

Parent-Child Communication, Child Report
Grade 8/Year 9 Update

FAST Track Project Technical Report
Cari McCarty & Suzanne Doyle
December, 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

Citation

Instrument

Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. (1994). Parent-Child Communication, (Child). Report

Report

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

Data Sources

Raw: c9q

Scored: pcc9

I. Scale Description

The **Parent-Child Communication Scale, Child Report**, adapted from the Revised Parent-Adolescent Communication Form of the Pittsburgh Youth Study (see Thornberry, Huizinga, & Loeber, 1995), is a 10-item measure which assesses children's perceptions of their primary caregiver's openness to communication. The answers are coded on 5-point scales where 1 represents "almost never" and 5 represents "almost always."

II. Report Sample

This technical report is based upon Year 9, Cohort 1 data, including both high-risk control and normative samples. With missing cases excluded, the total N (including overlap) was 366, with 303 normative and 126 high-risk control youth.

97 youth (21% of cohort) were missing observations for the entire measure, including 84 normative youth (22%) and 29 high-risk youth (19%). The missing cases included 20 observations from the Durham site, 31 observations from Nashville, 22 observations from Pennsylvania, and 24 observations from Seattle. Data were missing for 38 girls and 59 boys. Ethnic breakdown for missing data was: 1 Asian, 41 Black, 3 Hispanic, 47 White, 5 Other.

III. Scaling

Exploratory factor analyses conducted using Grade 5 data on the normative sample yielded two scales that paralleled the scales created in the original Technical Report (McMahon, Kim, & Jones, 1997): Parent Communication and Child Communication. Items 4 and 9 did not load on either scale. Each scale score was calculated by taking an average of the items comprising the scale if at least 50% of the items were nonmissing.

The resulting scales, associated reliability estimates and descriptive indices for the Normative (Norm) and High-Risk Control (HRC) samples are provided below. Higher scores indicate more frequent communication on the part of the person named in the scale.

Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha

	<u>Normative (n=303)</u>	<u>HRC (n=126)</u>
Parent Communication (Items 1,2,3,6r,10)	.66	.67
Child Communication (Items 5, 7, 8)	.81	.82

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 = 240) and the High-Risk Control sample (including overlapping Normative youth, n = 126). Results indicated that the Low-Risk Control respondents had significantly higher scores on Child Communication (indicating more frequent communication from the child to the parent) and Parent Communication (indicating more frequent communication from the parent to the child) than did the High-Risk respondents.

<u>PCC Scale</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>t Value</u>	<u>Pr > t </u>	<u>Low-Risk Mean (n=240)</u>	<u>High-Risk Mean (n=126)</u>
Parent Communication	364	3.01	0.003	3.85	3.62
Child Communication	364	2.12	0.03	3.46	3.24

V. Recommendations for Use

The parent communication scale on this measure reflects the child's perception of the primary caregiver's effort to maintain open communication with him/her. The child communication scale reflects the frequency with which the child communicates his/her feelings and problems with the primary caregiver. Similar constructs, although measured by different combinations of items, can be found on the Parent-Child Communication, Parent Report measure.

VI. Item and Scale Means and SD's

ITEM MEANS-NORMATIVE SAMPLE

Variable	Label	Mean	Std Dev	N
C9QC1	Parent good listener	4.185	0.891	303
C9QC2	Parent can tell how child feels	3.709	1.019	302
C9QC3	Parent tried to understand thoughts	3.798	1.051	303
C9QC4	Some things I do not discuss w/parents	2.898	1.013	303
C9QC5	Discuss problems w/parents	3.264	1.069	303
C9QC6	Parent insults child when angry	1.848	1.117	303
C9QC7	Parent can tell how really feels	3.440	1.171	303
C9QC8	Can let parent know what bothers child	3.525	1.139	303
C9QC9	Some things par do not let me discuss	1.749	1.063	303
C9QC10	Can say what I think if par disagrees	3.145	1.201	303

ITEM MEANS-HIGH RISK CONTROL SAMPLE

Variable	Label	Mean	Std Dev	N
C9QC1	Parent good listener	4.016	1.043	126
C9QC2	Parent can tell how child feels	3.516	1.186	124
C9QC3	Parent tried to understand thoughts	3.592	1.040	125
C9QC4	Some things I do not discuss w/parents	3.016	1.103	126
C9QC5	Discuss problems w/parents	3.079	1.157	126
C9QC6	Parent insults child when angry	1.921	1.100	126
C9QC7	Parent can tell how really feels	3.296	1.185	126
C9QC8	Can let parent know what bothers child	3.341	1.154	126
C9QC9	Some things par do not let me discuss	1.857	1.115	126
C9QC10	Can say what I think if par disagrees	2.905	1.249	126

Scale Means

Scale	Normative Sample (n=303)		High-Risk Control (n= 121)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Parent Communication	3.80	0.69	3.62	0.73
Child Communication	3.41	0.96	3.24	1.00

VII. Scale Correlations

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, Normative Sample (n=303) above diagonal, High-Risk Control (n=126) below diagonal.

	PACOM	CHCOM
Parent Communication	1.00	0.63
Child Communication	0.60	1.00