

## Family Expressiveness Questionnaire

Fast Track Project Technical Report

Prepared by Mark Greenberg, Craig Mason, & Lili Lengua

October 2, 1995

### Table of Contents

- I. Source
- II. Scale Derivation
- III. Missing Data
- IV. Descriptives
- V. Intercorrelations
- VI. Site Differences

### References

#### FAST Track Technical Report Reference

Greenberg, M., Mason, C., & Lengua, L. & Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (1995). Family expressiveness questionnaire: Technical report. Unpublished Manuscript, University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

#### I. Source

This 13-item measure is a revision of the original 40-item measure developed by Halberstadt (1986). This parent report measure assesses the frequency and nature of family communication of both positive and negative emotional states.

#### II. Scale Derivation

A principal components analysis (with varimax rotation) of the "Family Expressiveness Questionnaire" based on Year One, Cohort One Normative Sample data was performed. By default, all components with eigenvalues greater than 1 were extracted. The resulting 2 factor solution accounted for 52% of the variance:

Scale		Fact	Fact.		Scale	Mean
Name	Items	One	Two	Item Description	Alpha	Inter-Item
						Correlatio
						n
Negative Expression P1gfneg	P1G1FE11	.77		Disappointed/empathy for another	.82	.44
	P1G1FE5	.75		member		
	P1G1FE6	.70		Mentions another's behavior bothers		
	P1G1FE13	.70		them		
	P1G1FE8	.67		Talk to someone when their feelings		
	P1G1FE7	.52	.41	hurt		
	P1G1FE12	.52	.45	Discusses reasons for anger		
Positive Expression P1gfepos	P1G1FE2	.51		Explains point of view	.82	.39
				Cheer up another family member		
				Happy		
				Tell someone something is bothering		
				them		
	P1G1FE4		.77	Someone shows love		
P1G1FE9		.71	Hug or snuggle			
P1G1FE10		.71	Praise another family member			
P1G1FE1		.69	Tell someone they look nice			
P1G1FE3		.58	Someone says "I am sorry"			

NOTE: Values less than 0.4 have been omitted.

Factor 1 corresponds to a "Negative Expression", while factor 2 appears to correspond to "Positive Expression". Factor based scales were calculated by: 1) rescaling all items to a possible 0-10 range, 2) summing the values of items on each factor, 3) dividing by the number of items present or responded to by each subject, and 4) multiplying by the number of items on each scale (6 items for negative expression and 7 for positive expression). While the loadings for items #7 and #12 were greater on Factor One than on Factor Two, both were included on the "Positive Expression" scale because 1) they had adequate loadings on Factor Two, and 2) they were conceptually consistent with the positive expression factor. Subscale scores were considered missing if greater than 25% of the items on a scale were missing.

**III. Missing Data**

One subject (Normative sample) was missing data on the negative and positive expression subscales. For the Normative sample, N = 386; for the High-risk sample, N = 310.

**IV. Descriptives**

The mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis of each of the subscales for the Normative and High-Risk samples are presented in the following table. None of the subscale distributions deviated markedly from a normal distribution.

**Normative Sample**

<b>Subscale</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>Skewness</b>	<b>Kurtosis</b>
Positive Expression	51.71	11.57	-0.58	0.50
Negative Expression	37.54	10.96	0.11	-0.48

**High-Risk Sample**

<b>Subscale</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>Skewness</b>	<b>Kurtosis</b>
Positive Expression	49.26	11.59	-0.41	0.32
Negative Expression	36.55	11.45	0.28	-0.53

**IV. Intercorrelations**

The correlations between the Positive Expression and Negative Expression subscales for the Normative and High-risk samples were 0.64 and 0.61 respectively.

**VI. Site Differences**

Mean site differences were explored using PROC GLM in SAS. There were no significant site, intervention, or site x intervention differences.

	F	p value
<b>Normative Sample</b>		
Positive Expression	2.47	0.06
Negative Expression	2.29	0.08

Based on Cohort 1, Year 1 Normative Data  
General Linear Model

Level of SITE	N	-----P1GFEPOS-----		-----P1GFENEG-----	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
DURH	100	53.7333333	12.2202019	39.4200000	11.6617710
NASH	100	49.4500000	12.1878649	35.5333333	10.7749137
PENN	98	51.2925170	9.6518153	37.0748299	10.1677263
WASH	88	52.4242424	11.7523104	38.2196970	10.9561866

	F	p value
<b>Normative Sample</b>		
Positive Expression	2.47	0.06
Negative Expression	2.29	0.08

Based on Cohort 1, Year 1 Normative Data  
General Linear Model

Level of SITE	N	-----P1GFEPOS-----		-----P1GFENEG-----	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
DURH	78	49.6153846	12.0242752	36.7606838	12.2761512
NASH	81	48.3470508	13.3581873	36.5432099	11.8725225
PENN	81	48.0833333	10.5111956	34.9000000	9.5943607
WASH	71	51.2206573	9.9560851	38.1690141	11.9361892