

A Developmental Analysis of the Factorial Validity of the Parent-Report Version of the Adult Responses to Children's Symptoms in Children Versus Adolescents With Chronic Pain or Pain-Related Chronic Illness

[Q3] Melanie Noel,^{*} Tonya M. Palermo,^{*,†,‡,§} Bonnie Essner,^{*} Chuan Zhou,^{*,†,‡,§} Rona L. Levy,[¶] Shelby L. Langer,[¶] Amanda L. Sherman,^{||} and Lynn S. Walker^{||}

^{*}Center for Child Health, Behavior & Development, Seattle Children's Research Institute, Seattle, Washington. Departments of [†]Anesthesiology, [‡]Pediatrics, and [§]Psychiatry, University of Washington School of Medicine, Seattle, Washington.

[¶]School of Social Work, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

^{||}Department of Pediatrics, Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Nashville, Tennessee.

Abstract: The widely used Adult Responses to Children's Symptoms measures parental responses to child symptom complaints among youth aged 7 to 18 years with recurrent/chronic pain. Given developmental differences between children and adolescents and the impact of developmental stage on parenting, the factorial validity of the parent-report version of the Adult Responses to Children's Symptoms with a pain-specific stem was examined separately in 743 parents of 281 children (7–11 years) and 462 adolescents (12–18 years) with chronic pain or pain-related chronic illness. Factor structures of the Adult Responses to Children's Symptoms beyond the original 3-factor model were also examined. Exploratory factor analysis with oblique rotation was conducted on a randomly chosen half of the sample of children and adolescents as well as the 2 groups combined to assess underlying factor structure. Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the other randomly chosen half of the sample to cross-validate factor structure revealed by exploratory factor analyses and compare it to other model variants. Poor loading and high cross loading items were removed. A 4-factor model (Protect, Minimize, Monitor, and Distract) for children and the combined (child and adolescent) sample and a 5-factor model (Protect, Minimize, Monitor, Distract, and Solicitousness) for adolescents was superior to the 3-factor model proposed in previous literature. Future research should examine the validity of derived subscales and developmental differences in their relationships with parent and child functioning.

Perspective: This article examined developmental differences in the structure of a widely used measure of caregiver responses to chronic pain or pain-related chronic illness in youth. Results suggest revised structures that differ across developmental groups can be used with youth with a range of clinical pain-related conditions.

© 2014 by the American Pain Society

Key words: Pediatric pain, parental behaviors, chronic pain, children, adolescents, Adult Responses to Children's Symptoms, factor analysis.

An understanding of child chronic and recurrent pain necessitates understanding of the social and familial context in which pain is experi-

enced.^{2,9,12,33} Caregiver behaviors exert a powerful influence on child pain behaviors.^{3,6,40,45} Specifically, solicitous and protective behaviors (eg, positive

Received March 31, 2014; Revised September 30, 2014; Accepted October 8, 2014.

[Q1] M.N. is funded by a Post-PhD Fellowship Award from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research and is a trainee member of Pain in Child Health, a Strategic Training Initiative in Health Research of the Canadian Institutes of Health Research. Funding for this research was provided by NIH grants awarded to T.M.P. (R01 HD062538 and K24 HD060068), R.L.L. (R01 HD050345; R01 HD036069), and L.S.W. (R01 HD23264).

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Address reprint requests to Melanie Noel, PhD, Center for Child Health, Behavior & Development, Seattle Children's Research Institute, 2001 Eighth Ave, Suite 400, Seattle, WA 98121. E-mail: melanie.noel@seattlechildrens.org

1526-5900/\$36.00

© 2014 by the American Pain Society

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2014.10.005>

2 The Journal of Pain

Factorial Validity of the ARCS

reinforcement for pain behaviors such as activity restriction) have been associated with a variety of negative outcomes among children and adolescents with recurrent/chronic pain.^{5,6,13,25,30,39,40,44,49} Protectiveness has also been associated with caregiver emotional distress, catastrophizing, and helplessness.³⁹

For more than 2 decades, the predominant measure used to assess parental responses to pediatric chronic pain was the Illness Behavior Encouragement Scale (IBES⁴⁶), which assessed solicitous responding to abdominal pain and symptom complaints. To capture a wider range of parental response styles, the Adult Responses to Children's Symptoms (ARCS) was developed as an extension of the IBES.⁴⁸ Initial factor analysis suggested a 3-factor structure (Protect, Minimize, and Encourage & Monitor). Among mothers of youth (aged 8–15 years) with recurrent abdominal pain, Protect scores were associated with higher child gastrointestinal symptoms, health care costs, and self-reported parent protective behaviors.⁴⁴ The validity of the other subscales is less established. To date, only 1 study examined the factorial validity of the ARCS in a sample of youth (aged 8–17 years) with various chronic pain conditions. Although the 3-factor model provided good fit to the data, several modifications to the original measure were required.⁵ Moreover, this reanalysis did not include exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of the revised measure, which is typically conducted in measure development work. To date, research has not examined other factor structures beyond the original 3-factor model that would likely account for a greater percentage of variance in parental responses.

Use of the ARCS has led to important insights into the relationship between caregiver behaviors and pediatric chronic pain,^{6,13,25,32,40,42,44} including the influence of behavioral interventions on parental responses.^{27,28,31,35} However, studies examining the psychometric properties of the ARCS included youth (eg, 8–17 years) spanning various developmental stages who were treated as a homogeneous group. It is unclear whether the scale performs differently in children versus adolescents, which may affect interpretation of research data in studies conducted among both children and adolescents. Adolescence is a unique developmental period wherein autonomy from caregivers and reliance on peers substantially increases.⁵⁰ The incidence of most types of chronic pain²⁴ increases throughout childhood and adolescence. Moreover, the demands and impact of parenting a child with chronic pain likely change as children progress toward adulthood.

This study is the first to examine the factorial validity of other factor structures of the ARCS beyond the original 3-factor model. It is also the first study to apply a developmental analysis to the measurement of caregiver responses to child pain and symptom complaints by examining the factorial validity of the ARCS *separately* in caregivers of children versus adolescents with chronic pain or pain-related chronic illness. In light of important developmental differences between children and adolescents and the potential impact of developmental

stage on parenting processes, it was hypothesized that the underlying structure of the ARCS might differ between children and adolescents.

