

Appendix C: Parent Developmental Interview Coding Manual
Version 9.3

Robert C. Planta, Thomas G. O'Connor, Marla Morog, Suzanne Button, Jaqueline Dimmock, and Robert S. Marvin

University of Virginia

February, 1995

Overview of the conceptual model

This manual presents a system for scoring parents' representations of their relationship with their child and of themselves as a parent. These representations are elicited in a semi-structured interview format. This particular manual and scoring system was developed using the Parent Development Interview, a semi-structured interview concerning parents' representations of their relationships with their child. The PDI contains questions regarding a parent's description of their relationship in general, and with respect to specific topics or themes/situations such as discipline, achievement, separation, and affect.

Parents are probed throughout the interview to provide examples for their characterizations of the child, and for thoughts and feelings associated with these examples/episodes. Although this manual was developed on the PDI, the **scoring system** is designed to be sufficiently flexible to be applied to almost any semi-structured interview of parenting, and can be used in clinical and research applications. An overview of the conceptual model underlying the PDI and this scoring system is detailed in Planta et al. (1994).

In the present scoring system, parents' mental representations of their relationship with their child are assessed with respect to three areas: a) content or themes represented, b) process or *how* the parent represents him/herself and the content, and c) affective tone of representations. Together, these three areas provide a fairly comprehensive view of the representational system with respect to a given parent-child relationship, from the parents' perspective. These three areas are conceptually distinct (to some degree) and can provide qualitatively different information. The 14 scales are classified into these three areas. The

content area includes “Mentions compliance”, “Ineffectiveness of compliance/control management” , “Mentions business of caregiving”, “Mentions child’s achievement”, and “Comfort/Safe haven”. The process areas include “Perspective-taking”, “Enmeshment”, “Neutralize”, and “Confusion of response.” The Affect area includes “Anger”, “Positive Affect”, “Guilt”, “Worry/Anxiety about the future”, and “Pain/Burden”. The system, as developed, is open-ended. One could easily imagine adding questions to the interview or constructs to the scoring system, along with associated scales. This manual only details the scoring system as developed to date, and will most likely change with further research and refinement.

Overview of the scoring system

This scoring system in which responses to each question are rated was designed as an alternative to global rating scales. There are two important advantages of this system over a coding system that is based on the parent's responses to the interview *as a whole*. First, because parents' responses to each question are scored, this system can discriminate individuals based on hypothesized "mismatches" of responses and questions (e.g., reporting a response reflecting anger for the "What makes you happy as a parent?" question), discriminate groups of parents on a specific question (e.g., the "What gives you the most pain?" question may be more salient for parents of children with a particular characteristic, e.g. a disability or illness, than other parents) and identify specific questions that appear most salient or provocative for parents in general (e.g., "What gives you the most pain?" may be a more discriminating/differentiating question than "What gives you the most joy in being a parent?"). Second, this system may increase variability of the scales because "themes" in the parent's responses (e.g., "Pain") surface across several questions, and, therefore, ratings are composited across the interview. Thus, for example, parents who consistently mention "Pain" (i.e., pain is an organizing theme in their representational model) are easily discriminated from their peers who may mention pain only in response to the question, "What gives you the most pain as a parent?".

Overall the system is designed to provide as comprehensive a description as possible of parents' mental representations without sacrificing detail, and to provide maximum flexibility in analysis and research. One scale - **Confusion** - is scored globally over the

interview as a whole. This scale is designed to reflect a possibly large number of disparate elements, all of which are hypothesized to indicate some form of disorganization in the parent's representational system. The scale points for this scale are presented following the rest of the system.

A 4-point scale (0 - 3) was adopted to score each response to a single question in the interview on each scale. A completed scoring system will have all questions in the PDI scored on all scales in the scoring system. Scoring criteria for each scale point are given below.

