (the parent used guilt induction to get compliance), 13 (the child did something clearly prosocial and the parent ignored it), 21 (the parent did not pay attention when the child talked), 33 (the percentage of time that the mother misbehaved), 40 (the parent was overly permissive), 41 (the parent's discipline was erratic), 45 (the parent hovered over the child), 52 (the parent related to the child as a peer), 53 (the parent seemed distant from the child), 55 (the child treated the mother with respect), and 56 (the child seemed distant to the mother).

There are six subscales for this measure. Items for the main inventory as well as for the addendum comprise the subscales. All of these subscales are mean scores that are based on factor analysis or are theoretically derived.

Subscale	Items
Parent Warmth (CII2WAR)	13r, 20, 21r, 23-25, 29, 35, 51, 53r, H1, H2
Appropriate Discipline (CII2APP)	6r, 7r, 8, 15, 19, 33rx, 40r, 41r, 45r, 58, H3-H5
Harsh Discipline (CII2HAR)	4, 17, 18, 39, 46
Physical Discipline (CII2PHY)	31, H6
Child Warmth toward Parent (CII2CWM)	12, 26, 30, 37, 56r
Child Noncompliance toward Parent (CII2NON)	1x, 2, 27b, 32, 34x, 54, 55r

Cronbach's alphas were calculated for each subscale and are shown in the table below:

Subscales	Cronbach's Alpha	
	Control Sample	Normative Sample
Parent Warmth (CII2WAR)	.78	.81
Appropriate Discipline (CII2APP)	.62	.64
Harsh Discipline (CII2HAR)	.62	.64
Physical Discipline (CII2PHY)	.26	.15
Child Warmth toward Parent (CII2CWM)	.56	.60
Child Noncompliance toward Parent (CII2NON)	.87	.80

Two scales especially showed an adequate level of internal consistency for both the control and the normative samples, the *Parent Warmth* scale and the *Child Noncompliance* scale. One subscale, *Physical Discipline*, showed an inadequate level of internal consistency for both samples.

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 all of the subscales. Three of the subscales show the respondents from the normative sample scoring higher than those in the control sample; these subscales were *Parent Warmth*, *Appropriate Discipline*, and *Child Warmth toward Parent*. The three other scales show the respondents of the control sample scoring higher than those from the normative sample.

Comparison of Means for Normative and Control for CII Y2								
Variable	Label	Normative		Control		DF	t Value	Pr > t
		Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev			
CII2APP	Y2 CII Appropriate Discipline	2.23	0.22	2.13	0.24	429	-4.16	<.0001
CII2CWM	Y2 CII Child Warmth toward Parent	1.70	0.42	1.56	0.41	429	-3.54	0.0004
CII2HAR	Y2 CII Harsh Discipline	1.09	0.24	1.20	0.32	429	4.08	<.0001
CII2NON	Y2 CII Child Noncompliance toward Parent	1.04	0.34	1.26	0.49	429	5.27	<.0001
CII2PHY	Y2 CII Physical Discipline	0.99	0.15	1.06	0.22	429	3.70	0.0002
CII2WAR	Y2 CII Parent Warmth	2.16	0.38	2.05	0.39	429	-2.69	0.0074

In addition, ten items also indicated significant differences between the high-risk control sample and the normative sample. Four of these items showed the respondents from the normative sample scoring higher than those from the control sample; these items were: O2G38 (the parent seems confident of parenting skills), O2G42 (the parent is consistent), O2G43 (the parent seemed in good control of the child), and item O2G59 (whether the family needed intervention).

The other six items showed the respondents from the control sample scoring higher than those in the normative sample: item O2G3 (the child did not comply and the parent followed up with another command/reprimand), item O2G5 (the parent threatened and followed through), item O2G9 (the parent tried

to pleasantly tease), item O2G22 (the parent ignored the child's inappropriate behavior), item O2G27a (the mother was angry or irritable), and item O2G44 (the parent seemed to have little control).

Item O2G10 (the parent clearly pinpointed the infraction) approached significance ($p = 0.09$), with the respondents in the control sample scoring higher than those in the normative sample.

