

Life Changes
Kindergarten/Year 1
Fast Track Project Technical Report
Jennifer Godwin
January 13, 2004

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. Item and Scale Correlations

Citations

Instrument

Dodge, K.A., Bates, J.E., and Pettit, G.S. (1990). Mechanisms in the cycle of violence. *Science*, 250, 1678-1683.

Reports

Godwin, J. (2004). *Life Changes* (Fast Track Project Technical Report). Available from the Fast Track Project website: <http://www.fasttrackproject.org>

Miller-Johnson, S. and Maumary-Gremaud, A. (1995). *Developmental History and Life Changes* (Fast Track Project Technical Report). Durham, NC: Duke University.

Data Sources

Raw: P1C

Scored: LCH1

I. Scale Description

The Life Changes measure, which was originally part of a larger measure called Developmental History, consists of a 15-minute interview that is completed with the parent as part of the summer interview. The Developmental History, developed and used by Dodge and colleagues (1990), is part of a longitudinal study of family origins of children's behavior problems. The measure assesses a number of constructs: perceptions of the parent-child relationship, developmental history, life changes, child care history, discipline strategies, expected success of child in life, school, and service utilization.

There are five versions of the Developmental History measure, based on the time point of administration. Version 1 is administered during year 1 and includes all of the constructs listed above. In addition, the life changes items are asked both for the pre-kindergarten and kindergarten years. Version 2 is administered during year 2 and includes: perceptions of the parent-child relationship, life changes (only for the previous year), discipline strategies, expected success of child in life and school, and service utilization items. In year 3, the Life Changes measure includes only four areas: life changes for the previous year, discipline strategies, perceptions of the parent-child relationship, and service utilization items. The fourth version is given during year 4 and includes the same four areas as in year 3; however, the choices for discipline strategies changed. Finally, in year 5 and thereafter, respondents are asked only questions about life changes for the previous year and about service utilization.

The Life Changes measure has been modified over time but the basic items are primarily still the same.

The measure first assesses whether any events, major or minor, have occurred during the past year for the child; examples of these events include a parent's divorce or death, a move to a new location, or financial problems. These questions are rated on a scale of 0 (did not occur), 1 (minor), and 2 (major).

The parent is then asked open-ended questions about his/her relationship with the child; these answers are then scored, as are the interviewer's impressions of the parent for these questions, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 representing a very negative response and 5 representing a very positive response.

Next, the interviewer describes a series of six situations, and the parent is asked to describe how she/he would handle the misbehavior in that situation (i.e. ignoring the actions, reasoning, directions, etc.). Interviewers then code these responses as 0 (not mentioned), 1 (mentioned), or 2 (typical). The parent is then asked their opinion about the child's success in school and in life, followed by questions about older siblings and whether any family members have received any treatment services during the past year.

In year 1, cohorts 2 and 3 were asked a series of questions not asked of cohort 1. These items are not discussed in this report, but include the following: P1CPK4 - P1CPK11, P1CPK20, P1CDH26 - P1CDH33, P1CDH42, P1CDH44 - P1CDH51, P1CDH60, P1CDH68, P1CDH69, P1C74, P1C76, P1C78, P1C79.

In addition, cohort 3 was asked some additional questions not asked in the previous two cohorts. These items are not discussed in this report, but include the following: P1CPK12 - P1CPK19, P1CPK25, P1CTR1 - P1CTR48, P1CDH34 - P1CDH41, P1CDH52 - P1CDH59, P1CDH61, P1C75, P1C78, P1C80.

II. Report Sample

These exploratory analyses were conducted with the first cohort on the high-risk sample (n=310, control=155 and treatment=155) and on the normative sample (n=387, 618 with overlap) during the first year of the study.

In addition, it should be noted that 479 records were missing 3 or more items; of these, 226 were from the high-risk sample (62 from Durham, 48 from Nashville, 56 from Pennsylvania, and 60 from Washington) and 226 were from the normative sample (75 from Durham, 42 from Nashville, 73 from Pennsylvania, and 63 from Washington); a number of these were from the overlap sample.

