Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality Measures:

Updated User's Manual

OPRE Report 2014-65

April 2015

DISCLAIMER:
The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, the Office of Head Start, the Administration for Children and Families, or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

This Updated User's Manual and other reports sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation are available at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/index.html.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:
The authors would like to express their appreciation to Laura Hoard and Nancy Geyelin Margie at the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation and Kiersten Beigel at the Office of Head Start.

Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality Measures: Updated User's Manual

OPRE Report 2014-65

April 2015

Submitted to:
Laura Hoard, *Project Officer*
Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U. S. Department of Health and Human Services

Submitted by:
Kwang Kim, Valerie Atkinson, Ning Rui, Christine Nord
Westat

Lina Guzman, Nicole Forry, Manica Ramos, Eliza Brown,
Child Trends

Toni Porter
Consultant

Project Director:
Kwang Kim, Westat

Contract Number: HHSP23320095655WC

This Updated User's Manual is in the public domain. Permission to reproduce is not necessary.

Suggested citation:
Kim, K., Porter, T., Atkinson, V., Rui, N., Ramos, M., Brown, E., Guzman, L., Forry, N., and Nord, C. (2015). *Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality Measures: Updated User's Manual.* OPRE Report 2014-65. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

This page is intentionally blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality (FPTRQ) project, sponsored by the Administration for Children and Families' Office of Head Start (OHS) and Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE), was a four-year effort to develop measures of the quality of family and provider/teacher relationships in early care and education (ECE) settings for children from birth through age five. The measures were developed by Westat and Child Trends with additional support from a group of experts who provided guidance and advice.

The following activities have been conducted to develop the Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality (FPTRQ) measures and to ensure that they capture information necessary for assessing the quality of family and provider/teacher relationships.

- Conducted an extensive review of the conceptual and empirical literature on family and provider/teacher relationships,
- Developed a conceptual model,
- Consulted with experts,
- Conducted focus groups with parents and providers/teachers in Head Start/Early Head Start, center-based, and family child care programs,
- Reviewed existing family and provider/teacher relationship measures,
- Developed measure items through an iterative process which included multiple rounds of testing through cognitive interviews,
- Conducted cognitive interviews with parents, providers/teachers, family services staff, and directors,
- Conducted pilot and field studies of the director, provider/teacher, and parent measures, and
- Conducted a pilot test of the family services staff and family services staff parent measures.

The following FPTRQ measures were developed.

- The **director measure** asks respondents general questions about the ECE environment, the children enrolled in the program, and how the program supports family and provider/teacher relationships.
- The **provider/teacher measure** asks respondents general questions about how they work with parents of children in their care.
- The **parent measure** asks parents general questions about how they work with their child's lead provider or teacher (not aides or assistant teachers).
- The **family services staff measure** asks respondents questions about how they work with all parents of children in their Head Start/Early Head Start programs.

  The **family services staff parent measure** asks parents questions about how they work with their family services staff in Head Start/Early Head Start programs.

The FPTRQ measures include multiple subscales under the four broader constructs of Knowledge, Attitudes, Practices, and Environmental Features. These measures can be used by a variety of ECE stakeholders who share an interest in improving provider/teacher relationships with families and family engagement in ECE programs.

This page is intentionally blank.

Contents

Chapter		Page
	Executive Summary	v
1	Introduction	1
	1.1 Overview	1
	1.2 Why Are the FPTRQ Measures Important?	3
	1.3 Why Are the FPTRQ Measures Necessary?	5
	1.4 What Are the FPTRQ Measures?	8
2	The FPTRQ Conceptual Model	9
3	Measure Development Activities	13
4	The FPTRQ Measures	17
	4.1 Description of the Five FPTRQ Measures	17
	4.2 Subscales of the FPTRQ Measures	19
5	How to Administer and Score the FPTRQ Measures	21
	5.1 How to Administer and Score the Measures	21
	5.1.1 Getting Ready to Use the FPTRQ Measures	21
	5.1.2 Administering the Measures	22
	5.1.3 Using the Excel Scoring Sheets	23
	5.1.4 Measure Response Codes	25
	5.1.5 Unanswered Items	25
	5.1.6 Reverse-coded Items	26
	5.1.7 Calculation of Subscale Scores	27
	5.1.8 Calculation of Total Scores	27
	5.2 Linking the Measures	28
	5.3 Using the Measures	29
6	Potential Uses and Limitations of the FPTRQ Measures	31
	6.1 Potential Uses of the FPTRQ Measures	31
	6.1.1 Policymakers	31
	6.1.2 Practitioners and the Professional Development Community	33
	6.1.3 Researchers	34
	6.2 Limitations of the FPTRQ Measures	35

Chapter Page

7 Technical Information about the FPTRQ Measures 37

7.1 Field Study Sample 37

7.1.1 Participating Early Care and Education Programs 37
7.1.2 Participating Providers/Teachers 39
7.1.3 Participating Parents 40

7.2 Item Response Rates and Reliability of the FPTRQ Measures 42
7.3 Summary 49

References 51

Appendix

A FPTRQ Measure Items and Item Numbers for Subscales A-1

B Focus Groups B-1

C Cognitive Interview Sample and Procedures C-1

D Summary of Pilot Study D-1

E Summary of Field Study E-1

F Summary Statistics F-1

G Cultural Sensitivity G-1

H Family Services Staff Measure Development Process H-1

Table

1-1 Common and unique features of three perspectives 1

1-2 Research evidence of associations of FPTRQ elements of effective provider/teacher facilitation of relationships with families and family and child outcomes 7

3-1 List of Technical Working Group members for FPTRQ 14

4-1 FPTRQ subscale definitions 19

5-1 Reverse-coded items 26

7-1 Percent of children ages 0-5 enrolled in center-based programs 38

Table		Page
7-2	Percent of children ages 0-5 enrolled in Head Start/Early Head Start programs	38
7-3	Percent of children ages 0-5 enrolled in family child care	38
7-4	Percent of providers and teachers employed in the program, by program type	38
7-5	Percent of aides and teaching assistants employed in the program, by program type	39
7-6	Race/ethnicity of providers/teachers, by program type	39
7-7	Highest level of education of providers/teachers, by program type	40
7-8	Child care provider or teacher has child development associate (CDA) credential, by program type	40
7-9	Race/ethnicity of parents, by program type	40
7-10	Language of parents spoken most at home, by program type	41
7-11	Highest level of education of parents, by program type	41
7-12	Annual household income of parents, by program type	41
7-13	Cronbach's alpha of the provider/teacher measure overall	43
7-14	Cronbach's alpha of the provider/teacher measure, by program type	44
7-15	Cronbach's alpha of the provider/teacher measure, by educational attainment	44
7-16	Cronbach's alpha of the provider/teacher measure, by CDA	45
7-17	Cronbach's alpha of the provider/teacher measure, by race/ethnicity	45
7-18	Cronbach's alpha of the parent measure overall	46
7-19	Cronbach's alpha of the parent measure, by program type	46
7-20	Cronbach's alpha of the parent measure, by education	47
7-21	Cronbach's alpha of the parent measure, by household income	47
7-22	Cronbach's alpha of the parent measure, by race/ethnicity	48
7-23	Cronbach's alpha of the parent measure, by language	48

Figure		Page
2-1	FPTRQ Conceptual Model	11

This page is intentionally blank.

Introduction 1

1.1 Overview

The Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality (FPTRQ) project, sponsored by the Administration for Children and Families' Office of Head Start (OHS) and Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE), was a four-year effort to develop measures of the quality of family and provider/teacher relationships in early care and education (ECE) settings for children from birth through age five. The measures were developed by Westat and Child Trends with additional support from a group of experts who provided guidance and advice.

The FPTRQ project created five measures of parent and provider/teacher relationships, including: 1) the **director measure**; 2) the **provider/teacher measure**; 3) the **parent measure**; 4) the **family services staff measure**; and 5) the **family services staff parent measure**. The FPTRQ measures integrate features from three perspectives of family-provider/teacher relationships in ECE: family support/ family-centered care; parent involvement/family involvement/family engagement, and family-sensitive caregiving (see Table 1-1). The measures incorporate the features that are consistent across these three perspectives as well as those that are unique to each of these perspectives.

Table 1-1. Common and unique features of three perspectives

Common Features of Perspectives	Unique Features of Each Perspective
• Ecological perspective • Child outcomes • Family-related outcomes • Strengths-based family-provider partnerships	***Family support/family-centered care:*** • Specific practices articulated for practitioners. • Focus on empowerment of families. • Focus on the family-provider relationship itself as a goal. ***Parent involvement/family involvement/family engagement:*** • Family-provider relationship is a means to an end for enhancing child outcomes. • Specific roles for parents and providers. • Focus on center-based early care and education or K-12 schools; does not address home-based settings. • Includes clearly articulated child outcomes related to children's learning and school success. • Focuses on extending work of providers/teachers with children to supporting how parents work with children. ***Family-sensitive caregiving*** • Provider attitudes and knowledge-gathering as specific domains related to family needs and circumstances. • Specific focus on work-related support and employment outcomes for families. • Focus on provider outcomes.

SOURCE: Forry, Bromer, Chrisler, Rothenberg, Simkin, & Daneri, 2012

The *Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality Measures: Updated User's Manual*[1] introduces these measures, describes how they were developed, and provides in-depth information on how to use them. Specifically,

- Chapter 1 explains why measures of quality in family and provider/teacher relationships are important and necessary and provides an overview of the measures;
- Chapter 2 presents the FPTRQ conceptual model that informed the development of the measures;
- Chapter 3 describes the process for developing the measures;
- Chapter 4 describes the measures, including definitions of the subscales;
- Chapter 5 presents information on how to administer and score the measures;
- Chapter 6 discusses possible uses and limitations of the measures; and
- Chapter 7 presents technical information about the FPTRQ measures.

Additional information about the FPTRQ measures is included in the appendices:

- Appendix A consists of the items for each subscale of the FPTRQ provider/teacher and parent measures;
- Appendix B provides an overview of the FPTRQ focus groups;
- Appendix C summarizes the FPTRQ cognitive interviews;
- Appendix D describes the FPTRQ pilot study;
- Appendix E presents the FPTRQ field study;
- Appendix F shows additional technical information about the FPTRQ measure subscales;
- Appendix G discusses the challenges of measuring cultural sensitivity; and
- Appendix H describes the early stages of development of the Head Start/Early Head Start family services staff measure and the family services staff parent measure for Head Start/Early Head Start parents who work with these staff.

[1] The *Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality Measures: User's Manual* (November 2014) was updated in April 2015 to edit the discussion of the family services staff (FSS) and FSS parent measures which underwent pilot testing from December 2014 through mid-February 2015.

1.2 Why Are the FPTRQ Measures Important?

Research indicates that parents have an enormous influence on their children's development (Halle, Zaff, Calkins, & Margie, 2000; Maccoby, 2000; McLoyd, 1998). Yet a significant proportion of young children under age five--approximately 60 percent--regularly participate in non-parental child care arrangements in ECE settings (Laughlin, 2013). Changing labor force patterns, particularly the increasing work force participation of mothers with young children, have contributed to the growing use of center-based child care and other formal ECE programs (Laughlin, 2013).

A variety of studies have found that child care has mixed impacts on children's outcomes (Burchinal, Kainz, Cai, Tout, Zaslow, Martinez-Beck, & Rathgeb, 2009; Clarke-Stewart, Vandell, Burchinal, O-Brien, & McCartney, 2002; Elicker, Clawson, Hong, Kim, Evangelou, & Kontos, 2005), and that the role of parents in supporting their children's social-emotional and cognitive development is far greater than the influence of their children's participation in ECE programs (NICHD Early Child Care Research Network, 2006). A small body of research also suggests that family-provider/teacher relationships in ECE programs can contribute to children's school readiness (Dunst, 2002; Dunst, Boyd, Trivette, & Hamby, 2002; Mendez, 2010) as well as improved parent-child relationships and parental self-efficacy (Dunst, 2002; Green, McAllister, & Tarte, 2004; Kaczmarek, Goldstein, Florey, Carter,& Cannon, 2004; Kossek, Pichler, Meese, & Barratt, 2008; Small, 2009), which can, in turn, affect positive outcomes for their children.

ECE researchers, policymakers, and practitioners increasingly acknowledge relationships between families and providers/teachers as a significant aspect of ECE quality. For example, a recent volume by Zaslow et al. (2011) highlights the importance of provider/teacher responsiveness with, and sensitivity to, families in order to help families foster their children's learning and development. Many state ECE administrators affirm the importance of supporting and engaging families in children's early education by including family partnerships/family engagement indicators in Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS) and in state competencies for ECE providers (Porter, Bromer, & Moodie, 2011; Porter & Bromer, 2013). Likewise, national associations and the Federal Government recognized the importance of family partnerships/family engagement in ECE by including family engagement quality indicators in professional standards, such as those articulated by the National Association for the Education of Young Children and National Association for Family Child Care, and in the performance standards used for Head Start (Porter & Bromer, 2013).

Studies indicate that strong relationships between families and providers/teachers are associated with positive outcomes for families, children, and providers/teachers.[2] For families, these outcomes include:

- Family engagement in ECE programs, families' supports for children's learning (Brookes et al., 2006; Green, McAllister, & Tarte, 2004; Reid, Webster-Stratton, & Hammond, 2007), and improved parental satisfaction with ECE arrangements (Adams & Christenson, 2000; Dempsey & Keen, 2008; King, King, Rosenbaum & Goffin, 1999; Mensing, French, Fuller & Kagan, 2000);

- Family members' feelings of empowerment and capacity (Dunst & Dempsey, 2007; Dunst, Trivette, & Hamby, 1996; Green et al., 2004);

- Family well-being, including reduced stress and improved mental health (Chazen-Cohen et al, 2007; Dunst & Trivette, 2009; Guterman & Hahm, 2001; Trivette, Dunst, & Hamby, 2010); and

- Positive parenting, home learning environment, and parent-child relationships (Dunst, Trivette, & Hamby, 2007; Green et al., 2004; McCart, Wolf, Sweeney, & Choi, 2009; Raikes et al., 2006; Reid et al., 2007; Reynolds & Robertson, 2003; Trivette et al., 2010.

For children, a small number of studies identify associations with family-provider/teacher relationships and positive child outcomes, including:

- Children's cognitive development/academic performance (Mendez, 2010; Rimm-Kaufman, Pianta, Cox, & Bradley, 2003);

- Social-emotional development, attachment, and demonstration of appropriate behaviors (Dunst & Dempsey, 2007; Graves & Shelton, 2007; Lee et al., 2009; Mendez, 2010; Powell et al., 2010; Roggman et al., 2009; Sheridan et al., 2010); and

- Positive physical health outcomes (Palfrey et al., 2005).

In addition, a small number of research studies show associations between positive family-provider/teacher relationships and provider/teacher outcomes, including:

- Providers/teachers' feelings of competency (Trivette et al., 2010);

- Self-efficacy (Brown, Knoche, Edwards, and Sheridan, 2009; Trivette et al., 2010);

- Connectedness with families (Brown et al., 2009); and

- Enhanced skills in communicating with families (Brown et al., 2009; Kaczmarek, Goldstein, Florey, Carter, and Cannon, 2004).

---

[2] A more detailed summary of the associations between elements of positive family-provider relationships and family, child, and provider outcomes is provided in the *Family-Provider Relationship Quality: Review of Conceptual and Empirical Literature of Family-Provider Relationships*, available at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/resource/family-provider-relationship-quality-review-of-conceptual-and-empirical.

These findings apply across ethnically and racially diverse families. Study samples also included families across a wide range of incomes whose children participated in a variety of ECE settings, including center-based and family child care programs, Head Start and Early Head Start (Forry et al., 2012).

1.3 Why Are the FPTRQ Measures Necessary?

The FPTRQ measures represent a departure from many existing instruments that have been developed to measure the quality of family-provider relationships and family engagement in several ways. First, they fill a gap in conceptualization of this aspect of ECE quality because the FPTRQ measures are based on a theoretical model that integrates three broad perspectives of family-provider/teacher relationships. Second, the FPTRQ measures fill a gap in measurement of the quality of these relationships because they assess all of the elements that empirical research suggests are associated with effective provider/teacher facilitation of relationships with families and positive family and child outcomes.[3] Third, the FPTRQ measures were developed for use in most ECE settings, including center-based programs, Head Start/Early Head Start, and family child care, and for racially and economically diverse populations.

The conceptual model that informed the development of the FPTRQ measures integrates three perspectives on family-provider/teacher relationships that have been applied to ECE settings. These perspectives are (1) family support/family-centered care, (2) parent involvement/family involvement/family engagement, and (3) family-sensitive caregiving.[4] The FPTRQ model represents a new theoretical basis for measuring quality in family-provider/teacher relationships (Table 1-1) because it incorporates the features that these perspectives share in common as well as the features that are unique to each perspective.

The features incorporated into the FPTRQ model that are consistent across the perspectives include:

- An ecological view of child development that recognizes the interdependence of providers, families, and communities in shaping children's well-being;

[3] In the FPTRQ conceptual model, cultural sensitivity is assumed to be embedded in all the elements, but it is only indirectly assessed in the FPTRQ measures. (See Appendix G for an explanation.)

[4] For more information about the family-centered care perspective, see the Orelena Hawkins Puckett Institute Site on presentations, http://www.puckett.org/presentations.php. More information about the family involvement/family engagement perspective is available at the Harvard Family Research Project web site, http://www.hfrp.org/family-involvement. The family-sensitive caregiving perspective is described in Bromer, J., Paulsell, D., Porter, T., Henly, J., Ramsburg, D., & with Families and Quality Workgroup members. (2011). Family-sensitive caregiving: A Key component of quality in early care and education arrangements. In M. Zaslow, K. Tout, T. Halle & I. Martinez-Beck (Eds.), *Quality measurement in early childhood settings*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing.

- A focus on child outcomes, through direct pathways such as supporting learning at home and enhancing continuity of care, and through indirect pathways such as responsiveness to family needs;

- Family-related supports and outcomes, including a focus on social and peer supports as a key to family well-being as well as a focus on adult outcomes;

- A strengths-based approach to working with families that recognizes the unique resources and assets that families contribute to programs; and

- The centrality of family and provider/teacher relationships.

The model also incorporates the unique features of these perspectives, including:

- The importance of family capacity and empowerment and of social supports for parents, from the family support/family-centered care perspective, which gained momentum from the success of Head Start/Early Head Start and other efforts to serve the whole family;

- The focus on strong school/family partnerships and shared responsibility for children's learning, central to the parent involvement/family involvement/family engagement perspectives from the center-based ECE and K-12 education literature; and

- The focus on provider/teacher responsiveness and sensitivity towards the needs of working families and an emphasis on both *family* outcomes related to work and employment and *child* outcomes, as well as an articulation of attitudes, knowledge and practices as domains of provider/teacher sensitivity from the family-sensitive caregiving perspective, which was developed specifically to apply to a range of ECE settings.

The FPTRQ measures differ in several ways from other instruments that have been designed to assess the quality of family-provider/teacher relationships.

- The FPTRQ measures draw from an extensive review of the theoretical and empirical literature on family and provider/teacher relationships across a variety of fields (Forry et al., 2012). The FPTRQ measures incorporate *all of the elements* that are associated with effective provider/teacher facilitation of these relationships.[5] These elements, which are described in detail in the following chapter and in Appendix A, are grouped into four constructs: Attitudes, Knowledge, Practices, and program Environmental Features (Table 1-2). Other measures, by contrast, are aligned with a single construct such as trust (e.g., The Trust Scale: Adams & Christenson, 1998) or aligned with a single perspective such as parent involvement/family involvement/family engagement (e.g., The Family

[5] Cultural sensitivity, which is also associated in the literature with effective provider/teacher facilitation of relationships with families, is measured indirectly through the FPTRQ measures.

Involvement Questionnaire: Fantuzzo, Tighe, & Childs, 2000) or family-centered care (e.g., Family Centered Practices Scale: Dunst & Trivette, 2006).[6]

- The FPTRQ measures include *both parents' and providers'/teachers'* reports of their relationships with each other. In addition, the FPTRQ measures include an assessment of program environmental features that promote family and provider/teacher relationships, thus providing an understanding of the context in which these relationships are created and sustained.

- The FPTRQ measures have been designed to be used in *most ECE settings* (center-based and family child care as well as Head Start/Early Head Start).

- The FPTRQ measures have been tested with *racially/ethnically diverse populations with a broad range of incomes*.

- The FPTRQ provider/teacher, parent, family services staff (FSS), and FSS parent measures are also available in Spanish.

Table 1-2. Research evidence of associations of FPTRQ elements of effective provider/teacher facilitation of relationships with families and family and child outcomes

Element	Family outcomes/effects identified in the literature	Child outcomes/effects identified in the literature
Attitudes		
Respect	X	X
Commitment	X	
Openness to Change	X	X
Understanding Context	X	
Knowledge		
Family-specific Knowledge	X	
Practices		
Communication	X	X
Responsiveness	X	
Collaboration	X	
Connecting to Services	X	
Family-focused Concern	X	
Environmental Features		
Welcoming	X	
Communication Systems	X	
Culturally-diverse Materials	X	
Information about Resources	X	
Peer-to-peer Parent Activities	X	

SOURCE: Forry et al., 2012; Porter & Bromer, 2013.

[6] A detailed review of existing measures of family-provider/teacher relationships is provided in the *Family-Provider Relationship Quality: Review of Conceptual and Empirical Literature of Family-Provider Relationships*, available at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/resource/family-provider-relationship-quality-review-of-existing-measures-of.

1.4 What Are the FPTRQ Measures?

The FPTRQ measures are self-administered questionnaires for providers/teachers, parents, program directors, family services staff, and parents about family services staff. These questionnaires are appropriate for diverse populations (including low- and high-income families, ethnically/racially diverse providers/teachers and families, providers/teachers and parents with diverse educational levels, and Spanish-speaking families). The measures focus on effective provider/teacher facilitation of relationships with families.

The FPTRQ measures can help inform policy, practice, and research. For example, state and local administrators can use the questionnaires to inform the development or revision of QRIS family partnership indicators and ratings. Practitioners and professional development systems can use the questionnaires to identify or monitor the quality of relationships and to inform the development of training and coursework. Researchers can use the questionnaires to test associations between provider/teacher relationships with families and specific child, family, and provider/teacher outcomes.

