

**Factor Structure and Predictive Validity of  
the HOME-Short Form for  
Three Racial/Ethnic Groups in the  
National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement**

**Carrie L. Mariner, Martha J. Zaslow, and Barbara Sugland  
Child Trends, Inc.**

**Methods Working Paper # 98.2**

*When examining the effectiveness of parenting measures, the degree to which the measure is valid across racial/ ethnic groups is a critical issue to consider. Although some investigators have expressed concerns with validity of the HOME- Short Form across racial/ ethnic groups, the issue has not been systematically analyzed.*

*The purpose of this working paper is to examine the comparability across three major racial/ethnic groups (European American, African American, and Mexican American) of the factor structure and predictive validity of three versions of the HOME-Short Form (infant/toddler, early childhood, and middle childhood versions) used in the 1988 wave of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement. Factor analyses were carried out examining the factor structure in the full sample and for each racial/ethnic subgroup separately. In the early childhood and middle childhood versions of the HOME-Short Form, there is great similarity in the factor structures found for the three racial/ethnic groups and for the sample as a whole. This is not the case, however, for the infant/toddler version. Prediction to child outcomes in longitudinal analyses was comparable when scales were created based on full-sample factor analyses and on factor analyses for separate racial/ethnic groups. That is, use of race/ethnicity-specific scales did not improve prediction. It is noteworthy, however, that the particular subscales that served as significant predictors of the child behavioral and cognitive outcomes differed for the three racial/ethnic groups.*

*In general, the findings indicate that while the same underlying constructs appear to exist in parenting behavior and the home environment across racial/ethnic groups (except in very early development), these constructs do not relate to later developmental outcomes in the same way across groups. Rather, different aspects of parenting and the home environment serve as the strongest predictors of development for each group.*

**Factor Structure and Predictive Validity of  
the HOME-Short Form for  
Three Racial/Ethnic Groups in the  
National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement**

**Carrie L. Mariner, Martha J. Zaslow, and Barbara Sugland<sup>1</sup>**

**Methods Working Paper # 98.2**

**Introduction**

A key question regarding the usefulness of the HOME-Short Form in survey administration is that of whether it functions similarly when used in different racial/ethnic groups. One way to address this question is to ask whether the factor structure that emerges from factor analyses with the items of the HOME-SF is the same across racial/ethnic groups. A second perspective concerns predictive validity: whether scales formed from the items of the HOME-Short Form predict to child outcomes in a comparable manner across racial/ethnic groups.

In previous work, Sugland and colleagues (1995) examined the comparability across racial/ethnic groups of the early childhood version of the HOME-Short Form, using National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement data from the 1988 wave of data collection. The factor structure and predictive validity of the HOME-SF were examined for European-American, African-American and Mexican American subsamples as well as for the sample as a

---

<sup>1</sup>This paper was completed as part of the work on NICHD Grant No. R01 HD31056. The authors would like to thank Connie Blumenthal and Deanna Cooke for their work on analyses, Deborah Coates for helpful input on interpretation of findings, Kristin A. Moore for input on all phases of this set of analyses, and Julie A. Floryan for much appreciated help in bringing this paper to closure.

whole. In the present paper we report on parallel analyses for the versions of the HOME-Short Form for infancy/toddlerhood and for middle childhood, again using data from the 1988 wave of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement. To present a comprehensive picture across the three age groups (infancy/toddlerhood, early childhood, and middle childhood), we incorporate into our presentation of results a summary of the findings for the early childhood period that have been reported on previously.

Current literature on the HOME-SF is limited to a small number of studies which address racial/ethnic group differences. This information may be especially meaningful in the design of new measures of parenting and the home environment, since differences in the underlying factors in different racial/ethnic groups could warrant either the development of measures specific to these groups or the broadening of a common set of measures to better reflect parenting in all racial/ethnic groups.

## Method

### Sample

**Special Characteristics of the Children of the NLSY.** The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY) is a sample of youth who have been followed into early adulthood. Some of the young women had children, who were then studied in the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement (NLSY-CS) (Baker, Keck, Mott and Quinlan, 1993). Since the original youth were the sampling base, rather than the children of these youth, the children have particular characteristics which could be important to the interpretation of any NLSY-CS data. These children are the first children born in the sample. Therefore, they are born to

younger mothers and are more likely to be first born than the general population of children in the US. Additionally, because the first group of children are born to the youngest mothers in the NLSY, the children of the NLSY are more likely to live in poverty or receive welfare than the general population.

**Characteristics of the Samples Reported on in Present Analyses.** Among different age groups of NLSY-CS children used in the current analyses, important differences also exist. The older the age group of children, the younger their mothers were when they first gave birth. Also, the oldest group of children has mothers who are currently slightly older, less educated, and more likely to be single when compared to younger groups of children (see Table 1). Because the particular child from each family included in the current analyses was selected randomly, those children in the youngest age group are least likely to be first born, when compared to the other age groups in this sample. These differences between the age groups should be kept in mind when interpreting differences in factor structure between the groups.

As shown in Table 1, some differences in sample characteristics also exist between racial/ethnic groups. For example, among mothers of the youngest children (0 to 2.11 years), 13 percent of European-American mothers were unmarried, compared to 28 percent of Hispanic mothers, and 59 percent of African-American mothers.

The total number of eligible children was 5380, although 11% of these children were removed from the analysis when one sibling was selected per family. Hispanics made up 19 percent of the sample, with 29 percent African American, and 52 percent white.

### **Measures Used in Present Analyses**

Three versions of the HOME-SF were used: Infant/Toddler, for 0-2.11 year old children; Early Childhood, for 3-5.11 year olds; and Middle Childhood, for 6-9.11 year olds. The Infant/Toddler version has 18 items, 10 answered by the mother, and 8 rated by the interviewer. The Early Childhood version has 27 items (15 maternal report, 12 interviewer rating), as does the Middle Childhood version (17 maternal report, 10 interviewer rating). Both the maternal report items and the interviewer ratings were collected during an in-home interview, during which both the mother and the child were present.

The measures of child well-being were taken in 1990, and included the PIAT Reading Recognition subtest and the Behavior Problems Index (BPI). The PIAT (Peabody Individual Achievement Test) measures word recognition and pronunciation ability for children ages five and up. The BPI is a sum of 28 items measuring a wide range of problems, such as cheating, fighting, unhappiness, and confusion. More information about these measures can be found in the NLSY Child Handbook (Baker, Keck, Mott and Quinlan, 1993).

Covariates used in regression analyses were measured in 1988, and included dummy variables for mother's education less than high school and high school, no college; mother not married; mother a teen at child's birth; child gender; and child weight less than 2,500 grams at birth.