Coding Instructions

1. Record the start and end time of each response.
2. Carefully *record* parent responses to each question, taking detailed notes of the parents' response, then rate his/her response on all rating scales. It is sometimes helpful to rate the parent's responses as they are mentioned (e.g., rate "Mentions Business" immediately after the parent reports a relevant statement) and not wait to code until after the response is complete.
3. Here are some general coding guidelines when a response includes several sections or subresponses.
 - a) If multiple references to a particular scale are present in a single response, code the highest level present.
 - b) The scales were designed to be conceptually distinct (although some overlap is certainly expected). Check individual scales for scoring rules regarding any possible coding hierarchy of related codes.
4. There are a few very specific coding instructions to handle some potentially confusing situations. Coders need to be familiar with the description of a construct given in the manual and make reasoned judgements about the extent to which that construct is reflected in the parent's response. Each construct and scale point has examples associated with it in the codebook, but in many/most cases these examples will not be exactly what is contained in a given interview. It is necessary for the coder to study

the manual, construct descriptions, and examples at scale anchor points to become familiar with the range of responses and how a given construct is scaled.

a) When using the PDI, always code the first separation under "First separation". In some cases, two "first separations" are probed if the first separation involved mom leaving the child at the hospital. In any case, the first separation (chronologically first) is coded.

b) The parent's response (i.e., what is considered codable) to the adjective section includes whatever the parent says to back up his/her example.

General code points for each scale:

0 = no evidence of construct, parent's response does not include any reference to construct or related issues.

1 = vague, minimal evidence of construct; parent's response includes reference to topics "close" to the construct being assessed; parent may also mention the construct but does not give a clear (full, complete) example.

2 = clear evidence; there is clear evidence the parent mentions the dimension directly or the dimension is clearly a part of the parent's response, although no episodic example is given, or little detail or elaboration is present.

3 = detailed, elaborated, or episodic description; parent offers a qualitative or quantitative extension of a "3" response. These are often prototypic examples or definitions of a given construct.

NOTE: Coders should expect that the information coded within a given response will most likely be in the form of incomplete sentences, phrases, subtle expressions embedded within the response, etc. It is not the case that codes are typically made on the basis of highly detailed, complete responses containing highly relevant information.

Preliminary Reliability Results

This scoring system has been used on approximately 40 interviews of mothers, collected by the Child-Parent Attachment Project at the University of Virginia. These mothers were part of a study of children between the ages of 15 and 50 months. The children in the study include subsamples with cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and a control group with no known disability or illness condition.

All interviews have been coded by two independent coders. Reliability is calculated two ways; exact hits on the 0-3 scale are always the criterion for agreement. In one method of calculation, agreement is calculated based on simply the code assigned by the raters (0 to 3). Interrater agreement using this method is above 90% for the 40 cases coded. However, this method may inflate agreement because a large proportion of responses are coded "0" because there is no relevant content for a particular construct in a particular response. Because of this, we calculated reliability ONLY for those responses on which one coder assigned something other than a "0." Using this method, interrater agreement exceeds 70% for the 40 cases coded.

Content Codes: Mentions Compliance, Ineffectiveness with Control/Compliance, Mentions Business of Caregiving, Mentions Child's Achievement, Mentions Comfort/Safe Haven

These scales reflect the content domains of the parent's representational model of parenting. These refer to the content of interactions between parent and the target child, and in a sense, to the role(s) that the parent plays in the development of the child. We hypothesize at least 4 such domains: Compliance, Caregiving, Developmental Achievement, and Comfort/Safe Haven. Within each of these domains are scales for the parent's reference to that domain - thus there is a "Mentions ____" scale for each domain. For the Compliance domain there is a specific scale reflecting aspects of the parent's representations with respect to that particular domain. Within the Caregiving domain there is the Mentions Business of

Caregiving- which assesses the parent's view of him/herself in the functional aspects of childrearing. Comfort/Safe Haven measures the parent's view of him/herself as an attachment figure.

For these scales ONLY content involving the parent and the TARGET CHILD is coded. For example, if the parent discusses non-compliant interactions with a child other than the target, these are not coded on these scales.

Mentions compliance/control.

This scale measures whether the parent's response refers to the child's compliance with parental (or other) rules or struggles over parent's (vs the child's) control in the situation or class of situations being discussed. (This scale does not measure problems with compliance, but simply whether compliance is mentioned in the response). There must be an explicit reference to the target child. There is no assumption that this scale is positive or negative (i.e., distinguishes good and bad parenting); it simply reflects how dominant the theme of behavior management/compliance is in the parent's working model of him/herself as a parent. At the high end compliance is clear in the response, at the low end it is not present.

