

GUIDELINES

Coder Impressions Inventory (CII)

Complete one CII for each parent following each home visit. Each item must be filled in, because a blank will affect the total score. Check your data completely for any missed items before you hand it in.

The following are guidelines to observe when marking a particular item.

Questions 2-71 are rated as follows:

No basis *indicates no opportunity to evaluate this item*
Did not occur *indicates zero occurrences or you did not observe this behavior*
One example *actually means "few" or "one to three" times*
Multiple *means 4 or more times.*

2. The child did not comply with at least one parental request/command.
 This item refers to the number of non-complies of a child.
3. The child did not comply, and the parent followed up on the issue with another command/reprimand.
 This item gets at parents who do not track compliance by their child, and is not only an indication of issuing commands that offer no opportunity to comply.
4. The parent threatened punishment for a transgression. ("If you do that again, I'll beat the ... out of you.")
 Consider threats of punishment only. An appropriate consequence for a child's behavior would be a disciplinary tactic and not punishment. The word transgression implies that the child has done something sinful. To answer this question, simply think about whether or not the parent threatened punishment. Sometimes a punishment or disciplinary action is warranted for a misbehavior, but in this case, we want to catch parents who threaten punishment, regardless of the child's behavior. Otherwise, observers may start splitting hairs about what should be considered misbehavior or transgression.
- 5a. The parent threatened punishment for a transgression and followed through.
 Mark no basis if there was no threat of punishment.

- 5b. The parent warned child of consequence if misbehavior continued. (“If you can’t keep the crayons on the paper, I’ll need to take them away.”)
This item would cover a parental warning (as in DPICS coding - a command accompanied by a negative consequence that is appropriate for the noncompliant behavior.) Mark no basis if no misbehavior was observed, mark did not occur, if no warning was given to misbehaviors.
9. The parent gave rationales (not lecturing, but simple, clear reasons) when appropriate.
Consider tone of voice as well as specific verbal explanations given to child.
10. The parent tried to pleasantly tease or kid or humor the child out of sour mood, conflict, etc.
Mark no basis if child was not in sour mood or in a conflictual interaction.
11. The parent clearly pinpointed the infraction/misbehavior when disciplining.
For this item consider discipline in a broad sense, to include all of the possible ways parents structure, teach, and direct children. It would include any re-directing, limit-setting, ignoring, as well as time-outs, sticker charts, and other forms of contingent reward.
The parent must explain why the child is being disciplined. In addition, this must be a positive form of discipline. Can the parent and the child both tell what the discipline is for? For example, saying “You are a bad boy!” is not sufficient for the child to understand exactly why he is being disciplined. When a parent says, “You are going to time-out for hitting”, that parent clearly is pointing out the misbehavior when disciplining.
If a parent randomly disciplines or punishes the child without warning or explanation, code “did not occur” assuming there was a reason for discipline.
12. The parent labeled the misbehavior, but no follow-through or punishment.
If a parent continually reminds a child of the expectations and what the child is doing wrong but without enforcing the rules, this would be labeling the misbehavior without discipline.
13. The child did something clearly prosocial (extra nice, volunteered, did something for family, was cooperative) and the parent gave a positive response.
In order to be considered prosocial, the child must do something out of the ordinary or volunteer to help. Simply being cooperative is not sufficient to be considered prosocial. An example of this is “That’s great you set the table without being asked.” Here, the parent is giving a positive response to the child initiating the table-setting. Contrast this example with a parent simply thanking the child for complying to a request or command. The child must deserve the praise for some reason.

14. The child did something clearly prosocial (extra nice, volunteered, did something for family, was cooperative) and the parent ignored it or paid no attention.
If the child was not at all prosocial, mark no basis. Otherwise this item measures the parental response to the child's prosocial actions, including their cooperation within the family.
15. Time out, other social isolation.
Mark this if the child goes into time-out, or if a sibling does, or if there is reference made to using the technique. This item measures that it is a technique used in the family. Code this whether or not the time-out is warranted.
16. A point program or contingent rewards.
Mark this if you observe a sticker chart or other contingent reward program being used, or reference to one. This item measures that it is a technique used in the family.
17. Withdrawal of privileges.
Mark this if you observe privileges withdrawn, or threatened to be withdrawn. This item measures that it is a technique used in the family.
18. The parent seemed to provoke the child into arguments.
Consider that the child does not necessarily have to argue with the parent. In order for this item to be coded, the parent should have a generally antagonistic and nit-picking attitude. The child might not necessarily be saying anything in return. Use your coder gut-feeling as a guide.
22. Problem-solved with child.
The definition of problem solving is that it can be a statement, question or command that invites the child in an open-ended way to solve a problem.
23. Did not pay attention when child talked.
Code this when the parent appears to be disinterested or oblivious to the child, not merely unable to hear a child.
24. Ignored child's inappropriate behavior.
Mark this when a parent clearly ignores misbehavior, that is uses the technique of ignore by remaining silent, or maintaining a neutral facial expression, or avoiding or breaking eye contact, or making no response to the child except to turn away.
45. Parent seems confident of parenting skills.
The sole purpose of this item is to gauge the parent's perceived confidence, not competence. Even if a parent is exhibiting less than exemplary parenting skills, code them as confident if they appear to be sure of themselves and what they are doing.

47. Overly permissive, *laissez-faire*, negligent (discipline style).
Mark this if any of these descriptions seems to fit for the parent. All three do not necessarily have to describe the parent's style.
48. Erratic, inconsistent, haphazard (discipline style).
"Inconsistent" or "erratic" behavior does not necessarily have to be negative or greatly inappropriate, just inconsistent, that is variable or changeable. For instance: a parent reacting/responding to a child for a minor behavior, while ignoring more serious ones. Also, parental mood swings without obvious provocation could be an indication of such a discipline style.
69. Parent relates positive comments about the child to the interviewer.
We will have to assume that marking "does not fit at all" covers both the parent who doesn't comment on their child to the observer and when there is no opportunity.
76. Cleanliness (of physical environment).
Consider that "extremely clean" is not necessarily a good thing. If it appears that the house is not at all "kid friendly" and has nothing out of place, this would be coded as extremely clean. Most homes, however, if they are comfortable and obviously lived-in, would be coded as 2.
80. Mark TV OFF even if it's on when you arrive and the parent then turns it off. We don't want to penalize parents for having it on before the coders' arrival.