The FPTRQ Conceptual Model 2

The Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality (FPTRQ) conceptual model is based on an extensive review of the theoretical and empirical literature, including 46 conceptual articles and studies related to family and provider/teacher relationships (Forry et al., 2012). The model assumes that the relationship between families and providers/teachers is bi-directional. In other words, families may be more likely to become engaged and involved in their children's development and learning activities when they feel supported, understood, and empowered by programs and providers/teachers and when they are better able to balance work and family responsibilities. At the same time, providers and teachers may become more sensitive and responsive to the needs of families as parents become more involved and engaged in programs.

The FPTRQ conceptual model is structured as a logic model in an effort to summarize a complex issue. It consists of four components: (1) factors that may influence the family and provider/teacher relationships, (2) elements and constructs of effective provider/teacher facilitation of family and provider/teacher relationships, (3) intermediate outcomes, and (4) effects (see Figure 2-1). Each component has the potential to be dynamic; for example, changes in one component, such as parent/family characteristics may alter the relationship with the provider/teacher. In addition, there is no assumption about the amount of time that is needed to produce outcomes or effects because the empirical evidence about this issue is limited (Forry et al., 2012).

Within the "elements and constructs of effective provider/teacher facilitation of family and provider/teacher relationships" component in Figure 2-1, the model proposes four constructs: 1) Attitudes, 2) Knowledge, 3) Practices, and 4) Environmental Features. These constructs reflect unique, but overlapping, dimensions of professional practice.[7] With the exception of the Knowledge construct, each construct consists of several elements.

- *Attitudes* refers to providers'/teachers' beliefs and values about families and children in their care that inform their work with these families. The four elements conceptualized to fall within this construct are Respect, Commitment, Openness to Change, and Understanding Context.

- *Knowledge* reflects specific information providers/teachers have about families they serve. This construct includes a single element, Family-specific Knowledge.

[7] Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2005). The influence of attitudes on behavior. In D. Albarracin, B. T. Johnson & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The handbook of attitudes* (pp. 173-222). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- *Practices* refers to providers'/teachers' interactions and engagement with families in the ECE setting. The five elements are Family-focused Concern, Communication, Responsiveness, Connecting to Services, and Collaboration.

- *Environmental Features* reflects the tone, physical environment, organizational climate, and program-level resources/supports for providers and families. The five elements include Welcoming, Communication Systems, Culturally-diverse Materials, Information about Resources, and Peer-to-Peer Parent Activities.

The model also includes elements of cultural responsiveness and empowerment. These elements are assumed to be embedded in the four constructs and the related elements.

In addition to the constructs related to effective provider/teacher facilitation of relationships with families, the FPTRQ conceptual model consists of several other components. They include:

- Potential characteristics or factors (i.e., parent/child, family, community, and provider/teacher/program characteristics; provider/teacher/program professional development) that may influence family-provider/teacher relationships (see Figure 2-1: Factors that May Influence Family and Provider/Teacher Relationships);

- Intermediate outcomes for providers/teachers, children and families associated with effective provider facilitation of family-provider/teacher relationships (see Figure 2-1: Intermediate Outcomes); and

- Effects of effective provider/teacher facilitation of family-provider/teacher relationships on families, children, and providers (see Figure 2-1). A description of the other components of the model (e.g., provider/teacher characteristics) is available in the FPTRQ literature review.

Figure 2-1. FPTRQ Conceptual Model

This page is intentionally blank.

Measure Development Activities 3

To develop the Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality (FPTRQ) measures and to ensure that they capture information necessary for assessing the quality of family and provider/teacher relationships, Westat and Child Trends performed the following activities.

- **Conducted an extensive review of the conceptual and empirical literature** to identify key elements of family-provider/teacher relationships in early care and education (ECE) settings. The review includes the theoretical and conceptual articles on family and provider/teacher relationships cited in previous chapters, as well as findings from qualitative and quantitative studies related to family and provider/teacher relationships. These empirical studies examine factors associated with positive family and provider/teacher relationships and antecedents of effective family and provider/teacher relationships. The studies also include descriptions of interventions that aim to improve families' relationships with providers/teachers as well as descriptions of effective provider/teacher facilitation of relationships with families. (See the FPTRQ literature review: http://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/family_provider_multi.pdf.)

- **Developed the conceptual model** of the key components of effective provider/teacher facilitation of relationships with families that promote family engagement and lead to better family, child, and provider/teacher outcomes. The FPTRQ conceptual model (presented in the previous section) is bi-directional; that is, families and providers/teachers influence each other. In other words, families who feel supported and valued by providers/teachers will be more likely to engage in their ECE programs, and providers/teachers who come to know families well will be more likely to become engaged with families.

- **Consulted with experts**[8] in relevant fields on possible content and format of the measure. These experts advised the project team on conceptualization and measurement of family and provider/teacher relationships in ECE settings and reviewed project products. The following nine individuals served on the Technical Working Group (Table 3-1).

[8] In addition to the Technical Working Group members, other experts provided support to the project. They included: two substantive experts (Mary Dallas Allen, University of Alaska-Anchorage and Leanne Whiteside-Mansell, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences) who provided feedback on the FPTRQ measures and the conceptualization and measurement of empowerment and cultural responsiveness. Eight experts (Barb Sawyer, National Association of Family Child Care; Cassandra Piper, Child Care Aware; Yasmina Vinci, National Head Start Association; Jeanne Swapp, Migrant and Seasonal Head Start; LaVonne Goslin, Margaret Mascarenas, and Ruth Kie, Pueblo of Laguna Division of Early Childhood Early Intervention, Early Head Start, Head Start and Tribal Child Care, and Diana Schaack, Center for the Study of Child Care Employment) also provided feedback on the environmental elements identified in the FPTRQ conceptual model.

Table 3-1. List of Technical Working Group members for FPTRQ

Name	Affiliation
Catherine Ayoub	Brazelton Touchpoints Center, Harvard Medical School
Carl Dunst	Orelena Hawks Puckett Institute Asheville, North Carolina
Julia Henly	The University of Chicago School of Service Administration
Judie Jerald	Office of Head Start, Save the Children
Elena Lopez	Harvard Graduate School of Education
Julia Mendez	University of North Carolina, Greensboro
Douglas Powell	Purdue University
Suzanne Randolph	University of Maryland, College Park
Lori Roggman	Utah State University

- **Conducted nine focus groups** with a total of 72 parents and providers/teachers in Head Start/Early Head Start, center-based and family child care programs to identify the extent to which the research-based FPTRQ elements of effective provider/teacher facilitation of relationships with families resonated with parents and provider/teachers (Appendix B).

- **Reviewed 62 existing measures** of family and provider/teacher relationships to identify items that could be used or adapted for the FPTRQ measures, identify gaps in existing items for which new items might need to be developed, and identify issues that would need to be considered in the measure development (Porter et al., 2012). The 62 measures were categorized by structural features, item content, and psychometric properties. (See the FPTRQ Measure Review, http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/resource/family-provider-relationship-quality-review-of-existing-measures-of.)

- **Developed measure items** through an iterative process which included multiple rounds of testing through cognitive interviews with parents, providers/teachers and directors as well as Head Start/Early Head Start family services staff (FSS). Measure items were developed in several phases: review/adaptation of items from existing instruments; construction of separate measures for parents, providers/teachers, and directors with parallel items when appropriate; and an environment and policy checklist. Criteria for item selection included clarity and conciseness; items that captured the element definition; positively and negatively worded items to capture consistent responses; items with high thresholds that are not often asked; items that would work across settings and diverse ethnic, racial, and income groups; and items that would translate into Spanish.

- **Conducted three rounds of cognitive interviews** with parents, providers/teachers and directors to identify if there were comprehension problems with the measure items, whether the items worked as intended, and whether the respondents could accurately answer with the choices provided. As a result of the interviews, the environment and policy checklist was incorporated into the director measure, and separate measures were developed for Head Start/Early Head Start FSS and parents who work with these staff. (See Appendix C for more details on the cognitive interviews and Appendix H for more details on the FSS measures.)

- **Conducted a pilot study** with samples of convenience of parents, providers/teachers, and directors in two cities in spring 2013 to test the measures and data collection procedures. Psychometric analysis of the pilot data generally confirmed the FPTRQ conceptual model. The measures performed well, both as comprehensive instruments and within subscales. Minor wording changes were made to the measures, and a few poorly-performing items were removed. In addition, recruitment procedures for parents were streamlined for the field study. (See Appendix D for more information about the pilot study.)

- **Conducted a field study** in six cities with samples of convenience of parents, providers/teachers, and directors in spring 2014. A total of 253 ECE programs, including Head Start/Early Head Start, center-based, and family child care programs participated. Participating programs differed greatly in size and in number of teachers. The characteristics of participating providers/teachers and parents were also diverse in terms of race/ethnicity and educational background. In addition, there was diversity among parents' income and their primary language spoken at home. (See Appendix E for additional information about the field study.) The data collected from the field study was used to conduct psychometric analyses of the measures.

- **Developed separate measures** for Head Start/Early Head Start FSS and parents who work with them. These measures were tested in a separate pilot test and the pilot test data were used for psychometric analysis. (See Appendix H for a description of the process the development the FSS and FSS parent measures. Detailed information about the pilot test of the FSS measures and technical information is found in the *Family Services Staff and Family Services Staff Parent Measures: Amendment to the FPTRQ User's Manual*[9] on the OPRE website at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/development-of-a-measure-of-family-and-provider-teacher-relationship-quality-fptrq.)

[9] Kim, K., Atkinson, V., Brown, E., Guzman, L., Ramos, M., Forry, N., Porter, T., and Nord, C. (2015). *Family Services Staff and Family Services Staff Parent Measures: Amendment to the FPTRQ User's Manual.* OPRE Report 2015-57. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

This page is intentionally blank.

The FPTRQ Measures 4

4.1 Description of the Five FPTRQ Measures

All five of the Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality (FPTRQ) measures have been tested for item comprehension using cognitive interviews. They have also undergone extensive psychometric testing (data from the pilot and field studies, as well as from the pilot test of the FSS measures) and item analysis in early care and education (ECE) settings.

The **director measure** is intended for use with program directors in center-based, family child care, and Head Start/Early Head Start settings for children from birth through 5 years old. This measure asks respondents general questions about the ECE environment, such as the number of child care providers or teachers employed by the program; general questions about the children enrolled in the program, such as the ages of children who are eligible for the program and the number of children who are enrolled in the program; and general questions about how the program supports family and provider/teacher relationships, such as the ways in which the program communicates with parents, information about services they provide to parents, and services the program offers parents such as sick care or extended hours. The director measure includes 57 items and takes about 10 minutes to complete on average.

The **provider/teacher measure** is intended for ECE providers and teachers of children from birth through 5 years old in a center-based, family child care, or Head Start/Early Head Start ECE program. This measure asks respondents general questions about how they work with all parents of children in their care, such as how easy or difficult it is for parents to reach them during the day and how often parents share information about their home life with the provider. The provider/teacher measure includes 64 items (including 4 demographic items) and takes about 10 minutes to complete on average. It is available in English and Spanish.[10]

The **parent measure** is intended for parents of children birth through 5 years old who are cared for by providers or teachers in a center-based, family child care, or Head Start/Early Head Start ECE program. The measure asks parents general questions about how they work with their child's lead provider or teacher (not aides or assistant teachers), such as how easy or difficult it is to reach their provider/teacher

[10] The Spanish version of the provider/teacher measure was not tested in the pilot or field studies; the translation was done later.

during the day and how comfortable they feel talking to their provider/teacher about various topics. The parent measure includes 75 items (including 8 demographic items) and takes about 10 minutes to complete on average. It is available in English and Spanish.

The **FSS measure** is for Head Start/Early Head Start family services staff (FSS), referred to as Family Service Workers (FSWs) in the measure. It asks respondents questions about how they work with Head Start/Early Head Start parents they are assigned to work with, such as how often they have offered parents ideas or suggestions about parenting and how often they have helped families find services they need. The FSS measure includes 112 items (including 11 demographic items) and takes about 15 minutes to complete on average. It is available in English and Spanish.

The **FSS parent measure** is for parents to complete about the Head Start/Early Head Start family services staff (FSS) member, referred to as the Family Service Worker (FSW) in the measure, who serves their family. It asks respondents questions about how they work with their FSW, such as how often their FSW remembers personal details about their family and how comfortable they feel sharing information about certain topics with their FSW. The FSS parent measure includes 76 items (including 9 demographic items) and takes about 10 minutes to complete on average. It is available in English and Spanish.

In addition, **short forms of the provider/teacher, parent, FSS, and FSS parent measures** are available in both English and Spanish. These short forms may be useful for special circumstances that do not allow the use of the FPTRQ full measures; however, for the most comprehensive collection of information we strongly recommend the use of the full measures. The short forms were created by identifying measure items that performed best, based on (1) alpha if item deleted (i.e., How reliable is the scale when a particular item is not included in the scale?), (2) item-total correlation (i.e., How well does a particular item discriminate between respondents who have higher and lower levels of relationship quality, based on the scale score created by dropping the particular item?), (3) item characteristic curves (i.e., To what extent do scores for an item span the entire scale range?) (Gorecki et al., 2013), and (4) conceptual review (i.e., Are any of the items selected to be dropped based on psychometric properties essential to obtain adequate conceptual coverage?). See the *Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality (FPTRQ) Measures Short Forms: Amendment to the User's Manual* and the *Family Services Staff and Family Services Staff Parent Measures: Amendment to the FPTRQ User's Manual* for more information on the OPRE website at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/development-of-a-measure-of-family-and-provider-teacher-relationship-quality-fptrq.

4.2 Subscales of the FPTRQ Measures

This section describes the definitions of the FPTRQ subscales and the subscales that are included in the provider/teacher, parent, FSS, and FSS parent measures. In addition, a brief description of the director measure is included.

Definition of the subscales. The FPTRQ provider/teacher, parent, FSS, and FSS parent measures group the elements from the FPTRQ conceptual model into three broad constructs (Attitudes, Knowledge, and Practices) and ten subscales within those constructs: (1) Family-specific Knowledge, (2) Collaboration, (3) Responsiveness, (4) Connecting to Services, (5) Communication, (6) Family-focused Concern, (7) Commitment, (8) Understanding Context, (9) Openness to Change, and (10) Respect. The definitions of the subscales are presented in the following table (Table 4-1).

Table 4-1. FPTRQ subscale definitions

Construct	Subscale	Definition
Knowledge	**Family-specific Knowledge** (Provider/Teacher Measure–12 items) (Parent Measure–15 items) (FSS measure–19 items) (FSS parent measure–17 items)	Includes knowledge and an understanding of families' cultures; the context in which they live; situations that affect them; and their abilities, needs, and goals
Practices	**Collaboration** (Provider/Teacher Measure–15 items) (Parent Measure–11 items) (FSS measure–11 items) (FSS parent measure–11 items)	Collaborate with and engage families in the program through joint goal setting, decision-making, and following up on this decision-making process through the development of action plans
	Responsiveness (Provider/Teacher Measure–4 items) (Parent Measure–11 items) (FSS measure–11 items) (FSS parent measure–14 items)	Engage in sensitive, flexible, and responsive support of families' identified needs and goals
	Connecting to Services (FSS Measure–6 items)	Advocating for and connecting families to peer and community supports/resources
	Communication (Provider/Teacher Measure–4 items) (Parent Measure–8 items) (FSS measure–15 items) (FSS parent measure–7 items)	Promote positive, two-way communication that is responsive to families' preferences and providers/teachers' personal boundaries
	Family-focused Concern (Parent Measure–3 items) (FSS measure–3 items)	Communication that demonstrates interest in the family as a unit

Table 4-1. FPTRQ subscale definitions—Continued

Construct	Subscale	Definition
Attitudes	**Commitment** (Provider/Teacher Measure–4 items) (Parent Measure–9 items) (FSS measure–8 items) (FSS parent measure–8 items)	Sensitivity to the needs of children, parents, and families; intrinsic motivation, or viewing work as "more than a job;" and being sincere, honest, encouraging, accessible, and consistent in interactions with parents and children
	Understanding Context (Parent Measure–4 items) (FSS measure–4 items) (FSS parent measure–4 items)	Having an appreciation for the broader context in which children's development and families' lives are situated and viewing the family as a unit, rather than focusing on an individual child.
	Openness to Change (Provider/Teacher Measure–8 items) (FSS measure–3 items)	Willingness to alter their normal practices in order to be sensitive to an individual child, parent, or family's needs, and a willingness to be flexible in varying their practices based on input received from a parent/family member
	Respect (Provider/Teacher Measure–4 items) (Parent Measure–5 items) (FSS measure–7 items) (FSS parent measure–4 items)	Valuing the child and the family; being non-judgmental, courteous/welcoming, and non-discriminatory; being accepting of divergent opinions of parents (e.g., on managing children's behavior/how to socialize children); and being considerate and patient with parents when trying to elicit changes in their behavior

Director measure. The director measure includes items that map on to the five environmental elements of the FPTRQ conceptual model (welcoming, communication systems, culturally-diverse materials, information about resources, and peer-to-peer parent activities) in addition to data about the program characteristics. The measure also includes items that relate to the program's responsiveness to families' work schedules and financial needs, such as the availability of extended drop-off/pick-up times and flexible payment schedules. More detailed information about the items that are used to measure these elements is included in Appendix A.

How to Administer and Score the FPTRQ Measures 5

This chapter describes how to administer and score the Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality (FPTRQ) measures, including preparing hard copies of the measures, administering the measures, and using the Excel scoring sheets. It also describes the item response codes and reverse-coded items. The final sections discuss how to link the FPTRQ measures and why these measures should be used together to collect comprehensive information about family and provider/teacher relationships.

5.1 How to Administer and Score the Measures

Printable PDF versions of the FPTRQ measures can be downloaded at no cost from the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE) website at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/development-of-a-measure-of-family-and-provider-teacher-relationship-quality-fptrq. Also, Excel scoring sheets, which are designed to calculate overall, construct, and subscale scores of the FPTRQ measures, are located on the same website.

5.1.1 Getting Ready to Use the FPTRQ Measures

Users should take the following steps to make hard copies of the FPTRQ measures:

- Determine the number of each type of measure you will need from the OPRE website.
- You will probably want to print a few extras of each type of measure in case any get lost.
- When using the measures with multiple providers or teachers, a linked ID system should be used so that provider/teacher measures are linked to the parent measures from their classroom. This would be true within or across centers/programs. (See the Linking the Measures section below for details on creating IDs.)
- When using the measures with multiple programs, you will want to develop a systematic linked ID system to ensure that the director measures are linked to provider/teacher and parent measures from the correct program. (See the Linking the Measures section below for details on creating IDs.)

5.1.2 Administering the Measures

The FPTRQ measures are designed to be self-administered questionnaires. Each measure is designed to take only about 10 minutes, so most respondents can complete and return the measure within a few minutes of receiving it. If parents are concerned about confidentiality, parent names do not need to be included on the measures, and their responses will only be associated with the unique ID linking to the correct provider or teacher and/or program. If your organization has an Internal Review Board (IRB) which protects the rights and welfare of participants in research studies, you should consult with your IRB.

Someone other than the provider or teacher should collect the parent measures, and, in some cases, someone other than the director should collect the provider/teacher measures (when not being used for professional development). Providers/teachers and parents could also be given an envelope in which they can securely place and seal the completed measure before returning it in person. Collecting the completed measures by hand is generally the best way to ensure the measures are returned, but parent respondents can also be given the option to mail the measures back in an envelope. When you give the FPTRQ measures to respondents to complete, encourage them to answer all of the questions.

5.1.3 Using the Excel Scoring Sheets

Excel scoring sheets are available on the OPRE website at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/development-of-a-measure-of-family-and-provider-teacher-relationship-quality-fptrq and can be used to automatically calculate overall, construct, and subscale scores in the provider/teacher, parent, family services staff (FSS), and FSS parent measures, as well as scores for the environment and policy checklist in the director measure.

The following steps describe how to use the Excel scoring sheets. You will need the Excel software program on your computer to use the scoring sheets.

- Excel scoring sheets for the director, provider/teacher, parent, FSS, and FSS parent measures are available on the OPRE website at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/development-of-a-measure-of-family-and-provider-teacher-relationship-quality-fptrq. Download and save the sheets on your computer.

- The Excel scoring sheets are available in English and Spanish for all FPTRQ measures except the director measure. The English and Spanish versions of the Excel scoring sheets are exactly the same, with the exception of the language of the question stem. Both English and Spanish versions of the same FPTRQ measure can be entered into the same Excel scoring sheet (e.g., PROVQ2A is the same item in the Provider/Teacher measure in both the English and Spanish versions).

- For each completed measure, enter the responses in the appropriate Excel scoring sheet (for example, parent measure responses in the parent measure Excel scoring sheet) under the assigned measure ID.

- You *must* use the item response codes shown below when entering responses for each item into the Excel scoring sheet.

- When a response code (shown below) is entered into the scoring sheet, construct and subscale scores will automatically be generated for each measure.

- In order to compute total, construct, and subscale scores of the FPTRQ measures, it is critical that all questions in each measure should be answered completely. If one or more questions are not answered, scores for the total, construct, and subscales that include those unanswered questions will not be computed. It is recommended that when giving the FPTRQ measures to respondents to complete, you ask them to answer all the questions and not to leave any questions unanswered.

- Enter responses for all providers/teachers within the same program (with the same program ID) into the same provider/teacher scoring sheet. If you are using the measures with providers or teachers at multiple programs, a different provider/teacher Excel scoring sheet should be used for each program, and then the file can be named with the program ID. More detailed information about creating and linking the measure IDs is provided in the next section.

- Enter responses for all parents of children cared for by the same provider/teacher (with the same provider/teacher ID) into the same parent scoring sheet. If you are using the measures with multiple providers/teachers, a different parent scoring sheet should be used for each provider or teacher. More detailed information about creating and linking the measure IDs is provided in the next section.

- Once the measure data are entered in the Excel sheets, the data can be uploaded to other analysis software, such as Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) or Statistical Analysis System (SAS), to conduct more detailed analyses.

