# Parent-Child Communication, Parent Report Grade 7/Year 8

# 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

VIII.References

#### Citation

#### Instrument

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

## Report

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

#### **Data Sources**

Raw: p8x

Scored: pcp8

#### I. Scale Description

The **Parent-Child Communication Scale, Parent Report**, adapted from the Revised Parent-Adolescent Communication Form of the Pittsburgh Youth Study (see Loeber, Farrington, Stouthamer-Loeber, & Van Kammen, 1998; Thornberry, Huizinga, & Loeber, 1995), is a 20-item measure which assesses primary caregivers' perceptions of their openness to communication and their children's communication skills. The answers are coded on 5-point scales where 1 represents "almost never" and 5 represents "almost always." Scale scores were derived using Exploratory Factor Analysis, as detailed in the appendix.

Note: The scaling for this measure has changed since the original Fast Track Technical Report was written by McMahon, Jones, and Kim (1997).

# II. Report Sample

This technical report is based upon Year 8, Cohort 1 data, including both high-risk control and normative samples. With missing cases excluded, the total N (including overlap) was 391, with 323 normative and 133 high-risk control youth.

72 parents (16% of cohort) were missing observations for the entire measure, including parents of 64 normative youth (16%) and 22 high-risk youth (14%). The missing cases included 12 observations from

the Durham site, 23 observations from Nashville, 15 observations from Pennsylvania, and 22 observations from Seattle. Data were missing for parents of 29 girls and 43 boys. Ethnic breakdown for missing data was: 1 Asian, 34 Black, 3 Hispanic, 31 White, 3 Other.

# III. Scaling

Each scale score was calculated by taking an average of the items comprising the scale, if at least 50% of the items were non-missing. The scaling procedure was derived from exploratory factor analyses on the Normative and High Risk Control (HRC) samples, conducted separately for the Parent and Child Communication items at Year 5.

The resulting scales, associated reliability estimates and descriptive indices for the Normative and HRC samples are provided below. Four items (Items 8, 14, 18, 19) were not used in the scales due to a conceptual difference between them and the other items, as well as lowered internal consistency when these items were retained. Higher scores indicate better communication (Parent Communication), more restriction of certain topics of communication (Parent Restricted Topics), more empathy (Child Empathy/Listening) and more appropriate emotional expression (Child Emotional Expression).

## **Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha**

	Normative (n=323)	HRC (n =133)
Parent Communication (Items 1, 4, 7, 9, 13, 20)	.78	.77
Parent Restricted Topics (Items 6, 17)	.47	.56
Child Empathy/Listening (Items 2, 3, 5)	.70	.66
Child Emotional Expression (Items 10, 11r, 12r, 15r, 16)	.76	.68

# IV. <u>Differences Between Groups</u>

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 = 258) and the High-Risk Control sample (including overlapping Normative youth, n = 133). Results indicated that Low-Risk parents rated higher scores on Parent Communication, Child Empathy/Listening, and Child Emotional Expression, indicating better communication between Low-Risk youth and their parents, compared to High-Risk controls. Low-Risk parents also scored significantly lower (indicating less restriction in communication topics) on the Parent Restricted Topics scale.

PCC-P Scale	DF	t Value	e Pr > [t]		Low-R Mean	isk (n=266)	High-F Mean	Risk (n=141)
Parent Communication Parent Restricted Topics	233 389	4.35* -2.11	.0001 .035		4.21 1.73		3.91 1.91	
Child Empathy/Listening Child Emotional Expression*	389	389 4.08	3.80 .0001	.0002	3.92	3.95	3.61	3.65

<sup>\*</sup>T-test with Satterthwaite correction for degrees of freedom (df) given statistical inequality of variances.

#### V. Recommendations for Use

Note that this scaling should supercede that used in the original Technical Report written by McMahon, Jones, and Kim (1997). Related constructs, although measured by different combinations of items and

informed by child-report, can be found on the Parent-Child Communication, Child Report measure.