Methods

Participants

Participants included 743 caregivers (92.7% mothers) of children and adolescents (468 girls, 275 boys) aged 7 to 18 years (mean age = 12.75 years, standard deviation = 2.79 years). Participants were allocated to developmental groups (ie, "child group" and "adolescent group") based on definitions put forth by the Standards for Research (StaR) in Child Health, an international initiative to enhance the reliability and relevance of randomized clinical trials in childhood and adolescence.⁴⁷ Specifically, the child group included caregivers of children between the ages of 7 and 11 years ($n = 281$), and the adolescent group included caregivers of children between the ages of 12 and 18 years ($n = 462$). Splitting the sample at 12 years is justified based on developmental differences that emerge at this age (eg, beginning of the Period of Formal Operations in Piaget's Stages of Cognitive Development marked by the onset of abstract thinking³⁶).

Data were pooled from 3 multisite research studies that included caregivers of children and adolescents with recurrent/chronic pain or pain-related chronic illness (inflammatory bowel disease). This includes data from both published studies^{25-28,48} as well as ongoing data collection. The research was conducted at 5 sites: 2 in Seattle, WA (Seattle Children's Hospital and University of Washington), 1 in Tacoma, WA (Mary Bridge Children's Hospital), 1 in Morristown, NJ (Goryeb Children's Hospital/Atlantic Health System), and 1 in Nashville, TN (Vanderbilt University). Four sites collected data from caregivers of children with recurrent and chronic pain (eg, functional abdominal pain, musculoskeletal pain) ($n = 558$), and 1 site collected data from parents of children diagnosed for at least 3 months with inflammatory bowel disease (Crohn's disease or ulcerative colitis; $n = 185$).

Across all research studies from which data were pooled, the following common inclusion criteria were used: 1) child or adolescent had a primary presenting complaint of chronic or recurrent pain (persistent pain ≥ 3 months) or was diagnosed with inflammatory bowel disease at least 3 months prior, 2) child or adolescent was within 7 to 18 years of age (ie, 7–17, 8–18, or 10–17 years), and 3) caregiver was able to read and comprehend questionnaires in English. Caregivers were excluded if their child or adolescent had a comorbid chronic illness (diabetes, arthritis, cancer), developmental delay, or cognitive impairment. Caregivers of children and adolescents were typically recruited through physician referral from pediatric gastroenterology and multidisciplinary pain clinics. Participants were also recruited through pediatric clinics and community-posted flyers. The data included from all research studies were collected as part of site-specific Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved

138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203

204 protocols. Informed consent was obtained from each
205 participant during original data collection.

207 **Measures**

209 **Demographic Information**

211 Caregivers provided demographic information
212 including their child's age, sex, and race.

214 **ARCS**

216 The ARCS was developed to provide assessment of
217 parent behavior in the context of child chronic and recur-
218 rent pain.⁴⁸ Composed of 29 items, the ARCS assesses a
219 wider range of parent behaviors as compared to its pre-
220 decessor, the IBES,⁴⁶ which solely assesses solicitous
221 responding during episodes of abdominal pain and
222 other symptoms. Items were derived from the IBES and
223 the Significant Other Response Scales of the West
224 Haven-Yale Multidimensional Pain Inventory,²³ a mea-
225 sure developed for use with adults. In addition, items
226 were based on semistructured interviews with 145
227 mothers of children with recurrent abdominal pain
228 (aged 8–18 years) who described how they responded,
229 or wished they had responded, to recent episodes of
230 their child's pain.

232 On the ARCS, caregivers are required to indicate how
233 often they engage in various behaviors using a 5-point
234 Likert-type scale with the anchors "never" and "always."
235 The stem used was specific to parental responses to their
236 child's aches or pains. In the initial development paper,
237 factor analysis using principal components extraction
238 with oblique rotation resulted in 3 factors (Protect, Mini-
239 mize, and Encourage & Monitor). The 3 subscales have
240 shown adequate internal consistency.⁴⁸ The validity of
241 the Protect subscale has also been established; among
242 mothers of children aged 8 to 15 years with recurrent
243 abdominal pain, protectiveness has been shown to be
244 associated with reporting of their own protective
245 responses to episodes of their children's abdominal
246 pain as assessed by 28-day diaries, number of health
247 care visits for gastrointestinal symptoms, and higher
248 health care costs.⁴⁴ Moreover, ARCS Protect scores have
249 been shown to be associated with child pain and func-
250 tional disability⁵ as well as less parent psychological flex-
251 ibility.³² Conversely, less support has been found for the
252 reliability and validity of the Minimize and Encourage
253 & Monitor subscales,⁵ which has been cited as a reason
254 for their exclusion in previous research.^{25,30} In the only
255 examination of the factorial validity of the ARCS, the
256 3-factor model provided good fit to the data among a
257 large sample of children and adolescents with a variety
258 of complex chronic pain conditions,⁵ albeit with several
259 modifications to the original measure (removal of Items
260 5, 27, and 29; addition of several error covariances;
261 allowing several items to cross-load).

263 **Procedure**

265 Across all research studies from which data for the cur-
266 rent study were pooled, demographic information was
267 provided and the ARCS was completed by caregivers at

270 a baseline visit (ie, prior to random assignment or partici-
271 pating in any other aspects of the studies, including
272 intervention or subsequent assessments).

274 **Data Analysis**

276 Statistical analyses were conducted using Stata,
277 version 12.1 (StataCorp LP, College Station, TX), and
278 SPSS, version 19 (IBM Corp, Armonk, NY). Factor analysis
279 was conducted using a 2-step approach, with EFA
280 followed by confirmatory factor analysis. To split the
281 sample, we applied a stratified randomization algo-
282 rithm. Within each developmental group, half of the
283 sample was randomly assigned to EFA and the other
284 half to confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). EFA and CFA
285 were then conducted within each developmental group
286 and with the 2 groups combined.

