Parenting and Pandemic Pressures: Examining nuances in Parent, Child, and Family Well-being Concerns during COVID-19 in a Canadian Sample

Colucci, L, Smith, J.A., Browne, D.T

University of Waterloo

Supplemental Material

Table 1

Tables

Correlation Matrix for Included Variables

							Parent	Parent			
		Child	Child Mental	Child School /	Child	Parent	Managing	Patience with	Family	Family	Family
Concern for:	Child Health	Loneliness	Health	Academics	Socialization	Balancing	Behaviours	Child	Connection	Supportiveness	Loneliness
1. Child Health	-										
Child Loneliness	.36**	-									
Child Mental Health	.47**	.71**	-								
Child School / Academics	.27**	.35**	.4**	-							
Child Socialization	.21**	.63**	.5**	.33**	-						
2. Parent Balancing	.16**	.31**	.32**	.26**	.31**	-					
Parent Managing Behaviors	.30**	.55**	.62**	.37**	.44**	.49**	-				
Parent Patience with Child	.16**	.35**	.37**	.23**	.32**	.4**	.55**	-			
3. Family Connection	.26**	.39**	.36**	.23**	.4**	$.28^{**}$.37**	.27**	-		
Family Supportiveness	.29**	.37**	.42**	.27**	.30**	.35**	.52**	.46**	.53**	-	
Family Loneliness	.24**	.41**	.37**	.24**	.33**	.22**	.41**	.44**	.37**	.45**	-

Note: Concern variables respectively reflect indicators for the 1. Child Concern, 2. Parent Concern, and 3. Family Concern latent variables **Correlation is significant at the p < 0.01 level (2-tailed). Listwise case deletion for incomplete cases, chart includes all data from the restricted sample (without multivariate outliers).

Additional Exploratory Analysis for Female and Male Caregivers

Descriptive information

Descriptive statistics for the female and male caregiver subsets of the data are included in Table 2. The sample of male caregivers in this dataset included n = 2895 participants. Missing data across this subset of the data was as follows: Child with a disability (2.69%), parent education (2.66%), job loss or reduced hours (16.72%), employment structure (20.45%), and all concern variables (<0.1-0.5% for all variables except parent concerns about child school/academics (6.67%)). The sample of female caregivers in this dataset included n = 26936 participants. Missing data across this subset of the data was as follows: Child with a disability (0.50%), parent education (0.27%), job loss (15.46%), employment structure (18.47%), and all "concern" (Child, parent and family) variables (<0.1-0.5% for all variables except parent concerns about child school/academics (7.28%)).

Analysis

The same confirmatory factor analysis procedure was applied to the respective mother and father data subsets.

Female Caregivers Only

The final measurement model from the manuscript (which includes four within-factor correlations) was tested and the model fit was within the acceptable range, though the CFI was slightly lower than the recommended \geq .95 cut off (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Model fit was as follows: n = 24649 $\chi^2(39) = 4296.13$, p < .001, CFI = .939, RMSEA = 0.082 (0.080-0.084), SRMR = .044. All three latent variables were significantly positively correlated (Child and parent concerns: r = .77; child and family concerns: r = .68, parent and family concerns: r = .79; ps < .001) and all the specified factor loadings for each latent variable were statistically significant (ps < .001). Similarly, when the structural model was tested with the addition of regressions for the sociodemographic variables, the model fit the data well, though the CFI was slightly lower than the recommended \geq .95 cut off. Model fit: n = 18368; $\chi^2(71) = 4132.56$, p <.001; CFI = .923; RMSEA = .069 (CI = .067-.071); SRMR = .037. Path estimates are depicted in Table 3.

Male Caregivers Only

The final measurement model from the manuscript (which includes two within-factor correlations) was tested and achieved was within the acceptable range, though the CFI was slightly lower than the recommended \geq .95 cut off (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Model fit was as follows: n = 2656, $\chi^2(39) = 444.74$, p < .001, CFI = .944, RMSEA = 0.079 (0.073-0.086), SRMR = .038. All three latent variables were significantly positively correlated (Child and parent concerns: r = .82; child and family concerns: r = .71, parent and family concerns: r = .84; ps < .001) and all the specified factor loadings for each latent variable were statistically significant (ps < .001). Similarly, when the structural model was tested with the addition of regressions for the sociodemographic variables, the model fit the data well, though the CFI was slightly lower than the recommended \geq .95 cut off. Model fit: n = 1876; $\chi^2(71) = 406.72$, p <.001; CFI = .935; RMSEA = .064 (CI = .058-.070); SRMR = .034. Path estimates are depicted in Table 3.