An example screenshot of the FPTRQ parent measure scoring sheet is shown below. Users will enter the parent response codes for all parents with the same provider/teacher (in this example, with provider/teacher ID 0001-001) into the same scoring sheet. Each parent will have a unique ID assigned, and their responses will be entered in the column with their unique ID next to the corresponding row for each item in the measure. The total, construct, and subscale scores for each parent will automatically be calculated at the bottom of the scoring sheet.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
1		**FPTRQ Parent Measure Scoring Sheet**															
2			PARENT ID														
3		**Program ID**	0001	0001	0001	0001	0001	0001	0001	0001	0001	0001	0001	0001	0001	0001	0001
4		**Provider/Teacher ID**	001	001	001	001	001	001	001	001	001	001	001	001	001	001	001
5		**Parent ID**	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15
6	Item #	Item															
7	PARQ1a	Your child's experiences in the education and care setting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	PARQ1b	Your child's abilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	PARQ1c	Your child's general behavior	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	PARQ1d	Your child's learning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	PARQ1e	Goals you have for your child	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	PARQ1f	What to expect at each stage of your child's development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	PARQ1g	Your vision for your child's future	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	PARQ2a	Your provider's expectations for your child	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	PARQ2b	The rules your provider has for children in his or her care	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	PARQ2c	How you feel about the care and education your child receives	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17	PARQ3a	Your child has siblings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	PARQ3b	You have other adult relatives living in your household	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19	PARQ3c	Household schedule	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	PARQ3d	Marital status	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21	PARQ3e	Personal relationship with a spouse or partner	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22	PARQ3f	Employment status	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23	PARQ3g	Financial situation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24	PARQ3h	Family life	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25	PARQ3i	Role that faith and religion play in your household	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	PARQ3j	Family's culture and values	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27	PARQ3k	Encourage your child's learning outside setting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
28	PARQ3l	Discipline your child	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
96																	
97																	
98		**PARENT MEASURE CONSTRUCTS AND SUBSCALES**															
99		**TOTAL Parent Measure Score**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100		**Construct: Knowledge**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
101		Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
102		**Construct: Practices**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
103		Sunscale: Collaboration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
104		Subscale: Responsiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
105		Subscale: Communication	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
106		Subscale: Family-focused Concern	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
107		**Construct: Attitudes**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
108		Subscale: Commitment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
109		Subscale: Understanding Context	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
110		Subscale: Respect	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.1.4 Measure Response Codes

The FPTRQ measures contain several types of response categories that respondents can choose from. The following coding scheme must be used to enter responses into the Excel scoring sheets to ensure correct scoring.

Response	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very often
Code	1	2	3	4

Response	None	Some	Most	All
Code	1	2	3	4

Response	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Code	1	2	3	4

Response	Very uncomfortable	Uncomfortable	Comfortable	Very comfortable
Code	1	2	3	4

Response	Not at all like my provider/FSS	A little like my provider/FSS	A lot like my provider/FSS	Exactly like my provider/FSS
Code	1	2	3	4

Response	Yes, I made a referral	No, I did not make a referral	Not applicable
Code	1	0	9

Response	Yes	No
Code	1	0

5.1.5 Unanswered Items

When entering responses from the completed FPTRQ measures into the Excel scoring sheets, you may find that some respondents did not answer all of the questions in the measures and left some blank. You should not enter responses for any unanswered questions and should leave the boxes by the corresponding question numbers blank in the Excel scoring sheets. You will still enter the responses to all completed questions into the Excel scoring sheets.

When automatically calculating subscale scores in the Excel scoring sheets, if one or more questions were not answered within a subscale, that subscale score will not be calculated for that individual, and the box for that subscale score in the Excel scoring sheet will be blank. Likewise, if any subscales within a construct do not have a subscale score, a construct score will not be calculated for that particular construct, and the box for that construct score in the Excel scoring sheet will be blank for that individual. The Excel total scores for individual measures will only be calculated if all questions were answered completely by the

respondent. For example, you can see in Table 7-13 in Chapter 7 that the total number of completed cases for both the subscales and constructs within the provider/teacher measures reflect the missing items.

If you use a statistical package such as SAS or SPSS to calculate subscale, construct, and total scores on the measures, you will need to take the necessary steps to exclude missing data for analysis, such as through a "listwise deletion" procedure.

5.1.6 Reverse-coded Items

Depending on the item, a response can have either a positive or negative connotation. For example, a response of 'Strongly agree' to the statement 'I teach and care for children because I enjoy it' has a positive connotation, while a response of 'Strongly agree' to the statement 'I see this job as just a paycheck' has a negative connotation. For scores to be calculated correctly, all responses need to be scored so that positive responses have the same codes and negative responses have the same codes. Therefore, in this example, for the item 'I teach and care for children because I enjoy it', the 'Strongly agree' response is coded as a '4'. However, for the item 'I see this job as just a paycheck', the 'Strongly agree' response is coded as a '1'. This is called "reverse-coding".

The Excel scoring sheets are programmed to automatically compute reverse-coded items, so you can just enter the original responses into the scoring sheet. However, if you are planning to use a statistical package such as SAS or SPSS without first using the Excel scoring sheets, you need to take necessary steps to reverse the codes for the items shown in Table 5-1.

Table 5-1. Reverse-coded items

FPTRQ measure	Reverse-coded items
Provider/Teacher Measure	PROVQ8a, PROVQ8b, PROVQ8c, PROVQ8d, PROVQ9b, PROVQ9d
Parent Measure	PARQ7c, PARQ7g, PARQ7h, PARQ7j, PARQ9a, PARQ9b, PARQ9c, PARQ9d
Family Services Staff Measure	FSSQ5a, FSSQ5b, FSSQ5c, FSSQ5d, FSSQ5e, FSSQ5f, FSSQ12b, FSSQ12d
Family Services Staff Parent Measure	FSSPQ5a, FSSPQ5b, FSSPQ5c, FSSPQ5d, FSSPQ8c, FSSPQ8g, FSSPQ8h, FSSPQ8j, FSSPQ9e

NOTE: Recode 1=4; 2=3; 3=2; and 4=1.

The FPTRQ measures use the following conventions to easily identify the item numbers for each measure:

- PROVQ for items in the provider/teacher measure;
- PARQ for items in the parent measure;
- DIRQ for items in the director measure;
- FSSQ for items in the family services staff measure; and
- FSSPQ for items in the family services staff parent measure.

5.1.7 Calculation of Subscale Scores

As discussed earlier, subscale scores are automatically calculated when using the Excel scoring sheets. For those using statistical packages such as SPSS and SAS, subscale scores can be calculated by adding individual item scores included in each subscale. For example, the Responsiveness subscale in the provider/teacher measure is composed of four items (PROVQ10a, PROVQ10b, PROVQ10c, and PROVQ10d). Therefore, the Responsiveness subscale score is equal to the score of PROVQ10a + score of PROVQ10b + score of PROVQ10c + score PROVQ10d. Since each of these items is scored in the range of 1-4, this subscale score will range from 4-16. The items included in each of the subscales can be found in Appendix A, Table A-1 for the provider/teacher measure and Table A-3 for the parent measure.

In the director measure, there are three construct scores that can also be calculated by adding individual item scores. Since the items in these constructs have responses of "Yes" or "No," a response of "Yes" will be scored 1 and a response of "No" will be scored 0. The items included in each of the constructs in the director measure can be found in Appendix A in Table A-5.

5.1.8 Calculation of Total Scores

As discussed earlier, total scores are automatically calculated when using the Excel scoring sheets. For those using statistical packages such as SPSS and SAS, total scores can be calculated by adding each subscale across the measures. For example, the provider/teacher measure is composed of seven subscales (Family-specific Knowledge, Collaboration, Responsiveness, Communication, Openness to Change, Respect, and Commitment). Therefore, the provider/teacher measure total score is equal to the score of Family-specific Knowledge score + Collaboration score + Responsiveness score + Communication score + Openness to Change score + Respect score + Commitment score. Although the total score provides a broad

overview of the quality of the teacher/provider and parent relationship, subscale scores are most useful to identify potential areas for professional development and training.

5.2 Linking the Measures

The FPTRQ measures (director, provider/teacher, parent, FSS, and FSS parent measures) are designed to gather information from early care and education (ECE) programs, providers/teachers, and family services staff, as well as from parents whose child is cared for by the specific provider/teacher in the program and/or parents who work with a specific family services staff member. Therefore, during data collection, it is important that the director measures, provider/teacher measures, parent measures, FSS measures, and FSS parent measures are marked systematically using IDs that will allow linking the measure information. This will ensure that provider/teacher and FSS measure information for all providers/teachers and family services staff within a single program will be linked to the director measure information for the same program. Parent measure information from all parents within a single provider's/teacher's class will also be correctly linked to the provider/teacher measure information for that same provider/teacher. Likewise, FSS parent measure information for all parents working with a particular FSS member will be linked to that particular FSS measure.

This is an example linked ID system that could be adapted to the number of programs, providers/teachers, and/or parents:

1. Unique four-number ID identifying the program could be assigned to each director measure. Here is an example:

    - Program ID for the Happy Days program for the director measure: **1001**.

2. Each provider/teacher measure could have a seven-number ID, with the first four numbers corresponding to the program, and the next three numbers corresponding to unique provider. Here is an example:

    - Provider/teacher ID for Ms. Brown (101), a teacher in the Happy Days Program: 1001-**101**.

3. Each parent measure could have a nine-number ID, with the first four numbers identifying the program, next three numbers identifying the provider, and the last two numbers that are unique to the parent. Here is an example:

    - Parent ID for Ms. Sanchez (01), a parent of child in Ms. Brown's class in the Happy Days Program: 1001-001-**01**.

If you are collecting data from multiple programs, providers/teachers, or family services staff, it is especially critical to develop a systematic, linked ID system. This will ensure that multiple providers/teachers and/or family services staff in the same program are given the provider/teacher or FSS measures with IDs that correspond to that program. It will also ensure that multiple parents in the same provider's/teacher's class or who work with the same FSS are given the parent measures with IDs that correspond to that provider/teacher or FSS and program. The collected FPTRQ measure data from providers/teachers will be about the relationship quality with parents in their own class, and the data collected from parents will be about their relationship quality with their own child's provider/teacher. Likewise, the collected FPTRQ measure data from family services staff will be about their relationships with the parents they currently serve, and the data collected from the FSS parent measure will be from parents reporting about the FSS with whom they work.

Here are examples of parent measure IDs if you are collecting from multiple programs:

- 1001-101-01
- 1001-101-02
- 1002-101-01
- 1002-102-01
- 1002-102-02
- 1003-101-01
- 1003-102-01

5.3 Using the Measures

In order to assess relationship quality from the view of providers/teachers and parents, it is advisable to use the provider/teacher and parent measures in combination with the director measure included to provide further context about the ECE setting.

Thirteen identical items are included in both the provider/teacher measure and the parent measure. A finding from the FPTRQ field study data analysis indicated that providers/teachers and parents did not always respond to these identical items the same way. This finding suggests that using just one

measure (either the provider/teacher measure or the parent measure only) would not provide comprehensive information about relationship quality between providers/teachers and parents.

We currently cannot define a threshold for 'high' or 'low' subscale scores on the FPTRQ measures due to the absence of outcome data that can indicate which subscale scores lead to positive outcomes. However, as shown in Appendix F, the mean scores, standard deviations, and ranges (minimum and maximum) of the subscales in the provider/teacher and parent measures can be used to compare your own subscale scores to the FPTRQ field study data. This will allow you to determine whether your average subscale scores are higher or lower than those of the field study. Moreover, Appendix F also shows quartile scores (25th percentile, 50th percentile or median, and 75th percentile) of each subscale. This information can be useful as a reference to see the distribution of the subscale scores. In summary, the data included in Appendix F should not be used for establishing threshold scores, but it could serve as a starting point to see how your subscale scores compare to others. In addition, since the FPTRQ field study data are not nationally representative, it is important to recognize that the data presented in Appendix F are not normed scores.

Potential Uses and Limitations of the FPTRQ Measures 6

The Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality (FPTRQ) measures can be used by a variety of early care and education (ECE) stakeholders who share an interest in improving provider/teacher relationships with families and family engagement in ECE programs. These stakeholders include policymakers such as state and local administrators; practitioners such as ECE program directors, teachers, and providers as well as the professional development system community; and researchers. The following sections suggest potential uses of the FPTRQ measures for each of these stakeholders. This chapter also provides information about the limitations of the FPTRQ measures.

6.1 Potential Uses of the FPTRQ Measures

6.1.1 Policymakers

The FPTRQ measures can be helpful for state and local administrators and program managers who are working with Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS), Race to the Top/Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grants, and Head Start/Early Head Start family engagement efforts.

State policymakers and local administrators can use the FPTRQ measures to strengthen existing QRIS family partnership standards and indicators, which some studies suggest lack specificity (Porter & Bromer, 2013) or variation (Zellman & Fiene, 2012). The subscales for Collaboration and Responsiveness, for example, could inform development of indicators that would clarify these aspects of practices in provider/teacher relationships with families, while the Family-specific Knowledge subscale could be used to identify the kinds of knowledge that providers/teachers should have about families. In addition, the director measure could be used to refine indicators that relate to the program environment. Policymakers and local administrators could also use the subscales for Openness to Change and Commitment to capture these aspects of quality, which are not currently included in QRIS standards (Porter, Bromer, & Moodie, 2011; Porter & Bromer, 2013).

The FPTRQ measures can also be helpful for administrators who have an interest in improving family engagement efforts, such as the RTT-ELC grantees. The provider/teacher and parent measures could be used to assess the family engagement component of this initiative because the FPTRQ model assumes that family engagement is an intermediate outcome of strong provider/teacher relationships with families. The construct scale for Practices from the provider/teacher measure, for example, could indicate the range of responses related to Communication, Collaboration, Responsiveness, and Family-focused Concern; the parent measure Practices construct scale could be used to assess parents' perceptions of these provider/teacher practices.

Administrators could also consider using individual subscales such as Communication or Collaboration from these measures to focus on specific aspects of practice that are associated with strong family and provider/teacher relationships. In addition, the FPTRQ measures could be used alongside other instruments such as the Strengthening Families Self-Assessment, which may be used in QRIS rating systems or RTT-ELC initiatives, to capture a more complete range of constructs and elements of quality in providers/teachers relationships with families.

Similarly, the FPTRQ measures could be used in conjunction with Head Start/Early Head Start Parent, Family and Community Engagement Framework Assessments (http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/hs/sr/approach/pdf/OHSApproach-to-School-Readiness_PFCE-Framework.pdf) to strengthen efforts to improve family and provider/teacher partnerships at the program level. Program managers can use the measures for self-assessment to measure constructs of quality such as provider/teacher Attitudes, Knowledge, and Practices. The director measure could be used to assess program environmental features and policies. The provider/teacher and parent measures could be used to assess each of these partners' perspectives on their relationships. The construct scales and subscales could be used to identify specific elements of these relationships that may need attention in continuous improvement efforts as well as changes in provider/teacher relationships with families over time.

In addition, the FPTRQ measures could be used as the basis for moving towards stronger alignment between family partnership competencies articulated in state professional development systems (PDS) and QRIS family partnership indicators. Some research suggests that there are gaps in this alignment with several of the FPTRQ elements, such as Openness to Change in the Attitudes construct and Responsiveness to families work-family balance in the Practices construct (Porter & Bromer, 2013). Policymakers could create a crosswalk between items in the FPTRQ construct scales and subscales, existing PDS competencies for family partnerships, and current QRIS indicators to identify gaps in alignment and develop language to fill these gaps. Porter and Bromer (2013) present an example of how such a crosswalk

could be created and used to address this issue in their brief on alignment of professional standards, PDS competencies and QRIS indicators with the FPTRQ model.

6.1.2 Practitioners and the Professional Development Community

The FPTRQ measures are a useful tool for programs and practitioners that seek to assess and improve their work with families. The construct scales and the subscales in the provider/teacher and parent measures can be used for programs' self-assessment to identify areas that are strengths or that may warrant attention in continuous improvement efforts.

Scores on specific construct scales can be used to inform individual professional development and reflective supervision for providers/teachers. For example, responses in the lower range of the Attitudes construct or in the lower range of the Knowledge construct could indicate the need to address providers'/teachers' openness to change or the types and extent of information they have about families. (Appendix F, Table F-4). Scores on specific subscales such as Collaboration or Responsiveness in the provider/teacher and the parent measures could point to the need to help providers/teachers improve their capacity to engage in joint decision-making and goal-setting with families or to engage in more sensitive, flexible, and supportive practices with families.

For example, providers/teachers' consistent reports of "rarely" or "never" on items about how often they meet with or talk to parents about their goals for their children or how their child is progressing towards parents' goals in the Collaboration subscale would suggest that there is a need to address this aspect of their relationships with parents. Similarly, a high range of "strongly disagree" or "disagree" in parents' responses to items such as "My child care provider/teacher is flexible in response to my work or school schedule" or "My child care provider/teacher uses my feedback to adjust the education and care provided to my child" on the Responsiveness subscale might indicate that attention should be paid to enhancing provider/teacher sensitivity and flexibility. The director measure, independently or in conjunction with the parent and provider/teacher measures, could be used to assess the degree to which program policies and practices support family partnerships; results could be used to enhance this area of program planning and development.

The FPTRQ measures can be a useful tool for the professional development community as well. The provider/teacher measure can be used to inform training and coursework related to specific construct scales such as Practices if responses to items are in the lower quartile (Appendix F, Table F-4). Similarly, training or coursework could be developed to enhance specific provider/teacher practices such as Responsiveness when subscale scores suggest a need for improved competencies in these areas. In addition,

assessing the "fit" between responses in the provider/teacher and the parent measures could be used to identify problems in the parent and provider/teacher relationship that could be addressed with targeted professional development efforts.

6.1.3 Researchers

Researchers can use the FPTRQ measures in a variety of ways. The provider/teacher measures can be used to test associations of the Attitudes, Knowledge, and Practices construct scales or specific subscales such as Commitment or Responsiveness with specific family and child outcomes to determine the measure's predictive validity. For example, responses in the lower range of the Attitudes construct or in the lower range of the Knowledge construct could be linked to poorer family or child outcomes (Appendix F, Table F-4). Scores on specific subscales such as Collaboration or Responsiveness in the provider/teacher and the parent measures could also be linked to specific family and child outcomes.

The provider/teacher measures could be used to test associations with such family outcomes as improved work-family balance, parent-child relationships, or parental perceptions of social and peer support. Associations with such child outcomes as improved cognitive and social-emotional development could be tested as well. In addition, the construct scales and subscales can be used concurrently with global quality measures to determine the construct validity of the measure.

Researchers could also use the FPTRQ measures in the evaluation of targeted interventions that aim to improve provider facilitation of family and provider/teacher partnerships or those that aim to enhance provider/teacher knowledge and practices. For example, providers/teachers' consistent scores in the low range on items in the Collaboration subscale would suggest that there is a need to address this aspect of their relationships with parents. Similarly, scores in the lowest quartile on the Responsiveness subscale might indicate that attention should be paid to enhancing provider/teacher sensitivity and flexibility. The director measure, independently or in conjunction with the parent and provider/teacher measures, could be used to assess the degree to which program policies and practices support family partnerships.

6.2 Limitations of the FPTRQ Measures

The FPTRQ measures have two major limitations. First, the measures have not been validated to examine any direct relationship between the relationship quality and any specific outcomes, and no examination of the FPTRQ measures has been conducted in conjunction with other existing family-relationship measures. Second, the FPTRQ field study and FSS pilot test used samples of convenience to collect data for reliability estimates and summary statistics, so the data presented are not nationally representative and should not be used to represent national estimates or normed scores. Additional minor limitations include the following:

- The measures have not yet been used for program monitoring, evaluation, or professional development. The work done to date focused solely on creating the measures.
- Of the Head Start/Early Head Start programs in the field study sample, only four were Early Head Start and this sample size was not sufficient to report findings specifically for Early Head Start.
- Most of the participating Head Start/Early Head Start programs were operated by community organizations. The field study sample included only a few Head Start/Early Head Start programs that were operated by school districts or government agencies.
- Only English and Spanish versions of the FPTRQ measures were created and tested; the measures were not translated into or tested in any other languages.
- Cultural sensitivity was not directly measured through measure items (see Appendix G).

This page is intentionally blank.

Technical Information about the FPTRQ Measures 7

This chapter describes technical information about the Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality (FPTRQ) measures. It includes the characteristics of the field test sample, reliability of the provider/teacher survey by program type, education, race/ ethnicity, and by acquisition of a Child Development Associate (CDA) credential. It also includes reliability of the parent measure by program type, education, race/ethnicity, household income, and by language. In addition, the section includes findings on the agreement of parallel items in the provider/teacher and parent surveys.

7.1 Field Study Sample

The field study sample was diverse, with participating programs, providers/teachers, and parents having a wide range of characteristics and backgrounds.

7.1.1 Participating Early Care and Education Programs

- From samples of convenience from six cities: Charlotte, NC; Minneapolis, MN; Philadelphia, PA; San Antonio, TX; San Francisco, CA; and Wichita, KS.
- The center-based child care programs ranged in size from 7 to 189 enrolled children, with a median size of 49 children enrolled (Table 7-1).
- The Head Start/Early Head Start programs ranged in size from 17 to 926 enrolled children, with a median size of 101 children enrolled (Table 7-2).
- The family child care programs ranged in size from 3 to 23 enrolled children, with a median size of 6 children enrolled (Table 7-3).
- The ECE programs varied in the number of providers/teachers employed, with most of the family child care programs having two or fewer providers/teachers, while center-based and Head Start/Early Head Start programs had between 3 and 15 teachers employed (Table 7-4).
- The sampled programs varied in the number of aides and teaching assistants employed, with most of the family child care programs having none or only one. Center-based and Head Start/Early Head Start programs generally had two or more aides and teaching assistants employed (Table 7-5).