287 We removed ARCS Items 5, 27, and 29 per the previ-
288 ous published validation study⁵ before conducting any
289 analyses. Missing values for ARCS items ranged from 2
290 to 13. Among the original 747 participants, few had
291 missing data; 4 caregivers missed more than 5 items,
292 3 caregivers missed 5 items, 7 missed 3 items, 7 missed
293 2 items, and 54 missed 1 item. A total of 672 (90%) par-
294 ticipants completed all 29 ARCS items. The most
295 frequent missing items were 15, 16, 18, and 25. Given
296 the small amount of missing data, we dropped partici-
297 pants with more than 5 missing items. As such, the final
298 sample consisted of 743 parents, with 369 allocated to
299 EFA (139 for child sample; 230 for adolescent sample)
300 and 374 allocated to CFA (142 for child sample; 232
301 for adolescent sample). Similar to other research exam-
302 ining the factorial validity of measures in pediatric
303 pain,²⁹ missing data were accounted for by applying
304 the hot-deck imputation method.¹

305 We first conducted EFA on the ARCS items to explore
306 whether an item was strongly and differentially corre-
307 lated with latent subscales (factors). Items were dropped
308 if the factor loadings were below the recommended .32
309 threshold and if 2 items loaded at or above .32 on more
310 than 1 factor.⁴³ Based on these criteria, we systematically
311 removed items 1 at a time and analyses were rerun. Each
312 prior analysis informed decisions about which items to
313 subsequently remove. Items were removed until clean
314 solutions were attained, defined as factor loadings that
315 were $>.32$ and no cross-loading items. In addition, factor
316 structures that included a factor with less than 3 items
317 loading onto it were not retained.⁷

318 EFAs were conducted using principal axis factoring.⁸ In
319 order to choose a factor structure, we used the criteria
320 that eigenvalues were ≥ 1.0 .⁷ In addition, the initial scree
321 plot was also used to determine the initial number of fac-
322 tors to retain. EFA produced loading matrices that were
323 rotated using 2 methods, orthogonal rotation and obli-
324 que rotation, to determine the factor structure, with
325 the latter allowing correlated factors. Given that neither
326 rotation significantly changed the factor loadings, an
327 oblique rotation was ultimately used and reported here-
328 in based on previous research suggesting that parental
329 responses measured by the ARCS are not orthogonal.^{5,48}
330 Items were allocated to the factor to which they loaded

4 The Journal of Pain

Factorial Validity of the ARCS

most highly. We ran the factor analysis using Pearson correlation matrix (reported in Tables 2, 3 and 4). A sensitivity analysis using rank-based Spearman correlation matrix was also conducted.

Using results from EFA, multiple-factor measurement models (ie, CFA) were conducted using the validation samples, separately for the child and adolescent groups. This was done in order to test the adequacy of fit of the hypothesized models from EFA and to compare fit indices for identified factor structures across developmental groups. CFA was conducted within a structural equation modeling (SEM) framework, and coefficients were estimated using maximum likelihood estimation. CFA was conducted using Stata, version 12.1.

Fit indices were used as the primary indicators to select a final model structure for the child and adolescent samples. We examined the root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA) and coefficient of determination. An RMSEA of .06 or less indicates good fit whereas an RMSEA above .10 indicates poor fit. Coefficient of determination for SEM measures the amount of variation accounted for in the endogenous constructs by the exogenous constructs, and a value of 1 is considered perfect fit. The comparative fit index and the Tucker-Lewis index were used to assess the goodness of fit of the specified multiple-factor measurement models; values close to 1 indicate good fit. Item loadings in the final CFA were then used to calculate subscale/factor scores. In addition to fit indices, scree plots, reliability of subscales (Cronbach's alpha), and interpretability of factors (eg, number of items loaded onto each factor, conceptual divergence from other factors) were examined to inform decisions about superiority of models. These additional criteria were especially applied when fit indices of model variants were highly similar within developmental groups.

We took the more principled approach toward this analysis, in which hypotheses were identified a priori via EFA and then tested via CFA. We opted not to conduct post hoc model modification purely based on modification indices as such an approach is data driven and vulnerable to chance and sample size. It should be noted that modifying the models essentially changes the hypotheses and the analysis becomes exploratory such that the resultant models require testing with additional data. Indeed, many authors have cautioned against sole use of the modification index.^{19,21,38} Finally, subscale scores for the final child and adolescent models were compared between youth with IBD and youth with chronic pain using independent samples t-tests.

Results

The random split was performed using Stata, version 12.1. No significant differences were found on ARCS items or demographic variables between split halves of the 2 samples. Participant characteristics are shown in Table 1. The majority of caregivers were mothers (91.8–94.3% across samples). The majority of their children were white (90.5–92.9%) and female (60.5–64.5%).

EFA

Child Sample

For the child sample, EFA with iterated principal factor extraction method resulted in 7 factors with eigenvalues above 1.0 and 60.9% variance explained. Examination of the scree plot was suggestive of only a 3-, 4-, or 5-factor structure. To contrast the 3-, 4-, 5-, 6-, and 7-factor models, 5 additional EFAs using the iterated principal factor extraction method with oblique rotation were conducted forcing 7, 6, 5, 4, and 3 factors, respectively. However, the 7-, 6-, and 5-factor models consisted of factors with only 2 items; therefore, they did not meet our criteria for inclusion⁷ and were not tested in the CFA stage. Item loadings derived from the rotated pattern matrices from these analyses were used to allocate items to latent factors in the subsequent CFAs.