Table 2

Descrit	ptive Si	<i>tatistics</i>	for S	Study V	Variables	stratified	by.	Parent	Sex
							~		

			le	Female		
Variabl	% or M	SD	% or M	SD		
Parent Age (Years)	15-34	14.02		20.29		
	35-44	62.69		64.20		
	45-54	21.13		14.88		
	55+	2.14		0.63		
Child with a	No	88.29		82.68		
Disability						
Parent Education	Did not attend	18.79		24.65		
	University					
Job Loss or Reduced	No	67.27		60.30		
Hours						
Employment	Inside home	61.88		47.79		
Structure						
	Outside home	7.86		17.25		
	Mixed	30.26		34.96		
Child Health		2.00	0.85	2.00	0.842	
Child Loneliness	2.50	0.88	2.71	0.89		
Child Mental Health	2.64	0.89	2.56	0.89		
Child School / Acade	2.47	1.17	2.52	1.18		
Child Socialization	3.06	0.81	3.05	0.82		
Parent Balancing	3.15	0.89	3.15	0.92		
Parent Managing Ch	2.75	0.90	2.81	0.91		
Parent Patience	2.49	0.95	2.55	0.94		
Family Connection	2.43	0.76	2.45	0.77		
Family Supportivene	2.28	0.88	2.26	0.89		
Family Loneliness		2.04	0.94	2.08	0.98	

Note: Values reflect the number of complete cases within each level of the variable, after exclusion of missing data (i.e., "Not Stated" and "Not applicable"

responses) and multivariate outliers. The range for all concern variables was 1 (Not at all concerned)-4 (Extremely concerned).

Table 3

Structural regression model parameter estimates for social determinants of health in association with parent-reported concerns, by

parent sex

Parent Sex	Variable	Ch	ild	Pare	enting	Family Concerns		
		Cone	cerns	Con	cerns			
		Unstandardized (SE)	Standardized	Unstandardized (SE)	Standardized	Unstandardized (SE)	Standardized	
	Completed University	-0.06 (0.01)	-0.07***	0.01 (0.01)	0.01	-0.05 (0.01)	-0.04***	
	Job/hours Loss	0.03 (0.01)	0.04***	0.01 (0.01)	0.01	0.07 (0.01)	0.7***	
Female	Child Disability	0.16 (0.01)	0.17***	0.21 (0.01)	0.16***	0.09 (0.01)	0.07***	
	Employment							
	• In vs Out	0.03 (0.01)	0.04**	-0.06 (0.02)	-0.06***	0.05 (0.01)	0.5***	
	• In vs Mixed	0.02 (0.01)	0.03**	0.01 (0.01)	0.01	0.01 (0.01)	0.01	
	• Out vs Mixed	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.00	0.08 (0.02)	0.07***	-0.04 (0.02)	-0.04*	
	Variable	Child		Parenting		Family		
		Concerns		Concerns		Concerns		
		Unstandardized (SE)	Standardized	Unstandardized (SE)	Standardized	Unstandardized (SE)	Standardized	
	Completed University	-0.04 (0.04)	-0.04	-0.02 (0.05)	-0.01	-0.07 (0.04)	-0.06	
Male	Job/hours Loss	0.02 (0.03)	0.02	0.02 (0.04)	0.01	0.08 (0.03)	0.8*	
	Child Disability	0.12 (0.04)	0.10**	0.14 (0.06)	0.08*	0.03 (0.05)	0.02	
	Employment							
	• In vs Out	0.05 (0.05)	0.04	-0.13 (0.08)	-0.07	0.03 (0.06)	0.02	
	• In vs Mixed	0.07 (0.03)	0.07*~	0.03 (0.04)	0.02	0.05 (0.04)	0.05	
	• Out vs Mixed	0.03 (0.01)	0.02	0.17 (0.08)	0.12*	0.07 (0.07)	0.05	

Note: All variables were dummy coded such that parents who **did not** complete university, parents who **did not** experience job loss and those **without** a child with a disability were all coded 0. Significant paths bolded: $*\sim p = .047$, $*p \le .05$, $**p \le .01$, $***p \le .001$