This scale can be tricky when coding parents' experiences with infants, but the coder should code what the parent says, even if the **coder** knows that a 3 month-old is not capable of compliance per se ("he was fussing at me all day, he just would not do what I wanted"). If the parent frames the content as compliance, then it is coded on this scale. When discussing an infant and there is clearly no reference to compliance ("he was sick that day and fussed all morning") score a "0."

3 = parent offers a detailed (i.e., episodic scenario) example or gives several examples of compliance, e.g., "he usually does what he is told, but sometimes he can get a little fussy and protest a little if he had a rough morning or he just wants to assert himself-- he's two, you know".

2 = parent mentions some aspect of compliance/behavior management or rules violated or limits tested, e.g., he didn't do what I told him to do", "she behaved like a good little girl", "he refused to go to bed", "she kept testing limits all night" "he followed directions". The response is not detailed or elaborate but contains explicit reference to compliance.

1 =reference to compliance is oblique, as when "he can be temperamental", "he fussed", "he was showing off again", coder must make inferences regarding behavior management issue, there is not an explicit reference to compliance with parent/rule/limits. The reference may also be vague and unclear, e.g., "he had a bad (good) day.

0 = no reference at all to compliance

Ineffectiveness of Compliance/Control Management

Parent reports problems with compliance/control of child's behavior. This scale measures the extent to which the parent reports difficulty with their management of child noncompliance, or feeling out of control. This is not a scale of how "out of control" the child is, because very out of control children may not be *represented* by the parent as a compliance problem. Thus the scale reflects the parents perceptions of themselves as out of control or ineffective. Parents who score above a '2' are in some degree of distress. The main objective of this scale is to discriminate parents who see themselves as able to negotiate (possible developmentally-related) compliance/behavior management issues from those who see themselves as ineffective or their children as out of control. At the high end parents represent themselves as helpless, overwhelmed and lacking in skills to manage the child; there is a sense of "giving up" or passive resignation and no evidence that the parent takes action to manage the situation. At the low end the parents feel effective (even if child is noncompliant).

- 3 = parent sees self as out of control or helpless/overwhelmed, or unable to respond to child's behavior e.g., "I just don't know what to do with him, he's all over the place and getting into everything-- shouting, kicking his sister-- and I just don't know what to do with him". The critical aspect of this scale point is the parent's reported helplessness, passivity, or lack of self-control (e.g. "I lost it and smacked him") in the face of child noncompliance. At this level it is evident that the parent has difficulty managing themselves, as well as the child. Parents who report taking some action to reduce child noncompliance (e.g. "time-out" etc.) that are not just punitive are not scored.
- 2 = parent reports feeling/being ineffective but does take action to manage the child that is, the parent tried to do something to control the child, but was ineffective. e.g., "I told him not to climb up on the counter, but he did it anyway...he'll disobey what I say just to make me angry", "he really got the best of me the other day-- I just couldn't get him to stop misbehaving no matter what I did" "I sent him to his room but he still yelled and yelled until I let him out". The critical feature is that the parent reports some response to the child, but still feels ineffective.
- 1 = The parent reports child's bothersome behavior but parent's report of their response to the child's behavior is not complete or detailed enough to indicate whether the response was clearly successful or not in handling the behavior. The behavior clearly bothers the parent e.g., "he just wouldn't cooperate", "he was pulling things out of the cabinets when I was making dinner", "he likes to try to pull my strings/push my buttons" but it does not seem to lead to parent behavior and feelings of ineffectiveness. There is no evidence of clear, effective action by parent. In this case, the parent may do something ("time-outs") but the outcome in term of child management is unclear- e.g., "we ended up just having a difficult afternoon--- she was upset and I was upset".

0 = no mention of compliance problems or parent reports having confidence in successful strategies for managing the child's behavior problem, e.g., "when he's a pain like that what work is to just send him to his room and let him cool off. "We sometimes have a stand-off about him getting into his car seat and I just have to pick him up and put him there."

Mentions Business of Caregiving

Parent mentions caregiving behaviors involving direct personal contact with the child such as diapering, feeding, dressing, bathing, rocking, putting to bed, hygiene, giving medicine, etc. Often, caregiving examples may overlap with other codes (e.g., if parent reports having difficulty putting the child to bed), and that's OK. This scale reflects the extent to which the parent reports self as directly involved in the care of the child at the behavioral level.

