

**Parenting (Primary Caregiver)**  
**Grade 7/Year 8**

**FAST Track Project Technical Report**  
**Cari McCarty & Suzanne Doyle**  
**January 2002**

**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. (2002). Parenting (Primary Caregiver) (Technical Report) [On-line]. Available: <http://www.fasttrackproject.org/>

**Data Sources**

*Raw:* p8ab

*Scored:* ppc8

**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 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 (17%) 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 29 girls and 43 boys. Ethnic breakdown for missing

data was: 1 Asian, 34 Black, 3 Hispanic, 31 White, 3 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 and Praise items at Year 5. 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 (based on Year 5 scaling). Higher scores on the scales indicate a higher frequency of the construct label.

#### Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha

	<u>Normative (n=323)</u>	<u>HRC (n =133)</u>
<b>PRIMARY SCALING PROCEDURE</b>		
Appropriate Discipline (Items 1, 2, 4)	.36	.47
Harsh Discipline (Items 3, 6, 7, 8)	.55	.52
Positive Attention (Items 10, 11, 12, 16)	.79	.82
Tangible Rewards (Items 13, 14, 15)	.81	.76
<b>ALTERNATE SCALING PROCEDURE</b>		
Low Reinforcement-Youth Report (Child Items 10r-16r)	.86	.88
Low Reinforcement-Parent Report (Parent Items 9, 10r-16r)	.81	.81
Low Reinforcement-Combined (Sum of Parent & Youth Report)	.84	.84

### 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 = 258) and the High-Risk Control sample (including overlapping Normative youth, n = 133). Results indicated that the parents of High-Risk youth had higher scores on Appropriate Discipline, Harsh Discipline, and Low Reinforcement (Youth and Combined reports) compared to Low-Risk controls.

PCC-P Scale	DF	t Value	Pr >  t	Low-Risk Mean (n=258)	High-Risk Mean (n=133)
Appropriate Discipline	388	-3.34	.0009	3.14	3.41
Harsh Discipline	219*	-3.01	.003	1.48	1.62
Positive Attention	389	1.54	.125	4.21	4.10
Tangible Rewards	389	0.20	.845	3.46	3.44
Low Reinforcement-Youth	230*	-2.69	.008	2.37	2.65
Low Reinforcement-Parent	389	-1.20	.231	2.02	2.10
Low Reinforcement-Combined	382	-2.77	.006	4.39	4.75

\*T-test with Satterthwaite correction for degrees of freedom (df) used given statistical inequalities of variances.

## 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, and Kim (1997). The current scales are preferred because they are more specific, although the reliability coefficient for Appropriate Discipline is somewhat low in the Normative sample.

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
P8ABP1	Dislike Behavior-Take Away Privilege	3.378	1.208	323
P8ABP2	Dislike Behavior-Time Out	2.545	1.254	323
P8ABP3	Dislike Behavior-Scold	2.551	1.072	323
P8ABP4	Dislike Behavior-Discuss	3.709	0.985	323
P8ABP5	Dislike Behavior-Ignore	1.483	0.805	323
P8ABP6	Dislike Behavior-Spank	1.251	0.570	323
P8ABP7	Dislike Behavior-Hit	1.111	0.370	323
P8ABP8	Dislike Behavior-Lock out	1.050	0.280	323
P8ABP9	Like Behavior-Ignore	1.402	0.826	323
P8ABP10	Like Behavior-Smile	4.195	0.903	323
P8ABP11	Like Behavior-Praise	4.437	0.725	323
P8ABP12	Like Behavior-Physical Affection	4.149	0.963	323
P8ABP13	Like Behavior-Reward	3.533	1.107	323
P8ABP14	Like Behavior-Special Privilege	3.509	1.048	322
P8ABP15	Like Behavior-Do Something Special	3.359	1.070	323
P8ABP16	Like Behavior-Tell Someone	4.037	0.922	323
P8ABP17	Like Behavior-Question	2.328	1.337	323

ITEM MEANS-HIGH-RISK CONTROLS

Variable	Label	Mean	Std Dev	N
P8ABP1	Dislike Behavior-Take Away Privilege	3.750	1.044	132
P8ABP2	Dislike Behavior-Time Out	2.924	1.143	132
P8ABP3	Dislike Behavior-Scold	2.774	1.119	133
P8ABP4	Dislike Behavior-Discuss	3.541	1.055	133
P8ABP5	Dislike Behavior-Ignore	1.621	0.887	132
P8ABP6	Dislike Behavior-Spank	1.379	0.694	132
P8ABP7	Dislike Behavior-Hit	1.182	0.564	132
P8ABP8	Dislike Behavior-Lock out	1.144	0.540	132
P8ABP9	Like Behavior-Ignore	1.519	0.934	133
P8ABP10	Like Behavior-Smile	4.068	0.931	133
P8ABP11	Like Behavior-Praise	4.308	0.790	133
P8ABP12	Like Behavior-Physical Affection	3.977	1.004	133
P8ABP13	Like Behavior-Reward	3.59	1.030	133
P8ABP14	Like Behavior-Special Privilege	3.450	1.032	131
P8ABP15	Like Behavior-Do Something Special	3.271	1.074	133
P8ABP16	Like Behavior-Tell Someone	4.038	0.941	133
P8ABP17	Like Behavior-Question	2.797	1.369	133

Scale Means

Scale	Normative Sample (n=323)		High-Risk Control (n=133)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Appropriate Discipline	3.21	0.77	3.41	0.75
Harsh Discipline	1.49	0.40	1.62	0.48
Positive Attention	4.20	0.69	4.10	0.74
Tangible Rewards	3.47	0.91	3.44	0.86
Low Reinforcement-Youth	2.45	0.88	2.65	0.99
Low Reinforcement-Parent	2.02	0.62	2.10	0.63
Low Reinforcement-Combined	4.47	1.22	4.75	1.28

**VII. Scale Correlations**

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

	<b>APPDIS</b>	<b>HARDIS</b>	<b>POSATN</b>	<b>TANREW</b>
<b>Appropriate Discipline</b>	1.00	0.08	0.27	0.30
<b>Harsh Discipline</b>	0.05	1.00	-0.19	-0.04
<b>Positive Attention</b>	0.44	-0.19	1.00	0.49
<b>Tangible Rewards</b>	0.42	-0.22	0.52	1.00

	<b>Youth</b>	<b>Parent</b>	<b>Combined</b>
<b>Low Reinforcement-Youth</b>	1.00	0.29	0.87
<b>Low Reinforcement-Parent</b>	0.23	1.00	0.72
<b>Low Reinforcement-Combined</b>	0.88	0.66	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.