### **Strategy of Analysis**

Three types of analyses were conducted. First, principal axis factor analyses with oblique rotation was performed on both the full sample and the three racial/ethnic group subsamples. Oblique rotation was used to allow correlations between the different components of parenting,

since previous research in the field of parenting supports this expectation. Second, Cronbach's alpha was calculated for factor-based subscales in each of the samples. Third, ordinary least squares regressions were run, predicting the PIAT and BPI from new subscales made based on the factor analyses.

## Results

### Full Sample Analyses

The factor structures derived from looking at the full sample (that is, all racial/ethnic groups combined) are reported for the three age groups, infant/toddler (0 to 2 years), early childhood (3 to 5 years), and middle childhood (6 to 10 years), in Tables 2a to 2c. Those items which did not load at .30 or higher are not listed in the tables, which contain only the strongest loadings for each item.

In comparing the three age groups, the first thing which stands out is a difference in the number of factors. This may well be an artifact, however, of the number of items on the different scales. The Infant/Toddler scale has only 15 items, while the Early Childhood and Middle Childhood scales have more than 20. Thus, no strong conclusions can be drawn. Additionally, due to differences in item content, the emergence of a *School-Preparation* factor during early childhood, an *Expectations-of-Self-Care* factor in middle childhood, and *Physical-Environment* factors at both older ages cannot be interpreted as the emergence of new factors at these ages. Perhaps the only interpretable aspect of the comparison between the three age groups is that the items which remain similar on the three scales lead to similar factors of *Stimulation* and *Positive Maternal Involvement* in all three age groups.

### **Analyses for the Separate Racial/Ethnic Groups: Early Childhood**

**Factor Analyses.** Next, we will look within each age group and compare the factors derived from analyses with the full sample to the factors that emerge from analyses within each race/ethnicity group. To recapitulate what was discussed in the earlier article by Sugland and colleagues (1995), in the early childhood group, the full sample analyses found five factors, *Stimulation, School Preparation, Positive Maternal Involvement, Physical Environment, and No Observed Physical Punishment* (see Table 2b). These five factors are reproduced almost item for item in each of the three racial/ethnic groups, although the importance of the factors varies between groups (see Table 3).

Cronbach's alphas on subscales formed on the basis of full sample analyses and separate analyses for the three racial/ethnic groups are of similar magnitude to each other and slightly larger than the alphas of the two original HOME-SF subscales (Table 4).

**Prediction to Child Outcomes.** Subscales were formed on the basis of factor analyses with the full sample and the separate racial/ethnic group samples. Unit weighting of items, reversing negative loadings where appropriate, was used. Longitudinal predictions of PIAT Reading Recognition scores and Behavior Problem Index scores from these factor-based subscales also demonstrates the similarity of the full-sample and racial/ethnic group factors (Tables 5 and 6). It should be noted that, while the figures in Tables 5 and 6 are identical to those reported by Sugland and colleagues (1995), the significance levels are not. Rather, we report here on analyses referred to in the footnotes in Sugland et al. (1995) that rely on a procedure called "weighting up," in which the significance levels of the smaller groups

(Hispanic-Americans and African-Americans) are calculated as though the number of participants was equal to the number in the largest group (European-Americans).

To compare the percent of variance explained by each set of factor subscales, the appropriate figures to compare are the “R<sup>2</sup> Change” in models 2 and 3 of each analysis. Interestingly, while the subscales formed on the basis of analyses with the full sample and on the basis of the analyses for the three racial/ethnic groups separately predicted similar amounts of variance to each other, both predicted slightly better to the PIAT (2% to 7%) than to the BPI (2% to 5%) and the prediction patterns were different in the different racial/ethnic groups.

Since the findings for the factors based on the combined sample and the factors based on analyses for the separate racial/ethnic groups were so similar, further discussion will be limited to the findings regarding the scales developed from the factors for the combined sample (model 2). Among Hispanic-American 3-to-5-year olds, *Physical Environment* was the strongest predictor of BPI scores, while *No Observed Physical Punishment* predicted PIAT best. Among both African-Americans and European-Americans, *Stimulation*, which was not significant in the Hispanic-American group, even after weighting up the small sample, was the strongest predictor of the BPI. *Stimulation* was also the strongest predictor of the PIAT in European-Americans, but no scale clearly stood out in predicting the PIAT scores of African-Americans during early childhood. As was reported by Sugland and colleagues (1995), more of the scales predicted significantly in the European-American sample, but the difference across racial/ethnic groups was less dramatic using the weighted up results.

#### **Analyses of the Separate Racial/Ethnic Groups: Middle Childhood**



**Factor Analyses.** Looking next at the middle childhood group (ages 6 to 10), we see a somewhat similar pattern of results in the factor analysis. As in early childhood, the combined sample analysis found five factors (Table 2c), which, while different in content from the early-childhood factors, are replicated in each of the three racial/ethnic groups for the middle-childhood age range (Table 7). Again, the order of the factors varies between the groups. In this case, however, one factor, *Stimulation*, is not as similar across groups as the others are. The combined sample *Stimulation* factor has six items, as does the *Stimulation* factor in the African-American sample. However, the *Stimulation* factor has only four of these six items in the European-American sample, and only three in the Hispanic-American sample. Yet, these differences do not seem to reflect a major difference in the concept of stimulation. Rather, all three race-specific factors still seem to point toward literacy and enrichment as stimulation. As with the early childhood sample, Cronbach's alphas for both the combined sample and race/ethnicity-specific factor subscales are similar to or higher than the alphas for the original HOME-SF subscales and are similar to each other (Table 8).

**Prediction to Child Outcomes.** Concerning the longitudinal predictions of the PIAT and BPI, the middle childhood data again confirm the similarity of the combined sample and separate race/ethnicity factors. Differences in prediction between the combined sample and race/ethnicity-specific factor subscales are minimal and the percent of variance explained is similar (Tables 9 and 10).

As with early childhood, differences between racial/ethnic groups emerge in the patterns of prediction, that is, which specific scales serve as the strongest predictors of child outcomes for

each group. Again as for the early childhood results, findings for the combined sample factors will be discussed.

In this age group, *Physical Environment* is again the best predictor of BPI scores among Hispanic-Americans. The three factors which are similar in the two age groups, *Positive Maternal Involvement*, *Stimulation*, and *Physical Environment*, predict similar amounts of variance in PIAT scores in middle and early childhood among Hispanics, but the strongest predictor during early childhood, *No Observed Physical Punishment*, is no longer measured in middle childhood. Among African-Americans, *Stimulation*, which was the strongest predictor of BPI scores in early childhood has a beta of .01 (not significant), while the *Paternal Involvement* factor is the strongest predictor in middle childhood (-.14,  $p < .001$ ), followed closely by *Positive Maternal Involvement* (.12,  $p < .01$ ).