Comparison of Means for Normative and Control for CII Y2								
Variable	Label	Normative		Control		DF	t Value	Pr > t
		Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev			
O2G3	TC D/N and Parent Followed Up	1.48	0.88	1.79	0.91	429	3.38	0.0008
O2G5	Parent Threatened and Followed Through	0.88	0.33	0.96	0.26	429	2.64	0.0085
O2G9	Parent Tried to Pleasantly Tease, etc.	1.04	0.48	1.20	0.58	429	3.08	0.0022
O2G10	Parent Clearly Pinpointed Infraction	0.53	0.70	0.66	0.79	427	1.70	0.0890
O2G11	Parent Labeled Misbehavior/No Follow-Up	0.62	0.65	0.73	0.82	429	1.54	0.1240
O2G14	P. Used Time-out, Other Social Isolation	0.94	0.24	0.92	0.27	429	-0.70	0.4814
O2G16	P. Used: Withdrawal of Privileges	1.00	0.10	1.02	0.30	429	1.22	0.2224
O2G22	P. Ignored TC's Inappropriate Behavior	0.87	0.84	1.07	0.90	429	2.22	0.0271
O2G27A	Anger or Irritability: Mother	1.18	0.48	1.35	0.69	428	2.92	0.0037
O2G28A	Depression, Sad, Bummed Out: Mother	1.13	0.40	1.18	0.51	429	1.19	0.2363
O2G28B	Depression, Sad, Bummed Out: Child	1.15	0.45	1.22	0.55	428	1.48	0.1407
O2G36	Mother Encouraged Antisocial Behavior	0.81	0.60	0.88	0.61	429	1.16	0.2476
O2G38	Parent Seems Confident of Par. Skills	2.46	0.65	2.29	0.71	428	-2.50	0.0129
O2G42	Parent Consistent, Firm when Necessary	2.26	0.76	2.05	0.74	429	-2.83	0.0049
O2G43	Parent Seemed in Good Control of Child	2.62	0.56	2.32	0.70	428	-4.85	<.0001
O2G44	Parent Seemed to Have Little Control	1.17	0.42	1.46	0.63	429	5.70	<.0001
O2G47	P. Expressed Hostility w. Disciplining	0.64	0.66	0.64	0.79	429	-0.07	0.9459
O2G48	P. Seemed Overly Concerned re Being Fair	0.76	0.51	0.68	0.52	429	-1.61	0.1090
O2G49	P. Seemed Tentative w. Disciplining TC	0.65	0.73	0.70	0.76	429	0.61	0.5450
O2G50	P. Seemed to Discipline Child Well	1.25	1.27	1.07	1.15	429	-1.40	0.1619
O2G52r	Reversed-Parent Relates to TC as a Peer	2.45	0.71	2.50	0.76	429	0.67	0.5059
O2G57	Child Seemed to Fear Mother	1.06	0.27	1.07	0.26	429	0.56	0.5787
O2G59	Does Family Appear to Need Intervention?	2.54	1.21	1.78	1.25	429	-6.12	<.0001

V. Recommendations for Use

Analysts should note that three of the subscales were normally distributed for both the normative and control samples: *Parent Warmth*, *Appropriate Discipline*, and *Child Warmth toward Parent*. Three scales, *Harsh Discipline*, *Child Noncompliance*, and *Physical Discipline*, were positively skewed for both samples.

Two scales, *Harsh Discipline* and *Physical Discipline*, showed indications of floor effects. With *Harsh Discipline*, 72% of the normative sample and 56% of the control sample had scores between 0.0 and 1.0 (with 3.0 being the highest possible score). With *Physical Discipline*, 95% of the normative sample and 89% of the control sample had scores between 0.0 and 1.0 (with 3.0 being the highest possible score).

The *Physical Discipline* scale is only composed of two items, 31 (the mother was physically aggressive with the child) and H6 (the mother used physical punishment for the child). Both the normative and control

samples had a low inter-item correlation for this scale, 0.08 for the normative sample and 0.16 for the control sample. Analysts should use this scale with caution.