Adolescent Sample

For the adolescent sample, EFA with iterated principal factor extraction method resulted in 6 factors with eigenvalues above 1.0 and 57.7% variance explained. Examination of the scree plot was suggestive of only a 4- or 5-factor structure. To contrast the 3-, 4-, 5-, and 6-factor models, 4 additional EFAs using the iterated principal factor extraction method with oblique rotation were conducted forcing 6, 5, 4, and 3 factors, respectively. However, the 6-factor model consisted of factors with only 2 items; therefore, they did not meet our criteria for inclusion⁷ and were not tested in the CFA

Table 1. Participant Characteristics

VARIABLE	CHILD SAMPLE (N = 281)	ADOLESCENT SAMPLE (N = 462)
Child age (y), mean (SD)	9.72 (1.21)	14.60 (1.64)
Child gender		
Male	111 (39.5%)	164 (35.5%)
Female	170 (60.5%)	298 (64.5%)
Child race		
White	261 (92.9%)	418 (90.5%)
Black	6 (2.1%)	16 (3.5%)
Asian	4 (1.4%)	5 (1.1%)
Other (eg, Alaskan Native, Pacific Islander, Biracial)	6 (2.1%)	21 (4.5%)
Not reported	4 (1.4%)	2 (.4%)
Caregiver role		
Mother	265 (94.3%)	424 (91.8%)
Father	14 (5.0%)	34 (7.4%)
Grandparent	2 (.7%)	4 (.9%)
Site		
Seattle Children's Hospital	12 (4.3%)	138 (29.9%)
University of Washington, Mary Bridge Children's Hospital, Goryeb Children's Hospital/Atlantic Health System	146 (52.0%)	229 (49.6%)
Vanderbilt University	123 (43.8%)	95 (20.6%)
Pain group		
Inflammatory bowel disease	40 (14.2%)	145 (31.4%)
Chronic pain	241 (85.8%)	317 (68.6%)

Abbreviation: SD, standard deviation.

NOTE. Values are n (%) unless otherwise indicated.

stage. Item loadings derived from the rotated pattern matrices from these analyses were used to allocate items to latent factors in the subsequent CFAs.

Combined (Child and Adolescent) Sample

For the sample combining children and adolescents, EFA with iterated principal factor extraction method resulted in 5 factors with initial eigenvalues above 1.0 and 52.4% variance explained. Examination of the scree plot was suggestive of only a 4- or 5-factor structure; however, a 3-factor model was also examined in order to compare model variants to the originally proposed model. To contrast the 3-, 4-, and 5-factor models, 3 additional EFAs using the iterated principal factor extraction method with oblique rotation were conducted forcing 5, 4, and 3 factors, respectively. However, the 5-factor model consisted of a fifth factor composed of only 2 items; therefore, it did not meet our criteria for inclusion⁷ and was not tested in the CFA stage. Item loadings derived from the rotated pattern matrices from analyses of the 4- and 3-factor models were used to allocate items to latent factors in the subsequent CFAs.

CFA

Child Sample

CFAs were conducted on the child-only sample to examine the comparative fit of the 4- and 3-factor models with item loadings informed by EFA; as such, we fitted models with 4 and 3 correlated latent factors. Similar to the models derived for the combined (child

and adolescent) sample and the adolescent-only sample, the 4-factor model was characterized by separate Distract and Monitor factors as opposed to 1 combined Encourage & Monitor factor, as proposed in the original 3-factor model.⁴⁸ The final 4- and 3-factor models consisted of 23 and 22 items, respectively.

Fit indices yielded from the 2 CFAs were compared, and it revealed that the model with 4 latent factors had similar fit (RMSEA = .075, coefficient of determination = .993, comparative fit index = .811, Tucker-Lewis index = .787) to the 3-factor model variant (RMSEA = .074, coefficient of determination = .987, comparative fit index = .834, Tucker-Lewis index = .814). All coefficient estimates were significant at the $P < .05$ level. Given that fit indices were highly similar across the 4- and 3-factor models, reliability of subscales (Cronbach's alpha) and interpretability of factors (eg, number of items loaded on each factor, conceptual divergence from other factors) were compared to inform decisions about the superiority of each model. The fit indices for the 4- and 3-factor models were both in the acceptable/adequate range. A 4-factor model (in lieu of a 3-factor model) was chosen as the final child model because the fourth factor, Distract, was consistent across all models, was conceptually distinct from all other items, and had acceptable internal consistency. The EFA factor loading matrix for ARCS items for the final 4-factor model for the child model is shown in Table 2. The mean, median, standard deviation, score range, and alpha coefficient for each of the newly derived factors of the final 4-factor model for the child sample obtained through the EFA/CFA procedures are reported in Table 5.

Table 2. EFA Factor Loading Matrix for ARCS Items for the Final 4-Factor Child Model

ARCS ITEM	PROTECT	MONITOR	MINIMIZE	DISTRACT
1. Ask your child what you can do to help		.53		
2. Express irritation or frustration with your child			.56	
4. Talk to your child about something else to take your child's mind off it				.38
8. Bring your child special treats or little gifts	.36			
9. Try not to pay attention to your child			.45	
10. Ask your child questions about how he/she feels		.79		
11. Let your child stay home from school	.64			
12. Encourage your child to do something he or she enjoys (like watch TV or play a game)				.64
13. Tell your child that he/she doesn't have to finish all your homework	.58			
14. Tell your child there's nothing you can do about it			.36	
15. Give your child special privileges	.64			
16. Stay home from work or come home early (or stay home instead of going out or running errands)	.62			
17. Tell others in the family not to bother your child or to be especially nice to your child	.69			
18. Tell your child not to make such a fuss about it			.83	
19. Pay more attention to your child than usual	.59			
20. Let your child sleep in a special place (like in your room or on the couch)?	.44			
21. Tell your child that he/she needs to learn to be stronger			.65	
22. Let your child sleep later than usual in the morning	.68			
23. Keep your child inside the house	.63			
24. Try to involve your child in some activity				.72
25. Spend more time than usual with your child	.41			
26. Try to make your child as comfortable as possible		.70		
28. Check on your child to see how he/she is doing		.69		

NOTE. All original ARCS item numbers were unchanged for ease of comparability across models and studies. Weak loadings, defined as less than .32,⁴³ were suppressed. In addition to Items 5, 27, and 29, Items 3, 6, and 7 were removed because of poor loadings or high cross loadings.

