

## Parenting (Primary Caregiver)

Grade 5/Year 6

### **FAST Track Project Technical Report Cari McCarty & Suzanne Doyle June 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). Parenting (Primary Caregiver).

##### *Report*

McCarty, C.A. & Doyle, S.R. (2000). Parenting (Primary Caregiver) (Technical Report) [On-line]. Available: <http://www.fasttrackproject.org/>

#### **Data Sources**

*Raw:* p6x

*Scored:* ppc6

#### **I. Scale Description**

**Parenting-Primary Caregiver** incorporates two scales, the Parental Discipline Scale (first 8 items) and Parent Praise (last 9 items). The Parental Discipline Scale is a revised version of the Discipline Scale developed for the Pittsburgh Youth Study (Thornberry, Huizinga, & Loeber, 1995). This 8-item scale provides parent-report of the frequency of 8 different disciplinary strategies for the infraction of family rules. The Parent Praise scale is drawn from the Positive Parenting Scale of the Pittsburgh Youth Study (Thornberry et al., 1995). This 9-item scale provides a parent report on the frequency with which parents provide positive praise and support when their children do something that they like or approve of. All items are rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always).

#### **II. Report Sample**

This technical report is based upon Year 6, Cohort 1 data, including both high-risk control and normative samples. With missing cases excluded, the total N (including overlap) was 407, with 337 normative and 141 high-risk control youth.

56 parents (12% of cohort) were missing observations for the entire measure, including parents of 50 normative youth (13%) and 14 high-risk youth (9%). Most of the missing data are assumed to have resulted from natural attrition from baseline at Year 1. The missing cases included 7 observations from the Durham site, 13 observations from Nashville, 16 observations from Pennsylvania, and 20

observations from Seattle. Data were missing for 24 girls and 32 boys. Ethnic breakdown for missing data was: 1 Asian, 18 Black, 1 Hispanic, 31 White, 5 Other.

### III. Scaling

Two different methods for scaling will be presented. The primary scaling procedure was derived from exploratory factor analyses on the Normative and High Risk Control (HRC) samples, conducted separately for the Discipline & Praise items at Year 5. A more detailed discussion of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis for the primary scaling procedure can be found in the addendum. The alternate scaling was constructed to closely parallel the algorithms used by Loeber and his colleagues in the Pittsburgh Youth Study's "Positive Parenting/Low Reinforcement" construct. It includes items from both the parent and youth versions of this measure, both combined and in separate scales. Although our alternate scale comprises the same items as their scale, our measure uses a 5-point scale, whereas theirs utilized a 3-point scale. Each scale score is derived from the mean of the items that compose it, with the exception of Low Reinforcement, which is the sum of the means of the parent and youth reports.

The resulting scales, associated reliability estimates and descriptive indices for the Normative and High Risk Control samples are provided below. Three items (Items 5, 9, 17) 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 on the scales indicate a higher frequency of the construct label.

#### Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha

	<u>Normative (n=337)</u>	<u>HRC (n =141)</u>
<b>PRIMARY SCALING PROCEDURE</b>		
Appropriate Discipline (Items 1, 2, 4)	.42	.47
Harsh Discipline (Items 3, 6, 7, 8)	.48	.47
Positive Attention (Items 10, 11, 12, 16)	.74	.76
Tangible Rewards (Items 13, 14, 15)	.81	.80
<b>ALTERNATE SCALING PROCEDURE</b>		
Low Reinforcement-Youth Report (Child Items 10r-16r)	.80	.77
Low Reinforcement-Parent Report (Parent Items 9, 10r-16r)	.80	.78
Low Reinforcement-Combined (Sum of Parent & Youth Report)	.79	.78

### 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 = 266) and the High Risk Control sample (including overlapping Normative youth, n = 141). Results indicated that the parents of High Risk youth had higher scores on Appropriate Discipline, Harsh Discipline, and Low Reinforcement (Parent and Combined reports) compared to Low-Risk controls. They rated themselves significantly lower on Positive Attention compared to Low-Risk controls. Also, there was a trend for High Risk parents to score higher on the Low Reinforcement (Youth) scale.

PCC-P Scale	DF	t Value	Pr >  t	Low-Risk Mean (n=266)	High-Risk Mean (n=141)
Appropriate Discipline	405	-2.35	.019	3.26	3.44
Harsh Discipline	405	-3.84	.0001	1.64	1.83
Positive Attention	405	3.06	.002	4.28	4.09
Tangible Rewards	405	1.00	.316	3.44	3.35
Low Reinforcement-Youth	392	-1.73	.084	2.13	2.27
Low Reinforcement-Parent	405	-2.30	.022	2.01	2.15
Low Reinforcement-Combined	406	-2.46	.014	4.13	4.41

## V. Recommendations for Use

This measure was scaled so as to create identical scales as those generated by the youth's report on the About My Parent measure. Note that this scaling is different from what was used in the original Technical Report written by McMahon, Jones, & Kim (1997). The current scales are preferred because they are more specific.