VI. Item and Subscale Means and SDs

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
O2G1x	Recorded-TC's Conduct During Observation Session	361	0.648	0.511	0.000	3.000
O2G2	TC D/N Comply w/ Parental Request	362	1.829	0.834	0.000	3.000
O2G3	TC D/N and Parent Followed Up	362	1.541	0.896	0.000	3.000
O2G4	Parent Threatened Punishment	362	0.978	0.287	0.000	3.000
O2G5	Parent Threatened and Followed Through	362	0.887	0.317	0.000	1.000
O2G6r	Reversed-Parent Made Unreasonable Requests	362	2.923	0.332	1.000	4.000
O2G7r	Reversed-Parent Used Guilt Induction	362	2.959	0.270	1.000	4.000
O2G8	Parent Gave Rationale when Appropriate	362	1.525	0.774	0.000	3.000
O2G9	Parent Tried to Pleasantly Tease, etc.	362	1.064	0.487	0.000	3.000
O2G10	Parent Clearly Pinpointed Infraction	362	0.544	0.690	0.000	3.000
O2G11	Parent Labeled Misbehavior/No Follow-Up	362	0.638	0.652	0.000	3.000
O2G12	TC Did Something Clearly Prosocial	360	1.242	0.528	0.000	3.000
O2G13r	Reversed-TC Did Something Prosocial, P. Ignored	362	3.249	0.498	2.000	4.000
O2G14	P. Used Time-out, Other Social Isolation	362	0.945	0.229	0.000	1.000
O2G15	P. Used: Point Program/Contingent Claims	362	1.006	0.149	0.000	3.000
O2G16	P. Used: Withdrawal of Privileges	362	1.000	0.105	0.000	2.000
O2G17	Parent Seemed to Provoke Child	362	1.072	0.333	1.000	3.000
O2G18	Parent Used Sarcasm in Hurtful Way	362	1.105	0.380	0.000	3.000
O2G19	Parent Modeled Positive Behavior for TC	362	1.624	0.840	0.000	3.000
O2G20	Parent Paid Attention when TC Talked	362	2.793	0.535	0.000	3.000
O2G21r	Reversed-Parent D/N Pay Attention when TC Talked	362	2.757	0.588	1.000	4.000
O2G22	P. Ignored TC's Inappropriate Behavior	362	0.898	0.824	0.000	3.000
O2G23	Parent Discussed Future Activity w/ TC	362	1.276	0.558	0.000	3.000
O2G24	P. Encouraged TC to Try Something New	362	1.381	0.677	0.000	3.000
O2G25	Mother Was Verbally Affectionate to TC	362	1.754	0.850	0.000	3.000
O2G26	TC Was Verbally Affectionate to Mother	362	1.279	0.588	0.000	3.000
O2G27A	Anger or Irritability: Mother	361	1.205	0.519	1.000	3.000
O2G27B	Anger or Irritability: Child	361	1.280	0.616	0.000	3.000
O2G28A	Depression, Sad, Bummed Out: Mother	362	1.133	0.413	1.000	3.000
O2G28B	Depression, Sad, Bummed Out: Child	361	1.152	0.443	1.000	3.000
O2G29	Mother Physically Affectionate w/ TC	362	1.304	0.573	1.000	3.000
O2G30	TC Physically Affectionate w/ Mother	362	1.171	0.445	1.000	3.000
O2G31	Mother Physically Aggressive w/ TC	362	1.044	0.206	1.000	2.000
O2G32	TC Physically Aggressive w/ Mother	362	1.025	0.188	1.000	3.000
O2G33rx	Recorded-Est. % Time Family was Misbehaving (M)	361	2.811	0.460	0.000	2.999
O2G34x	Recorded-Est. % Time Family was Misbehaving (TC)	361	0.194	0.384	0.000	2.999
O2G35	Mother is Positive, Reinforcing Parent	361	2.277	0.738	0.000	3.000
O2G36	Mother Encouraged Antisocial Behavior	362	0.843	0.591	0.000	3.000
O2G37	TC Enjoyed Parents Verbal Rewards	362	2.064	1.017	0.000	3.000
O2G38	Parent Seems Confident of Par. Skills	361	2.452	0.657	0.000	3.000
O2G39	Parent Overly Strict, Authoritative	362	1.180	0.457	0.000	3.000
O2G40r	Reversed-Parent Overly Permissive, Laissez-Faire	362	2.757	0.512	1.000	4.000
O2G41r	Reversed-Parent Erratic, Inconsistent, Haphazard	362	2.732	0.539	1.000	4.000
O2G42	Parent Consistent, Firm when Necessary	362	2.227	0.762	0.000	3.000
O2G43	Parent Seemed in Good Control of Child	361	2.579	0.596	0.000	3.000
O2G44	Parent Seemed to Have Little Control	362	1.215	0.468	0.000	3.000
O2G45r	Reversed-Seemed to Track Child Too Closely	362	2.823	0.442	1.000	3.000
O2G46	Parent Uses Nagging to Get Compliance	362	1.171	0.445	1.000	3.000
O2G47	P. Expressed Hostility w. Disciplining	362	0.627	0.684	0.000	3.000
O2G48	P. Seemed Overly Concerned re Being Fair	362	0.771	0.499	0.000	3.000
O2G49	P. Seemed Tentative w. Disciplining TC	362	0.641	0.720	0.000	3.000
O2G50	P. Seemed to Discipline Child Well	362	1.193	1.250	0.000	3.000
O2G51	Friendly Relations b/w Family & Child	362	2.594	0.584	1.000	3.000
O2G52r	Reversed-Parent Relates to TC as a Peer	362	2.425	0.742	1.000	3.000
O2G53r	Reversed-Parent Seemed Distant, Detached from TC	362	2.583	0.645	1.000	3.000
O2G54	TC Seemed to Have Hostile Set to Mother	362	1.182	0.427	1.000	3.000
O2G55r	Reversed-Child Treated Mother with Respect	362	1.401	0.588	1.000	3.000
O2G56r	Reversed-TC Seemed Aloof, Detached from Mother	362	2.622	0.593	1.000	3.000
O2G57	Child Seemed to Fear Mother	362	1.058	0.257	1.000	3.000
O2G58	Mother Treated Child w/ Respect	362	2.550	0.595	1.000	3.000
O2G59	Does Family Appear to Need Intervention?	362	2.403	1.247	0.000	4.000
O2H1	LABELLED PRAISE	361	1.759	0.910	0.000	3.000
O2H2	PRAISE FOR CHILD COMPLIANCE	361	1.909	0.898	0.000	3.000
O2H3	CLEAR INSTRUCTION (ALPHA)	361	2.914	0.351	0.000	3.000
O2H4	WHEN-THEN RULES	361	1.127	0.500	0.000	3.000
O2H5	STANDING RULES	361	1.025	0.368	0.000	3.000
O2H6	PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT	361	0.967	0.256	0.000	3.000

