

PCIT Interaction Rating Scale (IRS)

Kindergarten / Year 1

Fast Track Project Technical Report

Bob McMahon, Lili Lengua, Hyoshin Kim, and Karen Jones

8/28/97

Table of Contents:

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

I. Source

In this adapted version of the **Interaction Rating Scales** (IRS; Crnic & Greenberg, 1990), the observer completes a total of 16 global ratings of the mother and child with respect to gratification, sensitivity and involvement.

II. Scale Derivation

Items were designed to measure parents' and children's gratification, sensitivity and involvement during an interaction task. Items were designated as measures of either Parental Warmth/Involvement or Child Warmth toward Parent. Each construct was tested separately using confirmatory factor analyses (CFA, with maximum likelihood estimation) with data from the **Year 1, Cohort 1 Normative Sample**. The models demonstrated good fit to the data. The models were retested using CFA with data from the **Year 1, Cohort 1 High Risk Sample**, and demonstrated good fit to the data. Note that six additional items were included in the questionnaire for Year 1 Cohort 1 to assess Control. The Control items were not collected for any other cohort or year, and are not included in these analyses.

(Norm N=385, HR N=308)		Normative		High-risk	
	Items	Load	CFI/Alpha	Load	CFI/Alpha
Parental Warmth	Child's Game- Gratification/M (#1)	.88	.84/.88	.89	.87/.88
	Child's Game- Sensitivity (#3)	.82	$\chi^2(9)=209.84$.80	$\chi^2(9)=131.30$
	Child's Game- Involvement (#4)	.76		.74	
	Parent's Game- Gratification/M (#6)	.69		.68	
	Lego Task- Gratification/M (#10)	.66		.70	
	Lego Task- Sensitivity/M (#12)	.59		.60	

(Norm N=385, HR N=307)		Normative		High-risk	
	Items	Load	CFI/Alpha	Load	CFI/Alpha
Child Warmth toward	Child Game Gratification (Child) #2	.88	.91/.79	.96	.92/.75
	Child Game Involvement (Child) #5	.76	$\chi^2(2)=50.27$.67	$\chi^2(2)=31.59$
Parent	Parent Game Gratification (Child) #7	.60		.57	
	Lego Task Gratification (Child) #11	.53		.46	

III. Missing Data

A subject's score was considered missing if 50% of the items were missing.

Year 1:	Missing Normative	Missing High-risk
Parental Warmth/Involvement (irs1war)	1	1
Child Warmth toward Mother (irs1cwa)	1	1

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 distributions deviate markedly from a normal distribution. Scale items range from 1 to 5.

Subscale	N	Mean	S.D.	Skew	Kurt
Normative Sample					
Parental Warmth/Involvement (irs1war)	386	3.48	0.79	-0.59	0.28
Child Warmth toward Mother (irs1cwa)	386	3.58	0.77	-0.64	0.57
High-risk Sample					
Parental Warmth/Involvement (irs1war)	309	3.34	0.79	-0.28	-0.42
Child Warmth toward Mother (irs1cwa)	309	3.45	0.76	-0.37	0.06

V. Subscale Intercorrelations

In the Year 1 Normative sample the correlation between Parental Warmth and Child Warmth was .84. In the Year 1 High-risk sample the correlation between Parental Warmth and Child Warmth was .82.

VI. Site Differences

Mean Site differences were explored using PROC GLM in SAS. In Year 1, there were significant site effects for the Normative sample for both Parental Warmth and Child Warmth. For Parental Warmth, Penn State and Washington were significantly greater than Durham. For Child Warmth, Penn State and Washington were significantly greater than Durham and Nashville.

There were no significant intervention differences in the High-risk sample, however, there were significant Site and Site x Intervention effects. For Parental Warmth, the intervention group mean was less than the control group mean in Durham, whereas, the control group mean was less than the intervention group mean in Washington. For Child Warmth, the intervention group mean was less than the control group mean in Durham.