III. Scaling

As noted earlier, there are four main sections to the Life Changes measure: perceptions of the parent-child relationship, life changes (only for the previous year), discipline strategies, and service utilization items. These are then broken down into twelve subscales, which are described as follows.

Two subscales measure the perceptions of the parent-child relationship: *Quality of Parent-Child Relationship - Parent Rating* (items P2C18, P2C219R, P2C20, P2C21) and *Quality of Parent-Child Relationship - Observer Rating* (items P2C22, P2C23, P2C24, P2C25). The mean value is calculated for each of these subscales.

The third subscale, called the *Stress Scale Sum Score* is summed across the scale to represent the cumulative total of life changes experienced by the family. This subscale is calculated for Kindergarten and pre-Kindergarten in Year 1.

Eight of the subscales come as part of the section on discipline strategies. In this portion of the measure, the parent is presented with a series of vignettes that cover episodes of child misbehavior. The parent is asked to describe how they would respond to the scenario. The interviewer then rates whether or not the parent mentioned using any of the following discipline strategies: Ignore, Reasoning, Inductive Reasoning, Verbal Punishment, Withdrawal of Privileges, Commands, Proactive Guidance, or Physical Punishment.

Each of the discipline strategies are summed across the vignettes, averaged, and maintained as a

separate scale score. In other words, the items on the scale represent the responses for each vignette for that specific discipline strategy.

The last subscale, entitled *School and Life Success Mean Score*, is calculated by summing and averaging the mean value for the four questions the parent answers to predict how well his/her child will do in both school and in life. It should be noted that this subscale was used only for years 1 and 2 in administration of this study.

Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each subscale and are shown in the table below:

Cronbach's Alpha for Scales		
Variable	Normative	High Risk
Y1 LC Ignore/Do Nothing mean score (LCH1idn)	0.22	0.38
Y1 LC Reasoning mean score (LCH1rsn)	0.63	0.58
Y1 LC Inductive Reasoning mean score (LCH1irs)	0.22	0.22
Y1 LC Verbal Punishment mean score (LCH1vpn)	0.64	0.66
Y1 LC Withdraw of Privileges mean score (LCH1wpr)	0.51	0.43
Y1 LC Directives mean score (LCH1dir)	0.62	0.60
Y1 LC Proactive Guidance mean score (LCH1prg)	0.36	0.16
Y1 LC Physical Punishment mean score (LCH1ppn)	0.60	0.55
Y1 LC Quality Parent-Child Relat_Parent (LCH1qpr)	0.70	0.66
Y1 LC Quality Parent-Child Relat_Observ (LCH1qob)	0.87	0.86
Y1 Kindergarten Stress Scale sum score (LCH1str)	0.60	0.68
Y1 LC School and Life Success mean scor (LCH1sls)	0.62	0.54
PK Stress Scale sum score (LCH1pks)	0.68	0.73

The reliability coefficients for several scales indicated an acceptable reliability: the *Quality of the Parent-Child Relationship-parent version* (both samples), the *Quality of the Parent-Child Relationship—observer version* (both samples), and *Pre-Kindergarten Stress Scale*, ranging from .68 to .87. Four subscales indicated a poor reliability for both samples: the *Ignore Mean Score*, the *Inductive Reasoning Mean Score*, the *Withdrawal of Privileges Mean Score*, and *Proactive Guidance Mean*, ranging from .22 to .51. The other subscales indicated lower reliability levels.

IV. Differences Between Groups

High Risk vs. Normative Sample

A series of t-tests indicated significant differences for eight of the subscales. The normative sample has statistically significantly higher mean scores on the *Reasoning* scale, *Inductive Reasoning* scale, both *Parent-Child Relationship* scales, and the *School and Life Success* scale, while the normative sample has statistically significantly lower mean scores on the *Withdrawal of Privileges*, the *Pre-Kindergarten* and *Kindergarten Stress* scales.

Among the 55 items in this measure that are not included in the scales, the means of 25 items were statistically different for the high risk and normative samples. The items with statistically significant differences are in italics in the table below.

Treatment vs. Control Sample

A series of t-tests indicated significant differences for four of the subscales. The treatment sample has

statistically significantly higher mean scores relative to the control sample on the *Directives* scale and the *Parent-Child Relationship-Parent* scale, while the treatment sample has statistically significantly lower mean scores on the *Withdrawal of Privileges* and *Physical Punishment* scales.