NOTE: taking the child to a sitter, the doctor's, providing treatment or rehabilitation, or arranging daycare for the child are all NOT considered direct physical caregiving as defined for the purposes of this scale. These parenting behaviors are NOT scored here.

3 = parent reports involvement in caregiving behaviors with the child, e.g., "I washed him and then we had breakfast-I have to get him ready for school by seven", "bathing usually takes at least 30 minutes because there's the dressing/undressing-- that's an easy 15 minutes in itself, and then sometimes she doesn't like the water temperature-- she's really sensitive to that". Parent mentions one clear instance of involvement in caregiving behavior with direct contact with child, e.g., "I fed him", "I put him to sleep".

2 = Some caregiving appears to be performed but it is unclear if the parent is directly involved with the target child; questionable direct involvement in caregiving with the child, or questionable whether the parent is actively caregiving. For example, the

parent mentions making dinner, but it is not clear whether it is for the child, or "we have breakfast at 730, lunch at 1100 and everyone is in bed by 9", "someone gets him up and ready each morning" , "we feed him using a spoon". For parallel reasons, going out to eat is scored a "2".

1 = vague reference to the construct of direct/physical caregiving (e.g., "he's fun to take care of", "taking care of him is tough" "makes me feel good to be able to provide for her needs").

0 = no mention of direct/physical caregiving (taking to sitter is scored a '0')

Mentions child's achievement/performance

This scale measures the parent's references to the child's performance of skills and behaviors or more general reference to developmental progress. The scale assesses the parents' mental occupation with the child's developmental progress. The key to scoring interview content is the parents' indication of the **progression** aspect of the child's behavior, and not just reference to child behavior in general or absence of a skill (e.g. "he's starting to learn to walk" vs. "he can't walk"). A mention of time is a very good clue that the parent is thinking about progress. The high end is an explicit, detailed example of the child's progress in a certain area of development (social, motor, cognitive, language, self-help)

3 = parent reports detailed description of child's progress in terms of what the child is actually doing progress-wise (each day he gets better are walking, he can now go from the table to the chair), a brief history of the child's developmental skills, e.g., "well, he started crawling at 5 months, but he really didn't start to walk until 18 months, but he could stand while holding on to the table at around 12 months". Parent may also go into detail regarding what s/he has to do to get the child to perform desired skills ("I have to work with her everyday to get her to walk, if I don't do it, she won't walk.").

If parent gives a "2" level response for 2 separate developmental areas (language, self-help), score a "3."

2 = there is clear indication of the parent having a sense of developmental progress, the parent is not vague regarding the child's progress but does not offer details on the child's behavior/skills (e.g., motor, communication). Examples of a "2" include "she needs to learn how to interact with other kids," or "he's not doing what he should be doing (at this age)", indicating awareness of the lack of progression. Also included are clear references to future performance, e.g., "I worry about whether he'll be able to walk", "I'm not sure when she'll be able to speak clearly".

1 = the reference to **progression** is vague or it is questionable that the parent is aware of progression, this can include statements the child is not "average" --- these are considered a less direct example of the parent's awareness of progress. Examples of a "1" include "she needs to interact with other kids," "he's not like normal kids (vs. "she needs to learn how to...)", or "it would make things easier if he could talk." A basic comparison is included here – "she does not walk (speak)."

0 = there is no mention of a developmental progression, but there is a mention of the child's behavior or skills (e.g., "he likes to run", "she can't talk", "she likes social interactions").

Comfort/save haven/secure base

Parent mentions him/herself comforting, soothing, or having contact with the (distressed or not) child in response to separation/threat/fear/disequilibrium on the part of the child or parent gives example of child's secure base behavior. Particularly salient are instances in which the parent reports the child was distressed by something, sought the parent, and the parent comforted the child. These are instances of prototypic comfort/save-haven behavior and when they are reported in a detailed manner they should be given a 3.

At the lower end of the scale are examples in which there appears to be evidence for general comfort or physical contact situations.

3 = Parent describes an episode in which s/he comforts or soothes a child in response to separation, threat, or fear. The parent must refer to the fact that the child was distressed (see above types of distress) **and** the (parent) behavior that resulted in the alleviation of the distress, e.g., "she was scared by the clown at the parade so I gave her a hug", "he is never happy when I drop him off at daycare, but if I stick around for a few minutes he seems to be ok", "she woke up the other night after a nightmare and I had to calm her down". In the case of a "3" it is clear the child's attachment system has been activated and that the parent's response terminated the attachment behavior.