Adolescent Sample

CFAs were conducted on the adolescent sample to examine the comparative fit of the 5-, 4-, and 3-factor models with item loadings informed by EFA; as such, we fitted models with 5, 4, and 3 correlated latent factors. Similar to the models derived for the combined (child and adolescent) and child-only samples, the 4- and 5-factor models were characterized by separate Distract and Monitor factors as opposed to 1 combined Encourage & Monitor factor, as proposed in the original 3-factor model.⁴⁸ The 5-factor model was characterized by an additional factor, composed of 3 items that previously loaded onto the Protect factor.⁴⁸ We named this factor "Solicitousness" as it seemed to capture responses characterized by solicitous behaviors (eg, doing the child's chores for them, giving special privileges and gifts/treats) that are similar but distinct from items comprising the Protect scale. The numbers of items comprising the final 5-, 4-, and 3-factor models were 20, 23, and 23, respectively.

Fit indices yielded from the 3 CFAs were compared, and it revealed that the model with 5 latent factors had better fit (RMSEA = .052, coefficient of determination = .997, comparative fit index = .915, Tucker-Lewis index = .899) than the 4-factor (RMSEA = .058, coefficient of determination = .997, comparative fit index = .882, Tucker-Lewis index = .867) and 3-factor model variants (RMSEA = .082, coefficient of determination = .988, comparative fit index = .747, Tucker-Lewis index = .718). Both the 4- and 5-factor models were in the good range and superior to the 3-factor model, which was in the acceptable/adequate range. All coefficient estimates were significant at the $P < .05$ level. The fit indices for the 5- and 4-factor models were in the good range; the fit indices for the 3-factor model were in the acceptable/adequate range. Based on

these results, a 5-factor model was chosen as the final model for adolescents. The EFA factor loading matrix for ARCS items for the final 5-factor model for the adolescent model is shown in Table 3. The mean, median, standard deviation, score range, and alpha coefficient for each of the newly derived factors of the final 5-factor model for the adolescent sample obtained through the EFA/CFA procedures are reported in Table 5.

Combined (Child and Adolescent) Sample

CFAs were conducted on the combined (child and adolescent) sample to examine the comparative fit of the 4- and 3-factor models with item loadings informed by EFA; as such, we fitted models with 4 and 3 correlated latent factors. Similar to the models derived for the child- and adolescent-only samples, the 4-factor model was characterized by separate Distract and Monitor factors as opposed to 1 combined Encourage & Monitor factor, as proposed in the original 3-factor model.⁴⁸ The final 4- and 3-factor models each consisted of 24 items.

Fit indices yielded from the 2 CFAs were compared, and it revealed that the model with 4 latent factors had better fit (RMSEA = .058, coefficient of determination = .996, comparative fit index = .882, Tucker-Lewis index = .867) as compared to the 3-factor model variant (RMSEA = .069, coefficient of determination = .990, comparative fit index = .820, Tucker-Lewis index = .800). All coefficient estimates were significant at the $P < .05$ level. The fit indices for the 4-factor model were in the good range; the fit indices for the 3-factor model were in the acceptable/adequate range. The 4-factor model (in lieu of a 3-factor model) was chosen as the final model for children and adolescents combined. The EFA factor loading matrix for the final 4-factor model for the combined sample is shown in Table 4. Descriptive

Table 3. EFA Factor Loading Matrix for ARCS Items for the Final 5-Factor Adolescent Model

	ARCS ITEM	PROTECT	SOLICITOUSNESS	MONITOR	MINIMIZE	DISTRACT
645	1. Ask your child what you can do to help			.69		
646	2. Express irritation or frustration with your child				.48	
647	3. Do your child's chores or pick up your child's things instead of making him/her do it		.48			.76
648	4. Talk to your child about something else to take your child's mind off it					
649	8. Bring your child special treats or little gifts		.64			
650	10. Ask your child questions about how he/she feels			.74		
651	11. Let your child stay home from school	.64				
652	12. Encourage your child to do something he or she enjoys (like watch TV or play a game)					.55
653	13. Tell your child that he/she doesn't have to finish all your homework	.47				
654	14. Tell your child there's nothing you can do about it				.47	
655	15. Give your child special privileges		.68			
656	16. Stay home from work or come home early (or stay home instead of going out or	.60				
657	running errands)					
658	17. Tell others in the family not to bother your child or to be especially nice to your child	.50				
659	18. Tell your child not to make such a fuss about it				.73	
660	21. Tell your child that he/she needs to learn to be stronger				.55	
661	22. Let your child sleep later than usual in the morning					
662	23. Keep your child inside the house	.71				
663	24. Try to involve your child in some activity	.66				
664	26. Try to make your child as comfortable as possible				.54	.79
665	28. Check on your child to see how he/she is doing				.84	

NOTE. All original ARCS item numbers were unchanged for ease of comparability across models and studies. Weak loadings, defined as less than .32,⁴³ were suppressed. In addition to Items 5, 27, and 29, Items 6, 7, 9, 19, 20, and 25 were removed because of poor loadings or high cross loadings.

732 statistics and internal consistency values for each of the
733 newly derived 4-factor model for the combined (child
734 and adolescent) sample obtained through the EFA/CFA
735 procedures are reported in Table 5.
736

737 Individual Differences in Factor Scores

738 Means and standard deviations of the subscale scores
739 for each developmental group and for the combined
740 (child and adolescent) sample are shown in Table 4.
741 Given that different items were removed because of
742 weak and high cross loadings across each sample, and
743 factors were composed of different items, direct compar-
744 isons in subscale scores across developmental groups
745 were not made.
746

747 Among each of the child and adolescent samples,
748 compared to caregivers of youth with chronic pain, care-
749 givers of youth with IBD had significantly higher scores
750 on the Protect ($t[45.92] = 4.21, P < .001$; $t[460] = 4.58,$
751 $P < .001$) and Monitor subscales ($t[67.23] = 2.92, P < .01$;
752 $t[327.35] = 4.75, P < .001$) and lower scores on the Mini-
753 mize subscale ($t[73.45] = -3.55, P < .01$; $t[460] = -4.06,$
754 $P < .001$). Caregivers of adolescents with IBD versus
755 chronic pain had higher scores on the Solicitousness sub-
756 scale ($t[460] = 4.39, P < .001$). Caregivers of children with
757 IBD versus chronic pain had higher scores on the Distract
758 ($t[64.73] = 2.58, P < .05$) subscale.
759
760
761
762