Among the 55 items in this measure that are not included in the scales, the means of only 2 items were statistically different for the treatment and control samples (P1CDH62 and P1CPK3). The items with statistically significant differences are in italics in the table below.

Comparison of Means for Normative and High Risk for Scales							
Variable	Normative		High Risk		DF	t Value	Pr > t
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev			
Y1 LC Ignore/Do Nothing mean score (LCH1idn)	0.06	0.11	0.07	0.13	606	1.24	0.2163
Y1 LC Reasoning mean score (LCH1rsn)	0.32	0.27	0.26	0.24	616	-2.72	0.0068
Y1 LC Inductive Reasoning mean score (LCH1irs)	0.13	0.14	0.10	0.12	601	-2.09	0.0369
Y1 LC Verbal Punishment mean score (LCH1vpn)	0.18	0.22	0.20	0.24	616	1.19	0.2354
Y1 LC Withdraw of Privileges mean score (LCH1wpr)	0.47	0.26	0.54	0.24	616	3.63	0.0003
Y1 LC Directives mean score (LCH1dir)	0.38	0.27	0.39	0.27	616	0.47	0.6411
Y1 LC Proactive Guidance mean score (LCH1prg)	0.03	0.09	0.03	0.07	595	-0.63	0.5321
Y1 LC Physical Punishment mean score (LCH1ppn)	0.17	0.21	0.21	0.21	616	1.94	0.0525
Y1 LC Quality Parent-Child Relat_Parent (LCH1qpr)	4.06	0.54	3.58	0.61	606	-10.50	<.0001
Y1 LC Quality Parent-Child Relat_Observer (LCH1qob)	3.65	0.68	3.27	0.74	615	-6.80	<.0001
Y1 Kindergarten Stress Scale sum score (LCH1str)	4.07	3.45	5.93	4.66	562	5.60	<.0001
Y1 LC School and Life Success mean score (LCH1sls)	4.45	0.44	4.22	0.47	599	-6.06	<.0001
PK Stress Scale sum score (LCH1pks)	7.44	4.92	9.81	5.86	598	5.46	<.0001

Comparison of Means for Normative and High Risk for Items							
Variable	Normative		High Risk		DF	t Value	Pr > t
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev			
TC: reaction to changes (P1C17)	2.74	0.91	2.51	0.98	589	-3.00	0.0028
childcare/mother (P1CDH1)	4.73	0.89	4.65	1.05	601	-0.97	0.3344
childcare/father (P1CDH2)	2.75	1.90	2.08	2.01	615	-4.29	<.0001
childcare/older sib (P1CDH3)	0.66	1.26	0.51	1.11	602	-1.51	0.1305
childcare/relative living in home (P1CDH4)	0.48	1.24	0.60	1.37	615	1.15	0.2487
childcare/relative coming to home (P1CDH5)	0.54	1.03	0.52	1.01	616	-0.24	0.8120
childcare/babysitter at home (P1CDH6)	0.30	0.80	0.35	0.93	602	0.76	0.4483
childcare/goes to relative (P1CDH7)	1.36	1.49	1.43	1.52	616	0.54	0.5893
childcare/babysitters home (unlicensed) (P1CDH8)	0.48	1.16	0.62	1.35	603	1.37	0.1707
childcare/babysitters home (licensed) (P1CDH9)	0.23	0.92	0.22	0.88	614	-0.17	0.8620
childcare/daycare center (P1CDH10)	0.32	1.07	0.63	1.49	559	3.02	0.0026
childcare/after school care (P1CDH11)	0.28	0.93	0.39	1.03	559	1.27	0.2044
childcare/other (P1CDH12)	1.42	1.86	1.33	1.81	547	-0.60	0.5473
childcare decision-convenience (P1CDH13)	0.52	0.50	0.54	0.50	598	0.57	0.5676
childcare decision-educational (P1CDH14)	0.07	0.26	0.08	0.28	597	0.62	0.5324