Table 7-1. Percent of children ages 0-5 enrolled in center-based programs

Number of children	Center-based programs
7–49	50%
50–69	19%
70–99	20%
100–189	11%
Median	49

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Director Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-2. Percent of children ages 0-5 enrolled in Head Start/Early Head Start programs

Number of children	Head Start/Early Head Start
17–49	16%
50–79	22%
80–129	27%
130–200	14%
201–926	20%
Median	101

NOTE: The highest number of children currently enrolled was 926 reported by one Head Start/Early Head Start program in the sample. The second and third highest members were 920 and 469, respectively, each reported by one Head Start/Early Head Start Program.
SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Director Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-3. Percent of children ages 0-5 enrolled in family child care

Number of children	Family child care
3–5	34%
6–8	34%
9–12	23%
13–23	9%
Median	6

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Director Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-4. Percent of providers and teachers employed in the program, by program type

Number of providers/teachers	Center-based program (n=127)	Head Start/Early Head Start (n=48)	Family child care (n=76)
0	0%	0%	18%
1	2%	0%	50%
2	10%	4%	20%
3–4	25%	29%	9%
5–8	29%	31%	3%
9–15	20%	21%	0%
16–38	13%	15%	0%
Median	6	6	1

NOTE: The highest number of providers/teachers reported was 38 by one ECE program in the sample.
SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Director Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-5. Percent of aides and teaching assistants employed in the program, by program type

Number of aides and teaching assistants	Center-based program (n=124)	Head Start/Early Head Start (n=48)	Family child care (n=75)
0	17%	8%	57%
1	9%	0%	25%
2	17%	10%	9%
3–4	23%	21%	7%
5–10	21%	40%	1%
11–54	13%	21%	0%
Median	3	5	0

NOTE: The highest number of aides/teaching assistants reported was 54 by one ECE program in the sample.
SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Director Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

7.1.2 Participating Providers/Teachers

- The race/ethnicity of providers/teachers was diverse across each of the types of early childhood education programs (Table 7-6).
- The ECE programs varied in the highest level of education of the providers/teachers employed, with most of the Head Start/Early Head Start teachers having at least an associate's degree, while providers/teachers in center-based and family child care programs ranged from having a high school diploma to having a graduate school degree (Table 7-7).
- Slightly more than a third of family child care providers/teachers reported having some college. The educational attainment patterns of center-based and family child care providers/teachers were similar to those reported in the Initial Findings from the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE), OPRE Report #2013-38, October 2013.
- About half of the providers/teachers from center-based and Head Start/Early Head Start programs had a Child Development Associate (CDA) credential. About a third of the providers in family child care programs had this credential (Table 7-8).

Table 7-6. Race/ethnicity of providers/teachers, by program type

Race/ethnicity	Center-based program (n=230)	Head Start/ Early Head Start (n=100)	Family child care (n=93)
White, non-Hispanic	38%	34%	38%
Black or African American, non-Hispanic	27%	35%	35%
Hispanic or Latino	23%	11%	22%
Other, non-Hispanic	12%	20%	5%

NOTE: Other race includes American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Other Asian, Native Hawaiian, Guamanian or Chamorro, Samoan, and other Pacific Islander
SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Provider/Teacher Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-7. Highest level of education of providers/teachers, by program type

Level of education	Center-based program (n=229)	Head Start/Early Head Start (n=99)	Family child care (n=93)
High school diploma or GED	16%	0%	16%
Some college, no degree	34%	5%	34%
Associate's degree	15%	30%	15%
Bachelor's degree	28%	47%	28%
Graduate school degree	7%	17%	7%

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Provider/Teacher Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-8. Child care provider or teacher has child development associate (CDA) credential, by program type

CDA	Center-based program (n=229)	Head Start/Early Head Start (n=98)	Family child care (n=92)
Has CDA credential	46%	54%	29%

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Provider/Teacher Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

7.1.3 Participating Parents

- The race/ethnicity of parents was varied across the program types (Table 7-9).
- For the majority of parents from all three types of programs, English was the language most parents spoke at home. (Table 7-10).
- More than half of parents from center-based and family child care programs had at least an associate's degree (Table 7-11). The majority of parents from Head Start/Early Head Start programs in the field study sample had a high school diploma or some college as their highest level of education. The educational attainment patterns of Head Start/Early Head Start parents were similar to those reported in the FACES 2009 Parent Interview.
- The majority of parents from Head Start/Early Head Start programs reported an annual household income of less than $25,000, which is consistent with the income requirements for participation in the program. The reported annual household incomes of parents from center-based and family child care programs varied. About half of parents from center-based programs and family child care reported annual household incomes of $45,000 or more (Table 7-12).

Table 7-9. Race/ethnicity of parents, by program type

Race/ethnicity	Center-based program (n=635)	Head Start/ Early Head Start (n=288)	Family child care (n=261)
White, non-Hispanic	42%	16%	37%
Black or African American, non-Hispanic	22%	43%	33%
Hispanic or Latino	25%	25%	18%
Other, non-Hispanic	11%	16%	11%

NOTE: Other race includes American Indian/Alaska native, Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Other Asian, Native Hawaiian, Guamanian or Chamorro, Samoan, and other Pacific Islander.
SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Parent Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-10. Language of parents spoken most at home, by program type

Primary language	Center-based program (n=632)	Head Start/Early Head Start (n=283)	Family child care (n=257)
English	85%	64%	89%
Spanish	5%	16%	4%
English and Spanish equally	5%	7%	5%
English and another language equally	2%	8%	<1%
Other language	3%	5%	1%

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Parent Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-11. Highest level of education of parents, by program type

Level of education	Center-based program (n=635)	Head Start/Early Head Start (n=285)	Family child care (n=259)
Less than a high school diploma	5%	14%	1%
High school diploma or GEDs	16%	29%	14%
Some college, no degree	19%	34%	28%
Associate's degree	9%	12%	11%
Bachelor's degree	27%	8%	24%
Graduate school degree	24%	4%	21%

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Parent Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-12. Annual household income of parents, by program type

Income	Center-based program (n=629)	Head Start/Early Head Start (n=283)	Family child care (n=257)
Less than $25,000	27%	66%	23%
$25,000–$44,999	22%	27%	28%
$45,000–$74,999	13%	5%	22%
$75,000 or more	38%	3%	28%

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Parent Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

7.2 Item Response Rates and Reliability of the FPTRQ Measures

The FPTRQ provider/teacher and parent measures include multiple subscales under the three broader constructs of Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices. Cronbach's alphas were computed to determine internal consistency reliability of each subscale and construct. Cronbach's alphas increase as the inter-correlations among measure items increase, indicating the degree to which a set of items measures a single construct. General guidelines for interpreting Cronbach's alphas (α) include the following (George & Mallery, 2003; Kline, 2000):

- $\alpha \geq 0.9$ – Excellent;
- $0.7 \leq \alpha < 0.9$ – Good;
- $0.6 \leq \alpha < 0.7$ – Acceptable;
- $0.5 \leq \alpha < 0.6$ – Poor; and
- $\alpha < 0.5$ – Unacceptable.

The FPTRQ provider/teacher and parent measures had high individual item response rates overall and were found to be reliable, overall, as well as when broken down by program type and demographic characteristics. As shown below, overall Cronbach's alphas for each of the subscales in the provider/teacher and parent measures fall in the "Acceptable" category or higher (Tables 7-13 and 7-18). Reliability information about the family services staff (FSS) and FSS parent measures can be found in the *Family Services Staff and Family Services Staff Parent Measures: Amendment to the FPTRQ User's Manual.*

As noted in Chapter 5, it is important that all items in the FPTRQ measures be answered by respondents, because individual subscale scores are only calculated when all items within the subscale were answered. That is, if one or more items within a subscale were not answered by a respondent, that subscale score for the respondent will not be calculated. For example, if a respondent answered 14 of the total 15 items within the Collaboration subscale in the provider/teacher measure, a score for the Collaboration subscale was not calculated for that respondent. Therefore, that respondent will not have a Collaboration subscale score and would be excluded from comparison with other respondents for that particular subscale. However, other subscales scores calculated for that respondent are eligible for comparison with those of other respondents. Moreover, as shown in the reliability tables below, the number of cases vary slightly for each subscale (for example, the number of cases in Table 7-13 ranges from 396-420) because different numbers of respondents did not answer some items within each subscale. You will also notice that the number of construct scores varies and is a function of the lack of a subscale score for a particular construct

(e.g., if the Collaboration subscale was missing for a respondent, the construct score for Practices was not calculated for that respondent).

Based on the data from the filed study and the FSS pilot test, most respondents answered all of the items in the measures, but there were a few rare cases where one or more items were not answered and one or more subscales for that measure could not be calculated. However, we did not find any distinct pattern of particular items being left unanswered by respondents (i.e., missing data or item nonresponse) in the FPTRQ measure. Individual items throughout the FPTRQ measures were answered by nearly all respondents.

Reliability of the provider/teacher measure.

The provider/teacher measure includes seven subscales under three broad constructs. As shown in the following tables (Tables 7-13, 7-14, 7-15, 7-16, 7-17), most of the subscales among three program types and across respondent characteristics show at least acceptable, and mostly good or excellent, reliabilities. Only a few show poor reliabilities, generally due to a lack of variation among responses (almost all the provider/teachers responded to the item with a 3 or 4).

Table 7-13. Cronbach's alpha of the provider/teacher measure overall

Provider/teacher measure	Number of items	Overall	
		Number of cases	α
Construct: Knowledge	12	407	0.90
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge	12	407	0.90
Construct: Practices	23	396	0.91
Subscale: Collaboration	15	403	0.91
Subscale: Responsiveness	4	419	0.72
Subscale: Communication	4	413	0.77
Construct: Attitudes	16	399	0.77
Subscale: Commitment	4	420	0.63
Subscale: Openness to Change	8	404	0.74
Subscale: Respect	4	420	0.81

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Provider/Teacher Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014

Table 7-14. Cronbach's alpha of the provider/teacher measure, by program type

Provider/teacher measure	Number of items	Center-based program		Head Start/ Early Head Start		Family child care	
		Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α
Construct: Knowledge	12	224	0.91	94	0.90	89	0.87
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge	12	224	0.91	94	0.90	89	0.87
Construct: Practices	23	214	0.91	94	0.86	88	0.93
Subscale: Collaboration	15	219	0.91	95	0.86	89	0.92
Subscale: Responsiveness	4	227	0.72	100	0.64	92	0.80
Subscale: Communication	4	225	0.77	97	0.66	91	0.80
Construct: Attitudes	16	218	0.79	95	0.77	86	0.73
Subscale: Commitment	4	228	0.67	99	0.56	93	0.60
Subscale: Openness to Change	8	221	0.74	97	0.75	86	0.74
Subscale: Respect	4	228	0.81	99	0.77	93	0.83

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Provider/Teacher Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-15. Cronbach's alpha of the provider/teacher measure, by educational attainment

Provider/teacher measure	Number of items	High school diploma or less		Some college or associate's degree		Bachelor's or graduate degree	
		Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α
Construct: Knowledge	12	55	0.94	191	0.87	159	0.90
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge	12	55	0.94	191	0.87	159	0.90
Construct: Practices	23	52	0.94	188	0.90	154	0.92
Subscale: Collaboration	15	56	0.93	191	0.89	154	0.92
Subscale: Responsiveness	4	56	0.77	198	0.72	163	0.67
Subscale: Communication	4	55	0.83	196	0.76	160	0.77
Construct: Attitudes	16	55	0.82	186	0.76	156	0.77
Subscale: Commitment	4	57	0.74	199	0.64	162	0.59
Subscale: Openness to Change	8	56	0.77	189	0.70	157	0.75
Subscale: Respect	4	58	0.87	198	0.82	162	0.59

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Provider/Teacher Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-16. Cronbach's alpha of the provider/teacher measure, by CDA

Provider/teacher measure	Number of items	Has CDA		No CDA	
		Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α
Construct: Knowledge	12	176	0.91	227	0.89
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge	12	176	0.91	227	0.89
Construct: Practices	23	174	0.90	219	0.92
Subscale: Collaboration	15	176	0.91	224	0.91
Subscale: Responsiveness	4	183	0.70	232	0.74
Subscale: Communication	4	182	0.78	227	0.77
Construct: Attitudes	16	175	0.77	220	0.78
Subscale: Commitment	4	184	0.62	232	0.64
Subscale: Openness to Change	8	177	0.73	223	0.75
Subscale: Respect	4	184	0.82	232	0.81

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Provider/Teacher Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-17. Cronbach's alpha of the provider/teacher measure, by race/ethnicity

Provider/teacher measure	Number of items	White		Black or African American		Hispanic or Latino		All other races	
		Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α
Construct: Knowledge	12	151	0.89	124	0.87	82	0.91	50	0.94
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge	12	151	0.89	124	0.87	82	0.91	50	0.94
Construct: Practices	23	149	0.90	120	0.91	75	0.92	52	0.93
Subscale: Collaboration	15	149	0.91	124	0.90	78	0.92	52	0.92
Subscale: Responsiveness	4	157	0.72	127	0.66	83	0.79	52	0.72
Subscale: Communication	4	154	0.75	125	0.73	82	0.81	52	0.85
Construct: Attitudes	16	149	0.80	119	0.72	80	0.76	51	0.81
Subscale: Commitment	4	157	0.56	128	0.59	83	0.76	52	0.58
Subscale: Openness to Change	8	151	0.78	121	0.71	81	0.65	51	0.82
Subscale: Respect	4	156	0.83	128	0.77	84	0.81	52	0.85

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Provider/Teacher Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Reliability of the parent measure.

The parent measure includes eight subscales under the three broader constructs of Knowledge, Practice, and Attitude. As shown in the following tables (Tables 7-18, 7-19, 7-20, 7-21, 7-22, 7-23), all of the subscales among three program types and across respondent characteristics show at least acceptable, and mostly good or excellent, reliabilities.

Table 7-18. Cronbach's alpha of the parent measure overall

Parent measure	Number of items	Overall	
		Number of cases	α
Construct: Knowledge	15	1,121	0.94
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge	15	1,121	0.94
Construct: Practices	33	1,027	0.96
Subscale: Collaboration	11	1,122	0.92
Subscale: Responsiveness	11	1,147	0.91
Subscale: Communication	8	1,151	0.91
Subscale: Family-focused Concern	3	1,153	0.75
Construct: Attitudes	18	1,111	0.88
Subscale: Commitment	9	1,144	0.90
Subscale: Understanding Context	4	1,165	0.97
Subscale: Respect	5	1,138	0.83

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Parent Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-19. Cronbach's alpha of the parent measure, by program type

Parent measure	Number of items	Center-based Program		Head Start/ Early Child Start		Family child care	
		Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α
Construct: Knowledge	15	601	0.94	268	0.95	252	0.94
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge	15	601	0.94	268	0.95	252	0.94
Construct: Practices	33	567	0.96	262	0.94	243	0.95
Subscale: Collaboration	11	601	0.92	270	0.91	251	0.91
Subscale: Responsiveness	11	617	0.92	276	0.91	254	0.91
Subscale: Communication	8	612	0.91	281	0.89	258	0.91
Subscale: Family-focused Concern	3	616	0.77	282	0.74	255	0.72
Construct: Attitudes	18	599	0.88	265	0.87	247	0.88
Subscale: Commitment	9	616	0.91	277	0.87	251	0.90
Subscale: Understanding Context	4	628	0.97	281	0.98	256	0.98
Subscale: Respect	5	613	0.85	272	0.76	253	0.84

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Parent Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-20. Cronbach's alpha of the parent measure, by education

Parent measure	Number of items	High school diploma or less		Some college or associate's degree		Bachelor's or graduate degree	
		Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α
Construct: Knowledge	15	266	0.95	394	0.94	457	0.94
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge	15	266	0.95	394	0.94	457	0.94
Construct: Practices	33	250	0.96	383	0.95	437	0.96
Subscale: Collaboration	11	267	0.92	399	0.90	452	0.92
Subscale: Responsiveness	11	276	0.93	408	0.90	460	0.91
Subscale: Communication	8	282	0.93	405	0.91	459	0.90
Subscale: Family-focused Concern	3	282	0.77	406	0.74	461	0.75
Construct: Attitudes	18	272	0.90	392	0.84	446	0.86
Subscale: Commitment	9	279	0.93	407	0.89	456	0.89
Subscale: Understanding Context	4	289	0.98	410	0.97	462	0.96
Subscale: Respect	5	279	0.86	400	0.80	458	0.80

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Parent Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-21. Cronbach's alpha of the parent measure, by household income

Parent measure	Number of items	Less than $25,000		$25,000–$44,999		$45,000–$74,999		$75,000 or more	
		Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α
Construct: Knowledge	15	378	0.94	274	0.93	148	0.95	306	0.94
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge	15	378	0.94	274	0.93	148	0.95	306	0.94
Construct: Practices	33	364	0.95	267	0.96	138	0.95	291	0.96
Subscale: Collaboration	11	383	0.91	279	0.91	144	0.92	303	0.92
Subscale: Responsiveness	11	401	0.91	280	0.92	144	0.93	308	0.90
Subscale: Communication	8	403	0.92	280	0.91	146	0.91	307	0.88
Subscale: Family-focused Concern	3	403	0.76	282	0.76	146	0.74	308	0.75
Construct: Attitudes	18	384	0.88	274	0.87	141	0.89	300	0.87
Subscale: Commitment	9	401	0.92	278	0.90	144	0.91	308	0.88
Subscale: Understanding Context	4	409	0.97	284	0.98	146	0.99	311	0.93
Subscale: Respect	5	394	0.83	280	0.82	145	0.86	307	0.80

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Parent Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-22. Cronbach's alpha of the parent measure, by race/ethnicity

Parent measure	Number of items	White		Black or African American		Hispanic or Latino		All other races	
		Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α
Construct: Knowledge	15	399	0.94	331	0.95	253	0.93	138	0.95
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge	15	399	0.94	331	0.95	253	0.93	138	0.95
Construct: Practices	33	384	0.96	316	0.95	240	0.96	132	0.95
Subscale: Collaboration	11	396	0.92	331	0.92	258	0.91	137	0.91
Subscale: Responsiveness	11	403	0.92	341	0.90	259	0.91	144	0.92
Subscale: Communication	8	403	0.90	339	0.90	267	0.93	142	0.91
Subscale: Family-focused Concern	3	405	0.74	341	0.77	263	0.77	144	0.70
Construct: Attitudes	18	396	0.87	333	0.87	250	0.88	132	0.87
Subscale: Commitment	9	404	0.90	340	0.91	263	0.92	137	0.86
Subscale: Understanding Context	4	407	0.94	344	0.97	270	0.98	144	0.98
Subscale: Respect	5	405	0.80	339	0.81	255	0.86	139	0.86

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Parent Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table 7-23. Cronbach's alpha of the parent measure, by language

Parent measure	Number of items	English		Spanish	
		Number of cases	α	Number of cases	α
Construct: Knowledge	15	1,043	0.94	78	0.91
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge	15	1,043	0.94	78	0.91
Construct: Practices	33	997	0.96	75	0.96
Subscale: Collaboration	11	1,039	0.92	83	0.91
Subscale: Responsiveness	11	1,061	0.91	86	0.91
Subscale: Communication	8	1,063	0.91	88	0.94
Subscale: Family-focused Concern	3	1,067	0.75	86	0.74
Construct: Attitudes	18	1,033	0.88	78	0.86
Subscale: Commitment	9	1,059	0.90	85	0.91
Subscale: Understanding Context	4	1,076	0.97	89	0.98
Subscale: Respect	5	1,057	0.84	81	0.82

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Parent Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

7.3 Summary

The FPTRQ field study sample included ECE programs, providers/teachers, and parents with diverse characteristics and backgrounds. The respondents completed the FPTRQ measures during the field study, and the field study data were used for calculating the internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of each measure. Almost all of the reliabilities of the provider/teacher measure and the parent measure by program type and by respondent characteristics fall in the acceptable range, with most of them in the good or excellent ranges. The Spanish version of the provider/teacher measure has not been field tested; however, given the reliability results of the Spanish version of the parent measure (i.e., Cronbach's alphas range between .74 and .98 which are very similar to those of the English version) we are fairly confident that the Spanish version of the provider/teacher will also show at least acceptable, and mostly good or excellent reliability.

This page is intentionally blank.

References

Adams, K. S., & Christenson, S. L. (2000). Trust and the family-school relationship examination of parent-teacher differences in elementary and secondary grades. *Journal of School Psychology, 38*, 477-497.

Anderson, T. W., & Rubin, Herman. (1956). Statistical inference in factor analysis. In *Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 5: Contributions to Econometrics, Industrial Research, and Psychometry* (111—150). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Brookes, S., Summers, J. A., Thornburg, K., Ispa, J. M., & Lane, V. (2006). Building successful home visitor-mother relationships: A qualitative look at contributing factors. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 21*, 25-45.

Brown, J. R., Knoche, L. L., Edwards, C. P., & Sheridan, S. (2009). Professional development to support parent engagement: A case study of early childhood practitioners. *Early Education and Development, 20*(3), 482-506.

Brown, T.A. (2006). *Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Applied Research*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Burchinal, P., Kainz, K., Cai, K., Tout, K., Zaslow, M., Martinez-Beck, I., & Rathgeb, C. (2009). *Early care and education quality and child outcomes. Research-to-policy brief #2009-15*.

Chazan-Cohen, R., Ayoub, C., Pan, B. A., Roggman, L., Raikes, H., McKelvey, L., Whiteside-Mansell, L., & Hart, A. (2007). It takes time: Impacts of Early Head Start that lead to reductions in maternal depression two years later. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 28*(2), 151-170.

Clarke-Stewart, K. A., Vandell, D. L., Burchinal, M., O'Brien, M., & McCartney, K. (2002). Do regulable features of child-care homes affect children's development? *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 17*(1), 52-56.

Dempsey, I., & Keen, D. (2008). A review of processes and outcomes in family-centered services for children with a disability. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 28*(1), 42-52.

Dunst, C. J. (2002). Family-centered practices: Birth through high school. *Journal of Special Education, 36*(3), 139-147.

Dunst, C. J., & Dempsey, I. (2007). Family–professional partnerships and parenting competence, confidence, and enjoyment. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 54*(3), 305-318.

Dunst, C.J., & Trivette, C. M. (2009). Meta-analytic structural equation modeling of the influences of family-centered care on parent and child psychological health. *International Journal of Pediatrics*. doi: 10.1155/2009/576840

Dunst, C. J., Trivette, C. M., & Hamby, D. W. (1996). Measuring the helpgiving practices of human services program practitioners. *Human Relations, 49*, 815-835.

Dunst, C., Boyd, K., Trivette, C. M., & Hamby, D. W. (2002). Family-oriented program models and professional helpgiving practices. *Family Relations, 51*, 221-229.

Dunst, C. J., Trivette, C. M., & Hamby, D. W. (2006). *Family support program quality and parent, family and child benefits* (1st ed.). Asheville, NC: Winterberry Press.