The finding of Sugland and colleagues (1995) at early childhood that prediction is more consistent among European-Americans is not evident during middle childhood. That is, for this age group, none of the racial/ethnic groups clearly shows more consistent prediction of HOME subscales to child outcomes. Overall, prediction of BPI and PIAT is slightly weaker in middle childhood than in early childhood, and patterns of prediction within racial/ethnic groups are only partially replicated between early and middle childhood.

#### **Analyses of the Specific Racial/Ethnic Groups: Infants and Toddlers**

**Factor Analyses.** The youngest group of children, infants and toddlers, shows an entirely different pattern than that found at other ages. There are three factors in the combined sample, *Stimulation*, *Positive Maternal Involvement*, and *Non-Punitiveness* (Table 2a). When we look at

the analyses by racial/ethnic groups, however, we see that the three factors are not reproduced closely in any of the racial/ethnic groups (see Table 11). While the Hispanic-American group does have a three-factor structure, none of the three factors are similar to the factors for the combined sample. Among Hispanic-American infants and toddlers, in contrast to the pattern for the combined sample, *Stimulation* does not include toys. Rather, *Toys* make up a third factor, which has no parallel in the combined sample analyses. Factor 2 among Hispanic-Americans is titled *Positive Maternal Involvement*, but actually includes both the items from the combined sample involvement factor, plus *Non-Punitiveness* items. These results suggest the existence of four constructs - stimulation, toys, positive maternal involvement, and non-punitiveness - which are combined differently into three factors in the combined sample and the separate Hispanic-American sample.

This idea of four constructs is supported in the European-American sample of infants and toddlers, which has four factors, essentially representing the four constructs discussed above (Table 11). The African-American sample, on the other hand, has a combined stimulation and toys factor, a *Non-Punitiveness* factor, and a *Positive Maternal Involvement* factor, as would be expected from the four constructs, but also adds a fourth factor different from any of the others. Factor 4 is titled *Mother-Views-Self-as-Social-Partner/Teacher*. This factor is made of two items which did not load on any factors in the other racial/ethnic groups or the combined sample. The two items concern talking to the child while working, and believing in spending time to teach children rather than letting children learn on their own.

**Prediction to Child Outcomes.** While this finding could mean that this particular type

of maternal involvement is important in the home environments of very young African-American children, results of longitudinal predictions do not support this view. Factor 4 does not predict significantly to either the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (Table 12) or the Behavior Problems Index (Table 13), measured four years after the HOME. Also, it should be noted that this unique African-American factor is made up of mother-report items, while the maternal-involvement factor found in African-Americans, European-Americans and the combined sample contains only observational items. It is possible that this unique factor is simply a mother-reported-maternal-involvement factor. While further evidence would be needed to draw a firm conclusion, the lack of prediction to both a cognitive and a social/behavioral outcome measure suggests that this particular race/ethnicity-specific factor is not very important to understanding the home environments of young children.

Looking now at the full pattern of predictions to PPVT-R and BPI in the infant/toddler sample, we see that factors derived from the combined sample analyses and the analyses within the separate racial/ethnic groups again predict similar amounts of variance (Tables 12 and 13). In a dramatic departure from the results from the two other age groups, one prediction, PPVT-R in Hispanic-Americans, has a much larger percent of explained variance (13% to 14%) than any of the other predictions (1% to 5%). This seems to be the result of strong prediction by the *Positive-Maternal-Involvement* subscale, whether looked at in the combined sample (model 2) or race/ethnicity specific (model 3) analysis.

As with the other two age groups, the patterns of prediction differ somewhat between racial/ethnic groups looked at using the combined sample factor subscales. However, differences

in predictive patterns are more difficult to interpret, since the race/ethnicity-specific factors differ substantially between the racial/ethnic groups in the infant/toddler sample.

Concerning the reliabilities of the factor subscales in the infant/toddler sample, the combined sample and race/ethnicity-specific subscales are again comparable to or better than the original HOME-SF subscales, yet similar to each other (Table 14). The one exception to this finding is the combined sample *Non-Punitiveness* subscale applied to the Hispanic-American group. In this case, the alpha was noticeably lower than the alpha for the original HOME-SF subscale of Emotional Support (alpha=.31 versus .48). This is in keeping with the finding that *Non-Punitiveness* combines with *Maternal Involvement* in the Hispanic-American sample, rather than standing alone as a factor.

### Discussion

In conclusion, by comparing factor analyses performed in a combined sample to analyses performed in separate-race/ethnicity samples, we can draw three conclusions. First, the factor structures are similar among the racial/ethnic groups in early and middle childhood, but quite different in infancy/toddlerhood. It should be remembered that the infant/toddler group is the least skewed by the special sampling method used in the NLSY-CS. These children are the least likely to have mothers who were very young at first birth and are most likely to have better-educated, married mothers. This subsample is also less biased toward firstborns. Because it cannot be determined from the data currently available whether the differences between the three age groups are the result of sampling bias or whether they are substantive differences, this issue clearly requires further investigation.

Second, the use of subscales based on the factors found for specific race/ethnicity samples neither increases nor decreases the amount of variance explained in predicting to developmental outcomes in any of the three age groups. This is not surprising, given that for two of the age groups studied, the same items tended to load on both the combined sample and race/ethnicity-specific factors, despite some differences in the arrangement of these items.

Third, even where the combined sample and race/ethnicity-specific factors are quite similar, the particular subscales which predict the BPI and the PPVT-R or PIAT are different in the different racial/ethnic groups. This suggests that while very similar underlying constructs exist in the home environments of different racial/ethnic groups, the constructs do not relate to later outcomes in the same way. For example, during middle childhood, although a *Paternal Involvement* factor emerges in all three racial/ethnic groups, it does not predict behavior problems in Hispanics or European-Americans, but is the most important predictor of behavior problems in African-Americans. Clearly, this has important implications for different family processes in the three groups.

Based on these conclusions, three recommendations can be made for the development of future measures. First, the complexity of racial/ethnic group factor patterns in the period of infancy/toddlerhood (ages 0 to 2 years) seems to necessitate a measure with a greater number of items than is currently available in the HOME-SF. The HOME-SF scale for this age group has fewer items than the scales for either of the other two age groups. By expanding the number of items, a future measure could shed more light on the complex factor patterns found at this age. Second, we can proceed with some confidence in relying upon measures for early and middle

childhood with one set of items and subscales for all three of the racial/ethnic groups studied; and measures development work for these age groups can aim for a set of items that can be used appropriately across the three major racial/ethnic groups in the United States. Third, when measures of the home environment are modified or extended in further work, it will be important to ask whether, as in the present analyses, different subscales serve as the best basis for predicting child outcomes across different racial/ethnic groups.