Comparison of Means for Normative and High Risk for Items								
Variable		Normative		High Risk		DF	t Value	Pr > t
		Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev			
childcare decision-quality	(P1CDH15)	0.44	0.50	0.41	0.49	599	-0.71	0.4805
childcare decision-social	(P1CDH16)	0.18	0.39	0.16	0.36	597	-0.78	0.4349
childcare decision-affordable	(P1CDH17)	0.21	0.41	0.22	0.41	600	0.20	0.8433
childcare decision-other	(P1CDH18)	0.33	0.47	0.33	0.47	597	0.06	0.9536
changes in childcare arrangements	(P1CDH19)	1.30	0.70	1.41	0.76	489	1.76	0.0791
TC contact with absent parent	(P1CDH20)	1.66	0.72	1.47	0.54	302	-2.96	0.0034
time TC spent w/absent parent	(P1CDH21)	1.53	1.72	1.20	1.56	353	-1.88	0.0605
qual of resp visit with absent parent	(P1CDH22)	2.47	1.28	2.70	1.40	356	1.64	0.1023
Who usually deals w/TCs misbehavior	(P1CDH23)	1.35	0.72	1.34	0.69	596	-0.19	0.8485
Both parents present-who deals	(P1CDH24)	1.95	0.90	1.88	0.89	424	-0.82	0.4121
K: frequency of punishment/prim cg	(P1CDH25)	1.57	1.00	2.06	1.10	609	5.80	<.0001
K-frequency of punishment/2nd parent	(P1CDH43)	0.88	0.92	1.06	1.09	421	1.88	0.0609
Bruise/mark-minor/major	(P1CDH62)	0.03	0.18	0.13	0.37	443	4.28	<.0001
K-worry about harm to TC	(P1CDH63)	0.10	0.47	0.28	0.81	493	3.51	0.0005
hits/how often TC behaves this way	(P1CFR1)	2.69	1.10	3.13	1.09	607	4.99	<.0001
teases/how often TC behaves this way	(P1CFR2)	2.32	1.09	2.63	1.17	601	3.41	0.0007
not play nicely/how oft TC behaves	(P1CFR3)	2.70	1.01	3.09	1.02	609	4.85	<.0001
mess/how often TC behaves this way	(P1CFR4)	3.49	1.18	3.60	1.13	603	1.17	0.2423
disobeys/how often TC behaves this way	(P1CFR5)	3.06	1.03	3.45	0.99	608	4.81	<.0001
stays up/wont eat/how oft TC beh.	(P1CFR6)	2.73	1.18	3.06	1.27	594	3.30	0.0010
IR#5: int rating for phys. punish (PK)	(P1CIR5)	2.20	0.82	2.66	0.89	611	6.65	<.0001
IR#6: int rating for phys. harm (PK)	(P1CIR6)	1.66	0.72	2.03	0.93	577	5.49	<.0001
IR#7: int rating for phys. punish (K)	(P1CIR7)	2.20	0.80	2.64	0.85	604	6.54	<.0001
IR#8: int rating for physical harm (K)	(P1CIR8)	1.62	0.62	1.89	0.77	582	4.74	<.0001
Planned pregnancy?	(P1CPN1)	2.20	1.06	2.59	1.07	603	4.53	<.0001
Health during pregnancy	(P1CPN2)	1.38	0.67	1.45	0.75	593	1.28	0.2005
Time of pregnancy at 1st doc visit	(P1CPN3)	1.52	0.99	1.76	1.11	597	2.78	0.0056
medical care and frequency of visits	(P1CPN4)	4.70	0.75	4.45	0.96	561	-3.55	0.0004
target childs health at birth	(P1CPN5)	1.27	0.57	1.32	0.65	598	0.97	0.3347
PR #5-Satisfaction w/cost of child care	(P1CPR5)	4.22	1.22	4.12	1.23	372	-0.82	0.4133
PR #6-Satisfact w/qual. of child care	(P1CPR6)	4.61	0.80	4.55	0.81	475	-0.86	0.3923
PR #7-Satisfac w/ TCs acad. exper.	(P1CPR7)	4.23	1.07	4.13	1.09	452	-1.04	0.2992
PR #8-Satisfac. w/TCs social exper.	(P1CPR8)	4.42	0.91	4.29	0.96	461	-1.58	0.1143
PK-who dealt w/TC misbehaviors	(P1CPK1)	1.41	0.81	1.42	0.84	610	0.20	0.8443
PK-TC misbehaviors-both parents	(P1CPK2)	1.86	0.90	1.81	0.87	471	-0.63	0.5285
PK-punishment behavior-how often	(P1CPK3)	1.76	1.09	2.29	1.11	611	5.92	<.0001
PK-how 2nd parent punishes	(P1CPK21)	0.89	1.00	1.27	1.26	445	3.67	0.0003
PK-Bruise/mark-minor/major	(P1CPK26)	0.10	0.35	0.22	0.54	524	3.22	0.0013