2 = there is a report of safe haven/comfort-seeking behavior on the part of the child. The child is distressed and is seeking the parent for comfort because of distress, but there is no information on what the parent did in response to the child's behavior or whether the parent's presence alleviated the distress, e.g., "he was upset when I came home and calmed down when he saw me" or "she tugs my leg when I drop her off at daycare in the morning", or "she didn't want to go away from me/home on her first day at daycare", or "he saw a scary dog and ran and hid behind me". Also, any reunion behavior by the child is scored as a "2" e.g., "it's nice to come home at the end of the day because he gives me a big hug", "she's happy to see me when I pick her up from school" (in these cases of extended separations prior to reunion, we assume the child is in some state of disequilibrium even if there is no evidence for overt distress). In the case of a "2" it is clear the child's attachment system has been activated but it is not clear what the parent's response was, and whether that response terminated the attachment behavior

1 = Parent gives example of comfort-seeking or contact-seeking and there is no evidence of disequilibrium/distress of the child, e.g., "he comes up to nuzzle while we watch t.v.", "he loves to run up to my bed in the morning and give me a big hug" OR

parent reports unspecified child distress that s/he responds to, as in the case of caring for an infant, and the overall answer is unclear e.g., "she gets fussy sometimes and likes to be held." These are very vague or general answers in which comfort-seeking by the child and parental responses are both unclear. There is a possibility that the child's attachment behavior system has been activated but no clear evidence.

0 = no contact between child and parent, or contact (even pleasurable contact) is clearly not related to attachment system being activated in that situation, e.g. "he likes to play together in the tub" It is clear the child's attachment behavior system has NOT been activated.

NOTE: Management of child's physical needs (feeding, changing) are NOT scored here unless there is a comfort-seeking component.

Process codes: Perspective taking, Enmeshment, Neutralizing/defensive, Confusion of response.

This set of scales reflects process dimensions of the parent's representational system. Included are scales for constructs reflecting aspects of the parent's differentiation from the child (Perspective-Taking, Enmeshment), the processing of affect in the representations (Neutralizing), and indicators of disorganization in mental processes when discussing the relationship with the child (Confusion of Response).

As before, the coder should focus ONLY on content relevant to the TARGET CHILD and not code (on these scales) content referring to a sibling or another child, or children in general. Also, on these scales it is important the coder have a sense of the overall scale descriptor before assigning a particular code, because it is impossible to script each example in an anchor-point description.

Perspective-Taking

Parent's response indicates that s/he views the child with independent states, thoughts and feelings (these must be tenable, believable, not misattributions). Simply labeling

feelings (i.e., something internal to the child) (e.g. "she felt sad", "things have been hard for her" "he does better with a sitter than he used to") are scored a "1" because they do not qualify not as real perspective-taking, if s/he describes the idea of taking the child's perspective score a "1".

In order to receive a score of "3" the parent must provide an example indicating awareness of the child's perspective - including a description of the child's state and a NARRATED link between the child's state and the reason for that state. If the state is described and plausible reasons are included in the answer but NOT narrated, the response is coded a "2" and if the state is described without the answer including plausible reasons for the state, it is coded a "1." Examples of hypothetical perspective taking, e.g. "if she wanted to go to the park and I said no she'd be pretty mad" are coded IF the example is related to plausible real-life situations but NOT coded if its far in the future or not related to current parent-child interactions e.g. "I worry about how he feels when he gets to school" said of a 12 month old.

3 = parent puts him/herself in the position/mindset of the child and is not just labeling the child's feelings/thoughts. Parent's response is an attempt to understand the child from the child's perspective and offer reasons for the child's experience (reasons from the child's view). For a "3" answer, the parent identifies the child's state, links to state to a "cause" and narrates the link between state and cause, e.g., "she had a tough time adjusting to the new schedule because she needs stability after all the changes we've been through", "going to the doctor's is tough because she has no control over what happens". Statements such as "she liked to go to the library because she enjoys the time together" "he was angry because I took his toy away" are also included, although minimal.