Table 1  
 Characteristics of African-American Mothers in NLSY-CS 1988, One Sibling Study Sample<sup>1</sup>

Characteristic of Focal Child's Mother	Hispanic Mothers			African-American Mothers			European-American Mothers		
	Children Ages 0-2.11	Children Ages 3-5.11	Children Ages 6-9.11	Children Ages 0-2.11	Children Ages 3-5.11	Children Ages 6-9.11	Children Ages 0-2.11	Children Ages 3-5.11	Children Ages 6-9.11
Currently Single	28%	20%	38%	59%	63%	66%	13%	24%	29%
Younger than 25 years	20%	17%	7%	22%	21%	8%	13%	11%	6%
Education:									
< 12 years	28%	33%	37%	18%	19%	25%	9%	15%	21%
12 years	43%	43%	43%	45%	51%	52%	53%	57%	60%
> 12 years	30%	24%	20%	37%	30%	23%	39%	28%	19%
Eligible Sample Size	311	327	373	415	495	630	944	970	915

1. Some information taken from Tables 1a, 1b, and 1c of Sugland, B.W., Zaslow, M., Smith, J.R., Brooks-Gunn, J., Coates, D., Blumenthal, C., Moore, K.A., Griffin, T., & Bradley, R.H. (1995), unpublished manuscript.



Table 2a  
Factor Structure for All Races for the HOME-SF for Child Ages 0 through 2 years 11 months

Item and Description	Loading
All Races:	
<i>Factor 1, Stimulation:</i>	
Has at least 10 children's books	.77
Parent reads to child	.70
Number of push/pull toys child has	.43
Number of cuddly toys child has	.42
<i>Factor 2, Positive Maternal Involvement:</i>	
Parent spoke to child twice or more	.63
Parent responded verbally to child's speech	.59
<i>Factor 3, Non-Punitiveness:</i>	
Parent did not slap/spank child	.50
Parent did not restrict child's exploration	.39
Number of times parent spanked child in past week	.36

SOURCE: Child Trends, Inc., calculations of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement 1988 data, One Sibling Study Sample.

NOTES: Table values are based on weighted data.  
Only items which loaded at .30 or higher on at least one factor are included in the table.  
The highest loading was chosen for items with more than one loading above the .30 cutoff.

Table 2b  
Factor Structure for All Races for the HOME-SF for Child Ages 3 through 5 years 11 months

Item and Description	Loading
<b>All Races:</b>	
<i>Factor 1, Stimulation:</i>	
Parent reads to child	.64
Has at least 10 children's books	.52
Has 5 tapes/records and tape recorder	.37
Child taken on outing	.35
Family gets magazines regularly	.35
Child taken to museum	.33
<i>Factor 2, School Preparation:</i>	
Parent helps child learn numbers	-.85
Parent helps child learn colors	-.78
Parent helps child learn alphabet	-.75
Parent helps child learn shapes	-.61
<i>Factor 3, Positive Maternal Involvement:</i>	
Parent conversed with child at least twice	-.76
Parent answered child's questions verbally	-.67
Parent's voice conveyed positive feeling	-.64
<i>Factor 4, Physical Environment:</i>	
House/apartment reasonably clean	-.82
House/apartment minimally cluttered	-.56
Child's play environment is safe	-.54
Home not dark/perceptually monotonous	-.51
<i>Factor 5, No Observed Physical Punishment:</i>	
Parent did not slap/spank child	.74
Parent did not restrict/shake/grab child	.63

SOURCE: Child Trends, Inc., calculations of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement 1988 data, One Sibling Study Sample.

NOTES: Table values are based on weighted data.  
Only items which loaded at .30 or higher on at least one factor are included in the table.  
The highest loading was chosen for items with more than one loading above the .30 cutoff.

Table 2c  
Factor Structure for All Races for the HOME-SF for Child Ages 6 through 9 years 11 months

Item and Description	Loading
<b>All Races:</b>	
<i>Factor 1, Stimulation:</i>	
Child taken to museum	.56
Child taken to theater/concert	.53
Parent reads to child	.38
Child reads for enjoyment	.34
Child gets lessons/does activities	.33
Child has musical instrument	.32
<i>Factor 2, Expectations of Self Care</i>	
Child expected to clean own room	.73
Child expected to make bed	.63
Child expected to clean up after spills	.60
Child expected to pick up after self	.56
<i>Factor 3, Paternal Involvement:</i>	
Child spends time with father/father figure	-.86
Child eats meal with both mother and father/father figure	-.74
Child spends time in outdoor activities with father/father figure	-.67
<i>Factor 4, Positive Maternal Involvement</i>	
Parent conveys positive feeling	-.78
Parent answers child's questions verbally	-.74
Parent introduces interviewer by name	-.59
Parent encourages child to contribute to conversation	-.51
<i>Factor 5, Physical Environment:</i>	
House/apartment reasonably clean	-.75
Home not dark/perceptually monotonous	-.54
House/apartment minimally cluttered	-.51

SOURCE: Child Trends, Inc., calculations of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement 1988 data, One Sibling Study Sample.

NOTES: Table values are based on weighted data.  
Only items which loaded at .30 or higher on at least one factor are included in the table.  
The highest loading was chosen for items with more than one loading above the .30 cutoff.

Table 3  
Factor Structure by Race/Ethnicity for the HOME-SF for Child Ages 3 through 5 years 11 months