Comparison of Means for Normative and High Risk for Items								
Variable	Normative		High Risk		DF	t Value	Pr > t	
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev				
<i>PK-worry of harm to TC</i> (P1CPK27)	0.28	0.81	0.53	1.15	554	3.05	0.0024	
<i>PK-how did changes affect TC</i> (P1CPK44)	2.67	1.03	2.19	1.01	612	-5.89	<.0001	

Comparison of Means for Treatment and Control for Scales								
Variable	Treatment		Control		DF	t Value	Pr > t	
	treat_mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev				
Y1 LC Ignore/Do Nothing mean score (LCH1idn)	0.07	0.13	0.07	0.12	308	-0.15	0.8808	
Y1 LC Reasoning mean score (LCH1rsn)	0.27	0.24	0.26	0.24	308	-0.24	0.8132	
Y1 LC Inductive Reasoning mean score (LCH1irs)	0.10	0.12	0.11	0.12	308	1.13	0.2582	
Y1 LC Verbal Punishment mean score (LCH1vpn)	0.18	0.22	0.23	0.25	308	1.93	0.0540	
Y1 LC Withdraw of Privileges mean score (LCH1wpr)	0.49	0.23	0.59	0.24	308	3.59	0.0004	
Y1 LC Directives mean score (LCH1dir)	0.42	0.27	0.35	0.27	308	-2.06	0.0406	
Y1 LC Proactive Guidance mean score (LCH1prg)	0.03	0.07	0.03	0.07	308	-0.40	0.6912	
Y1 LC Physical Punishment mean score (LCH1ppn)	0.18	0.19	0.23	0.22	300	2.38	0.0180	
Y1 LC Quality Parent-Child Relat_Parent (LCH1qpr)	3.65	0.58	3.50	0.64	308	-2.12	0.0347	
Y1 LC Quality Parent-Child Relat_Observer (LCH1qob)	3.30	0.71	3.23	0.78	307	-0.73	0.4683	
Y1 Kindergarten Stress Scale sum score (LCH1str)	5.84	4.78	6.02	4.55	304	0.34	0.7373	
Y1 LC School and Life Success mean score (LCH1sls)	4.24	0.44	4.20	0.51	299	-0.80	0.4226	
PK Stress Scale sum score (LCH1pks)	9.91	6.01	9.72	5.72	307	-0.29	0.7686	

Comparison of Means for Treatment and Control for Items								
Variable	Treatment		Control		DF	t Value	Pr > t	
	treat_mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev				
TC: reaction to changes (P1C17)	2.51	0.97	2.51	0.99	295	0.03	0.9768	
childcare/mother (P1CDH1)	4.64	1.10	4.67	1.01	308	0.27	0.7877	
childcare/father (P1CDH2)	2.06	2.06	2.09	1.96	308	0.11	0.9101	
childcare/older sib (P1CDH3)	0.56	1.16	0.46	1.05	306	-0.82	0.4115	
childcare/relative living in home (P1CDH4)	0.66	1.45	0.54	1.29	307	-0.81	0.4214	
childcare/relative coming to home (P1CDH5)	0.51	1.01	0.53	1.02	308	0.17	0.8668	
childcare/babysitter at home (P1CDH6)	0.32	0.88	0.39	0.98	308	0.67	0.5037	
childcare/goes to relative (P1CDH7)	1.33	1.55	1.53	1.49	308	1.16	0.2487	
childcare/babysitters home (unlicensed) (P1CDH8)	0.52	1.29	0.71	1.40	308	1.22	0.2231	
childcare/babysitters home (licensed) (P1CDH9)	0.26	0.96	0.17	0.80	298	-0.84	0.4036	
childcare/daycare center (P1CDH10)	0.57	1.41	0.70	1.56	307	0.79	0.4303	
childcare/after school care (P1CDH11)	0.45	1.10	0.33	0.95	288	-0.93	0.3547	
childcare/other (P1CDH12)	1.27	1.76	1.38	1.87	279	0.52	0.6068	
childcare decision-convenience (P1CDH13)	0.58	0.50	0.51	0.50	298	-1.13	0.2603	
childcare decision-educational (P1CDH14)	0.09	0.29	0.08	0.26	297	-0.50	0.6152	