Elicker, J., Clawson, C., Hong, S-Y., Kim, T-E., Evangelou, D., & Kontos, S. (2005). *Child care for working poor families: Child development and parent employment outcomes. Community child care research project: Final report.* West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University.

Forry, N., Bromer, J., Chrisler, A., Rothenberg, L., Simkin, S., & Daneri, P. (2012). *Quality of family-provider relationships: Review of conceptual and empirical literature of family-provider relationships*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Franze, S. E., Foster, M., Abbott-Shim, M., McCarty, F., & Lambert, R. (2002). Describing Head Start family service workers: An examination of factors related to job satisfaction, empowerment, and multiculturalism. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, *83*(3), 257-264

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Green, B. L., McAllister, C. I., & Tarte, J. M. (2004). The strengths-based practices inventory: A tool for measuring strengths-based service delivery in early childhood and family support programs. *Families in Society, 85*(3), 327–334.

Guterman, N. B., & Hahm, H. C. (2001). Empowering parents in home visitation. In N. B. Guterman (Ed.), *Stopping child maltreatment before it starts: emerging horizons in early home visitation services* (pp. 162-186). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Graves, K. N., & Shelton, T. L. (2007). Family empowerment as a mediator between family-centered systems of care and changes in child functioning: Identifying an important mechanism of change. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 16*, 556-566.

Halle, T., Zaff, J., Calkins, J., & Margie, N. G. (2000). Part II: Reviewing the Literature on Contributing Factors to School Readiness in *Background for community-level work on school readiness: A review of definitions, assessments, and investment strategies*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *6*(1), 1-55.

Kaczmarek, L. A., Goldstein, H., Florey, J. D., Carter, A., & Cannon, S. (2004). Supporting families: A preschool model. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 24*(4), 213-226.

King, G., King, S., Rosenbaum, P., & Goffin, R. (1999). Family centered caregiving and well-being of parents of children with disabilities: Linking process with outcome. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 24*, 41–53.

Kline, P. (2000). *The handbook of psychological testing* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge, page 13

Kossek, E. E., Pichler, S. M., Meece, D., & Barratt, M. E. (2008). Family, friend, and neighbor child care providers and maternal well-being in low-income systems: An ecological social perspective. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 81*, 369-391.

Laughlin, L. (2013). *Who's Minding the Kids? Child Care Arrangements: Spring 2011*. Current Population Reports, P70-135. U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.

Lee, M. Y., Greene, G. J., Hsu, K. S., Solovey, A., Grove, D., Fraser, J. S., Washburn, P., & Teater, B. (2009). Utilizing family strengths and resilience: Integrative Family and Systems Treatment (I-FAST) with children and adolescents with severe emotional and behavioral problems. *Family Process, 48*(3), 395-416.

Maccoby, E. (2000). Parenting and its effects on children: On reading and misreading behavior genetics. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *51*(1), 1-27.

McDonald, R. P., & Krane, W. R. (1977). A note on local identifiability and degrees of freedom in the asymptotic likelihood ratio test. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, *30*(2), 198-203

McDonald, R. P., & Krane, W. R. (1979). A Monte Carlo study of local identifiability and degrees of freedom in the asymptotic likelihood ratio test. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology, 31*(1), 121-132.

McLoyd, V.C. (1998). Socioeconomic disadvantage and child development. *American Psychologist, 53,* 185-204.

Mensing, J. F., French, D., Fuller, B., & Kagan, S. L. (2000). Child care selection under welfare reform: How mothers balance work requirements and parenting. *Early Education & Development, 11*(5), 573–595.

McCart, A., Wolf, N., Sweeney, H. M., & Choi, J. (2009). The application of a family-based multi-tiered system of support. *NHSA Dialog: A Research-to-Practice Journal for the Early Intervention Field, 12*(2), 122-132. doi: 10.1080/15240750902774692

Mendez, J. L. (2010). How can parents get involved in preschool? Barriers and engagement in education by ethnic minority parents of children attending Head Start. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 16*(1), 26-36.

NICHD Early Child Care Research Network (ECCRN). (2006). Child-care effect sizes for the NICHD study of early child care and youth development. *American Psychologist, 61*, 99-116.

Palfrey, J. S., Hauser-Cram, P., Bronson, M. B., Warfield, M. E., Sirin, S., & Chan, E. (2005). The Brookline Early Education Project: A 25-year follow-up study of a family-centered early health and development intervention. *Pediatrics, 116*(1), 144-152.

Porter, T., Bromer, J., & Moodie, S. (2011). *Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS) and family-sensitive caregiving in early care and education arrangements: Promising directions and challenges.* Research-to-Policy, Research-to-Practice Brief OPRE 2011-11d. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved from: http://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/qrisfsc_0.pdfb

Porter, T., & Bromer, J. (2013). *Family-provider partnerships: Examining alignment of early care and education professional and performance standards, state competencies, and Quality Rating and Improvement Systems indicators in the context of research*. Issue Brief OPRE 2013-35. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Porter, T., Guzman, L., Kuhfeld, M., Caal, S., Rodrigues, K., Moodie, S., & Ramos, M. (2012). *Family-provider relationship quality: Review of existing measures of family-provider relationships*, OPRE Report #2012-47, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Porter, T. & Bromer, J. and Forry, N. (2015). *Assessing Quality in Family and Provider/Teacher Relationships: Using the Family and Provider Teacher Relationship Quality (FPTRQ) Measures in Conjunction with Strengthening Families and the Head Start Parent, Family and Community Engagement Frameworks and their Self-Assessment Tools.* OPRE Report 2015-56. Washington, D.C.: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Powell, D., Son, S.-H., File, N., & San Juan, R. R. (2010). Parent-school relationships and children's academic and social outcomes in public school pre-kindergarten. *Journal of School Psychology, 48*, 269-292.

Raikes, H., Green, B. L., Atwater, J., Kisker, E., Constantine, J., & Chazan-Cohen, R. (2006). Involvement in Early Head Start home visiting services: Demographic predictors and relations to child and parent outcomes. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 21*, 2-24.

Reid, M. J., Webster-Stratton, C., & Hammond, M. (2007). Enhancing a classroom social competence and problem-solving curriculum by offering parent training to families of moderate-to high-risk elementary school children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 36*(4), 605-620.

Reynolds, A. J., & Robertson, D. L. (2003). School-based early intervention and later child maltreatment in the Chicago longitudinal study. *Child Development, 74*(1), 3-26.

Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., Pianta, R. C., Cox, M. J., & Bradley, R. H. (2003). Teacher-rated family involvement and children's social and academic outcomes in kindergarten. *Early Education & Development, 14*(2), 179-198.

Rindskopf, D. (1984). Using phantom and imaginary latent variables to parameterize constraints in linear structural models. *Psychometrika*, *49(1*), 37-47.

Roggman, L. A., Boyce, L. K., & Cook, G. A. (2009). Keeping kids on track: Impacts of a parenting-focused Early Head Start program on attachment security and cognitive development. *Early Education and Development, 20*(6), 920-941.

Sheridan, S. M., Knoche, L. L., Edwards, C. P., Bovaird, J. A., & Kupzyk, K. A. (2010). Parent engagement and school readiness: Effects of the Getting Ready Intervention on preschool children's social-emotional competencies. *Early Education and Development, 21*(1), 125-156.

Small, M. L. (2009). *Unanticipated gains: Origins of network inequality in everyday life*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Trivette, C. M., Dunst, C. J., & Hamby, D. W. (2010). Influences of family-systems intervention practices on parent-child interactions and child development. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 30*(1), 3-19.

Zaslow, M., Tout, K., Halle, T., & Martinez-Beck, I. (Eds.) (2011), *Quality measurement in early childhood settings*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing.

Zellman, G. L., & Fiene, R. (2012). *Validation of Quality Rating and Improvement Systems for Early Care and Education and School-Age Care*. Research-to-Policy, Research-to-Practice Brief OPRE 2012-29. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

2012-2013 Head Start Program Information Report (PIR) PIR Summary Report - National Level (January 29, 2014). http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/data/pir.

Appendix A:
FPTRQ Measure Items and Item Numbers for Subscales

Table A-1 shows the provider/teacher measure item numbers that are included in each subscale. This information is useful for those who might use statistical packages, such as SPSS, SAS, etc., to conduct statistical analyses of data collected from the FPTRQ measures. A PDF version of the FPTRQ provider/teacher measure can be downloaded at no cost and printed from the OPRE website at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/development-of-a-measure-of-family-and-provider-teacher-relationship-quality-fptrq.

Table A-1. FPTRQ provider/teacher measure item numbers for subscales

Construct	Subscale	Item number
Knowledge	Family-specific Knowledge	PROVQ3a,PROV Q3b, PROVQ3c, PROVQ3d, PROVQ3e, PROVQ3f, PROVQ3g, PROVQ3h, PROVQ3i, PROVQ3j, PROVQ3k, PROVQ3l
Practices	Collaboration	PROVQ1a, PROVQ1b, PROVQ1c, PROVQ1d, PROVQ1e, PROVQ1f, PROVQ1g, PROVQ1h, PROVQ2a, PROVQ2b, PROVQ2c, PROVQ4a, PROVQ4c, PROVQ5a, PROVQ5b
	Responsiveness	PROVQ10a, PROVQ10b, PROVQ10c, PROVQ10d
	Communication	PROVQ4b, PROVQ5c, PROVQ5d, PROVQ5e
Attitudes	Commitment	PROVQ9a, PROVQ9b, PROVQ9c, PROVQ9d
	Openness to Change	PROVQ6a, PROVQ6b, PROVQ6c, PROVQ6d, PROVQ7a, PROVQ7b, PROVQ10e, PROVQ10f
	Respect	PROVQ8a, PROVQ8b, PROVQ8c, PROVQ8d

Table A-2 shows the provider/teacher measure items that are included in each subscale.

Table A-2. FPTRQ provider/teacher measure items for subscales

Construct: Knowledge	
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge	PROVQ3a. I know if children have siblings
	PROVQ3b. I know if children have other adult relatives living in their households
	PROVQ3c. I know their parents' schedules
	PROVQ3d. I know the marital status of children's parents
	PROVQ3e. I know the parenting styles of children's parents
	PROVQ3f. I know the employment status of children's parents
	PROVQ3g. I know their financial situation
	PROVQ3h. I know the role that faith and religion play in children's households
	PROVQ3i. I know their cultures and values
	PROVQ3j. I know what their families do outside of the education and care setting to encourage their children's learning
	PROVQ3k. I know how parents discipline their child
	PROVQ3l. I know changes happening at home
Construct: Practices	
Subscale: Collaboration	PROVQ1a. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about their child's experiences in the education and care setting
	PROVQ1b. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about their child's abilities
	PROVQ1c. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about their child's learning
	PROVQ1d. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about problems their child is having in the education and care setting
	PROVQ1e. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about what to expect at each stage of their child's development?
	PROVQ1f. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about how their child is progressing towards developmental milestones
	PROVQ1g. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about goals parents have for their child
	PROVQ1h. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about how their child is progressing towards the parents' goals
	PROVQ2a. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about your expectations for the children in your care
	PROVQ2b. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about the rules you have for children in your care
	PROVQ2c. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about how you feel about the education and care you provide
	PROVQ4a. Since September, how often have you been able to share information with parents about their children's day
	PROVQ4c. Since September, how often have you been able to suggest activities for parents and children to do together
	PROVQ5a. How often are you able to answer parents' questions when they come up
	PROVQ5b. How often are you able to work with parents to develop strategies they can use at home to support their child's learning and development

Table A-2. FPTRQ provider/teacher measure items for subscales—Continued

Construct: Practices—Continued	
Subscale: Responsiveness	PROVQ10a. Part of my job is to help families get services available in the community
	PROVQ10b. Part of my job is to offer parents information about community events
	PROVQ10c. Part of my job is to respond to issues or questions outside of normal care hours
	PROVQ10d. Part of my job is to change my work schedule in response to parents' work or school schedule
Subscale: Communication	PROVQ4b. Since September, how often have you been able to offer parents books and materials on parenting
	PROVQ5c. How often are you able to set goals with parents for their child
	PROVQ5d. How often are you able to offer parents ideas or suggestions about parenting
	PROVQ5e. How often are you able to provide parents the opportunity to give feedback about your performance
Construct: Attitudes	
Subscale: Commitment	PROVQ9a. I teach and care for children because I enjoy it
	PROVQ9b. I see this job as just a paycheck (*reverse-scored*)
	PROVQ9c. I teach and care for children because I like being around children
	PROVQ9d. If I could find something else to do to make a living I would (*reverse-scored*)
Subscale: Openness to Change	PROVQ6a. I am open to using information on new and better ways to teach and care for children
	PROVQ6b. I encourage parents to provide feedback on my care and teaching practices
	PROVQ6c. I encourage parents to make decisions about their children's education and care
	PROVQ6d. Even though my professional or moral viewpoints may differ, I accept that parents are the ultimate decision makers for the care and education of their children
	PROVQ7a. When planning activities for children in your program, how often are you able to take into account information parents share about their children
	PROVQ7b. When planning activities for children in your program, how often are you able to take into account families' values and cultures
	PROVQ10e. Part of my job is to learn new ways to teach and care for children
	PROVQ10f. Part of my job is to change activities offered to children in response to families' feedback
Subscale: Respect	PROVQ8a. Sometimes it is hard for me to support the way parents raise their children (*reverse-scored*)
	PROVQ8b. Sometimes it is hard for me to support the way parents discipline their children (*reverse-scored*)
	PROVQ8c. Sometimes it is hard for me to support the goals parents have for their children (*reverse-scored*)
	PROVQ8d. Sometimes it is hard for me to work with parents who do not share my beliefs (*reverse-scored*)

Table A-3 shows the parent measure item numbers for each subscale. This information is useful for those who use statistical packages, such as, SPSS or SAS, etc., to conduct statistical analyses of data collected from the FPTRQ measures. A PDF version of the FPTRQ parent measure can be downloaded at no cost and printed from the OPRE website at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/development-of-a-measure-of-family-and-provider-teacher-relationship-quality-fptrq.

Table A-3. FPTRQ parent measure items for subscales

Construct	Subscale	Item number
Knowledge	Family-specific Knowledge	PARQ3a, PARQ3b, PARQ3c, PARQ3d, PARQ3e, PARQ3f, PARQ3g, PARQ3h, PARQ3i, PARQ3j, PARQ3k, PARQ3l, PARQ3m, PARQ3n, PARQ3o
Practices	Collaboration	PARQ1a, PARQ1b, PARQ1c, PARQ1d, PARQ1e, PARQ1f, PARQ1g, PARQ2a, PARQ2b, PARQ2c, PARQ4a
	Responsiveness	PARQ6a, PARQ6b, PARQ6c, PARQ6d, PARQ6e, PARQ6f, PARQ6h, PARQ6i, PARQ6j, PARQ6k, PARQ6l
	Communication	PARQ4b, PARQ4c, PARQ4d, PARQ5b, PARQ5c, PARQ5d, PARQ5e, PARQ5f
	Family-focused Concern	PARQ5a, PARQ5g, PARQ6g
Attitudes	Commitment	PARQ7a, PARQ7b, PARQ7d, PARQ7e, PARQ7f, PARQ7i, PARQ7k, PARQ8a, PARQ8b
	Understanding Context	PARQ9a, PARQ9b, PARQ9c, PARQ9d
	Respect	PARQ5h, PARQ7c, PARQ7g, PARQ7h, PARQ7j

Table A-4 shows the parent measure items included in each subscale.

Table A-4. FPTRQ parent measure items for subscales

Construct: Knowledge	
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge	PARQ3a. How comfortable would or do you feel sharing with your childcare provider or teacher if your child has siblings
	PARQ3b. How comfortable would or do you feel sharing with your childcare provider or teacher if you have other adult relatives living in your household
	PARQ3c. How comfortable would or do you feel sharing with your childcare provider or teacher your household schedule
	PARQ3d. How comfortable would or do you feel sharing with your childcare provider or teacher your marital status
	PARQ3e. How comfortable would or do you feel sharing with your childcare provider or teacher your personal relationship with a spouse or partner
	PARQ3f. How comfortable would or do you feel sharing with your childcare provider or teacher your employment status
	PARQ3g. How comfortable would or do you feel sharing with your childcare provider or teacher your financial situation
	PARQ3h. How comfortable would or do you feel sharing with your childcare provider or teacher your family life
	PARQ3i. How comfortable would or do you feel sharing with your childcare provider or teacher the role that faith and religion play in your household
	PARQ3j. How comfortable would or do you feel sharing with your childcare provider or teacher your family's culture and values
	PARQ3k. How comfortable would or do you feel sharing with your childcare provider or teacher what you do outside of the education and care setting to encourage your child's learning
	PARQ3l. How comfortable would or do you feel sharing with your childcare provider or teacher how you discipline your child
	PARQ3m. How comfortable would or do you feel sharing with your childcare provider or teacher problems your child is having at home
	PARQ3n. How comfortable would or do you feel sharing with your childcare provider or teacher changes happening at home
	PARQ3o. How comfortable would or do you feel sharing with your childcare provider or teacher health issues your child has such as food allergies or asthma

Table A-4. FPTRQ parent measure items for subscales—Continued

Construct: Practices	
Subscale: Collaboration	PARQ1a. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to your childcare provider or teacher about your child's experiences in the education and care setting
	PARQ1b. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to your childcare provider or teacher about your child's abilities
	PARQ1c. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to your childcare provider or teacher about your child's general behavior
	PARQ1d. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to your childcare provider or teacher about your child's learning
	PARQ1e. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to your childcare provider or teacher about goals you have for your child
	PARQ1f. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to your childcare provider or teacher about what to expect at each stage of your child's development
	PARQ1g. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to your childcare provider or teacher about your vision for your child's future
	PARQ2a. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to your childcare provider or teacher about your provider's expectations for your child
	PARQ2b. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to your childcare provider or teacher about the rules your provider has for children in his or her care
	PARQ2c. Since September, how often have you met with or talked to your childcare provider or teacher about how you feel about the care and education your child receives
	PARQ4a. How often does your childcare provider or teacher share information with you about your child's day
Subscale: Responsiveness	PARQ6a. My childcare provider or teacher respects me as a parent
	PARQ6b. My childcare provider or teacher is flexible in response to my work or school schedule
	PARQ6c. My childcare provider or teacher treats me like an expert on my child
	PARQ6d. My childcare provider or teacher tells me how my child is progressing towards goals or developmental milestones
	PARQ6e. My childcare provider or teacher uses my feedback to adjust the education and care provided to my child
	PARQ6f. My childcare provider or teacher encourages me to be involved in all aspects of my child's care and education
	PARQ6h. My childcare provider or teacher reflects the cultural diversity of students in activities
	PARQ6i. My childcare provider or teacher shows respect for different ethnic heritages
	PARQ6j. My childcare provider or teacher is respectful of religious beliefs
	PARQ6k. My childcare provider or teacher encourages parents to provide feedback on the way he/she cares for and teaches children
	PARQ6l. My childcare provider or teacher communicates the cultural values and beliefs I want my child to have

Table A-4. FPTRQ parent measure items for subscales—Continued

Construct: Practices—Continued	
Subscale: Communication	PARQ4b. How often does your childcare provider or teacher offer you books or materials on parenting
	PARQ4c. How often does your childcare provider or teacher suggest activities for you and your child to do together
	PARQ4d. How often does your childcare provider or teacher ask you about the cultural values and beliefs you want him/her to communicate to your child
	PARQ5b. How often does your childcare provider or teacher work with you to develop strategies you can use at home to support your child's learning and development
	PARQ5c. How often does your childcare provider or teacher listen to your ideas about ways to change or improve the care and education your child receives
	PARQ5d. How often does your childcare provider or teacher offer you ideas or suggestions about parenting
	PARQ5e. How often does your childcare provider or teacher provide you with opportunities to make decisions about your child's education and care
	PARQ5f. How often does your childcare provider or teacher provide you with opportunities to give feedback on his or her performance
Subscale: Family-focused Concern	PARQ5a. How often does your childcare provider or teacher ask about your family
	PARQ5g. How often does your childcare provider or teacher remember personal details about your family when speaking with you
	PARQ6g. My childcare provider or teacher asks me questions to show he/she cares about my family
Construct: Attitudes	
Subscale: Commitment	PARQ7a. My childcare provider or teacher is caring
	PARQ7b. My childcare provider or teacher is understanding
	PARQ7d. My childcare provider or teacher is flexible
	PARQ7e. My childcare provider or teacher is dependable
	PARQ7f. My childcare provider or teacher is trustworthy
	PARQ7i. My childcare provider or teacher is respectful
	PARQ7k. My childcare provider or teacher is available
	PARQ8a. I trust that my childcare provider or teacher can maintain a safe environment for my child
	PARQ8b. I trust that my childcare provider or teacher has my child's best interest at heart
Subscale: Understanding Context	PARQ9a. My childcare provider or teacher judges my family because of our faith and religion (*reverse-scored*)
	PARQ9b. My childcare provider or teacher judges my family because of our culture and values (*reverse-scored*)
	PARQ9c. My childcare provider or teacher judges my family because of our race/ethnicity (*reverse-scored*)
	PARQ9d. My childcare provider or teacher judges my family because of our financial situation (*reverse-scored*)
Subscale: Respect	PARQ5h. How often does your childcare provider or teacher contradict you in front of your child
	PARQ7c. My childcare provider or teacher is rude (*reverse-scored*)
	PARQ7g. My childcare provider or teacher is impatient (*reverse-scored*)
	PARQ7h. My childcare provider or teacher is unfriendly (*reverse-scored*)
	PARQ7j. My childcare provider or teacher is judgmental (*reverse-scored*)

Table A-5 shows the director measure item numbers for the environment and policy checklist, communication system, and information about resources. This information is useful for those who use statistical packages, such as SPSS or SAS, etc., to conduct statistical analyses of data collected from the FPTRQ measures. A PDF version of the FPTRQ director measure can be downloaded at no cost and printed from the OPRE website at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/development-of-a-measure-of-family-and-provider-teacher-relationship-quality-fptrq.