Coder Impressions Inventory Items Year 2 Control Sample

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
O2G1x	Recorded-TC's Conduct During Observation Session	147	0.857	0.662	0.000	3.000
O2G2	TC D/N Comply w/ Parental Request	147	2.075	0.853	1.000	3.000
O2G3	TC D/N and Parent Followed Up	147	1.789	0.908	0.000	3.000
O2G4	Parent Threatened Punishment	147	1.082	0.414	0.000	3.000
O2G5	Parent Threatened and Followed Through	147	0.959	0.258	0.000	2.000
O2G6r	Reversed-Parent Made Unreasonable Requests	147	2.837	0.497	1.000	3.000
O2G7r	Reversed-Parent Used Guilt Induction	147	2.871	0.426	1.000	3.000
O2G8	Parent Gave Rationale when Appropriate	147	1.565	0.794	1.000	3.000
O2G9	Parent Tried to Pleasantly Tease, etc.	147	1.197	0.581	0.000	3.000
O2G10	Parent Clearly Pinpointed Infraction	145	0.655	0.794	0.000	3.000
O2G11	Parent Labeled Misbehavior/No Follow-Up	147	0.728	0.816	0.000	3.000
O2G12	TC Did Something Clearly Prosocial	147	1.116	0.380	0.000	3.000
O2G13r	Reversed-TC Did Something Prosocial, P. Ignored	147	3.340	0.555	2.000	4.000
O2G14	P. Used Time-out, Other Social Isolation	147	0.918	0.275	0.000	1.000
O2G15	P. Used: Point Program/Contingent Claims	147	0.993	0.219	0.000	3.000
O2G16	P. Used: Withdrawal of Privileges	147	1.020	0.298	0.000	3.000
O2G17	Parent Seemed to Provoke Child	147	1.109	0.455	0.000	3.000
O2G18	Parent Used Sarcasm in Hurtful Way	147	1.177	0.492	0.000	3.000
O2G19	Parent Modeled Positive Behavior for TC	147	1.401	0.718	0.000	3.000
O2G20	Parent Paid Attention when TC Talked	147	2.701	0.645	0.000	3.000
O2G21r	Reversed-Parent D/N Pay Attention when TC Talked	147	2.673	0.714	1.000	4.000
O2G22	P. Ignored TC's Inappropriate Behavior	147	1.068	0.904	0.000	3.000
O2G23	Parent Discussed Future Activity w/ TC	147	1.313	0.606	0.000	3.000
O2G24	P. Encouraged TC to Try Something New	147	1.286	0.608	0.000	3.000
O2G25	Mother Was Verbally Affectionate to TC	147	1.694	0.849	1.000	3.000
O2G26	TC Was Verbally Affectionate to Mother	147	1.320	0.652	1.000	3.000
O2G27A	Anger or Irritability: Mother	146	1.349	0.691	1.000	3.000
O2G27B	Anger or Irritability: Child	146	1.432	0.733	1.000	3.000
O2G28A	Depression, Sad, Bummed Out: Mother	147	1.184	0.510	1.000	3.000
O2G28B	Depression, Sad, Bummed Out: Child	147	1.224	0.546	1.000	3.000
O2G29	Mother Physically Affectionate w/ TC	147	1.109	0.354	1.000	3.000
O2G30	TC Physically Affectionate w/ Mother	147	1.095	0.358	1.000	3.000
O2G31	Mother Physically Aggressive w/ TC	147	1.109	0.334	1.000	3.000