Comparison of Means for Treatment and Control for Items								
Variable	Treatment		Control		DF	t Value	Pr > t	
	treat_mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev				
childcare decision-quality (P1CDH15)	0.39	0.49	0.44	0.50	298	0.76	0.4490	
childcare decision-social (P1CDH16)	0.13	0.34	0.18	0.39	298	1.26	0.2085	
childcare decision-affordable (P1CDH17)	0.23	0.42	0.21	0.41	299	-0.34	0.7323	
childcare decision-other (P1CDH18)	0.34	0.48	0.32	0.47	298	-0.37	0.7118	
changes in childcare arrangements (P1CDH19)	1.42	0.80	1.40	0.71	250	-0.18	0.8594	
TC contact with absent parent (P1CDH20)	1.51	0.54	1.41	0.55	217	-1.36	0.1766	
time TC spent w/absent parent (P1CDH21)	1.19	1.52	1.20	1.61	201	0.03	0.9798	
qual of resp visit with absent parent (P1CDH22)	2.76	1.36	2.64	1.45	204	-0.65	0.5139	
Who usually deals w/TCs misbehavior (P1CDH23)	1.41	0.77	1.27	0.60	279	-1.76	0.0794	
Both parents present-who deals (P1CDH24)	1.99	0.89	1.76	0.88	198	-1.84	0.0673	
K: frequency of punishment/prim cg (P1CDH25)	1.95	1.10	2.18	1.10	305	1.82	0.0704	
K-frequency of punishment/2nd parent (P1CDH43)	0.93	0.99	1.20	1.19	214	1.79	0.0741	
Bruise/mark-minor/major (P1CDH62)	0.07	0.25	0.20	0.45	234	3.32	0.0010	
K-worry about harm to TC (P1CDH63)	0.32	0.82	0.25	0.79	304	-0.74	0.4604	
hits/how often TC behaves this way (P1CFR1)	3.14	1.16	3.13	1.01	307	-0.05	0.9640	
teases/how often TC behaves this way (P1CFR2)	2.52	1.22	2.75	1.11	302	1.73	0.0839	
not play nicely/how oft TC behaves (P1CFR3)	3.02	1.05	3.17	0.98	306	1.29	0.1985	
mess/how often TC behaves this way (P1CFR4)	3.66	1.10	3.53	1.17	303	-1.02	0.3086	
disobeys/how often TC behaves this way (P1CFR5)	3.42	1.01	3.48	0.98	306	0.57	0.5704	
stays up/wont eat/how oft TC beh. (P1CFR6)	3.03	1.28	3.09	1.27	301	0.42	0.6744	
IR#5: int rating for phys. punish (PK) (P1CIR5)	2.60	0.89	2.71	0.89	306	1.02	0.3068	
IR#6: int rating for phys. harm (PK) (P1CIR6)	1.97	0.90	2.09	0.96	306	1.16	0.2461	
IR#7: int rating for phys. punish (K) (P1CIR7)	2.58	0.78	2.70	0.92	294	1.25	0.2111	
IR#8: int rating for physical harm (K) (P1CIR8)	1.86	0.76	1.93	0.77	304	0.80	0.4224	
Planned pregnancy? (P1CPN1)	2.68	1.07	2.51	1.07	302	-1.35	0.1778	
Health during pregancy (P1CPN2)	1.45	0.74	1.45	0.76	301	0.03	0.9783	
Time of pregnancy at 1st doc visit (P1CPN3)	1.87	1.17	1.64	1.03	297	-1.84	0.0662	
medical care and frequency of visits (P1CPN4)	4.39	1.01	4.51	0.90	296	1.01	0.3126	
target childs health at birth (P1CPN5)	1.34	0.70	1.30	0.60	303	-0.50	0.6178	
PR #5-Satisfaction w/cost of child care (P1CPR5)	4.10	1.23	4.14	1.24	201	0.26	0.7939	
PR #6-Satisfact w/qual. of child care (P1CPR6)	4.46	0.93	4.64	0.65	218	1.80	0.0729	
PR #7-Satisfac w/ TCs acad. exper. (P1CPR7)	4.05	1.18	4.20	1.00	236	1.02	0.3065	
PR #8-Satisfac. w/TCs social exper. (P1CPR8)	4.34	0.99	4.23	0.92	242	-0.88	0.3795	
PK-who dealt w/TC misbehaviors (P1CPK1)	1.44	0.85	1.41	0.83	304	-0.35	0.7263	
PK-TC misbehaviors-both parents (P1CPK2)	1.86	0.86	1.75	0.88	222	-0.99	0.3216	
PK-punishment behavior-how often (P1CPK3)	2.09	1.14	2.48	1.04	305	3.12	0.0020	
PK-how 2nd parent punishes (P1CPK21)	1.24	1.25	1.30	1.28	233	0.36	0.7227	
PK-Bruise/mark-minor/major (P1CPK26)	0.22	0.60	0.22	0.47	288	-0.11	0.9156	