763 Discussion

764 This is the first examination of developmental differ-
765 ences in the underlying structure of a measure of
766
767
768

798 caregiver responses to pediatric chronic pain or pain-
799 related chronic illness. The factorial validity of the
800 ARCS⁴⁸ was investigated *separately* in caregivers of chil-
801 dren and adolescents with chronic/recurrent pain or
802 pain-related chronic illness as well as in both groups com-
803 bined. This is also the first study to examine the factorial
804 validity of other factor structures of the ARCS beyond the
805 original 3-factor model. Results revealed that a 5-factor
806 model (Protect, Solicitousness, Minimize, Monitor, and
807 Distract) for adolescents and a 4-factor model (Protect,
808 Minimize, Monitor, and Distract) for children and the
809 combined (child and adolescent) sample was superior to
810 the 3-factor model proposed in previous literature.⁴⁸
811 Although the addition of 1 or 2 more factors only slightly
812 improved the variance among our study sample, the 5-
813 and 4-factor models were deemed to represent a more
814 comprehensive view of the underlying constructs and
815 probably provide a better characterization of parental
816 responses in the target population. Across the child
817 and adolescent samples as well as the combined (child
818 and adolescent) sample, we found that items previously
819 combined into a single factor (Encourage & Monitor)
820 loaded onto 2 distinct factors (Distract and Monitor).
821 These results stand in contrast to previous research, are
822 suggestive of developmental differences in the perfor-
823 mance of this measure, and will be important to explore
824 in more detail in future studies.
825
826
827

828 Although other measures of caregiver responses to
829 pediatric chronic pain exist,^{18,20} the ARCS, and
830 particularly the Protect subscale, is among the most
831 widely used. Parent protectiveness is associated with a
832
833
834

769 **Table 4. EFA Factor Loading Matrix for ARCS Items for the Final 4-Factor Model for the Entire**
770 **Sample (Children and Adolescents Combined)**
771

772	773	774	775	776	777
	ARCS ITEM	PROTECT	MONITOR	MINIMIZE	DISTRACT
778	1. Ask your child what you can do to help		.65		
779	2. Express irritation or frustration with your child			.54	
780	3. Do your child's chores or pick up your child's things instead of making him/her do it	.45			
781	4. Talk to your child about something else to take your child's mind off it				.67
782	7. Get your child something to eat or drink	.34			
783	8. Bring your child special treats or little gifts	.45			
784	10. Ask your child questions about how he/she feels		.78		
785	11. Let your child stay home from school	.67			
786	12. Encourage your child to do something he or she enjoys (like watch TV or play a game)				.64
787	13. Tell your child that he/she doesn't have to finish all your homework	.66			
788	14. Tell your child there's nothing you can do about it			.47	
789	15. Give your child special privileges	.61			
790	16. Stay home from work or come home early (or stay home instead of going out or running errands)	.68			
791	17. Tell others in the family not to bother your child or to be especially nice to your child	.65			
792	18. Tell your child not to make such a fuss about it			.80	
793	19. Pay more attention to your child than usual	.53			
794	20. Let your child sleep in a special place (like in your room or on the couch)?	.43			
795	21. Tell your child that he/she needs to learn to be stronger			.51	
796	22. Let your child sleep later than usual in the morning	.72			
797	23. Keep your child inside the house	.57			
	24. Try to involve your child in some activity				.73
	25. Spend more time than usual with your child	.36			
	26. Try to make your child as comfortable as possible		.62		
	28. Check on your child to see how he/she is doing		.80		

NOTE. All original ARCS item numbers were unchanged for ease of comparability across models and studies. Weak loadings, defined as less than .32,⁴³ were suppressed. In addition to Items 5, 27, and 29, Items 6 and 9 were removed because of poor loadings or high cross loadings.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics for ARCS Subscale Scores for the Final Models

ARCS SUBSCALE	No. of ITEMS	MEAN	SD	MEDIAN	RANGE	CRONBACH'S ALPHA
Child sample (4-factor model)						
Protect	11	12.10	7.50	11.00	0–41	.86
Monitor	4	12.85	2.74	13.00	3–16	.78
Minimize	5	3.60	2.75	3.00	0–19	.64
Distract	3	6.98	2.28	7.00	0–12	.61
Adolescent sample (5-factor model)						
Protect	6	7.75	4.40	7.00	0–23	.77
Solicitousness	3	3.89	2.33	4.00	0–11	.67
Monitor	4	12.47	2.95	13.00	1–16	.80
Minimize	4	2.86	2.41	2.00	0–13	.65
Distract	3	6.52	2.58	7.00	0–12	.74
Entire sample (4-factor model)						
Protect	13	17.65	8.81	17.00	0–47	.87
Monitor	4	12.61	2.88	13.00	1–16	.79
Minimize	4	2.94	2.40	3.00	0–16	.63
Distract	3	6.70	2.48	7.00	0–12	.70

Abbreviation: SD, standard deviation.

host of negative child outcomes, including functional disability,^{6,13,40} school absence and impairment,³⁰ somatic^{6,40} and depressive⁵ symptoms, and greater health care utilization.⁴⁴ Moreover, protectiveness appears to be intertwined with caregivers' own mental health and is positively associated with caregiver anxiety, depression, and distress and less psychological flexibility and acceptance related to their child's pain.^{32,39,49} Findings revealed that items comprising the Protect scale in the original model and the derived 4-factor child model loaded onto 2 distinct factors (Protect and Solicitousness) in the 5-factor adolescent model. It could be that the responses characterized by the Solicitousness scale are capturing more extreme and/or developmentally atypical types of protective parent responses at this later developmental stage. However, future research is needed to examine the relationships of these derived subscales with parent and child outcomes (eg, anxiety, catastrophizing, and distress).