# VI. <u>Item and Scale Means and SD's</u>

ITEM MEANS- NORMATIVE SAMPLE

/ariable	Label	Mean	Std Dev	N
P8XC1	Can Discuss Beliefs Without Embarassment	4.418	0.889	323
P8XC2	Child is Good Listener	4.043	0.891	323
P8XC3	Child is Empathic	4.009	0.861	323
P8XC4	Parent Satisfied with Communication	4.220	0.818	323
P8XC5	Child Tries to Understand Parents View	3.644	0.949	323
P8XC6	Child Avoids Discussing Things	2.121	0.994	323
P8XC7	Discuss Childs Problems with Child	3.830	1.027	323
P8XC8	Child Insults Parent When Angry	1.675	1.023	323
P8XC9	Can Tell Child How Parent Really Feels	4.297	0.877	323
P8XC10	Child Talks about Personal Problems	3.491	1.074	322
P8XC11	Child Keeps Feelings to Self	2.509	1.039	322
P8XC12	Child Hides Anger	1.783	1.001	323
P8XC13	Encourage Child to Form Own Opinion	4.248	0.860	323
P8XC14	Difficult to Tell if Child is Upset	2.220	1.097	323
P8XC15	Child Piles Up Probs Till Overwhelming	1.820	1.066	323
P8XC16	Child Tells Parent What Bothers Child	3.749	1.010	323
P8XC17	Certain Topics Not Allowed to Discuss	1.433	0.880	323
P8XC18	Child Admits Mistakes	2.947	1.169	323
P8XC19	Child Can Disagree with Parent	3.728	1.203	323
P8XC20	Achieve Solutions in Problem Discussions	3.954	0.875	323

# ITEM MEANS-HIGH-RISK CONTROLS

Variable	Label	Mean	Std Dev	N
P8XC1	Can Discuss Beliefs Without Embarassment	4.218	1.040	133
P8XC2	Child is Good Listener	3.714	0.950	133
P8XC3	Child is Empathic	3.812	0.947	133
P8XC4	Parent Satisfied with Communication	3.857	0.922	133
P8XC5	Child Tries to Understand Parents View	3.436	0.972	133
P8XC6	Child Avoids Discussing Things	2.248	1.003	133
P8XC7	Discuss Childs Problems with Child	3.669	1.085	133
P8XC8	Child Insults Parent When Angry	2.211	1.315	133
P8XC9	Can Tell Child How Parent Really Feels	4.068	1.039	133
P8XC10	Child Talks about Personal Problems	3.301	1.037	133
P8XC11	Child Keeps Feelings to Self	2.677	1.004	133
P8XC12	Child Hides Anger	1.932	1.081	133
P8XC13	Encourage Child to Form Own Opinion	4.015	0.961	133
P8XC14	Difficult to Tell if Child is Upset	2.338	1.086	133
P8XC15	Child Piles Up Probs Till Overwhelming	2.143	1.194	133
P8XC16	Child Tells Parent What Bothers Child	3.496	0.966	133
P8XC17	Certain Topics Not Allowed to Discuss	1.564	0.956	133
P8XC18	Child Admits Mistakes	2.699	1.128	133
P8XC19	Child Can Disagree with Parent	3.609	1.211	133
P8XC20	Achieve Solutions in Problem Discussions	3.624	0.934	133

#### Scale Means

Scale	,		High-Risk Co Mean	ntrol (n=133) SD
Parent Communication Parent Restricted Topics	4.16	0.61	3.91	0.68
	1.78	0.76	1.91	0.82
Child Empathy/Listening	3.90	0.71	3.65	0.74
Child Emotional Expression	3.83	0.74	3.61	0.70

# **VII. Scale Correlations**

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, Normative Sample above Diagonal (n=323), High-Risk Controls below diagonal (n=133).

	PCOMM	PRT	CEL	CEE
Parent Communication	1.00	-0.24	0.63	0.57
Parent Restricted Topics	-0.19	1.00	-0.10	-0.15
Child Empathy/Listening	0.67	0.09	1.00	0.45
Child Emotional Expression	0.44	-0.23	0.34	1.00

# VIII. References

Loeber, R., Farrington, D.P., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., & Van Kammen, W.B. (1998). <u>Antisocial behavior and mental health problems: Explanatory factors in childhood and adolescence</u>. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McMahon, R., Jones, K., & Kim, H. (1997). <u>Parent-Child Communication Scale, Parent Report</u> (Technical Report) [On-line]. Available: <a href="http://www.fasttrackproject.org/">http://www.fasttrackproject.org/</a>

Thornberry, T., Huizinga, D., & Loeber, R. (1995). The prevention of serious delinquency and violence: Implications from the Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency. In J. Howell, B. Krisberg, D. Hawkins, & J.D. Wilson (Eds.), Sourcebook on serious, violent and chronic juvenile offenders (pp. 213-327). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.