O2G32	TC Physically Aggressive w/ Mother	147	1.116	0.414	1.000	3.000
O2G33rx	Recorded-Est. % Time Family was Misbehaving (M)	147	2.740	0.574	0.000	2.999
O2G34x	Recorded-Est. % Time Family was Misbehaving (TC)	147	0.377	0.564	0.000	2.999
O2G35	Mother is Positive, Reinforcing Parent	147	2.061	0.724	1.000	3.000
O2G36	Mother Encouraged Antisocial Behavior	147	0.884	0.614	0.000	3.000
O2G37	TC Enjoyed Parents Verbal Rewards	146	1.781	1.060	0.000	3.000
O2G38	Parent Seems Confident of Par. Skills	147	2.293	0.714	0.000	3.000
O2G39	Parent Overly Strict, Authoritative	147	1.286	0.561	1.000	3.000
O2G40r	Reversed-Parent Overly Permissive, Laissez-Faire	147	2.497	0.686	1.000	3.000
O2G41r	Reversed-Parent Erratic, Inconsistent, Haphazard	147	2.537	0.705	1.000	4.000
O2G42	Parent Consistent, Firm when Necessary	147	2.048	0.743	1.000	3.000
O2G43	Parent Seemed in Good Control of Child	147	2.320	0.702	1.000	3.000
O2G44	Parent Seemed to Have Little Control	147	1.456	0.633	1.000	3.000
O2G45r	Reversed-Seemed to Track Child Too Closely	147	2.776	0.507	1.000	3.000
O2G46	Parent Uses Nagging to Get Compliance	147	1.361	0.619	1.000	3.000
O2G47	P. Expressed Hostility w. Disciplining	147	0.639	0.793	0.000	3.000
O2G48	P. Seemed Overly Concerned re Being Fair	147	0.680	0.523	0.000	2.000
O2G49	P. Seemed Tentative w. Disciplining TC	147	0.701	0.762	0.000	3.000
O2G50	P. Seemed to Discipline Child Well	147	1.075	1.153	0.000	3.000
O2G51	Friendly Relations b/w Family & Child	147	2.429	0.662	1.000	3.000
O2G52r	Reversed-Parent Relates to TC as a Peer	147	2.497	0.762	1.000	4.000
O2G53r	Reversed-Parent Seemed Distant, Detached from TC	147	2.381	0.752	1.000	3.000
O2G54	TC Seemed to Have Hostile Set to Mother	147	1.320	0.585	1.000	3.000
O2G55r	Reversed-Child Treated Mother with Respect	147	1.633	0.683	1.000	3.000
O2G56r	Reversed-TC Seemed Aloof, Detached from Mother	147	2.469	0.675	1.000	3.000
O2G57	Child Seemed to Fear Mother	147	1.075	0.264	1.000	2.000
O2G58	Mother Treated Child w/ Respect	147	2.320	0.682	0.000	3.000
O2G59	Does Family Appear to Need Intervention?	147	1.776	1.254	0.000	4.000
O2H1	LABELED PRAISE	146	1.829	0.920	0.000	3.000
O2H2	PRAISE FOR CHILD COMPLIANCE	146	1.815	0.902	0.000	3.000
O2H3	CLEAR INSTRUCTION (ALPHA)	146	2.959	0.199	2.000	3.000
O2H4	WHEN-THEN RULES	146	1.205	0.550	0.000	3.000
O2H5	STANDING RULES	146	1.041	0.259	0.000	2.000
O2H6	PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT	146	1.007	0.249	0.000	3.000