Item and Description	Loading	Item and Description	Loading
<b>Hispanic-American:</b>		<i>Factor 3, Stimulation:</i>	
<i>Factor 1, Stimulation:</i>		Parent reads to child	.53
Parent reads to child	.71	Child taken to museum	.49
Has at least 10 children's books	.57	Child taken on outing	.42
Child taken to museum	.54	Has 5 tapes/records and tape recorder	.41
Has 5 tapes/records and tape recorder	.41	Has at least 10 children's books	.39
Child taken on outing	.39	Family gets magazines regularly	.35
Family gets magazines regularly	.32		
<i>Factor 2, School Preparation:</i>		<i>Factor 4, Physical Environment:</i>	
Parent helps child learn alphabet	-.81	House/apartment reasonably clean	.75
Parent helps child learn colors	-.81	House/apartment minimally cluttered	.61
Parent helps child learn numbers	-.75	Child's play environment is safe	.58
Parent helps child learn shapes	-.62	Home not dark/perceptually monotonous	.45
<i>Factor 3, No Observed Physical Punishment:</i>		<i>Factor 5, No Observed Physical Punishment:</i>	
Parent did not slap/spank child	-.86	Parent did not slap/spank child	.58
Parent did not restrict/shake/grab child	-.86	Parent did not restrict/shake/grab child	.50
Number times child spanked in past week	-.30	Number times child spanked past week	.49
<i>Factor 4, Positive Maternal Involvement:</i>		<b>European-American:</b>	
Parent conversed with child at least twice	-.69	<i>Factor 1, Stimulation:</i>	
Parent answered child's questions verbally	-.68	Parent reads to child	.57
Parent's voice conveyed positive feeling	-.62	Has at least 10 children's books	.42
		If child hit parent, parent would hit back	.39
<i>Factor 5, Physical Environment:</i>		Family gets magazines regularly	.36
House/apartment reasonably clean	-.70	Child taken to museum	.36
House/apartment minimally cluttered	-.62	Has 5 tapes/records and tape recorder	.33
Home not dark/perceptually monotonous	-.54		
Child's play environment is safe	-.42	<i>Factor 2, School Preparation:</i>	
		Parent helps child learn numbers	-.86
<b>African-American:</b>		Parent helps child learn colors	-.80
<i>Factor 1, School Preparation:</i>		Parent helps child learn alphabet	-.75
Parent helps child learn numbers	.88	Parent helps child learn shapes	-.65
Parent helps child learn colors	.75	<i>Factor 3, Positive Maternal Involvement:</i>	
Parent helps child learn alphabet	.74	Parent conversed with child at least twice	-.75
<i>Factor 2, Positive Maternal Involvement:</i>		Parent's voice conveyed positive feeling	-.68
Parent conversed with child at least twice	.75	Parent answered child's questions verbally	-.60
Parent answered child's questions verbally	.69	<i>Factor 4, Physical Environment:</i>	
Parent's voice conveyed positive feeling	.69	House/apartment reasonably clean	-.82
		Child's play environment is safe	-.58
		Home not dark/perceptually monotonous	-.56
		House/apartment minimally cluttered	-.54
		<i>Factor 5, No Observed Physical Punishment:</i>	
		Parent did not slap/spank child	-.77
		Parent did not restrict/shake/grab child	-.58

SOURCE: Child Trends, Inc., calculations of the NLSY-Child Supplement 1988 data, One Sibling Study Sample.  
NOTES: Table values are based on weighted data. Only items which loaded at .30 or higher on at least one factor are included in the table. The highest loading was chosen for items with more than one loading above the .30 cutoff.

Table 4

Reliabilities of HOME-SF Cognitive Stimulation Sub-Scale, HOME-SF Socioemotional Sub-Scale, and of New Parenting Scales Based on All Race and Race-Specific Factor Analyses for Child Ages 3 through 5 years 11 months

Sub-Scale Description	Chronbach's Alpha			
	All Races	Hispanic-American	African-American	European-American
<b>HOME-SF Sub-Scales</b>				
Cognitive Stimulation	.71	.69	.72	.70
Socioemotional Support	.59	.60	.52	.57
<b>New Sub-Scales Based on Factor Analyses of All Races</b>				
Stimulation	.58	.65	.62	.51
School Preparation	.84	.83	.81	.85
Positive Maternal Involvement	.73	.69	.76	.72
Physical Environment	.70	.66	.68	.71
No Observed Physical Punishment	.63 ( $r=.46$ ) <sup>a</sup>	.86 ( $r=.76$ )	.59 ( $r=.42$ )	.60 ( $r=.43$ )
<b>New Sub-Scales Based on Factor Analyses Separately by Race</b>				
Stimulation	--	.65	.62	.53
School Preparation	--	.83	.82	.85
Non-Punitive/No Observed Physical Punishment	--	.71	.59	.60
Positive Maternal Involvement	--	.69	.76	.72
Physical Environment	--	.66	.68	.71

SOURCE: Child Trends, Inc., calculations of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement 1988 data, One Sibling Study Sample.

NOTES: Table values are based on weighted data.  
Correlation coefficients ( $r$ ) are shown in addition to alpha for two-item sub-scales.

Table 5  
 OLS Regression Analyses of Parenting Sub-Scales Predicting PIAT Reading Recognition, 3 to 5 and 11 month year olds, Weighted Up Analyses

	Hispanic-American (N=217)			African-American (N=340)			European-American (N=488)		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<b>Controls</b>									
Mother's Education less than high school	-.43***	-.31***	-.31***	-.30***	-.29***	-.29***	-.28***	-.21***	-.23***
Mother's Education high school, no college	-.34***	-.26***	-.26***	-.09*	-.07+	-.07+	-.17***	-.13**	-.14***
Marital Status - Single	.05	.07+	.07*	-.09*	-.09+*	-.09*	.03	.07*	.07+
Age at first birth less than 20	-.08*	-.10**	-.11**	-.05	-.03	-.03	-.04	-.04	-.04
Gender of child-male	-.16***	-.11***	-.10**	-.03	-.03	-.03	-.08**	-.05	-.05
Low birth weight child (less than 2,500 g)	-.04	-.05	-.05	-.13***	-.11**	-.11**	-.06+	-.06	-.06
<b>Sub-scales based on Analyses of Total Sample</b>									
Stimulation		.10**			.10***			.15***	
School Preparation		.05			.04			.10**	
Positive Maternal Involvement		.07+			.09**			.09**	
Physical Environment		.11**			-.05			.07+	
No observed Punishment		.19***			-.11**			.09*	
<b>Sub-scales Based on Analyses of Race-Specific Samples</b>									
Stimulation			.09*			.10**			.10**
School Preparation			.05			.03			.11**
Positive Maternal Involvement			.06+			.09*			.09**
Physical Environment			.11**			-.05			.07*
No Observed Punishment			.09***			-.06			.09*
R <sup>2</sup>	.17***	.25***	.24***	.12***	.15***	.14***	.08***	.14***	.13***
R <sup>2</sup> Change <sup>a</sup>		.07***	.07***		.03***	.02**		.06***	.05**

SOURCE: Child Trends, Inc., calculations of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement 1988 data, One Sibling Study Sample.

NOTES: <sup>a</sup>This statistic compares the R<sup>2</sup> in Model 1 to the applicable model.  
 + p<0.10; \* p<0.05; \*\* p<0.01; \*\*\* p<0.001.

