

Parenting Practices Inventory
Kindergarten / Year 1
Fast Track Project Technical Report
Shari Miller-Johnson and Anne Maumary-Gremaud
5/3/95

Table of Contents

- I. Scale Description
- II. Scale Derivation
- III. Missing Data
- IV. Subscales Means, SD's and Reliability Coefficients
- V. Subscales Correlations
- VI. Recommendations for use

I. Scale Description

The Parenting Practices Inventory is a 17-item measure developed for this project to assess the parent's permissiveness of their discipline, the effectiveness of their discipline and the consistency of their discipline efforts. The items are coded on a 4-point scale describing specific frequency ratings ("never", "almost never", "sometimes", "often"). The measure was part of the Parent Screen for Year 1. Subsequently, it was moved to the parent summer interview for Year 2 due to concerns about the length of the parent screen.

II. Scale Derivation

An exploratory principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted on the normative sample of the Cohort 1 Year 1 data. Four eigenvalues greater than 1.0 were found. Examination of the scree plot showed a high first factor followed by three lower values. Examination of 2, 3, and 4-factor structures showed the 3-factor solution to yield the best findings in terms of minimizing the double loadings and providing a conceptual fit in accordance with previous results (Lochman & Conduct Problem Prevention Research Group, 1995), specifically:

- Items # 51.54.56.57.60 and 63 : assess the consistency of the parent's discipline
- Items # 53R.59.62R.64R.65R.67R: assess the effectiveness of the parent's discipline
- Items # 52.55.58.61.66: assess the punitiveness of their discipline

Item # 59 (difficulty in controlling child) loaded on the three factors equally. However, the reliability coefficients were generally higher when this item was included in the "effectiveness scale".

A maximum likelihood factor analysis with varimax and promax rotation had concordant results.

Reliability coefficients were then computed as follows:

<i>Consistency subscale</i>	0.71
<i>Effectiveness subscale</i>	0.70
<i>Punitiveness subscale</i>	0.69

Finally, the inter-items correlations were higher within subscales than between subscales, except for item # 59, which had moderately high correlations with most of the items.

III. Missing Data

Seventeen subjects had missing data for this measure, 11 from the Durham site, 4 from the Pennsylvania site and 2 from the Washington site. As per guidelines for handling missing data, a new value was created for the subject by computing the mean value of the other items in this subscale, if less than 50% of the subscale data was missing for this subject.

IV. Subscale Means, SD's, and Reliabilities

COHORT 1 YEAR 1

Consistency Subscale Mean Score All Groups Combined

Analysis Variable	P1ACSCR Consistency mean score		
N	Mean	Std Dev	Cronbach Alpha
609	2.2714833	0.5996173	0.706399

All Groups Combined by Site P1ACSCR Consistency mean score

SITE	Obs	N	Mean	Std Dev
DURH	164	164	2.1429539	0.5996102
NASH	146	146	2.3390411	0.6513806
PENN	164	163	2.3449216	0.5457451
WASH	136	136	2.2659314	0.5835110

High-Risk Sample by Control/Intervention Group

HR	Obs	N	Mean	Std Dev	Cronbach	Alpha
C	155	155	2.4000000	0.5962848	0.699838	0.699838
I	150	150	2.3838889	0.6053220	0.685490	0.685490
HR					0.692323	0.692323

High-Risk Sample by Site and Control/Intervention Group:

P1ACSCR Consistency mean score

SITE	HR	Obs	N	Mean	Std Dev
DURH	C	39	39	2.2820513	0.5800709
	I	39	39	2.2970085	0.6114152
NASH	C	40	40	2.4833333	0.6600095
	I	41	41	2.3333333	0.6810939
PENN	C	40	40	2.4791667	0.6029220
	I	40	40	2.4833333	0.4859859
WASH	C	36	36	2.3472222	0.5245936
	I	30	30	2.4333333	0.6366820

Normative Sample

Analysis Variable	P1ACSCR Consistency mean score		
N	Mean	Std Dev	Cronbach Alpha
382	2.2074607	0.5964416	0.710812

Normative Sample by Site

SITE	NORM	Obs	P1ACSCR Consistency mean score		
			N	Mean	Std Dev
DURH	N	100	100	2.0536111	0.5826215
NASH	N	100	100	2.3516667	0.6543024
PENN	N	97	97	2.2376861	0.5311020
WASH	N	85	85	2.1843137	0.5762171

Effectiveness Subscale Mean Score

All Groups Combined

Analysis Variable	P1AESCR Effectiveness mean score			
N	Mean	Std Dev	Cronbach Alpha	
609	1.6825397	0.5082535	0.730458	

