

**Parenting (Primary Caregiver)**  
**Grade 8/Year 9**

**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:* p9ab

*Scored:* ppc9

**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 9, Cohort 1 data, including both high-risk control and normative samples. With missing cases excluded, the total N (including overlap) was 367, with 304 normative and 126 high-risk control youth.

96 parents (21% of cohort) were missing observations for the entire measure, including parents of 83 normative youth (21%) and 29 high-risk youth (19%). The missing cases included 20 observations from the Durham site, 31 observations from Nashville, 20 observations from Pennsylvania, and 25 observations from Seattle. Data were missing for 39 girls and 57 boys. Ethnic breakdown for missing

data was: 1 Asian, 41 Black, 4 Hispanic, 45 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 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=304)</u>	<u>HRC (n =126)</u>
<b>PRIMARY SCALING PROCEDURE</b>		
Appropriate Discipline (Items 1, 2, 4)	.39	.49
Harsh Discipline (Items 3, 6, 7, 8)	.55	.33
Positive Attention (Items 10, 11, 12, 16)	.79	.69
Tangible Rewards (Items 13, 14, 15)	.82	.77
<b>ALTERNATE SCALING PROCEDURE</b>		
Low Reinforcement-Youth Report (Child Items 10r-16r)	.87	.80
Low Reinforcement-Parent Report (Parent Items 9, 10r-16r)	.84	.78
Low Reinforcement-Combined (Sum of Parent & Youth Report)	.86	.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 = 240) and the High-Risk Control sample (including overlapping Normative youth, n = 126). Results indicated that the parents of High-Risk youth had lower scores on Positive Attention, and higher scores on Low Reinforcement (Youth and Combined reports) compared to Low-Risk controls. There were also statistical trends in the direction of parents of High-Risk youth scoring higher on Harsh Discipline and Low Reinforcement (Parent report).

PCC-P Scale	DF	t Value	Pr >  t	Low-Risk Mean (n=240)	High-Risk Mean (n=126)
Appropriate Discipline	364	-0.34	.736	3.19	3.22
Harsh Discipline	364	-1.76	.079	1.44	1.51
Positive Attention	365	2.93	.004	4.24	4.03
Tangible Rewards	365	-0.31	.760	3.38	3.41
Low Reinforcement-Youth	364	-3.00	.003	2.44	2.73
Low Reinforcement-Parent	365	-1.67	.097	2.03	2.15
Low Reinforcement-Combined	361	-3.03	.003	4.48	4.88

## 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 reliability coefficients are somewhat low for Harsh Discipline (Normative sample) and Appropriate Discipline (High-Risk Control 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
P9ABP1	Dislike Behavior-Take Away Privilege	3.439	1.189	303
P9ABP2	Dislike Behavior-Time Out	2.422	1.168	303
P9ABP3	Dislike Behavior-Scold	2.541	1.094	303
P9ABP4	Dislike Behavior-Discuss	3.700	0.934	303
P9ABP5	Dislike Behavior-Ignore	1.432	0.755	303
P9ABP6	Dislike Behavior-Spank	1.132	0.402	303
P9ABP7	Dislike Behavior-Hit	1.053	0.265	303
P9ABP8	Dislike Behavior-Lock out	1.086	0.430	302
P9ABP9	Like Behavior-Ignore	1.388	0.792	304
P9ABP10	Like Behavior-Smile	4.171	0.862	304
P9ABP11	Like Behavior-Praise	4.461	0.716	304
P9ABP12	Like Behavior-Physical Affection	4.132	0.996	304
P9ABP13	Like Behavior-Reward	3.477	1.111	304
P9ABP14	Like Behavior-Special Privilege	3.526	1.062	304
P9ABP15	Like Behavior-Do Something Special	3.161	1.080	304
P9ABP16	Like Behavior-Tell Someone	3.990	0.956	304
P9ABP17	Like Behavior-Question	2.520	1.435	304

ITEM MEANS-HIGH-RISK CONTROLS

Variable	Label	Mean	Std Dev	N
P9ABP1	Dislike Behavior-Take Away Privilege	3.532	1.237	126
P9ABP2	Dislike Behavior-Time Out	2.524	1.276	126
P9ABP3	Dislike Behavior-Scold	2.634	1.070	126
P9ABP4	Dislike Behavior-Discuss	3.595	0.940	126
P9ABP5	Dislike Behavior-Ignore	1.603	0.830	126
P9ABP6	Dislike Behavior-Spank	1.206	0.598	126
P9ABP7	Dislike Behavior-Hit	1.080	0.325	126
P9ABP8	Dislike Behavior-Lock out	1.135	0.479	126
P9ABP9	Like Behavior-Ignore	1.532	0.969	126
P9ABP10	Like Behavior-Smile	4.040	0.907	126
P9ABP11	Like Behavior-Praise	4.333	0.738	126
P9ABP12	Like Behavior-Physical Affection	3.841	1.046	126
P9ABP13	Like Behavior-Reward	3.540	1.136	126
P9ABP14	Like Behavior-Special Privilege	3.563	1.077	126
P9ABP15	Like Behavior-Do Something Special	3.127	1.051	126
P9ABP16	Like Behavior-Tell Someone	3.897	1.003	126
P9ABP17	Like Behavior-Question	2.826	1.432	126

Scale Means

Scale	Normative Sample (n=304)		High-Risk Control (n=126)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Appropriate Discipline	3.19	0.75	3.22	0.83
Harsh Discipline	1.45	0.38	1.51	0.38
Positive Attention	4.19	0.69	4.03	0.66
Tangible Rewards	3.39	0.93	3.41	0.90
Low Reinforcement-Youth	2.51	0.88	2.73	0.85
Low Reinforcement-Parent	2.06	0.66	2.15	0.63
Low Reinforcement-Combined	4.57	1.25	4.88	1.14

**VII. Scale Correlations**

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, Normative Sample above diagonals (n=304) High-Risk Controls below diagonals (n=126).

	<b>APPDIS</b>	<b>HARDIS</b>	<b>POSATN</b>	<b>TANREW</b>
<b>Appropriate Discipline</b>	1.00	0.08	0.20	0.25
<b>Harsh Discipline</b>	0.14	1.00	-0.16	-0.13
<b>Positive Attention</b>	0.30	-0.15	1.00	0.58
<b>Tangible Rewards</b>	0.25	-0.18	0.52	1.00

	<b>Youth</b>	<b>Parent</b>	<b>Combined</b>
<b>Low Reinforcement-Youth</b>	1.00	0.29	0.86
<b>Low Reinforcement-Parent</b>	0.17	1.00	0.73
<b>Low Reinforcement-Combined</b>	0.84	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.