Table A-5. FPTRQ director measure item numbers

Construct	Item number
Environment and Policy Checklist	DIRQ14, DIRQ15A, DIRQ15B, DIRQ15C, DIRQ15D, DIRQ16, DIRQ17, DIRQ18, DIRQ19, DIRQ20, DIRQ21, DIRQ22, DIRQ23a, DIRQ23b, DIRQ23c, DIRQ23d, DIRQ23e
Communication Systems	DIRQ7a, DIRQ7b, DIRQ7c, DIRQ7d, DIRQ7e, DIRQ7f, DIRQ7g, DIRQ7h, DIRQ7i
Information about Resources	DIRQ8a, DIRQ8b, DIRQ8c, DIRQ8d, DIRQ8e, DIRQ8f, DIRQ8g, DIRQ8h, DIRQ8i, DIRQ8j, DIRQ9a, DIRQ9b, DIRQ9c, DIRQ9d, DIRQ9e

Table A-6 shows the director measure items included in the environment and policy checklist.

Table A-6. FPTRQ director measure items for environment and policy checklist

Domain	Questions
Welcoming	DIRQ14. Parents can visit the care setting anytime during care hours
	DIRQ15a. There are a variety of opportunities for parent involvement, including: volunteering in program/care activities
	DIRQ15b. There are a variety of opportunities for parent involvement, including: bringing in materials such as arts and crafts
	DIRQ15c. There are a variety of opportunities for parent involvement, including: participating in a parent committee
	DIRQ15d. There are a variety of opportunities for parent involvement, including: observing their own children in the care setting
	DIRQ16. Parents are invited to shape the planning of the program
	DIRQ17. The program has suggestion boxes or surveys for family members to give feedback about the program
	DIRQ18. The program offers special activities *just* for fathers or other male members of the family
Culturally-diverse information	DIRQ19. Written information and materials provided to families are in all languages spoken by families
	DIRQ20. Written information and materials provided to families are at the appropriate literacy level
Peer to peer support	DIRQ21. The program provides opportunities for family events
	DIRQ22. There are opportunities for parents to get together
Ways to provide parenting information	DIRQ23a. The program provides parenting information through: Parenting workshop/classes
	DIRQ23b. The program provides parenting information through: Bulletin boards
Welcoming	DIRQ23c. The program provides parenting information through: Newsletters
	DIRQ23d. The program provides parenting information through: Resource library with books and/or videos
	DIRQ23e. The program provides parenting information through: Pamphlets

Table A-7 shows the director measure items used for the communication systems and information about resources.

Table A-7. FPTRQ director measure items for communication systems and information about resources

Construct	Questions
Communication system	DIRQ7a. Website
	DIRQ7b. Newsletter
	DIRQ7c. Calendar
	DIRQ7d. Bulletin Boards
	DIRQ7e. Email
	DIRQ7f. Text message
	DIRQ7g. Telephone
	DIRQ7h. Parent-teacher conferences
	DIRQ7i. In-person discussions
Information about resources	DIRQ8a. Employment or job training
	DIRQ8b. Food pantries
	DIRQ8c. Child care subsidies or vouchers
	DIRQ8d. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF
	DIRQ8e. Adult education, GED classes, ESL classes, or continuing education
	DIRQ8f. Housing assistance
	DIRQ8g. Energy or fuel assistance
	DIRQ8h. Immigration or legal services
	DIRQ8i. Domestic violence programs
	DIRQ8j. Substance abuse programs
	DIRQ9a. Health screening (medical, dental, vision, hearing, or speech
	DIRQ9b. Developmental assessments
	DIRQ9c. Psychological counseling services for children
	DIRQ9d. Psychological counseling services for parents
	DIRQ9f. Social services such as housing assistance, food stamps, financial aid, or medical care

Appendix B:
Focus Groups

The purpose of the focus groups was to identify the extent to which the working definitions of the Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality (FPTRQ) elements resonate with providers/teachers, Head Start/Early Head Start family services staff (FSS) and parents as well as to obtain "native language"—the terms and words that providers/teachers and parents use to talk about these concepts. The focus group discussions used open-ended questions to elicit spontaneous perceptions of essential elements of strong family-provider/teacher relationships and asked participants to rank these elements. Then participants were asked to respond to the FPTRQ working definitions, asking for agreement or disagreement with the elements.

Focus group sample. A total of 72 early care and education (ECE) providers/teachers, Head Start/Early Head Start FSS, and parents participated in a total of nine focus groups conducted in metropolitan areas of Washington, DC, and Chicago, IL. Separate groups were conducted for parents and providers/teachers and were segmented by type of setting (e.g., center-based and family child care programs and Head Start/Early Head Start). Four of the focus groups were conducted with ECE providers/teachers and Head Start/Early Head Start FSS, and five groups were conducted with parents with children ages birth to five in family child care, Head Start/Early Head Start, and center-based settings. Participating parents were diverse in terms of family structure and race/ethnicity.

Agreement with the working FPTRQ element definitions. For the most part, providers/teachers', Head Start/Early Head Start FSS members' and parents' perceptions of strong family-provider/teacher relationships reflected the FPTRQ conceptual model and the definitions of the elements (Table B-1). In particular, parents, providers/teachers, and Head Start/Early Head Start FSS spontaneously identified the Attitudes elements of Respect and Openness to Change, providers/teachers' Knowledge about individual children and family culture, and the Practices elements Communication, Responsiveness, and Collaboration as important aspects of creating and maintaining relationships with each other. In addition, parents, providers/teachers and Head Start/Early Head Start FSS spontaneously identified the environmental features of Welcoming, Communication Systems, and Information about Resources as essential elements of strong family-provider relationships. There was a pervasive theme across all groups that family and provider/teacher relationships should be conceptualized within the context of the child.

Disagreement with the working FPTRQ element definitions. The focus group participants disagreed with some of the FPTRQ elements that were articulated in the original model. There were concerns about the Attitudes element of Empowerment, providers/teachers' Theoretical Knowledge of different kinds of family structures and systems as well as how adults learn, and Facilitating Family Strengths/Empowering Families (helping parents to see their own abilities and have confidence in their decisions), and, to a lesser degree, Flexibility, in the Practices construct.[11] In addition, several elements in the Environmental Features construct were only identified as important after participants were shown the working definitions. The environmental element of Culturally Diverse Materials (originally defined as Materials Reflective of Families' Culture and Diversity) was met with some confusion by the participants.

Table B-1. Focus group perspectives on the working FPTRQ element definitions

FPTRQ elements	Spontaneous agreement with working definitions	Prompted agreement with working definitions	Disagreement with working definitions
Attitudes			
Respect	X		
Commitment			
Empowerment *			X
Openness to Change	X		
Knowledge			
Theoretical/substantive Knowledge			X
Family-specific Knowledge	X		
Practices			
Communication	X		
Responsiveness	X		
Develop Equitable Relationships*	X		
Connecting to Services			
Collaboration	X		
Empower Families to Advocate for Themselves*			X
Provide Child-specific Information*	X		
Environmental Features			
Welcoming	X		
Communication Systems	X		
Culturally-diverse Materials		X	
Information about Resources	X		
Peer-to-peer Parent Activities	X		

[11] With the exception of theoretical knowledge, these constructs have been incorporated into other elements in the FPTRQ conceptual model. Theoretical knowledge was dropped as an element; items related to it are included as provider characteristics in the Provider/Teacher Measure.

Implications for item development. The focus group findings had several implications for item development. These implications are summarized in Table B-2.

Table B-2. Implications for item development

Issues with elements	Implications
Family and provider/teacher relationships should be viewed within the context of the child.	The child should be regarded as the common denominator of these relationships.
Elements related to respect, communication, and collaboration were ranked highly by providers, teachers and parents.	Some items such as communication and collaboration should be weighted more highly than others.
Differences in agreement about important elements between the parent and provider/teacher focus group participants as well as among the Head Start/Early Head Start, center-based, and family child care focus groups.	Some items might not apply across all settings, that is, center-based and family child care programs, and Head Start/Early Head Start.
Some constructs and elements were not mutually exclusive.	Suggests the need for updating the model by both modifying existing constructs and elements and adding new elements.

This page is intentionally blank.

Appendix C:
Cognitive Interview Sample and Procedures

Cognitive interviewing is a tool that gives researchers insights into respondents' cognitive processes during measure completion, thus assisting in identifying problems and potential solutions at each step in this process. Cognitive interviews can reveal whether:

- There are comprehension or interpretation problems;
- Questions work as intended;
- Respondents possess and are able to recall necessary information; and
- Respondents can accurately apply their responses to the answer choices provided.

Additionally, cognitive interviews help identify other unanticipated issues affecting data quality.

Five iterative rounds of cognitive interviews were conducted with findings from previous rounds informing later rounds. OMB generic clearance was obtained for all research activity. Staff trained in cognitive interviewing administered the cognitive interview protocol. Interviews were conducted in English or Spanish and lasted between 1.5 and 2 hours.

In total, cognitive interviews were conducted with 52 parents of children ages zero to five, 50 providers/teachers serving children under the age of five, 36 Head Start/Early Head Start family services staff (FSS), and 8 interviews with program directors (Table C-1).

Table C-1. Summary of cognitive interview issues and resolutions

Instrument tested	Key problems	Resolutions
Round 1		
• Provider/Teacher Measure (administered to center-based and family child care providers/teachers, and Head Start/Early Head Start FSS) • Parent Measure (Reporting about center-based and family child care providers/teachers, and Head Start/Early Head Start FSS) • Director Measure • Environment and Policy Checklist (Administered to providers/teachers and directors)	Questions were asked of the wrong staff person; environment and policy checklist questions could not be answered by providers/teachers.	Combined the environment and policy checklist with the director measure.
	Questions were not relevant to or did not apply to respondents' care setting or position. This was especially true for FSS whose relationship was reported to be more parent-focused than child-focused when compared to teachers.	Questions were revised to apply to all care settings. A separate measure was made for FSS.
	Some questions were perceived as repetitive.	Repetitive items were dropped.
	Some questions were perceived as vague.	Items were revised to be more specific.
	FSS were not consistently included in parents' answers.	A separate measure was developed after Rounds 2 and 3 and the pilot for parents to report about their relationship with FSS. Because the FSS measures were developed after the pilot and field studies, these measures were not field tested.
Rounds 2 and 3		
• Provider/Teacher Measure (administered to center-based and family child care providers only) • Parent Measure (Reporting about center-based and family child care providers only) • Director Measure (including items previously on environment and policy checklist)	"Empowerment" items were interpreted by parents as assuming that parents needed providers' help to be empowered; thus, items were interpreted as disempowering.	After additional work, new items were developed to capture concrete attitudes and practices as "strengths-based partnership," which contains three subcomponents: (1) strengths-based attitude; (2) partnerships/collective empowerment; and (3) parental self-efficacy. Newly developed items were tested in round 3 and 4.
	"Culture," "cultural values," and "cultural beliefs" were interpreted to mean varying things and were mapped onto response options incorrectly. Cultural items were not considered applicable or appropriate for care and education by some parents.	After additional work, new items were developed to assess cultural sensitivity. Newly developed items were tested in round 3. See Ramos et al. (2014) for a summary of the challenges encountered, lessons learned, and recommendations for measuring cultural sensitivity.
Rounds 4 and 5		
• FSS Measure • Parent Measure to report about FSS	Questions were too "teacher" oriented. Questions failed to capture the unique role of FSS. Questions failed to distinguish between FSS job requirements and high-quality relationship with families.	"Teacher" oriented questions (e.g., heavy focus on child outcomes/goals) were dropped. Family/parent support questions were added to capture the unique role of FSS. Question difficult or thresholds were raised to surpass job requirements of FSS (e.g., follow-up about goals instead of setting goals).

Across the five rounds of cognitive interviews, the results indicated that the majority of the questions were understood and worked as intended. A number of problems, however, were also identified. Specifically, during the first and second rounds of cognitive testing we found that items on empowerment and cultural sensitivity were not working well. To address this issue, the literature and measures reviews were

reexamined and an additional small-scale literature review and measures review focused on empowerment and cultural sensitivity were conducted. In addition, advice was sought from the Technical Working Group (TWG) as well as other experts in these areas. Based on this process, new operational definitions were developed for empowerment and cultural sensitivity. Existing items were reviewed, in light of the new definition leading to the revision and addition of items. These items were then tested in the pilot study and, again, in the third and fourth rounds of cognitive interviews.

In addition, during the early stages of development we became aware that a separate measure measuring the relationship between FSS and parents may be needed. The provider/teacher measure was piloted with a small number of FSS; the results indicated that the provider/teacher measure did not work well with FSS. The provider/teacher and parent measures were revised to increase their applicability to FSS and parent relationships. These measures were then tested in cognitive interviews (in Rounds 4 and 5) with FSS and parents working with FSS to test the applicability of the revised measure. These cognitive interviews confirmed that many items developed for the provider/teacher measure and the parent measure did not apply to relationships between parents and Head Start/Early Head Start FSS. As a result, separate measures were developed for Head Start/Early Head Start FSS and parents who use them with items that focused on the role of FSS. This measure was tested in Round 5 of the cognitive interviews. (See Appendix E for a description of the process for developing the FSS and the FSS parent measures.)

This page is intentionally blank.

Appendix D:
Summary of Pilot Study

The pilot study component of the Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality (FPTRQ) study was conducted to serve two main purposes. First, it provided the data necessary to conduct item analysis and other statistical review of responses to ensure that items had good distribution across the response categories and were not systematically skipped and to confirm that sets of items cluster as expected based on the conceptual model. Second, the pilot study provided an opportunity to test the sampling, recruitment, training procedures, and data collection systems for the field study.

The pilot study used samples of convenience based on available lists of early care and education programs from online resources. Atlanta, Georgia, and Seattle, Washington, were selected as the locations for the pilot study. Head Start/Early Head Start, center-based, and family child care programs were all represented in the sample. These programs varied by urbanicity, and the participating parents represented a range of races/ethnicities, home languages, and socioeconomic statuses.

The pilot study was conducted from February through May of 2013. Four FPTRQ measures were used to collect data in the pilot study – director, provider/teacher, parent, and parent about Head Start/Early Head Start family services staff (FSS).

The psychometric analysis of the pilot study data generally confirmed the conceptual model. In large part, items measured elements and constructs as intended so that there was a reasonable level of reliability, despite the fact that the sample sizes were small for psychometric analyses. Overall, the measures used in the pilot study performed well, both as comprehensive instruments and within subscales. Only minor revisions (revised item wording, removed low-performing items) were made to the measures for the field study. The results also indicated that the data collection procedures for both the director and provider/teacher measures worked well, and only a few minor revisions to the parent data collection procedures (removed screener, decided to recruit parents in person) were needed for the field study.

This page is intentionally blank.

Appendix E:
Summary of Field Study

The purpose of the field study was to provide the data necessary to conduct item analysis and other statistical review of responses in order to ensure that measure items have good distribution across the response categories and are not systematically skipped and to examine sets of items that group together as expected based on the conceptual model. The field study was also conducted to assess how well the measures work across various program types and with respondents of diverse background characteristics.

The field study was conducted from January through April 2014. A list of early care and education (ECE) programs was created from online resources of early education and child care programs (e.g., http://ChildCareCenter.us and http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/HeadStartOffices) in six selected cities (Charlotte, NC; Minneapolis, MN; Philadelphia, PA; San Antonio, TX; San Francisco, CA; and Wichita, KS).

A total of 414 ECE programs were contacted by phone to find out whether or not they were interested in participating in the field study. Of those, 256 programs expressed their interest in participating, and 253 programs actually participated in the field study data collection.

For center-based and Head Start/Early Head Start programs, the directors were asked to complete the director measure and to give permission for recruiters to speak to providers/teachers and parents in the program about participating. Working closely with program directors, our recruiters contacted individual providers/teachers in the program and enrolled up to two providers/teachers at each site who volunteered to participate. With help from participating providers/teachers, parents were provided with study materials and contacted regarding participation in the study, and recruiters enrolled up to three parents of children cared for by each of the participating providers/teachers. Both providers/teachers and parents of children were asked to complete and mail their completed measures (provider/teacher and parent measures, respectively) to Westat.

For family child care programs, the directors were often also the provider/teacher at the program, and therefore they were asked to complete both the director and the provider/teacher measures. Up to three parents from each family child care were also asked to participate in the field study.

From the 253 programs participating in the field study, 423 providers/teachers participated and completed the provider/teacher measures. A total of 1,184 parents returned their completed parent measures.

The following statistical analyses have been conducted with the field study data:

- The field study data were examined to determine the characteristics of the respondents and calculate the internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alphas) of the subscales in the FPTRQ measures.

- Exploratory factor analysis for both the provider/teacher and parent measures was conducted by examining the eigenvalues of the reduced correlation matrix. Factors with an eigenvalue greater than the average eigenvalue according to the Kaiser and Guttman rule for common factor analysis were extracted. It was found that many of the factors are moderately correlated with each other, which suggested that the common factor analysis was more appropriate than a principal component analysis.

- A rotation of the factors that were retained was then conducted. Although Varimax is the most common rotation option, the orthogonality (i.e., independence) of factors is often an unrealistic assumption. Because many of the factors were substantially correlated with each other, the promax, an oblique rotation approach to the analysis, was applied.

- A factor loading of 0.3 was used as the cutoff to determine if a variable belongs to a central factor, as suggested by Brown (2006, p. 130).

- There were some split loadings where an item was significantly (> 0.3) loaded on more than one factor. When this happened, the factor with the highest loading was chosen for the item.

- Factors with fewer than three items were excluded from the factor structure because a minimum of three variables per factor is critical (see Anderson & Rubin, 1956; McDonald & Krane, 1977, 1979; and Rindskopf, 1984). The items on these factors were examined and added to a remaining factor if they fit in that factor conceptually.

- Items in the provider/teacher and parent measures with loadings below 0.3 were dropped and not included in the measures. This decision led to a seven-factor structure for the provider/teacher measure. For the parent measure, initially the ten-factor structure was derived with two factors having only two items each. The items in those two factors were then added to other factors after examination of construct alignment. In the end, an eight-factor structure was derived for the parent measure.

- To validate the factor structures, confirmatory factor analysis was also conducted for the provider/teacher and parent measures. Promax rotation approach was applied to these analyses as well. The fit indices were examined to determine if the model fits the data well. For the provider/teacher measure, the confirmatory factor model with correlated factors yielded a standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) = 0.0676. According to Hu and Bentler (1999), SRMR of .08 or less is indicative of an acceptable fit. For the provider/teacher measure, the confirmatory factor model with correlated factors yielded a fit level of standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) = 0.0585, suggesting an

acceptable model fit. Ultimately, the factors that were identified in the factor analysis lined up well with the conceptual model developed for the study.

- Correlation coefficients among subscales of the parent and provider/teacher measures were examined. Most of the subscales in both the provider/teacher measure and the parent measure were positively related to each other. Notably, correlations among subscales within each construct were often higher than correlations among subscales that were not in the same construct. This suggests that subscales in the same constructs measure something common and each construct measures something that is not measured by other constructs. However, some subscales showed higher correlations with subscales not in the same construct. For example, in the provider/teacher measure, the Openness to Change subscale was more highly correlated with subscales from a different construct (e.g., the Communication, Collaboration, and Responsiveness subscales) than those from the same construct. In the parent measure, the Commitment subscale seemed to be more highly correlated with the Responsiveness and Family-focused Concern subscales, both of which were from a different construct, than with subscales from the same construct. These findings demonstrate that the elements of relationship quality between parents and providers/teachers are challenging to define in a mutually exclusive manner. It is suspected that there are numerous interrelated elements of relationship quality that are difficult to isolate from each other. This implies that improving even one element or dimension of relationship quality between parents and providers/teachers may have a positive overall effect.

This page is intentionally blank.

Appendix F:
Summary Statistics

Additional technical information is provided below from the field study data that were used for testing internal consistency reliability of the Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality (FPTRQ) measures. The tables below show means (averages), standard deviations, reported response ranges, and possible response ranges of the Environment and Policy Checklist in the director measure, subscales of the provider/teacher measure, and subscales of the parent measure.

The information below can be used to compare your own FPTRQ data collected in your program or research project to the FPTRQ field study data. You will see whether your average subscale scores or the checklist score are similar or different from those of the FPTRQ field study. However, please note that FPTRQ average scores presented below should not be treated as "standard" scores or target scores.

Director Measure: Environment and Policy Checklist

The items in Environment and Policy Checklist in the director measure include the opportunities for various parent involvement, suggestion boxes or measures for parents, special programs just for fathers, written information in multiple languages and appropriate literacy levels, opportunities for family events, and various means for providing parenting information. Table F-1 shows average numbers of the checklist items, by three program types (i.e., center-based, Head Start/Early Head Start, and family child care).

Table F-1. Summary statistics for the environment and policy checklist in the director measure, by program type

Scales	Program type	Number of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Reported response range	Possible response range
Environment and policy checklist (17 items)[1]	Center-based program	108	13.2	2.6	6-17	0-17
	Head Start/Early Head Start	47	16.4	0.8	14-17	
	Family child care	57	10.1	3.4	1-17	

[1] Seventeen items in the director measure are included in this checklist: DIRQ14, DIRQ15a-d, DIRQ16, DIRQ17, DIRQ18, DIRQ19, DIRQ20, DIRQ21, DIRQ22, and DIRQ23a-e; response options for these questions are "Yes" or "No."

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Director Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Provider/Teacher Measure: Number of Training or Coursework and Ways of Helping Families

The provider/teacher measure includes six items indicating the number of times providers and teachers participated in trainings or coursework in the last 10 years. Topics of the trainings or coursework include how to recognize developmental delays, child abuse and neglect, domestic violence, substance abuse, depression or mental health issues, or hunger. The provider/teacher measure also includes three items indicating the number of different types of help that early care and education (ECE) providers or teachers have provided to families, including encouraging families to seek or receive services, making appointments or arrangements for families to receive services, and helping families find services they need.

Table F-2 below shows the average numbers of training and coursework the ECE providers or teachers have taken during the past 10 years as well as the average number of services they provided to families, by three program types (i.e., center-based, Head Start/Early Head Start, and family child care).

Table F-2. Summary statistics for the number of trainings or coursework and ways of helping families in the provider/teacher measure, by program type

Count	Program type	Number of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Reported response range	Possible response range
Number of trainings or coursework (6 items)[1]	Center-based program	226	4.6	1.7	0.6	0-6
	Head Start/Early Head Start	99	5.2	1.4	0-6	
	Family child care	92	4.4	2.0	0-6	
Ways of helping families (3 items)[2]	Center-based program	227	1.4	1.2	0-3	0-3
	Head Start/Early Head Start	100	2.4	0.8	0-3	
	Family child care	93	1.4	1.2	0-3	

[1] Six items in the Provider/Teacher Measure are included: PROVQ11a-f.