Although previously conceived of as a single factor, distracting and monitoring responses consistently emerged as 2 separate dimensions in the final solutions. Operant theories of chronic pain hold that distracting responses serve to remove attention from pain behaviors and function to decrease them,^{11,22} whereas monitoring responses, by increasing attention to pain behaviors, serve the opposite function. Distracting parent behaviors have been shown to reduce child pain behaviors in the context of acute⁴ and chronic⁴⁵ pain. Conversely, distraction could be viewed as antithetical to recent acceptance and mindfulness-based approaches to the management of pediatric chronic pain, which emphasize exposure (versus distraction or avoidance) to moment-to-moment internal experience, even when the experience is perceived as aversive.¹⁴ There may be developmental differences in the degree to which each of these responses are used by parents. To the younger child with newer-onset pain, distraction may be effective

and adaptive; indeed, it is a particularly effective intervention for young children.³⁷ Conversely, it is possible that to the adolescent with chronic pain and illness behaviors that are more entrenched, distracting responses could be perceived as invalidating and function as a maladaptive form of avoidance. Further research using these newly separated factors (Distract and Monitor) is needed to better understand how distracting caregiver behaviors may relate to coping and functional outcomes in childhood versus adolescence.

Consistent with our hypotheses, developmental differences in the factor structure of the ARCS were supported in the present study and future research should continue to explore developmental differences in parental responses to child pain, especially in the context of any item modifications to the ARCS. Nevertheless, although different factor structures emerged for children and adolescents, this examination was limited by the items that were originally included in the ARCS. Initial measure development did not apply a developmental framework to item selection but rather was based, in part, on downward extension of an adult measure²³ as well as semi-structured interviews with mothers of patients with abdominal pain spanning several developmental stages (ie, age 8–18 years).⁴⁸ In the present study, different items were removed in the final child and adolescent samples because of poor and high cross loadings, suggesting differences in the relevance of these caregiver responses during early versus later developmental stages. Specifically, the item pertaining to doing the child's chores for them (Item 3) was dropped from the final child but not the adolescent model. This is unsurprising given that such responsibilities typically become expected of youth later in childhood and into adolescence. In addition, items included in the final child but not the adolescent models pertained to removing and directing attention to the child (Items 9 and 19), allowing the child to sleep in a special place (Item 20), and spending more time than usual with the child (Item 25). This suggests that these types of parent responses are less relevant during adolescence and there may be other more relevant domains that should be assessed during this later developmental stage. Further measure development may include modification of original ARCS items and/or the addition of new items that are informed by literature on developmental differences in pediatric pain as well as general child development.³⁶ Of particular importance to the period of adolescence may be inclusion of items tapping social and peer relationships and the social impact of chronic pain.^{16,10}

There are several reasons why parents may engage in different forms of help seeking in caring and responding to a child versus an adolescent. Parents who catastrophize about pain are likely to endorse engaging in protective responses.²⁵ Additionally, protectiveness has been shown to be the underlying process through which parents' helplessness influences child functional disability.³⁹ The degree of perceived threat and helplessness might be highest when chronic pain is experienced earlier in development, when dependence on caregivers is greatest, and the onset of pain complaints first occurs.² On

930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995

the other hand, protectiveness might increase as pain persists over time and illness behaviors become more entrenched during later developmental stages. Adolescence is marked by the transition toward self-management of pain and illness,¹⁵ during a time when reliance on the peer group and autonomy increases. Furthermore, adolescents tend to report greater avoidant behaviors and functional disability as well as different patterns of fear avoidance than younger children.⁴¹ This decreased reliance on parents as well as heightened avoidance and disability may also account for distinct patterns of parent responses in childhood and adolescence.³⁴ Future prospective research is needed to test these hypotheses, and the analytical method employed herein could be applied to other measures of caregiver responses to child pain.

The present study has limitations that might be addressed in future research. Although the sample included a range of chronic pain conditions or pain-related illness, the majority of individuals were Caucasian and had recurrent/chronic abdominal pain, similar to the original ARCS validation sample.⁴⁸ Abdominal pain may be unique; unlike other chronic pain types, it is more prevalent in childhood than adolescence.²⁴ In addition, inflammatory bowel disease was the only pain-related chronic disease studied; as such, there is a need for research to examine the factor structure of the ARCS in other pain-related chronic disease conditions (eg, cancer and sickle cell disease). Future research should also examine the developmental sensitivity of the ARCS in more diverse samples of youth and parents, including more fathers¹⁷ and other ethnic groups. Measures of parent and child psychological factors (eg, pain catastrophizing, distress) were not included and should be examined in relation to the derived subscales. The current investigation only examined parent-reported responses to child pain, which may differ in important ways from children's own perceptions and differentially predict treatment response. A prevailing shortcoming of existing literature is the reliance on cross-sectional designs that preclude examination of temporal changes in parent behaviors across development. Only a few prospective studies have examined the sensitivity of the ARCS Protect subscale to assess changes in parent responses following intervention.^{27,28,31} Longitudinal research is needed to assess the sensitivity of all derived ARCS subscales following intervention.

References

1. Andridge RR, Little RJ: A review of hot deck imputation for survey non-response. *Int Stat Rev* 78:40-64, 2010
2. Asmundson GJ, Noel M, Petter M, Parkerson H: Pediatric fear-avoidance model of chronic pain: Foundation, application, and future directions. *Pain Res Manag* 17:397-405, 2012
3. Chambers CT, Craig KD, Bennett SM: The impact of maternal behavior on children's pain experiences: An experimental analysis. *J Pediatr Psychol* 27:293-301, 2002

Some factors/subscales showed evidence of better internal reliability (eg, Protect and Monitor) than others (eg, Minimize), and the degree of internal consistency of some subscales (eg, Distract) differed across developmental groups. Future validation research is needed to expand upon these preliminary findings to examine the differential clinical utility of subscales for child and adolescent samples. Future research could also examine parent profiles using hierarchical cluster analysis and the ARCS, potentially in the context of other psychological fear-avoidance measures, as they may predict treatment response. Finally, some child clinical characteristics (eg, pain duration and frequency) were not uniformly collected across samples and available for analyses. It is likely that duration of pain/illness could influence caregiver responses to child symptom complaints, and these pain characteristics may differ as a function of developmental stage.