Comparison of Means for Treatment and Control for Items								
Variable	Treatment		Control		DF	t Value	Pr > t	
	treat_mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev				
PK-worry of harm to TC (P1CPK27)	0.55	1.19	0.51	1.11	306	-0.35	0.7289	
PK-how did changes affect TC (P1CPK44)	2.18	1.01	2.19	1.02	306	0.11	0.9104	

V. Recommendations for Use

Analysts should note that the distributions for the subscales in both the normative and high-risk samples were fairly normally distributed with slight amounts of skewness. One exception would be the subscale *Proactive Guidance Mean Score*, which was positively skewed for both the normative and high-risk samples.

A number of items were positively skewed for both the normative and high-risk samples. Seven of these skewed items came from the first 16 items of the measure that asked whether certain life events occurred in the family during the past year. These items included: P2C5 (divorce), P2C6 (parental separation), P2C7 (remarriage), P2C8 (parent-child separation), P2C10 (legal problems), P2C11 (problems with drugs or alcohol), and P2C15 (job loss).

Other items were highly skewed in both samples: P2C49 (use of physical punishment for not playing nicely with another child), P2C73 (use of physical punishment for refusing to go to bed on time), P2C76 (whether the child receives medication to control behavior or attention), P2C34OL (ignoring the child's teasing of another child), P2C42OL (ignoring the child not playing nicely with others), P2C44OL-control sample only (using inductive reasoning to deal with the child not playing nicely with others), P2C48OL (using proactive guidance to deal with a child not playing nicely with others), P2C52OL (using inductive reasoning when a child makes a mess and does not clean it up), P2C56OL (using proactive guidance when a child makes a mess and does not clean it up), P2C58OL (ignoring when a child disobeys), P2C60OL (using inductive reasoning when a child disobeys), P2C64OL (using proactive guidance when a child disobeys), P2C68OL (using inductive reasoning when a child refuses to go to bed or to eat), and P2C72OL (using proactive guidance when a child refuses to go to bed or to eat). In other words, out of 6 scenarios, parents in both samples were more likely to use the techniques of ignoring the misbehavior, using inductive reasoning, and using proactive guidance to discipline their children in four of the scenarios.

Despite the normal distributions of the subscales, analysts should use most of the subscales with caution due to their inadequate internal reliability coefficients. Only two subscales indicated acceptable reliabilities for both samples, the *Quality of Parent-Child Relationship—parent version* and the *Quality of Parent-Child Relationship—observer version*. In addition, analysts need to remember that the disciplinary techniques of ignoring, inductive reasoning, and using proactive guidance are highly skewed for both samples.