2 =parent indicates awareness of child's perspective, and may offer concrete example of child's state and may give reasons for it, e.g. "she's more aware of her surroundings now" "she seems to be getting used to separations" but does not narrate the links between state and reason. A "2-code" is different from a "3-code" because the parent

is not explicit about what caused the child's internal state or does not narrate the link between the two. Perspective-taking of the sort scored a "3" is easily inferred in many answers because the parent may describe a scenario in which the child's feelings and the reasons for them are obvious, but the links are not narrated. These responses are scored as "2".

Also included as a "2" are attempts to understand the child's state without a clear explanation of the cause "he really seemed upset but no way I could figure out why" "I think he's getting more comfortable at daycare because he seems less upset, but its hard to tell" "I can see it in his eyes that he gets excited when we go to the park."

1 = parent gives a statement regarding child's state - this report does not offer reasons for the state, either explicitly or by inference. "He was angry" "she enjoys time together" "he hates the doctor visits" "she was hoping to go to grandma's for the day"

-Parent mentions the idea of perspective-taking is scored a "1", e.g., "I try to think about how he'll react to what I do"

- Hypothetical perspective-taking is scored a "1" for example "when he gets to school I wonder how he'll feel about other kids teasing him."

0 = no evidence of perspective-taking

Enmeshment

Parent can receive a 3 for any of several reasons all of which are hypothesized to reflect inappropriate parent-child boundaries on the part of the parent. At the high end parent attitudes, feelings or behaviors are clearly inappropriate for the child - 1) roles of parent and child are reversed or confused ("I need hugs from her to feel good", "she's really my best friend, I can't do without her"), 2) parent's feelings are conditional and identical to the child's feelings (as in, e.g. "if s/he feels happy, then I feel happy") , 3) hypervigilance that is without apparent reason (e.g. "I have to watch him all the time, I'm afraid someone might steal him"}, 4) identity confusion ("This child is my life, everything I do is for him, and he is

everything to me,"), and 5) awarding the child inappropriate power and influence ("she felt my neediness and saw a hole in me, went in and dug around.").

At the more moderate levels, the "enmeshment" of parent and child could be understandable but remains a possible risk to the child's development, such as - parent is overinvolved in child's life (e.g., "I do everything for her") or ("if I'm not there all the time he might do something to hurt himself"), ("she makes me feel good", "we're just always together, we're never separated") or inappropriateness with respect to boundaries ("I need to watch her all the time"). At low levels ("1") enmeshment may be normal for involved parent-child relationship.

3 = solid evidence of clear enmeshment, from the multiple options listed in above, e.g., "I go to her to cheer me up", such that it is apparent in the example that roles are reversed or parent is extensively overinvolved. The parent's feelings or beliefs are clearly inappropriate with respect to parent-child boundaries. See "high end" examples above. "I was sad last Tuesday but we clicked when he saw I was sad and came up and gave me a hug, I needed that to feel better."

2 = there is a mild quality to the above statements such that they seem to indicate some degree of possible overinvolvement ("we're just always together, we're never separated" "he takes care of me, I take care of him") or inappropriateness with respect to boundaries ("I can't let him out of my sight") or power ("I'm so close to him it threatens my relationship with my husband") See "moderate" examples above.

1 = slight "enmeshment" such that it appears quite appropriate for child and parent and children and would not have an apparent negative impact on the child ("she makes me feel good") ("I need to keep a close eye on him all the time"). This scale point may reflect normative parenting practices under many circumstances; even though there may be a tone of overprotection, or role reversal it is not clearly enmeshing and may seem

circumstantial, although not enough detail is presented in order to be certain that no enmeshment is indicated (i.e. the response is a "0").

0 = no evidence of enmeshment, there is no information in the response about the boundary between parent and child- "I try to spend as much time with him as I can", "she's just a great kid, I love her to death". The response may at first seem codable as a "1" but is qualified with additional information so as to support it's appropriateness in a particular situation "he's pretty clumsy so I really need to hover near him when we are at the playground and he's trying to climb around.

Neutralize

The overriding theme of this code is the parent's attempt to distance him/herself from the NEGATIVE affective component of the question. The code is akin to the avoidant or dismissing strategy in discussions of attachment, in which emotion in the context of a discussion/interaction is dismissed, neutralized, or avoided. If the end result of the response does not seem to neutralize negative affect or somehow avoid the question, neutralize should not be scored at the high end. A parent who delays in responding to the question, but then goes on to talk at length about something else or discusses other feelings is not neutralizing. The scale is designed to reflect the degree to which a parent "backs away from" discussion of emotion in the interview, and may take many forms - including not responding or denying in response to a question about feelings ("I don't know"), or more sophisticated forms in which the parent responds with great detail for events, etc but does not provide any information about their feelings.