Table 6  
 OLS Regression Analyses of Parenting Sub-Scales Predicting Behavior Problems Index (BPI), 3 to 5 and 11 month year olds, Weighted Up Analyses

	Hispanic-American (N=222)			African-American (N=349)			European-American (N=508)		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<b>Controls</b>									
Mother's Education less than high school	.02	-.01	-.01	-.05	-.10*	-.11*	.06	.01	.02
Mother's Education high school, no college	-.01	-.004	-.0007	-.06	-.10*	-.10*	.05	-.01	.0006
Marital Status - Single	.12**	.13**	.13**	.15***	.12***	.12***	.18***	.15***	.15***
Age at first birth less than 20	.06	.04	.04	.05	.03	.03	-.03	-.04	-.04
Gender of child-male	.07+	.07+	.07+	.00009	-.01	-.02	-.08*	-.11**	-.10**
Low birth weight child (less than 2,500 g)	-.06	-.06	-.06	.04	.01	.01	.03	.02	.03
<b>Sub-scales based on Analyses of Total Sample</b>									
Stimulation		-.05			-.16***			-.16**	
School Preparation		.06			-.05			-.06+	
Positive Maternal Involvement		.07+			-.05			-.05	
Physical Environment		-.14***			.04			-.09**	
No observed Punishment		.03			-.09*			-.03	
<b>Sub-scales Based on Analyses of Race-Specific Samples</b>									
Stimulation			-.05			-.16***			-.14***
School Preparation			.06			-.03			-.08
Positive Maternal Involvement			.06			-.05			-.05
Physical Environment			-.14***			.04			-.10**
No Observed Punishment			.05			-.12**			-.03
R <sup>2</sup>	.03***	.06***	.06***	.03**	.07***	.08***	.05***	.10***	.09***
R <sup>2</sup> Change <sup>a</sup>		.03**	.03***		.04***	.05***		.05***	.05***

SOURCE: Child Trends, Inc., calculations of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement 1988 data, One Sibling Study Sample.

NOTES: \*This statistic compares the R<sup>2</sup> in Model 1 to the applicable model.  
 + p<0.10; \* p<0.05; \*\* p<0.01; \*\*\* p<0.001.

Table 7  
Factor Structure by Race/Ethnicity for the HOME-SF for Child Ages 6 through 9 years 11 months

Item and Description	Loading	Item and Description	Loading
<b>Hispanic-American:</b>			
<i>Factor 1, Expectations of Self-Care</i>			
Child is expected to pick up after self	.83	<i>Factor 4, Stimulation:</i>	
Child is expected to clean spills	.69	Child taken to museum	.66
Child is expected to clean own room	.58	Child taken to theater/concert	.65
Child is expected to make bed	.55	Child has musical instrument	.44
		Child gets lessons/does activities	.41
		Parent encourages hobbies	.39
		Parent reads to child	.34
<i>Factor 2, Paternal Involvement</i>			
Child spends time with father/father figure	.86	<i>Factor 5, Physical Environment:</i>	
Child spends time with father outdoors	.71	House/apartment reasonably clean	.79
Child eats meals with both mother and father	.69	Home not dark/perceptually monotonous	.49
		House/apartment minimally cluttered	.46
<i>Factor 3, Positive Maternal Involvement:</i>			
Parent answered child's questions verbally	.78	<b>European-American:</b>	
Parent's voice conveyed positive feeling	.71	<i>Factor 1, Positive Maternal Involvement:</i>	
Parent encouraged child to contribute to conversation	.45	Parent's voice conveyed positive feeling	.77
		Parent answered child's questions verbally	.74
		Parent introduced interviewer to child	.61
<i>Factor 4, Physical Environment:</i>			
House/apartment reasonably clean	.79	<i>Factor 2, Expectations of Self-Care</i>	
House/apartment minimally cluttered	.65	Child is expected to clean own room	.71
Home not dark/perceptually monotonous	.60	Child is expected to make bed	.63
		Child is expected to clean spills	.56
		Child is expected to pick up after self	.49
<i>Factor 5, Stimulation:</i>			
Parent reads to child	.41	<i>Factor 3, Paternal Involvement</i>	
Child gets lessons/does activities	.41	Child spends time with father/father figure	-.82
Has at least 10 children's books	.39	Child eats meals with both mother and father	-.71
		Child spends time with father outdoors	-.66
<b>African-American:</b>			
<i>Factor 1, Expectations of Self-Care</i>			
Child is expected to clean spills	.81	<i>Factor 4, Stimulation:</i>	
Child is expected to clean own room	.77	Child taken to museum	.56
Child is expected to pick up after self	.73	Child taken to theater/concert	.51
Child is expected to make bed	.61	Child reads for enjoyment	.38
		Parent reads to child	.33
<i>Factor 2, Paternal Involvement</i>			
Child spends time with father/father figure	.86	<i>Factor 5 Physical Environment:</i>	
Child spends time with father outdoors	.74	House/apartment reasonably clean	-.71
Child eats meals with both mother and father	.73	Home not dark/perceptually monotonous	-.56
		House/apartment minimally cluttered	-.53
<i>Factor 3, Positive Maternal Involvement:</i>			
Parent's voice conveyed positive feeling	-.81		
Parent answered child's questions verbally	-.68		
Parent encouraged child to contribute to conversation	-.67		
Parent introduced interviewer to child	-.59		

SOURCE: Child Trends, Inc., calculations of the NLSY-Child Supplement 1988 data, One Sibling Study Sample.

NOTES: Table values are based on weighted data. Only items which loaded at .30 or higher on at least one factor are included in the table. The highest loading was chosen for items with more than one loading above the .30 cutoff.



Table 8  
 Reliabilities of HOME-SF Cognitive Stimulation Sub-Scale, HOME-SF Socioemotional Sub-Scale, and of  
 New Parenting Scales Based on All Race and Race-Specific Factor Analyses for Child Ages 6 through 9 years 11 months

Sub-Scale Description	Chronbach's Alpha			
	All Races	Hispanic- American	African- American	European- American
<b>HOME-SF Sub-Scales</b>				
Cognitive Stimulation	.60	.58	.63	.58
Socioemotional Support	.60	.57	.65	.54
<b>New Sub-Scales Based on Factor Analyses of All Races</b>				
Stimulation	.54	.50	.62	.51
Positive Maternal Involvement	.74	.62	.77	.73
Physical Environment	.63	.70	.68	.60
Expectations of Self Care	.74	.79	.81	.71
Paternal Involvement	.78	.90	.91	.86
<b>New Sub-Scales Based on Factor Analyses Separately by Race</b>				
Stimulation	--	.45	.65	.49
Positive Maternal Involvement	--	.62	.77	.75
Physical Environment	--	.70	.68	.60
Expectations of Self Care	--	.79	.81	.71
Paternal Involvement	--	.90	.91	.86

SOURCE: Child Trends, Inc., calculations of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement 1988 data, One Sibling Study Sample.

NOTES: Table values are based on weighted data.  
 Correlation coefficients ( $r$ ) are shown in addition to alpha for two-item sub-scales.

