

**Parent Daily Report: PDR – Child Behavior Items**  
*Grade 4/Year 5 Update*

**FAST Track Project Technical Report**  
**Sean M. Hurley**  
**October, 2000**

**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. Item and Scale Correlations

**Citation**

*Instrument*

Chamberlain, P. & Reid, J. B. (1987). Parent observation and report of child symptoms. *Behavioral Assessment*, 9, 97-109.

Karns, A. (1997). Psychometric Properties of the Parent Daily Report: PDR – Child Behavior Items.

*Report*

Hurley, S.M. (2000). Parent Daily Report – Child Behavior Items (Technical Report) [On-line]. Available: <http://www.fasttrackproject.org>

**Data Sources**

*Raw:* p5k

*Scored:* pdr5

**I. Scale Description** (from the cohort1, year1 technical report)

The PDR is a 30 item checklist of behavior problems developed at the Oregon Social Learning Center. Parents are asked to indicate the presence of each behavior problem on a 0-1 scale (did or did not occur) during the past 24 hours. The first administration of the PDR took place during the summer interview with parents. Then, parents received several follow-up telephone calls from interview staff during the two weeks following the summer interview. During the first year of the project, four follow-up telephone calls were made to parents. After initial analyses suggested that it required only three reports to get a reliable estimate of child behavior problems, the number of follow-up telephone calls was reduced to two (in addition to one administration at the time of the interview). For all of the following analyses, parent's reports of their child's behavior were averaged across the first three administrations of the PDR.

**II. Report Sample**

This exploration was conducted on data for Cohort 1, Year 5, including both high-risk ( $n=155$ ) and normative samples ( $n=387$  including overlap, total  $N=463$ ). 43 students (9% of cohort) were missing responses for the entire scale, including 37 normative students (10%) and 14 high-risk students (9%). The non-respondents included 8 students from the Durham site (4 females, 4 males), 10 students from Nashville (5 females, 5 males), 14 students from Pennsylvania (6 females, 8 males), and 11 students from Seattle (2 females, 9 males).

### III. Scaling

See tech report dated November, 1997 for detailed scaling information.

### IV. Differences Between Groups

A series of t-tests comparing the high-risk control sample and the normative sample (excluding those students also in the high-risk sample) indicated differences on all scaled items at the .05 level. Means were higher for the high-risk control sample than for the normative sample on all items.

T-tests comparing the high-risk control sample to the treatment sample found no differences at the .05 level for any scaled items.

### V. Recommendations for Use

See tech report dated November, 1997 for recommendations for use.

### VI. Scale Means and SD's

High risk control sample:

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev
PDR5COA	Covert Antisocial - PDR Y5	141	0.0988475	0.1124505
PDR5HYP	Hyperactivity - PDR Y5	141	0.1674547	0.2401486
PDR5OAG	Oppositional+Aggressive - PDR Y5	141	0.2650333	0.2121501
PDR5OAR	Oppositional+Aggressive-Revised - PDR Y5	141	0.2154748	0.1795340

Normative sample (including overlap):

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev
PDR5COA	Covert Antisocial - PDR Y5	350	0.0688690	0.0976042
PDR5HYP	Hyperactivity - PDR Y5	350	0.1163492	0.1990881
PDR5OAG	Oppositional+Aggressive - PDR Y5	350	0.2152900	0.1861982
PDR5OAR	Oppositional+Aggressive-Revised - PDR Y5	350	0.1695774	0.1536636

### VII. Item and Scale Correlations

See tech report dated November, 1997 for detailed factor analysis.