All Groups Combined by Site

Analysis Variable : P1AESCR Effectiveness mean score

SITE	Obs	N	Mean	Std Dev
DURH	164	164	1.6089092	0.5569596
NASH	146	146	1.7522831	0.5379243
PENN	164	163	1.7315951	0.4574697
WASH	136	136	1.6376634	0.4584205

High-Risk Sample by Control/Intervention Group Effectiveness mean score

HR	Obs	N	Mean	Std Dev	Cronbach Alpha
C	155	155	1.8822581	0.5196176	0.713090
I	150	150	1.8655556	0.5233891	0.704606
HR					0.708724

High-Risk Sample Variable : P1AESCR Effectiveness mean score

SITE	HR	Obs	N	Mean	Std Dev
DURH	C	39	39	1.7799145	0.5912641
	I	39	39	1.9145299	0.5809749
NASH	C	40	40	1.9500000	0.5122433
	I	41	41	1.8699187	0.5608924
PENN	C	40	40	1.9291667	0.4962645
	I	40	40	1.9250000	0.4559671
WASH	C	36	36	1.8657407	0.4711004
	I	30	30	1.7166667	0.4696742

Normative Sample

Analysis Variable	P1AESCR Effectiveness mean score			
N	Mean	Std Dev	Cronbach Alpha	
382	1.5586824	0.4567995	0.695698	

Normative Sample by Site

Analysis Variable	P1AESCR Effectiveness mean score				
SITE	NORM	Obs	N	Mean	Std Dev
DURH	N	100	100	4327778	0.4586700
NASH	N	100	100	1.6916667	0.5304293
PENN	N	97	97	1.5661512	0.3780620
WASH	N	85	85	1.5418301	0.4040784

Punitiveness Subscale Mean Score

All Groups Combined

Analysis Variable	P1APSCR Punitiveness mean score		
N	Mean	Std Dev	Cronbach Alpha
609	2.5977011	0.5652130	0.649637

All Groups Combined by Site P1APSCR Punitiveness mean score

SITE	Obs	N	Mean	Std Dev
DURH	164	164	2.4990244	0.6217561
NASH	146	146	2.7109589	0.6029952
PENN	164	163	2.6525153	0.4965565
WASH	136	136	2.5294118	0.5015705

High-Risk Sample by Control/Intervention Group

Analysis Variable			; P1APSCR Punitiveness mean score		Cronbach	Alpha
HR	Obs	N	Mean	Std Dev		
C	155	155	2.8245161	0.5223998		0.590897
I	150	150	2.7906667	0.4744968		0.397334
HR						0.504792

High-Risk Sample by Site and Control/Intervention Group

Analysis	Variable	: P1APSCR Punitiveness means<			
SITE	HR	Obs	N	Mean	Std Dev
DURH	C	39	39	2.7384615	0.5715240
	I	39	39	2.8461538	0.4529704
NASH	C	40	40	2.9400000	0.4944824
	I	41	41	2.8341463	0.5566012
PENN	C	40	40	2.8600000	0.5343580
	I	40	40	2.8150000	0.4110961
WASH	C	36	36	2.7500000	0.4741910
	I	30	30	2.6266667	0.4448427

Normative Sample

Analysis Variable	P1APSCR Punitiveness mean score		
N	Mean	Std Dev	Cronbach Alpha
382	2.4801047	0.5701848	0.687921

Normative Sample by Site P1APSCR Punitiveness mean score

SITE	NORM	Obs	N	Mean	Std Dev
DURH	N	100	100	2.3004000	0.5975437
NASH	N	100	100	2.6660000	0.6280031
PENN	N	97	97	.5068041	0.4755601
WASH	N	85	85	2.4423529	0.4986593

V. Subscale Correlations

Normative Sample:

	Consistency	Effectiveness	Punitiveness
Consistency	1.0	0.44	0.44
Effectiveness	0.44	1.0	0.50
Punitiveness	0.44	0.50	1.0

High-Risk Sample:

	Consistency	Effectiveness	Punitiveness
Consistency	1.0	0.40	0.35
Effectiveness	0.40	1.0	0.36
Punitiveness	0.35	0.36	1.0

VI. Recommendations for Use

It is recommended that the mean scores for the Consistency, Effectiveness and Punitiveness subscale be utilized for analyses. Results are consistent with previous factorization (Lochman & Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, in press). The subscales demonstrate adequate reliability, although, there is a moderately high correlation between the Punitiveness and Effectiveness subscales in the normative sample. Furthermore, item # 59 can be classified with either the Punitiveness or Effectiveness subscales, resulting in only very low changes in the reliability coefficients.

References:

Lochman J.E. & Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (1995). Screening of child behavior problems for prevention programs at school entry. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63, 549-559.