Table 9  
 OLS Regression Analyses of Parenting Sub-Scales Predicting PIAT Reading Recognition, 6 to 9 and 11 month year olds, Weighted Up Analyses

	Hispanic-American (N=208)			African-American (N=380)			European-American (N=393)		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<b>Controls</b>									
Mother's Education less than high school	-.29***	-.22***	-.21***	-.27***	-.25***	-.25***	-.28***	-.22***	-.23***
Mother's Education high school, no college	-.09+	-.05	-.05	-.13**	-.12**	-.12**	-.14**	-.09+	-.09+
Marital Status - Single	-.07+	.004	.03	-.06	-.01	-.01	-.02	-.04	-.04
Age at first birth less than 20	-.05	-.04	-.02	.01	.02	.02	-.12**	-.10*	-.11**
Gender of child-male	-.05	-.04	-.03	-.10**	-.10**	-.10**	-.12**	-.12**	-.12**
Low birth weight child (less than 2,500 g)	-.16***	-.14***	-.15***	-.09**	-.08*	-.08*	-.12**	-.12**	-.12**
<b>Sub-scales based on Analyses of Total Sample</b>									
Stimulation		.08*			.08*			.13***	
Expectations of Self-Care		.04			.04			-.03	
Paternal Involvement		.11*			.05			-.07	
Positive Maternal Involvement		.07+			-.04			.09*	
Physical Environment		.09**			.10**			.13**	
<b>Sub-scales Based on Analyses of Race-Specific Samples</b>									
Stimulation			.14***			.05			.13**
Expectations of Self-Care			.04			.04			-.03
Paternal Involvement			.12**			.05			-.07
Positive Maternal Involvement			.03			-.04			.09*
Physical Environment			.10**			.10**			.14***
R <sup>2</sup>	.10***	.13***	.14***	.08***	.10***	.10***	.12***	.17***	.17***
R <sup>2</sup> Change <sup>a</sup>		.03***	.04***		.02**	.02**		.05***	.05***

SOURCE: Child Trends, Inc., calculations of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement 1988 data, One Sibling Study Sample.

NOTES: <sup>a</sup>This statistic compares the R<sup>2</sup> in Model 1 to the applicable model.  
 + p<0.10; \* p<0.05; \*\* p<0.01; \*\*\* p<0.001.

Table 10  
 OLS Regression Analyses of Parenting Sub-Scales Predicting Behavior Problems Index (BPI), 6 to 9 and 11 month year olds, Weighted Up Analyses

	Hispanic-American (N=218)			African-American (N=372)			European-American (N=413)		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<b>Controls</b>									
Mother's Education less than high school	.22***	.16**	.16**	.12*	.12*	.12**	.11*	.04	.05
Mother's Education high school, no college	.16**	.11*	.11*	.07	.08+	.08	.08	.03	.04
Marital Status - Single	.14***	.14**	.12**	.13***	.06	.06	.13***	.08+	.09+
Age at first birth less than 20	-.005	-.02	-.03	-.13***	-.13***	-.13***	-.04	-.05	-.05
Gender of child-male	.001	-.02	-.02	-.07+	-.06+	-.06+	.04	.02	.01
Low birth weight child (less than 2,500 g)	-.12***	-.14***	-.13***	.08*	.07*	.07*	.08+	.07+	.07+
<b>Sub-scales based on Analyses of Total Sample</b>									
Stimulation		-.11**			.01			-.14***	
Expectations of Self-Care		-.02			-.05			-.07+	
Paternal Involvement		-.03			-.14***			-.06	
Positive Maternal Involvement		.10**			.12**			-.02	
Physical Environment		-.20***			-.04			-.13**	
<b>Sub-scales Based on Analyses of Race-Specific Samples</b>									
Stimulation			-.14***			.02			-.13***
Expectations of Self-Care			-.02			-.05			-.06
Paternal Involvement			-.06			-.14***			-.06
Positive Maternal Involvement			.14***			.11**			.02
Physical Environment			-.21***			-.04			-.14***
R <sup>2</sup>	.06***	.12***	.12***	.05***	.08***	.08***	.03**	.08***	.07***
R <sup>2</sup> Change <sup>a</sup>		.06***	.06***		.03***	.03***		.05***	.04***

SOURCE: Child Trends, Inc., calculations of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement 1988 data, One Sibling Study Sample.

NOTES: <sup>a</sup>This statistic compares the R<sup>2</sup> in Model 1 to the applicable model.  
 + p<0.10; \* p<0.05; \*\* p<0.01; \*\*\* p<0.001.

Table 11  
Factor Structure by Race/Ethnicity for the HOME-SF for Child Ages 0 through 2 years 11 months

Item and Description	Loading	Item and Description	Loading
<b>Hispanic-American:</b>			
<i>Factor 1, Stimulation:</i>			
Parent reads to child	.71	<i>Factor 3, Positive Maternal Involvement:</i>	
Has at least 10 children's books	.66	Parent answered child's questions verbally	-.67
Child taken on outing	.44	Parent conversed with child at least twice	-.53
<i>Factor 2, Positive Maternal Involvement:</i>			
Parent conversed with child at least twice	.62	<i>Factor 4, Mother Views Self as Social Partner/Teacher</i>	
Parent answered child's questions verbally	.58	Parent talks to child while working	-.79
Parent did not slap/spank child	.54	Parent believes in spending time to teach children (as opposed to letting child learn on own)	-.38
Parent kept child in view	.45	<b>European-American:</b>	
Parent did not restrict child's exploration	.33	<i>Factor 1, Stimulation:</i>	
Child's play environment is safe	.31	Has at least 10 children's books	.82
<i>Factor 3, Developmentally Appropriate Toys:</i>			
Number of cuddly toys child has	.78	Parent reads to child	.40
Number of push/pull toys child has	.51	Child taken on outing	
<i>Factor 2, Positive Maternal Involvement:</i>			
<b>African-American:</b>			
<i>Factor 1, Stimulation:</i>			
Number of cuddly toys child has	.62	Parent conversed with child at least twice	.63
Has at least 10 children's books	.59	Parent answered child's questions verbally	.55
Number of push/pull toys child has	.52	Parent provided toys/activities for child	.46
Parent reads to child	.49	<i>Factor 3, Non-Punitive</i>	
Child taken on outing	.31	Parent did not slap/spank child	.54
<i>Factor 2, Non-Punitive:</i>			
Number times child spanked past week	.51	Parent did not restrict/shake/grab child	.35
Parent did not restrict child's exploration	.36	Number times child spanked past week	.34
Parent did not slap/spank child	.32	<i>Factor 4, Developmentally Appropriate Toys</i>	
<i>Factor 3, Non-Punitive</i>			
<i>Factor 4, Developmentally Appropriate Toys</i>			
Number of cuddly toys child has			
Number of push/pull toys child has			

SOURCE: Child Trends, Inc., calculations of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement 1988 data, One Sibling Study Sample.

NOTES: Table values are based on weighted data.  
Only items which loaded at .30 or higher on at least one factor are included in the table.  
The highest loading was chosen for items with more than one loading above the .30 cutoff.