[2] Three items in the Provider/Teacher Measure are included: PROVQ12a-c.

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Provider/Teacher Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Provider/Teacher Measure: Subscales

Table F-3 shows average (mean) scores, standard deviation, reported response ranges, and possible response ranges for the provider/teacher measure subscales, by three program types (i.e., center-based, Head Start/Early Head Start, and family child care).

Table F-3. Summary statistics for the subscales in the provider/teacher measure, by program type

Construct and subscale	Program type	Number of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Reported response range	Possible response range
Construct: Knowledge (12 items)	Center-based program	224	33.3	7.1	12-48	12-48
	Head Start/Early Head Start	94	32.9	6.4	21-48	
	Family child care	89	36.7	6.8	16-48	
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge (12 items)	Center-based program	224	33.3	7.1	12-48	12-48
	Head Start/Early Head Start	94	32.9	6.4	21-48	
	Family child care	89	36.7	6.8	16-48	
Construct: Practices (23 items)	Center-based program	214	77.6	9.7	46-92	23-92
	Head Start/Early Head Start	94	81.8	6.2	61-92	
	Family child care	88	76.3	11.1	38-92	
Subscale: Collaboration (15 items)	Center-based program	219	52.9	6.4	30-60	15-60
	Head Start/Early Head Start	95	55.5	4.1	39-60	
	Family child care	89	51.4	7.7	24-60	
Subscale: Responsiveness (4 items)	Center-based program	227	12.2	2.4	4-16	4-16
	Head Start/Early Head Start	100	12.5	1.9	8-16	
	Family child care	92	12.3	2.6	4-16	
Subscale: Communication (4 items)	Center-based program	225	12.5	2.7	4-16	4-16
	Head Start/Early Head Start	97	13.8	1.7	9-16	
	Family child care	91	12.4	2.9	4-16	
Construct: Attitudes (16 items)	Center-based program	218	54.4	4.9	40-64	16-64
	Head Start/Early Head Start	95	55.3	4.3	44-64	
	Family child care	86	54.0	4.6	44-63	
Subscale: Openness to Change (8 items)	Center-based program	221	29.0	2.6	20-32	8-32
	Head Start/Early Head Start	97	29.6	2.3	21-32	
	Family child care	86	29.0	2.6	21-32	
Subscale: Respect (4 items)	Center-based program	228	10.5	2.5	4-16	4-16
	Head Start/Early Head Start	99	11.0	2.2	7-16	
	Family child care	93	10.0	2.9	4-16	
Subscale: Commitment (4 items)	Center-based program	228	14.8	1.6	8-16	4-16
	Head Start/Early Head Start	99	14.8	1.4	11-16	
	Family child care	93	14.6	1.5	10-16	

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Provider/Teacher Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table F-4 shows quartile scores (lower quartile, median, and upper quartile) scores for the provider/teacher measure subscales, by three program types (center-based, Head Start/Early Head Start, and family child care).

Table F-4. Quartile statistics for the subscales in the provider/teacher measure, by program type

Construct and subscale	Program type	Number of cases	Lower quartile	Median	Upper quartile
Construct: Knowledge (12 items)	Center-based program	224	28	33	39
	Head Start/Early Head Start	94	28	32	37
	Family child care	89	32	37	41
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge (12 items)	Center-based program	224	28	33	39
	Head Start/Early Head Start	94	28	32	37
	Family child care	89	32	37	41
Construct: Practices (23 items)	Center-based program	214	72	80	85
	Head Start/Early Head Start	94	79	83	86
	Family child care	88	70	78	86
Subscale: Collaboration (15 items)	Center-based program	219	49	54	58
	Head Start/Early Head Start	95	54	57	59
	Family child care	89	47	52	58
Subscale: Responsiveness (4 items)	Center-based program	227	11	12	14
	Head Start/Early Head Start	100	11	12	14
	Family child care	92	11	12	14
Subscale: Communication (4 items)	Center-based program	225	11	13	15
	Head Start/Early Head Start	97	12	14	15
	Family child care	91	10	13	15
Construct: Attitudes (16 items)	Center-based program	218	51	55	57
	Head Start/Early Head Start	95	53	56	58
	Family child care	86	50	54	57
Subscale: Openness to Change (8 items)	Center-based program	221	27	30	31
	Head Start/Early Head Start	97	28	30	32
	Family child care	86	27	29	31
Subscale: Respect (4 items)	Center-based program	228	9	10	12
	Head Start/Early Head Start	99	9	11	12
	Family child care	93	8	10	12
Subscale: Commitment (4 items)	Center-based program	228	14	15	16
	Head Start/Early Head Start	99	14	15	16
	Family child care	93	13	15	16

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Provider/Teacher Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Parent Measure: Subscales

Table F-5 shows average (mean) scores, standard deviation, reported response ranges, and possible response ranges for the parent measure subscales, by three program types (center-based, Head Start/Early Head Start, and family child care).

Table F-5. Summary statistics for the subscales in the parent measure, by program type

Construct and subscale	Program type	Number of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Reported response range	Possible response range
Construct: Knowledge (15 items)	Center-based program	601	52.6	7.3	15-60	15-60
	Head Start/Early Head Start	268	52.6	7.0	17-60	
	Family child care	252	53.5	7.6	15-60	
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge (15 items)	Center-based program	601	52.6	7.3	15-60	15-60
	Head Start/Early Head Start	268	52.6	7.0	17-60	
	Family child care	252	53.5	7.6	15-60	
Construct: Practices (33 items)	Center-based program	567	109.4	17.0	49-132	33-132
	Head Start/Early Head Start	262	116.9	12.9	76-132	
	Family child care	243	115.9	13.8	53-132	
Subscale: Collaboration (11 items)	Center-based program	601	37.1	6.1	12-44	11-44
	Head Start/Early Head Start	270	39.8	4.6	22-44	
	Family child care	251	39.2	5.0	15-44	
Subscale: Responsiveness (11 items)	Center-based program	617	38.7	5.6	21-44	11-44
	Head Start/Early Head Start	276	40.2	4.8	23-44	
	Family child care	254	40.0	5.0	18-44	
Subscale: Communication (8 items)	Center-based program	612	23.3	6.0	8-32	8-32
	Head Start/Early Head Start	281	26.7	4.8	8-32	
	Family child care	258	25.5	5.4	8-32	
Subscale: Family-focused Concern (3 items)	Center-based program	616	10.2	1.9	3-12	3-12
	Head Start/Early Head Start	282	10.2	1.8	3-12	
	Family child care	255	10.8	1.5	4-12	
Construct: Attitudes (18 items)	Center-based program	599	67.7	5.7	43-72	18-72
	Head Start/Early Head Start	265	67.8	6.0	45-72	
	Family child care	247	68.8	5.1	46-72	
Subscale: Commitment (9 items)	Center-based program	616	33.7	3.5	18-36	9-36
	Head Start/Early Head Start	277	34.2	2.9	25-36	
	Family child care	251	34.4	2.7	23-36	
Subscale: Understanding Context (4 items)	Center-based program	628	15.3	1.8	4-16	4-16
	Head Start/Early Head Start	281	15.0	2.4	4-16	
	Family child care	256	15.3	1.9	4-16	
Subscale: Respect (5 items)	Center-based program	613	18.8	2.8	5-20	5-20
	Head Start/Early Head Start	272	18.0	3.3	5-20	
	Family child care	253	19.0	2.5	5-20	

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Parent Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table F-6 shows quartile scores (lower quartile, median, and upper quartile) scores for the parent measure subscales, by three program types (center-based, Head Start/Early Head Start, and family child care).

Table F-6. Quartile statistics for the subscales in the parent measure, by program type

Construct and subscales	Program type	Number of cases	Lower quartile	Median	Upper quartile
Construct: Knowledge (15 items)	Center-based program	601	48	54	59
	Head Start/Early Head Start	268	47	54	60
	Family child care	252	49	56	60
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge (15 items)	Center-based program	601	48	54	59
	Head Start/Early Head Start	268	47	54	60
	Family child care	252	49	56	60
Construct: Practices (33 items)	Center-based program	567	98	112	124
	Head Start/Early Head Start	262	109	120	128
	Family child care	243	109	120	127
Subscale: Collaboration (11 items)	Center-based program	601	33	38	42
	Head Start/Early Head Start	270	37	41	44
	Family child care	251	37	41	44
Subscale: Responsiveness (11 items)	Center-based program	617	35	41	44
	Head Start/Early Head Start	276	38	42	44
	Family child care	254	38	42	44
Subscale: Communication (8 items)	Center-based program	612	19	24	28
	Head Start/Early Head Start	281	24	27	31
	Family child care	258	22	26	30
Subscale: Family-focused Concern (3 items)	Center-based program	616	9	11	12
	Head Start/Early Head Start	282	9	11	12
	Family child care	255	10	11	12
Construct: Attitudes (18 items)	Center-based program	599	65	70	72
	Head Start/Early Head Start	265	66	70	72
	Family child care	247	68	71	72
Subscale: Commitment (9 items)	Center-based program	616	33	36	36
	Head Start/Early Head Start	277	33	36	36
	Family child care	251	34	36	36
Subscale: Understanding Context (4 items)	Center-based program	628	16	16	16
	Head Start/Early Head Start	281	16	16	16
	Family child care	256	16	16	16
Subscale: Respect (5 items)	Center-based program	613	19	20	20
	Head Start/Early Head Start	272	18	20	20
	Family child care	253	19	20	20

Source: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Parent Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table F-7 shows average (mean) scores, standard deviation, reported response ranges, and possible response ranges for the parent measure subscales, by English and Spanish versions.

Table F-7. Summary statistics for the subscales in the parent measure, by English and Spanish versions

Construct and subscales	English and Spanish version	Number of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Reported response range	Possible response range
Construct: Knowledge	English	1,043	52.8	7.3	15-60	15-60
(15 items)	Spanish	78	51.9	6.4	36-60	
Subscale: Family-specific	English	1,043	52.8	7.3	15-60	15-60
Knowledge (15 items)	Spanish	78	51.9	6.4	36-60	
Construct: Practices	English	997	112.5	15.8	49-132	33-132
(33 items)	Spanish	75	115.7	15.7	71-132	
Subscale: Collaboration	English	1,039	38.1	5.7	12-44	11-44
(11 items)	Spanish	83	39.5	5.2	20-44	
Subscale: Responsiveness	English	1,061	39.3	5.3	18-44	11-44
(11 items)	Spanish	86	39.4	5.2	22-44	
Subscale: Communication	English	1,063	24.5	5.8	8-32	8-32
(8 items)	Spanish	88	26.2	6.0	8-32	
Subscale: Family-focused	English	1,067	10.4	1.8	3-12	3-12
Concern (3 items)	Spanish	86	9.8	2.2	3-12	
Construct: Attitudes	English	1,033	68.1	5.6	43-72	18-72
(18 items)	Spanish	78	65.9	6.7	44-72	
Subscale: Commitment	English	1,059	34.0	3.1	18-36	9-36
(9 items)	Spanish	85	33.0	3.8	20-36	
Subscale: Understanding	English	1,076	15.2	1.9	4-16	4-16
Context (4 items)	Spanish	89	14.6	3.0	4-16	
Subscale: Respect	English	1,057	18.8	2.8	5-20	5-20
(5 items)	Spanish	81	17.9	3.5	5-20	

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Parent Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Table F-8 shows quartile scores (lower quartile, median, and upper quartile) scores for the parent measure subscales, by English and Spanish versions.

Table F-8. Quartile statistics for the subscales in the parent measure, by English and Spanish versions

Construct and subscales	English and Spanish version	Number of cases	Lower quartile	Median	Upper quartile
Construct: Knowledge	English	1,043	48	55	59
(15 items)	Spanish	78	47	54	57
Subscale: Family-specific	English	1,043	48	55	59
Knowledge (15 items)	Spanish	78	47	54	57
Construct: Practices	English	997	103	116	125
(33 items)	Spanish	75	108	119	128
Subscale: Collaboration	English	1,039	34	40	44
(11 items)	Spanish	83	36	41	44
Subscale: Responsiveness	English	1,061	36	41	44
(11 items)	Spanish	86	36	42	43
Subscale: Communication	English	1,063	21	25	29
(8 items)	Spanish	88	24	27	31
Subscale: Family-focused	English	1,067	9	11	12
Concern (3 items)	Spanish	86	9	10	12
Construct: Attitudes	English	1,033	66	71	72
(18 items)	Spanish	78	63	68	71
Subscale: Commitment	English	1,059	33	36	36
(9 items)	Spanish	85	30	35	36
Subscale: Understanding	English	1,076	16	16	16
Context	Spanish	89	15	16	16
(4 items)					
Subscale: Respect	English	1,057	19	19	20
(5 items)	Spanish	81	17	19	20

SOURCE: Analysis of data from the FPTRQ Parent Measure, Field Study conducted in spring 2014.

Appendix G:
Cultural Sensitivity

A high priority of the Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality (FPTRQ) project was to develop measures that are appropriate for diverse populations, including ethnically/racially diverse providers and families, and non-English speaking families. Throughout the iterative phases of the measurement development process (i.e., literature and measures review, expert consultation, focus groups, cognitive interviews, piloting), we struggled to develop items that measure providers/teachers' cultural sensitivity—a critical component to developing positive family-provider relationships. Through mixed-methods and iterative rounds of item development and testing, we tried different types of items and approaches (e.g., indirectly through families' comfort level, directly referring to "culture" or "religion") to assessing cultural sensitivity (see Table G-1).

After closely examining cultural sensitivity within the context of early childhood education, we decided to incorporate the notion of cultural sensitivity within all measure items. This approach acknowledges the central role cultural sensitivity has within each aspect of provider/teacher and family relationships.

A separate report, *Understanding and Measuring Provider's/Teacher's Cultural Sensitivity with Families: Lessons Learned and Measurement Recommendations,*[12] is available to provide more information about cultural sensitivity and can be found on the OPRE website at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/development-of-a-measure-of-family-and-provider-teacher-relationship-quality-fptrq.

[12] Ramos, M., Brown, E., Guzman, L., & Hickman, S. (2015). *Understanding and Measuring Provider's/Teacher's Cultural Sensitivity with Families: Lessons Learned and Measurement Recommendations*. OPRE Report 2015-55. Washington, D.C.: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Table G-1. Mixed-methods, iterative rounds of item development and testing of cultural sensitivity

Iterative phase	Approach	Issue	Interpretation of issue
1st round of cognitive interviews	Based on a broad literature and measures review, we attempted to measure cultural sensitivity via families' comfort level with or perceptions of judgment from their provider/teacher. We also assessed providers/teachers' knowledge of families' cultures and attempts to integrate cultures into lessons.	Some parents reported that cultural sensitivity items seemed redundant (although there were only 5). When rating their comfort level with providers, parents included other factors besides their providers' cultural sensitivity.	It appears that parents remembered cultural sensitivity items more than other sets of items measuring one construct. While cultural sensitivity affects parents' comfort level with providers, there are contributing factors other than cultural sensitivity.
2nd round of cognitive interviews	We revised items to directly refer to "culture," "cultural values, "cultural beliefs." We also referred to "religion" directly.	Parents interpreted "culture" differently (e.g., race/ethnicity, religion, moral values, birthdays, holidays, vegetarianism, heritage).	Given that culture is often transmitted via subtle gestures, mannerism, and words as opposed to overt expressions, some parents had a difficult time imagining ways providers could be sensitive to cultural values, norms, and beliefs.
3rd round of cognitive interviews	Revised wording from 2nd round of cognitive interviews.	Parents interpreted "culture" differently and responses were not always mapped as intended.	The response option "not at all like my provider," was intended to identify a provider lacking cultural sensitivity. However, parents used this response when: (1) the provider lacked cultural sensitivity (interpreted as intended); or (2) parents thought culture should not be discussed in schools (not interpreted as intended); or (3) if there had not been discussions about culture or cultural values and beliefs.
Interviews with Substantive Experts	Interviewed substantive experts to describe the challenges encountered and collect recommendations for how to move forward.	Substantive experts acknowledged the issues, but were only able to suggest more literature/measures to review. Experts suggested using semi-structured interviews to measure cultural sensitivity.	The current project focuses specifically on closed-ended measure items.

Table G-1. Mixed-methods, iterative rounds of item development and testing of cultural sensitivity—Continued

Iterative phase	Approach	Issue	Interpretation of issue
Focused, Extensive Literature and Measures Review	We revisited the literature to focus specifically on the definition of cultural sensitivity and examined how it had been measured on other measures/scales.	Cultural sensitivity is a complex concept with multiple components (i.e., cultural competence, cultural awareness, and cultural responsiveness) that can be measured as an attitude, practice, or knowledge (referred to as dimensions), and can be approached from the collective, group level or the specific, individual level.	Developing appropriate measure items for cultural sensitivity may extend beyond the scope of the current project. See Ramos et al. (2014) for a detailed review of challenges encountered and recommendations for measuring cultural sensitivity.
Final Measures	Instead of assessing cultural sensitivity directly with measure items we decided to incorporate the notion of cultural sensitivity within all other measure items.		

This page is intentionally blank.

Appendix H.
Family Services Staff Measure Development Process

Head Start and Early Head Start family services staff play a significant role in fulfilling Head Start/Early Head Start's two-generation mission. Family services staff assist families to achieve their personal goals, support families by advocating for them and connecting them to community services, and help families when times are difficult (Office of Head Start Family Service Workforce Meeting, 2010). Family services staff (FSS) also help families gain a better understanding of their child's educational development, support their children's learning at home, and link families to services that their child may need. Family services staff are often the Head Start/Early Head Start staff members who provide opportunities for parents to become involved in leadership activities as well as educational activities, such as literacy programs that meet families' articulated needs. Consistent with Head Start/Early Head Start's Performance Standards and its framework for Parent, Family and Community Engagement, family services staff are expected to develop relationships with families that are mutually respectful, sensitive, responsive to family interests and needs, and culturally competent.

To measure the unique relationships between families and their FSS in Head Start/Early Head Start programs, the Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality (FPTRQ) has developed measures that are specifically designed for Head Start/Early Head Start family services staff and the families who they serve. The development of the FSS measures reflected a growing understanding by the project team as the project progressed that relationships between FSS and families differ in important ways from that of relationships between providers/teachers and families. These differences first became apparent during the focus groups with parents and providers in Head Start/Early Head Start and later reinforced during the cognitive testing of the initial parent and provider/teacher measures which included FSS. The focus groups and cognitive testing suggested that the items developed to measure the relationship between families and providers/teachers were not applicable to the FSS and parent relationship because they did not adequately capture the role of the FSS, and they focused on the child rather than the parents and families.

The FSS measure and the parent FSS measure were not included in the pilot study and the field study, and thus were not included in the psychometric analyses. However, because FSS' relationships with families in Head Start/Early Head Start are an essential component of the program, the FPTRQ project is disseminating these measures along with the FPTRQ parent, provider/teacher, and director measures. Programs can use the FSS measure and the FSS parent measure to assess the quality of relationships that FSS have with families. Data from the measures can be used to identify strengths and weaknesses in these relationships, to guide professional development for FSS, and to inform program improvement.

Literature Review. To develop the FSS and FSS parent measures, we consulted the literature on Head Start/Early Head Start that was reviewed as part of the development of the FPTRQ conceptual model (Forry et al., 2012). The Head Start Performance Standards were also reviewed as part of this process. While research that specifically focuses on FSS is limited, findings from empirical studies indicate that Head Start/Early Head Start staff's strengths-based approach, supportiveness and cultural responsiveness were associated with family satisfaction with the program and their level of engagement in it. In addition, some research has found that staff's use of an empowerment approach was associated with parents' feeling of competence, improved support for their children's learning at home, and improved home environments. Other research has found that parents valued their relationships with FSS, as FSS helped them achieve their educational and personal goals as well as improve their relationships with their children.

Focus Groups. Among the nine focus groups conducted for the FPTRQ project, two were specifically conducted for Head Start/Early Head Start: one for providers (teachers, assistant teachers and FSS) and one for parents. Focus group discussions provided the first indication that both parents and FSS saw their relationships with each other as different from relationships between families and teachers. Specifically, FSS help parents solve their problems, act as a resource for information, and connect parents with services in the community. By contrast, relationships with teachers and assistant teachers focus on the child.

Cognitive Interviews. During the cognitive interviews, similar themes emerged about the distinctive relationship that FSS have with families. In the first round of cognitive interviews, many of the measure items proved difficult for the FSS and parents to answer because the items were not perceived as applicable to the FSS role in the Head Start/Early Head Start program. Despite revisions to the measure for the second round of cognitive interviews, these issues remained. To address these problems, separate measures were created for FSS and the parents they serve. These measures were tested through cognitive interviews in later rounds.

Development Process

The measure development process for the FSS measure and the FSS parent measure began with translating items from the provider/teacher and director measures that were related to the work of FSS, namely items that were not specific to the classroom setting. We started with items from the provider/teacher and director measures as these measures had been cognitively tested in three iterative rounds, were pilot tested, and were found to be interpreted as intended and working well. The provider/teacher and director measures provided a good base of items; however, more items were needed to assess the unique role FSS play

within the Head Start/Early Head Start program. To inform our new items we conducted a literature review, searched the Head Start/Early Head Start bylaws, consulted 2012-2013 Head Start Program Information Report, and interviewed Kiersten Beigel (from the Office of Head Start) to understand titles, prerequisites, roles, and responsibilities of FSS. New items were developed based on the information learned. Cognitive interviews were conducted with FSS to determine whether adapted and new items were interpreted as intended and applicable.

Before conducting cognitive interviews with FSS an additional literature search was conducted to identify key FSS characteristics that should be represented in our study to ensure the diversity of our sample and to better understand the role of the FSS. Key descriptive factors identified include: number of families served, caseload size, years of Head Start/Early Head Start experience, education, and enrollment of their own child in a Head Start/Early Head Start program (Franze et al., 2002). Our FSS cognitive interview sample was stratified based on these characteristics.