3 = strong attempt to neutralize affect. In the extreme form this is seen when the parent denies/refuses to respond to question, but also includes when parent expresses direct reluctance to engage in affective discussion, dismisses affect or ignores affective component of the question, denies feelings, or retracts earlier admission of feelings. A parent should also be scored a '3' if s/he transforms the negative affective component of the question into something neutral or positive (e.g., talks only of

happy times in the anger question) or uses strong euphemisms in place of discussing negative experiences/emotions (e.g. "it's God's will).

2 = less clear example of a '3'. These include examples when the parent "veers away" from negative affect, such that s/he may begin answering the question with negative affect ("yes, sometimes I do feel mad..") but then moves away ("but that almost never happens, and in fact I think we are happy most all the time."). These responses acknowledge negative affect but in a veiled or incomplete manner. Unlike a "3" they admit the possibility of negative affect but then turn away from it or minimize it, sometimes putting a positive "spin" on it.

1 = vague talk about negative affect (using global statements of feelings or indirect attempts to deflect "you know" and "you" statements). These also include statements such as "he acts like a normal boy" "he really makes an impression on her" in the context of discussing negative affect/experience, "positive-wrap-ups" such as "but I really felt fine" after presenting a negative experience.

0 = no evidence of neutralizing

Confusion of response

See description of this scale following the Affect codes

Affect codes: Anger, Pleasure, Guilt, Worry/Anxiety about the Future, Sadness/Pain

The 0-3 scale is also used for the affective tone expressed in the response. Use primarily verbal expressions when coding. It is not necessary that the parent display the affect both verbally and nonverbally in order to receive a score of '3'.

Note: Unlike the other sets of scales, the parent's response is coded if any relevant content is included, even if it refers to another child or experience other than the target child. If the parent clearly expresses one of the affects listed below in any modality a score of '3' should be given, even if the affect is directed toward/in response to something other than the child

(e.g., doctors, scornful neighbors). The hypothesis is that if an affect is stimulated during this parent interview, it is part of his/her "representational space".

Affect codes:

Code the highest level present in the response.

3 = multiple, strong, or detailed expressions of a particular affect being coded, e.g., "it felt so wonderful to watch him take his first step", "I was so angry I could have.....".

2 = solid or clear example of affect, e.g., "yes I feel angry".

1 =vague or oblique reference (e.g., "frustration" for anger)

0 = no evidence

Anger

Parent mentions feeling angry (or related synonym- e.g. frustrated) or gives an example that includes his/her anger. "Frustration" is likely to be coded as a 2.

3 = multiple, detailed or strong expressions of anger, e.g "I was really angry at him, he really made me mad" or "I could have killed him he was so obnoxious" "I whacked her." "I felt like picking him up like a basketball."

2 = direct expression of anger "I was angry" "I got really frustrated" the narration of the anger is unembellished.

1 = vague or oblique reference to anger e.g, "I was frustrated (impatient, aggravated) with him"

0 = no evidence of anger

Pleasure

Parent expresses or mentions feeling a positive affect that can take any of several forms, or describes affection between themselves and the child. Examples of positive affects include happiness, joy, close, pride, loving, etc. Or, parent mentions physical affection or gives an example that includes his/her physical affection- e.g. a hug, warm touching, cuddling, child in lap in affectionate manner, etc. Or, parent mentions being proud of child/child's accomplishments, etc., or parent gives an example that includes his/her pride in the child. Score a '1' if the feeling is vaguely positive, e.g., "understanding".

3 = multiple or strong or detailed examples of one of the positive affects noted above e.g.

"this was probably the best time I could have had as a parent, she laid close to me and I stroked her hair and rubbed her back, I felt about as close to her as I think is possible" "we really had a wonderful time together, she nuzzled next to me, it was great."

2 = clear example of positive affect e.g. "I was proud of him" "he came up and gave me a big kiss" "I really love her".