Table 12  
 OLS Regression Analyses of Parenting Sub-Scales Predicting Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R) in 1992,  
 0 to 2 and 11 month year olds, Weighted Up Analyses

	Hispanic-American (N=204)			African-American (N=268)			European-American (N=462)		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<b>Controls</b>									
Mother's Education less than high school	-.31***	-.19***	-.17***	-.26***	-.25***	-.23***	-.11**	-.11**	-.08*
Mother's Education high school, no college	-.16***	-.04	-.02	-.14***	-.12**	-.12**	-.11**	-.11**	-.09*
Marital Status - Single	.09*	.07*	.05	.01	.04	.03	-.09*	-.07+	-.07+
Age at first birth less than 20	-.17***	-.12**	-.08*	-.24***	-.21***	-.21***	-.12**	-.11**	-.10*
Gender of child-male	-.05	-.01	-.01	-.04	-.04	-.03	.09*	.09*	.07*
Low birth weight child (less than 2,500 g)	-.03	.06	.07+	-.02	-.01	-.02	-.04	-.03	-.03
<b>Sub-scales based on Analyses of Total Sample</b>									
Stimulation		.29***			.20***			.11**	
Positive Maternal Involvement		.21***			-.06			.03	
Non-Punitiveness		.08*			.07+			.13***	
<b>Sub-scales Based on Analyses of Race-Specific Samples</b>									
Stimulation			.27***			.21***			.20***
Positive Maternal Involvement			.24***			-.06+			-.02
Developmentally Appropriate Toys			.08*			n/a			-.06
Parent sees self as social partner/teacher			n/a			.01			n/a
Non-Punitiveness			n/a			.07			.12***
R <sup>2</sup>	.12***	.26***	.26***	.17***	.20***	.20***	.06***	.09***	.11***
R <sup>2</sup> Change <sup>a</sup>		.13***	.14***		.03***	.04***		.02***	.04***

SOURCE: Child Trends, Inc., calculations of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement 1988 data, One Sibling Study Sample.

NOTES: \*This statistic compares the R<sup>2</sup> in Model 1 to the applicable model.  
 + p<0.10; \* p<0.05; \*\* p<0.01; \*\*\* p<0.001.

Table 13  
 OLS Regression Analyses of Parenting Sub-Scales Predicting Behavior Problems Index (BPI) in 1992,  
 0 to 2 and 11 month year olds, Weighted Up Analyses

	Hispanic-American (N=223)			African-American (N=277)			European-American (N=474)		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<b>Controls</b>									
Mother's Education less than high school	.41***	.40***	.40***	.21***	.21***	.19***	.17***	.16***	.15***
Mother's Education high school, no college	.20***	.18***	.17***	.04	.03	.02	.14***	.13**	.12**
Marital Status - Single	-.03	-.03	-.02	.07+	.05	.04	.10**	.09*	.09*
Age at first birth less than 20	-.12**	-.14***	-.14***	-.08*	-.09*	-.09*	-.02	-.02	-.03
Gender of child-male	.03	.02	.03	-.07+	-.08*	-.08*	-.09	-.09*	-.08*
Low birth weight child (less than 2,500 g)	-.03	-.04	-.05	.01	.004	.01	-.04	-.04	-.04
<b>Sub-scales based on Analyses of Total Sample</b>									
Stimulation		-.05			-.06			-.11**	
Positive Maternal Involvement		.09*			.07+			-.03	
Non-Punitiveness		-.17***			-.20***			-.11**	
<b>Sub-scales Based on Analyses of Race-Specific Samples</b>									
Stimulation			-.02			-.13**			-.12**
Positive Maternal Involvement			-.09*			.07+			-.03
Developmentally Appropriate Toys			.04			n/a			-.02
Parent sees self as social partner/teacher			n/a			.05			n/a
Non-Punitiveness			n/a			-.22***			-.11**
R <sup>2</sup>	.11***	.14***	.12***	.05***	.09***	.10***	.05***	.08***	.08***
R <sup>2</sup> Change <sup>a</sup>		.03***	.01+		.04***	.05***		.02***	.03***

SOURCE: Child Trends, Inc., calculations of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement 1988 data, One Sibling Study Sample.

NOTES: \*This statistic compares the R<sup>2</sup> in Model 1 to the applicable model.  
 + p<0.10; \* p<0.05; \*\* p<0.01; \*\*\* p<0.001.

Table 14  
 Reliabilities of HOME-SF Cognitive Stimulation Sub-Scale, HOME-SF Socioemotional Sub-Scale, and of  
 New Parenting Scales Based on All Race and Race-Specific Factor Analyses for Child Ages 0 through 2 years 11 months

Sub-Scale Description	Cronbach's Alpha			
	All Races	Hispanic- American	African- American	European- American
<b>HOME-SF Sub-Scales</b>				
Cognitive Stimulation	.54	.50	.61	.51
Socioemotional Support	.40	.48	.41	.36
<b>New Sub-Scales Based on Factor Analyses of All Races</b>				
Stimulation	.67	.67	.66	.65
Positive Maternal Involvement	.58 ( <i>r</i> =.41)	.64 ( <i>r</i> =.47)	.56 ( <i>r</i> =.39)	.57 ( <i>r</i> =.40)
Non-Punitive	.40	.31	.49	.37
<b>New Sub-Scales Based on Factor Analyses Separately by Race</b>				
Stimulation	--	.67	.67	.66
Non-Punitive	--	--	.49	.37
Positive Maternal Involvement	--	.63	.56 ( <i>r</i> =.39)	.57
Developmentally Appropriate Toys	--	.60 ( <i>r</i> =.43)	--	.53 ( <i>r</i> =.36)
Mother Views Self as Social Partner/Teacher	--	--	.45 ( <i>r</i> =.30)	--

SOURCE: Child Trends, Inc., calculations of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement 1988 data, One Sibling Study Sample.

NOTES: Table values are based on weighted data.  
 Correlation coefficients (*r*) are shown in addition to alpha for two-item sub-scales.  
 Because the factor analyses of the separate racial/ethnic group samples resulted in differing factors for the three groups, alphas are only provided for those sub-scales appropriate for the specific racial/ethnic group.

### References

Baker, P.C., Keck, C.K., Mott, F.L. & Quinlan, S.V. (1993). The NLSY child handbook, revised edition: A guide to the 1986-1990 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth child data. Columbus, OH: Center for Human Resource Research.

Sugland, B.W., Zaslow, M., Smith, J.R., Brooks-Gunn, J., Coates, D., Blumenthal, C., Moore, K.A., Griffin, T., & Bradley, R.H. (1995). The early childhood HOME inventory and HOME-short form in differing racial/ethnic groups. Are there differences in underlying structure, internal consistency of subscales, and patterns of prediction? Journal of Family Issues, 16(5), 632-663.