Cognitive Interviews

FSS were recruited into the study to cognitively test the FSS measures using the following procedures. First, an email was sent to the Head Start Regional Program Area Manager from the Office of Head Start in the following areas: Alabama, Boston, California, the Chicago area, the DC area, Florida, Idaho, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, North Carolina, Seattle, and West Virginia. Next, Child Trends staff called Head Start/Early Head Start centers that were emailed to determine whether any FSS were interested in joining the study. Parents of children who were enrolled in Head Start/Early Head Start were recruited via ads posted on Craigslist. Interested individuals were asked to contact the study team via a toll-free number to complete a brief screener interview to establish study eligibility. The same procedures were used for all participants. Staff trained in cognitive interviewing administered the cognitive interview protocol, which included the items developed as well as probes and open-ended questions (e.g., "What came to mind when you read the question? Walk me through how you answered the question.") to assess respondents' understanding of key words and phrases and use of response options. Two measures were cognitively tested: FSS and FSS parent. The FSS measure assesses FSS' attitudes, knowledge, and practices related to their relationship with families. The FSS parent measure assesses parents' perceptions of their FSS' attitudes, knowledge, and practices.

Cognitive interviews lasted between 1.5 and 2 hours. Interviews were conducted in English only. All participants received a $50 stipend for their participation. Interviews were recorded with participants' permission. Cognitive interviews were conducted between January and June, 2014. A total of 35 interviews were completed with FSS serving families with children enrolled in Head Start/Early Head Start and 8 cognitive interviews were conducted with parents of a child who attends Head Start/Early Head Start.

At the end of data collection for each round, a debriefing session was held with study team members to review interview summaries and notes. The purpose of the debriefing was to identify comprehension/clarity issues, determine if questions and answer choices worked as intended, and determine if respondents were able to recall needed information and find the answer choice that closely matched their formulated response. During the debriefing, interviewers reviewed participants' responses to the measure items and open-ended cognitive interviewing questions and probes item-by-item. This process was repeated for FSS and parents. During the debriefing, the study team documented items that appeared to work well and highlighted problems identified through the cognitive testing interviews. Generally, the issues identified related to: (1) items that seemed more relevant for providers than FSS, (2) items that were part of the FSS job (not getting at the quality of the relationship), and (3) difficulty asking about providing services where need may vary. These issues were resolved.

The FSS and FSS parent measures were tested in a pilot test and psychometric properties were established. Detailed information about the pilot test of the FSS and FSS parent measures is found in the *Family Services Staff and Family Services Staff Parent Measures: Amendment to the FPTRQ User's Manual*[13] at the OPRE website at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/development-of-a-measure-of-family-and-provider-teacher-relationship-quality-fptrq. Based on data from the pilot test, FSS and FSS parent measure short forms were created and information on these short forms can be found in the *Family Services Staff and Family Services Staff Parent Measures: Amendment to the FPTRQ User's Manual.*

Table H-1[14] shows the family services staff (FSS) measure item numbers for each subscale. This information is useful for those who use statistical packages, such as SPSS or SAS, etc., to conduct statistical analyses of data collected from the FSS measures. Excel scoring sheets are available and can be used to automatically calculate overall, construct, and subscale scores in the FSS and FSS parent measures. A PDF version of the FSS measure and the Excel scoring sheets can be downloaded at no cost and printed from the

[13] Kim, K., Atkinson, V., Brown, E., Guzman, L., Ramos, M., Forry, N., Porter, T., and Nord, C. (2015). *Family Services Staff and Family Services Staff Parent Measures: Amendment to the FPTRQ User's Manual.* OPRE Report 2015-57. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

[14] Tables H-1 through H-4 have been updated based on the data analysis from the FSS pilot test conducted from December 2014 through mid-February 2015.

OPRE website at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/development-of-a-measure-of-family-and-provider-teacher-relationship-quality-fptrq.

Table H-1. Family services staff measure item numbers for subscales

Construct	Subscale	Item number
Knowledge	Family-specific Knowledge (19 items)	FSSQ3a, FSSQ3b, FSSQ3c, FSSQ3d, FSSQ3e, FSSQ3f, FSSQ3g, FSSQ3h, FSSQ3i, FSSQ3j, FSSQ3k, FSSQ3l, FSSQ3m, FSSQ3n, FSSQ3o, FSSQ6a, FSSQ6b, FSSQ6d, FSSQ6e
Practices	Collaboration (11 items)	FSSQ4c, FSSQ4d, FSSQ7a, FSSQ7b, FSSQ7c, FSSQ7d, FSSQ7e, FSSQ7f, FSSQ7g, FSSQ7h, FSSQ8m
	Responsiveness (11 items)	FSSQ2f, FSSQ4f, FSSQ4h, FSSQ6c, FSSQ6f, FSSQ6g, FSSQ8a, FSSQ8b, FSSQ8c, FSSQ8j, FSSQ9
	Communication (15 items)	FSSQ2a, FSSQ2b, FSSQ2c, FSSQ2d, FSSQ2e, FSSQ2g, FSSQ8h, FSSQ10a, FSSQ10b, FSSQ10c, FSSQ10d, FSSQ10e, FSSQ10f, FSSQ10g, FSSQ10h
	Connecting to Services (6 items)	FSSQ1a, FSSQ1b, FSSQ1c, FSSQ1d, FSSQ1e, FSSQ8n
	Family-focused Concern (3 items)	FSSQ4a, FSSQ8i, FSSQ8k
Attitudes	Commitment (8 items)	FSSQ4b, FSSQ8d, FSSQ8l, FSSQ12a, FSSQ12b, FSSQ12c, FSSQ12d, FSSQ12e
	Openness to Change (4 items)	FSSQ4g, FSSQ8e, FSSQ8f, FSSQ8g
	Respect (7 items)	FSSQ4e, FSSQ5a, FSSQ5b, FSSQ5c, FSSQ5d, FSSQ5e, FSSQ5f

Table H-2 below shows the FSS measure items that are included in each subscale.

Table H-2. Family services staff measure items for subscales

Construct: Knowledge		Item number
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge	Thinking about the families you serve, how many parents have you met with or talked to about the following? How many children they have	FSSQ3a
	Thinking about the families you serve, how many parents have you met with or talked to about the following? How many adult relatives live in their households	FSSQ3b
	Thinking about the families you serve, how many parents have you met with or talked to about the following? Their work and school schedules	FSSQ3c
	Thinking about the families you serve, how many parents have you met with or talked to about the following? Their marital status	FSSQ3d
	Thinking about the families you serve, how many parents have you met with or talked to about the following? Their parenting styles	FSSQ3e
	Thinking about the families you serve, how many parents have you met with or talked to about the following? Their employment status	FSSQ3f
	Thinking about the families you serve, how many parents have you met with or talked to about the following? Their family's financial situation	FSSQ3g
	Thinking about the families you serve, how many parents have you met with or talked to about the following? The role that faith and religion play in their children's household	FSSQ3h
	Thinking about the families you serve, how many parents have you met with or talked to about the following? Their family's culture and values	FSSQ3i
	Thinking about the families you serve, how many parents have you met with or talked to about the following? What they do outside of the Head Start/Early Head Start setting to encourage their children's learning	FSSQ3j
	Thinking about the families you serve, how many parents have you met with or talked to about the following? How they discipline their children	FSSQ3k
	Thinking about the families you serve, how many parents have you met with or talked to about the following? Problems their child is having at home.	FSSQ3l
	Thinking about the families you serve, how many parents have you met with or talked to about the following? Changes happening at home	FSSQ3m
	Thinking about the families you serve, how many parents have you met with or talked to about the following? Health issues their children may have	FSSQ3n
	Thinking about the families you serve, how many parents have you met with or talked to about the following? Health issues they or other family member may have	FSSQ3o
	When providing services to families in your program, how often do you take into account the following? Information parents share about their child	FSSQ6a
	When providing services to families in your program, how often do you take into account the following? Whether activities are welcoming to all family members, including fathers	FSSQ6b
	When providing services to families in your program, how often do you take into account the following? What you can do to make fathers or other family members feel comfortable at centers	FSSQ6d
	When providing services to families in your program, how often do you take into account the following? Families' values and cultures	FSSQ6e

Table H-2. Family services staff measure items for subscales—Continued

Construct: Practices		Full measure
Subscale: Collaboration	I work with parents to figure out the steps to reach their goals	FSSQ4c
	I encourage parents to make decisions about their children's education and care	FSSQ4d
	Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about the following? How their child is doing in the Head Start/Early Head Start program	FSSQ7a
	Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about the following? Their child's learning or development	FSSQ7b
	Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about the following? Goals parents have for their child	FSSQ7c
	Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about the following? Goals parents have for themselves	FSSQ7d
	Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about the following? How parents are progressing towards goals they have for themselves	FSSQ7e
	Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about the following? Problems their child is having in the Head Start/Early Head Start program	FSSQ7f
	Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about the following? Problems parents may be having with their work or school	FSSQ7g
	Since September, how often have you met with or talked to parents about the following? Parent's vision for their family's future	FSSQ7h
	Part of my job is to…Make home visits to provide support and to work on goal setting with the families	FSSQ8m

Table H-2. Family services staff measure items for subscales—Continued

Construct: Practices		Item number
Subscale: Responsiveness	Since September, how often have you been you able to do the following? Taken parents' values and culture into account when serving them	FSSQ2f
	I encourage parents to provide feedback on the services and support I provide them	FSSQ4f
	Even though my professional or moral viewpoints may differ, I accept that parents are the ultimate decision makers for the care and education of their children	FSSQ4h
	When providing services to families in your program, how often do you take into account the following? Information parents share about their home life	FSSQ6c
	When providing services to families in your program, how often do you take into account the following? Information parents share about their career or education goals	FSSQ6f
	When providing services to families in your program, how often do you take into account the following? Information parents share about their "life goals"	FSSQ6g
	Part of my job is to…Help families get services available in the community	FSSQ8a
	Part of my job is to…Offer parents information about community events	FSSQ8b
	Part of my job is to…Respond to issues or questions outside of normal work hours	FSSQ8c
	Part of my job is to…Tailor my approach when working with mothers, fathers, or other family members	FSSQ8j
	If families have a question or a problem comes up during the day, how easy or difficult is it for them to reach you?	FSSQ9

Table H-2. Family services staff measure items for subscales—Continued

Construct: Practices		Item number
Subscale: Communication	Since September, how often have you been able to do the following? Followed up with parents about goals they set for their child.	FSSQ2a
	Since September, how often have you been able to do the following? Followed up with parents about goals they set for themselves.	FSSQ2b
	Since September, how often have you been able to do the following? Offered parents ideas or suggestions about parenting.	FSSQ2c
	Since September, how often have you been able to do the following? Suggested activities for parents and children to do together.	FSSQ2d
	Since September, how often have you been able to do the following? Worked with parents to develop strategies they can use at home to support their child's learning and development	FSSQ2e
	Since September, how often have you been able to do the following? Offered parents books or materials on parenting	FSSQ2g
	Part of my job is to…Talk to parents about parenting	FSSQ8h
	Since September, how many of the families you serve have you given information on the following: Employment or job training?	FSSQ10a
	Since September, how many of the families you serve have you given information on the following: Food banks or pantries?	FSSQ10b
	Since September, how many of the families you serve have you given information on the following: Child care subsidies or vouchers?	FSSQ10c
	Since September, how many of the families you serve have you given information on the following: Adult education, GED classes, ESL classes, or continuing education?	FSSQ10d
	Since September, how many of the families you serve have you given information on the following: Housing assistance?	FSSQ10e
	Since September, how many of the families you serve have you given information on the following: Energy or fuel assistance?	FSSQ10f
	Since September, how many of the families you serve have you given information on the following: Parenting skills group?	FSSQ10g
	Since September, how many of the families you serve have you given information on the following: Health insurance?	FSSQ10h

Table H-2. Family services staff measure items for subscales—Continued

Construct: Practices		Item number
Subscale: Connecting to Services	Since September, how many of the families you serve have you directly helped in any of the following ways: Encouraged families to seek or receive services?	FSSQ1a
	Since September, how many of the families you serve have you directly helped in any of the following ways: Followed up with families about whether services they have received met their needs?	FSSQ1b
	Since September, how many of the families you serve have you directly helped in any of the following ways: Made appointments or arrangements for families to receive services they need?	FSSQ1c
	Since September, how many of the families you serve have you directly helped in any of the following ways: Helped families find services they need?	FSSQ1d
	Since September, how many of the families you serve have you directly helped in any of the following ways: Advocated on behalf of families to ensure that outside service providers are responsive?	FSSQ1e
	Part of my job is to…Help families meet their basic needs	FSSQ8n
Subscale: Family- focused Concern	My goal is to help parents reach their full potential	FSSQ4a
	Part of my job is to…Help parents reach their goals	FSSQ8i
	Part of my job is to…Help parents learn skills needed to succeed	FSSQ8k

Table H-2. Family services staff measure items for subscales—Continued

Construct: Attitudes		Item number
Subscale: Commitment	I help parents to reach their job and educational goals	FSSQ4b
	Part of my job is to…Learn the values and beliefs of the families I serve	FSSQ8d
	Part of my job is to…Consider how culture shapes the way I should approach my work with families	FSSQ8l
	I work as a Family Service Worker because I enjoy it	FSSQ12a
	I see this job as just a paycheck	FSSQ12b
	I work as a Family Service Worker because I like helping children and families reach their goals	FSSQ12c
	If I could find something else to do to make a living I would	FSSQ12d
	I work as a Family Service Worker because I like helping children and families get the services they need	FSSQ12e
Subscale: Openness to Change	I am open to using information on different ways to assist parents and children	FSSQ4g
	Part of my job is to…Change my work schedule in response to parents' work or school schedules	FSSQ8e
	Part of my job is to…Learn new ways to assist families	FSSQ8f
	Part of my job is to...Change how services are offered to children and families in response to parent feedback	FSSQ8g
Subscale: Respect	Parent's beliefs about childcare and education vary by culture	FSSQ4e
	Sometimes it is hard for me to support the way parents raise their children	FSSQ5a
	Sometimes it is hard for me to support the way parents discipline their children	FSSQ5b
	Sometimes it is hard for me to accept the different cultural beliefs of parents	FSSQ5c
	Sometimes it is hard for me to support the goals parents have for their children	FSSQ5d
	Sometimes it is hard for me to work with parents who have different beliefs than me	FSSQ5e
	Sometimes it is hard for me to accept the choices that parents make	FSSQ5f

Table H-3 shows the FSS parent measure item numbers for each subscale. This information is useful for those who use statistical packages, such as SPSS or SAS, etc., to conduct statistical analyses of data collected from the FSS parent measure. Excel scoring sheets are available and can be used to automatically calculate overall, construct, and subscale scores in the FSS and FSS parent measures. A PDF version of the FSS parent measure and the Excel scoring sheets can be downloaded at no cost and printed from the OPRE website at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/development-of-a-measure-of-family-and-provider-teacher-relationship-quality-fptrq.

Table H-3. Family services staff parent measure item numbers for subscales

Construct	Subscale	Item number
Knowledge	Family-specific Knowledge (17 items)	FSSPQ3a, FSSPQ3b, FSSPQ3c, FSSPQ3d, FSSPQ3e, FSSPQ3f, FSSPQ3g, FSSPQ3h, FSSPQ3i, FSSPQ3j, FSSPQ3k, FSSPQ3l, FSSPQ3m, FSSPQ3n, FSSPQ3o, FSSPQ3p, FSSPQ3q
Practices	Collaboration (11 items)	FSSPQ1a, FSSPQ1b, FSSPQ1c, FSSPQ1d, FSSPQ1e, FSSPQ1f, FSSPQ1g, FSSPQ1h, FSSPQ1i, FSSPQ1j, FSSPQ6a
	Responsiveness (14 items)	FSSPQ2c, FSSPQ4a, FSSPQ4b, FSSPQ4c, FSSPQ4d, FSSPQ4e, FSSPQ4f, FSSPQ4g, FSSPQ4h, FSSPQ8a, FSSPQ8b, FSSPQ8c, FSSPQ8d, FSSPQ9
	Communication (7 items)	FSSPQ2a, FSSPQ2b, FSSPQ2d, FSSPQ6b, FSSPQ6c, FSSPQ6d, FSSPQ6e
Attitudes	Commitment (8 items)	FSSPQ7a, FSSPQ7b, FSSPQ7d, FSSPQ7e, FSSPQ7f, FSSPQ7i, FSSPQ7k, FSSPQ8e
	Respect (4 items)	FSSPQ7c, FSSPQ7g, FSSPQ7h, FSSPQ7j
	Understanding Context (4 items)	FSSPQ5a, FSSPQ5b, FSSPQ5c, FSSPQ5d

Table H-4 below shows the FSS parent measure items that are included in each subscale.

Table H-4. Family services staff parent measure items for subscales

Construct: Knowledge		Item number
Subscale: Family-specific Knowledge	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? How many children you have	FSSPQ3a
	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? How many adult relatives live in your household	FSSPQ3b
	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? Your work and school schedule	FSSPQ3c
	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? Your marital status	FSSPQ3d
	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? Your personal relationship with a spouse or partner	FSSPQ3e
	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? Your employment status	FSSPQ3f
	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? Your financial situation	FSSPQ3g
	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? Your parenting style	FSSPQ3h
	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? Your family life	FSSPQ3i
	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? The role that faith and religion play in your household	FSSPQ3j
	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? Your family's culture and values	FSSPQ3k
	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? What you do outside of the Head Start/Early Head Start setting to encourage your child's learning	FSSPQ3l
	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? How you discipline your child	FSSPQ3m
	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? Problems your child is having at home	FSSPQ3n
	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? Changes happening at home	FSSPQ3o
	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? Health issues your child may have	FSSPQ3p
	How comfortable would or do you feel sharing the following information with your Family Service Worker? Health issues you or other family members may have	FSSPQ3q

Table H-4. Family services staff parent measure items for subscales—Continued

Construct: Practices		Item number
Subscale: Collaboration	Since September, how often have you met with or talked to your Family Service Worker about the following? How your child is doing in the Head Start/Early Head Start program	FSSPQ1a
	Since September, how often have you met with or talked to your Family Service Worker about the following? Your child's learning or development	FSSPQ1b
	Since September how often have you talked to your Family Service Worker about the following? Goals you have for your child	FSSPQ1c
	Since September how often have you talked to your Family Service Worker about the following? Goals you have for yourself	FSSPQ1d
	Since September, how often have you met with or talked to your Family Service Worker about the following? How your child is progressing towards your goals you have set for him/her	FSSPQ1e
	Since September how often have you talked to your Family Service Worker about the following? How you are progressing towards goals you have set for yourself	FSSPQ1f
	Since September, how often have you met with or talked to your Family Service Worker about the following? Problems your child is having in the Head Start/Early Head Start program	FSSPQ1g
	Since September, how often have you met with or talked to your Family Service Worker about the following? Problems you may be having with work or school	FSSPQ1h
	Since September, how often have you met with or talked to your Family Service Worker about the following? Your vision for your family's future	FSSPQ1i
	Since September how often have you talked to your Family Service Worker about the following? How you feel about the services that your Family Service Worker provides you and your family	FSSPQ1j
	How often does your Family Service Worker: Ask about your family?	FSSPQ6a

Table H-4. Family services staff parent measure items for subscales—Continued

Construct: Practices		Item number
Subscale: Responsiveness	Since September, how often has your Family Service Worker: Taken your values and culture into account when serving you?	FSSPQ2c
	My Family Service Worker…Encourages me to be involved in all aspects of my child's care and education in our Head Start/Early Head Start program	FSSPQ4a
	My Family Service Worker…Respects me as a parent	FSSPQ4b
	My Family Service Worker…Is flexible in response to my work or school schedule	FSSPQ4c
	My Family Service Worker…Treats me like an expert on my child	FSSPQ4d
	My Family Service Worker…Asks me questions to show he/she cares about my family	FSSPQ4e
	My Family Service Worker…Shows respect for different ethnic heritages	FSSPQ4f
	My Family Service Worker…Is respectful of religious beliefs	FSSPQ4g
	My Family Service Worker…Encourages parents to provide feedback on the services and support he/she provides them	FSSPQ4h
	My Family Service Worker is open to learning different ways to help parents and children	FSSPQ8a
	My Family Service Worker and I work together to make sure my child has the best care and support	FSSPQ8b
	My Family Service Worker has increased my confidence to accomplish goals for myself.	FSSPQ8c
	My Family Service Worker has my best interests at heart	FSSPQ8d
	How easy or difficult is it for you to reach your Family Service Worker during the day if you have a question or if a problem comes up?	FSSPQ9
Subscale: Communication	Since September, how often has your Family Service Worker: Suggested activities for you and your child to do together?	FSSPQ2a
	Since September, how often has your Family Service Worker: Answered your questions when they came up?	FSSPQ2b
	Since September, how often has your Family Service Worker: Offered you books or materials on parenting?	FSSPQ2d
	How often does your Family Service Worker: Work with you to develop strategies you can use at home to support your child's learning and development?	FSSPQ6b
	How often does your Family Service Worker: Listen to your ideas about ways to change or improve the education and care your child receives?	FSSPQ6c
	How often does your Family Service Worker: Offer you ideas or suggestions about parenting?	FSSPQ6d
	How often does your Family Service Worker: Remember personal details about your family when speaking with you?	FSSPQ6e

Table H-4. Family services staff parent measure items for subscales—Continued

Construct: Attitudes		Item number
Subscale: Commitment	My Family Service Worker is…Caring	FSSPQ7a
	My Family Service Worker is…Understanding	FSSPQ7b
	My Family Service Worker is…Flexible	FSSPQ7d
	My Family Service Worker is…Dependable	FSSPQ7e
	My Family Service Worker is…Trustworthy	FSSPQ7f
	My Family Service Worker is…Respectful	FSSPQ7i
	My Family Service Worker is…Available	FSSPQ7k
	My Family Service Worker sees this job as just a paycheck	FSSPQ8e
Subscale: Respect	My Family Service Worker is…Rude	FSSPQ7c
	My Family Service Worker is…Impatient	FSSPQ7g
	My Family Service Worker is…Unfriendly	FSSPQ7h
	My Family Service Worker is…Judgmental	FSSPQ7j
Subscale: Understanding Context	My Family Service Worker judges my family because of our faith and religion	FSSPQ5a
	My Family Service Worker judges my family because of our culture and values	FSSPQ5b
	My Family Service Worker judges my family because of our race/ethnicity	FSSPQ5c
	My Family Service Worker judges my family because of our financial situation	FSSPQ5d