Although Item 8 ("Tell your child to get out or lock him/her out of the house for a while") has low variability, it was retained in the Harsh Discipline scale due to its consistency with more punitive forms of discipline.

## VI. Item and Scale Means and SD's

### ITEM MEANS- NORMATIVE SAMPLE

Variable	Label	Mean	Std Dev	N
P6XP1	Dislike Behavior-Take Away Privilege	3.359	1.192	337
P6XP2	Dislike Behavior-Time Out	2.964	1.162	337
P6XP3	Dislike Behavior-Scold	2.902	1.074	337
P6XP4	Dislike Behavior-Discuss	3.608	0.904	337
P6XP5	Dislike Behavior-Ignore	1.733	0.948	337
P6XP6	Dislike Behavior-Spank	1.589	0.883	336
P6XP7	Dislike Behavior-Hit	1.190	0.556	337
P6XP8	Dislike Behavior-Lock out	1.047	0.285	337
P6XP9	Like Behavior-Ignore	1.555	0.966	337
P6XP10	Like Behavior-Smile	4.243	0.798	337
P6XP11	Like Behavior-Praise	4.409	0.714	337
P6XP12	Like Behavior-Physical Affection	4.318	0.829	337
P6XP13	Like Behavior-Reward	3.549	1.037	337
P6XP14	Like Behavior-Special Privilege	3.430	0.992	337
P6XP15	Like Behavior-Do Something Special	3.338	1.026	337
P6XP16	Like Behavior-Tell Someone	4.033	0.884	337
P6XP17	Like Behavior-Question	2.593	1.306	337

ITEM MEANS-HIGH-RISK CONTROLS

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev
P6XP1	Dislike Behavior-Take Away Privilege	141	3.553	0.974
P6XP2	Dislike Behavior-Time Out	141	3.227	1.031
P6XP3	Dislike Behavior-Scold	141	3.085	0.922
P6XP4	Dislike Behavior-Discuss	141	3.546	0.849
P6XP5	Dislike Behavior-Ignore	141	1.858	0.923
P6XP6	Dislike Behavior-Spank	141	1.809	1.007
P6XP7	Dislike Behavior-Hit	141	1.277	0.611
P6XP8	Dislike Behavior-Lock out	141	1.142	0.515
P6XP9	Like Behavior-Ignore	141	1.574	0.943
P6XP10	Like Behavior-Smile	141	4.035	0.906
P6XP11	Like Behavior-Praise	141	4.248	0.767
P6XP12	Like Behavior-Physical Affection	141	4.064	0.943
P6XP13	Like Behavior-Reward	141	3.433	1.016
P6XP14	Like Behavior-Special Privilege	141	3.390	0.969
P6XP15	Like Behavior-Do Something Special	141	3.234	0.983
P6XP16	Like Behavior-Tell Someone	141	4.007	0.882
P6XP17	Like Behavior-Question	141	2.816	1.280

Scale Means

Scale	Normative Sample (n=337)		High Risk Control (n=141)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Appropriate Discipline	3.31	0.76	3.44	0.67
Harsh Discipline	1.68	0.47	1.83	0.48
Positive Attention	4.25	0.60	4.09	0.66
Tangible Rewards	3.44	0.87	3.35	0.84
Low Reinforcement-Youth	2.15	0.80	2.27	0.80
Low Reinforcement-Parent	2.03	0.59	2.15	0.58
Low Reinforcement-Combined	4.17	1.07	4.41	1.07

**VII. Scale Correlations**

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, Normative Sample above diagonals (n=337), High Risk Controls below diagonals (n=141).

	<b>APPDIS</b>	<b>HARDIS</b>	<b>POSATN</b>	<b>TANREW</b>
<b>Appropriate Discipline</b>	1.00	0.17	0.19	0.28
<b>Harsh Discipline</b>	0.14	1.00	-0.12	0.02
<b>Positive Attention</b>	0.25	-0.18	1.00	0.52
<b>Tangible Rewards</b>	0.29	0.02	0.41	1.00

	<b>Youth</b>	<b>Parent</b>	<b>Combined</b>
<b>Low Reinforcement-Youth</b>	1.00	0.18	0.84
<b>Low Reinforcement-Parent</b>	0.21	1.00	0.68
<b>Low Reinforcement-Combined</b>	0.86	0.68	1.00

## **VII. References**

McMahon, R., Jones, K., & Kim, H. (1997). Parenting, (Primary Caregiver) (Technical Report) [On-line]. Available: <http://www.fasttrackproject.org/>

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.