Coder Impressions Inventory Subscales Year 2 Normative Sample

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
CII2WAR	Y2 CII Parent Warmth	362	2.136	0.388	1.167	3.083
CII2APP	Y2 CII Appropriate Discipline	362	2.214	0.220	1.392	2.692
CII2HAR	Y2 CII Harsh Discipline	362	1.101	0.247	0.600	2.600
CII2PHY	Y2 CII Physical Discipline	362	1.006	0.170	0.500	2.000
CII2CWM	Y2 CII Child Warmth toward Parent	362	1.676	0.411	0.800	2.800
CII2NON	Y2 CII Child Noncompliance toward Parent	362	1.080	0.367	0.643	3.000

Coder Impressions Inventory Subscales Year 2 Control Sample

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
CII2WAR	Y2 CII Parent Warmth	147	2.052	0.387	1.167	2.917
CII2APP	Y2 CII Appropriate Discipline	147	2.134	0.237	1.538	2.692
CII2HAR	Y2 CII Harsh Discipline	147	1.203	0.323	0.600	2.600
CII2PHY	Y2 CII Physical Discipline	147	1.058	0.223	0.500	2.000
CII2CWM	Y2 CII Child Warmth toward Parent	147	1.556	0.406	0.800	2.800
CII2NON	Y2 CII Child Noncompliance toward Parent	147	1.258	0.493	0.714	2.800

VII. Subscale Correlations

Coder Impressions Inventory Subscales Year 2 Report Sample

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 431 Prob > r under H0: Rho=0						
	cii2war	cii2app	cii2har	cii2phy	cii2cwm	cii2non
cii2war Y2 CII Parent Warmth	1.000	0.695 0.000	-0.180 0.000	-0.089 0.066	0.697 0.000	-0.153 0.001
cii2app Y2 CII Appropriate Discipline	0.695 0.000	1.000	-0.445 0.000	-0.116 0.016	0.515 0.000	-0.312 0.000
cii2har Y2 CII Harsh Discipline	-0.180 0.000	-0.445 0.000	1.000	0.208 0.000	-0.203 0.000	0.462 0.000
cii2phy Y2 CII Physical Discipline	-0.089 0.066	-0.116 0.016	0.208 0.000	1.000	-0.069 0.154	0.245 0.000
cii2cwm Y2 CII Child Warmth toward Parent	0.697 0.000	0.515 0.000	-0.203 0.000	-0.069 0.154	1.000	-0.257 0.000
cii2non Y2 CII Child Noncompliance toward Parent	-0.153 0.001	-0.312 0.000	0.462 0.000	0.245 0.000	-0.257 0.000	1.000