1 =vague, or indirect example of positive affect e.g. "we understand each other well" "he's doing well in school" "he's affectionate"

0 = no evidence of positive affect

Guilt

Parent mentions feeling guilty or gives an example that includes his/her guilt.

3 = multiple, strong, or detailed example ("I was really guilty" I wish I had done things differently I was mad at myself for while).

2 = guilt is clearly mentioned in the response. Also, score a '2' if parent mentions affect synonymous with guilt, e.g., "I'm sorry I punished him", "I felt horrible/awful/bad/etc." and then goes on to explain that s/he felt that way because of something she had done. "I couldn't be there for her when she was in the hospital"

1 = vague or unclear admission of guilt, e.g., "sometimes I get upset with myself", "I wish I had done something else".

0 = no mention of guilt or related feelings

NOTE: many responses that seem like guilt may also be coded under "Pain/Burden."

Worry/anxiety about the Future

Parent mentions feeling worried/anxious or gives an example that includes his/her worry/anxiety that is in **response to thinking about the future** or what the child might experience that might be negative. These could include expectations. The primary issue in parent's response is uncertainty of child outcome - not parent feeling bad because of something that happened. Reports about how the parent thought in the past - "we wondered if he would live" are scored as well.

3 = multiple, strong, or detailed examples of worry or anxiety about the future "I was worried he would die" or "I can't stop worrying about whether he'll make it with normal kids"

2 = clear expression of worry e.g. "yes I worry about his walking"

1 = vague, indirect expression of worry e.g. "I am concerned about his development" "I wonder if she'll be ok with the sitter"

0 = no evidence of worry/anxiety about child's future.

Pain/Burden

Parent reports (or shows) feelings of pain, sadness or reports being overwhelmed, burdened, or encumbered with respect to being a parent, the parental role, or about the child's own tough experiences. This code is a fairly frequent element of many responses so coders should be alert to this.

3 = multiple, strong, or detailed examples of pain/burden, including "I sometimes wonder if I can give him what he needs", "at times it seems like **too much for me**" or "I get depressed about his lack of progress" or "it hurts me so **bad** to see him this way" "it was **a really** stressful time".

2 = clear statement of the pain/burden associated with parenting - statements like "it hurts me to see him not be able to do things like other kids" "he's really a lot of work" or if the parent starts crying when talking about sad/burden content.

1 = vague or equivocal statements such as "its hard to be a parent" "I needed some time to myself" "I missed her" "getting dinner together is a 2 hour production"

0 = no evidence of pain/burden

Confusion - NOTE: This is a global scale - score only after the entire interview has been coded

This is a scale of dysfunction - it is specifically designed to reflect the degree of disorganization present throughout the interview and discussion of the parent's relationship with the child. Confusion can be evident in many different ways in the discussion and includes - the parent's persistent inability to seize upon a response, rambling or tangential responses, lack of an organizational thread to the responses, a confused style of reporting in which the parent needs repeated re-statements or clarifications of the question(s), or

distorted responses. It also includes blatant misattributions. It is hypothesized that this scale reflects the degree to which the parent's model of his/her relationship with his/her child is unorganized, lacks structure, or is contradictory and not coherent.

NOTE: This is a global seven-point scale, allowing the coder to assign more variability than the other scales, that are more closely tied to specific responses.

7 = Very confusing. This rating is assigned when the interview contains multiple, frequent, and often extreme examples of the types of confusion noted above. The interview may be very tangential so that the interviewer has to constantly re-orient the parent to the task or question, it may contain many confusing responses to questions, so that the nature of the response is very difficult to understand, there may be multiple contradictions within and across responses so that the parent appears unable to identify a coherent picture of the child or their relationship with the child, or the parent may introduce odd or bizarre interpretations of child behavior or experiences with the child that appear more than simply idiosyncratic.

5 = Confusing. There are clear examples of confusion as noted above but they do not reflect the interview as a whole, may be isolated to certain topics or questions, or if frequent, they are not so severe as to impair understanding of the interview as a whole. Nonetheless there is clear evidence for confusion at times during the interview.

3 = Mild confusion. There are milder examples of confusion as noted above. The parent may pursue tangents, ramble, give odd interpretations of child behavior or experience, etc.

1 = No evidence of confusion. Despite normal disfluencies, dialogue re-starts, etc. that occur throughout the interview, there is no evidence of mental confusion in the interview.