In summary, the present study is the first to apply a developmental analysis to the measurement of caregiver responses to child chronic pain and illness complaints and examine various factor structures of the ARCS beyond the originally proposed 3-factor model. Findings reveal that a 4-factor model for children and a 5-factor model for adolescents are superior to the 3-factor model proposed in past literature⁴⁸ and can be used with parents during these developmental stages. Although we recommend use of these derived factors for children and adolescents, the derived 4-factor model for the combined (child and adolescent) sample presented herein can be used uniformly across childhood and adolescence. Research is needed to further examine the validity of these derived subscales, particularly given that problematic items were removed from all final solutions. Given the consistent divergence of the Distract and Monitor factors across all models, it is recommended that these subscales be scored separately. This research highlights the need for consideration of developmental factors in pediatric pain research and offers an analytic approach for examining the sensitivity of our existing assessment tools. Integration of this revised measure into examinations of recent cognitive-behavioral models of pediatric chronic pain¹ may elucidate the complex interrelationships between caregivers and children in influencing trajectories of pain across the life span.

4. Chambers CT, Taddio A, Uman LS, McMurtry CM, HELPin-KIDS Team: Psychological interventions for reducing pain and distress during routine childhood immunizations: A systematic review. *Clin Ther* 31(Suppl 2):S77-S103, 2009
5. Claar RL, Guite JW, Kaczynski KJ, Logan DE: Factor structure of the Adult Responses to Children's Symptoms: Validation in children and adolescents with diverse chronic pain conditions. *Clin J Pain* 26:410-417, 2010
6. Claar RL, Simons LE, Logan DE: Parental response to children's pain: The moderating impact of children's emotional distress on symptoms and disability. *Pain* 138:172-179, 2008

1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127

10 The Journal of Pain

Factorial Validity of the ARCS

- 1128 7. Costello AB, Osborne JW: Best practices in exploratory
1129 factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the
1130 most from your analysis. *Pract Assess Res Eval*:173-178,
1131 2005. Available at: [http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?](http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=10&n=7)
1132 [Q2] [v=10&n=7](http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=10&n=7), 2005;10, 2005
- 1133 8. Cox BJ, Swinson RP, Parker JDA, Kuch K, Reichman JT:
1134 Confirmatory factor analysis of the fear questionnaire in
1135 panic disorder with agoraphobia. *Psychol Assess* 5:235-237,
1136 1993
- 1137 9. Craig KD: A social communications model of pain. *Can*
1138 *Psychol* 50:22-32, 2009
- 1139 10. Eccleston C, Wastell S, Crombez G, Jordan A: Adolescent
1140 social development and chronic pain. *Eur J Pain* 12:765-774,
1141 2008
- 1142 11. Fordyce WE: *Behavioural Methods for Chronic Pain and*
1143 *Illness*. St Louis, Mosby, 1976
- 1144 12. Goubert L, Craig KD, Vervoort T, Morley S, Sullivan MJ,
1145 Williams ACdC, Cano A, Crombez G: Facing others in pain:
1146 The effects of empathy. *Pain* 118:285-288, 2005
- 1147 13. Guite JW, McCue RL, Sherker JL, Sherry DD, Rose JB: Re-
1148 lationships among pain, protective parental responses, and
1149 disability for adolescents with chronic musculoskeletal
1150 pain: The mediating role of pain catastrophizing. *Clin J*
1151 *Pain* 27:775-781, 2011
- 1152 14. Grewal S, Petter M, Feinstein AB: The use of distraction,
1153 acceptance, and mindfulness-based techniques in the treat-
1154 ment of pediatric pain. *Pediatr Pain Lett* 14:1-9, 2012
- 1155 15. Hansen EH, Holstein BE, Due P, Currie CE: International
1156 survey of self-reported medicine use among adolescents.
1157 *Ann Pharmacother* 37:361-366, 2003
- 1158 16. Hatchette JE, McGrath PJ, Murray M, Finley GA: The role
1159 of peer communication in the socialization of adolescents'
1160 pain experiences: A qualitative investigation. *BMC Pediatr*
1161 8:1-8, 2008
- 1162 17. Hechler T, Vervoort T, Hamann M, Tietze AL, Vocks S,
1163 Goubert L, Hermann C, Wager J, Blankenburg M,
1164 Schroeder S, Zernikow B: Parental catastrophizing about
1165 their child's chronic pain: Are mothers and fathers different?
1166 *Eur J Pain* 515:e1-e9, 2011
- 1167 18. Hermann C, Zohsel K, Hohmeister J, Flor H: Dimensions
1168 of pain-related parent behavior: Development and psycho-
1169 metric evaluation of a new measure for children and their
1170 parents. *Pain* 137:689-699, 2008
- 1171 19. Hooper D, Coughlan J, Mullen MR: Structural equation
1172 modelling: Guidelines for determining model fit. *Electronic*
1173 *J Business Res Methods* 6:53-60, 2008
- 1174 20. Huguet A, Miró J, Nieto R: The inventory of parent/care-
1175 giver responses to the children's pain experience (IRPEDNA):
1176 Development and preliminary validation. *Pain* 134:128-139,
1177 2008
- 1178 21. Hurley AE, Scandura TA, Schriesheim CA, Brannick MT,
1179 Seers A, Vandenberg RJ, Williams LJ: Exploratory and
1180 confirmatory factor analysis: Guidelines, issues, and alterna-
1181 tives. *J Organ Behav* 18:667-683, 1997
- 1182 22. Joliffe CD, Nicholas MK: Verbally reinforcing pain
1183 reports: An experimental test of the operant model of
1184 chronic pain. *Pain* 107:167-175, 2004
- 1185 23. Kerns RD, Turk DC, Rudy TE: The West Haven-Yale Multi-
1186 dimensional Pain Inventory (WHYMPI). *Pain* 23:345-356,
1187 1985
24. King S, Chambers CT, Huguet A, MacNevin RC, 1194
McGrath PJ, Parker L, MacDonald AJ: The epidemiology of 1195
chronic pain in children and adolescents revisited: A system- 1196
atic review. *Pain* 152:2729-2738, 2011 1197
25. Langer SL, Romano JM, Levy RL, Walker LS, 1198
Whitehead WE: Catastrophizing and parental response to 1199
child symptom complaints. *Child Health Care* 38:169-184, 1200
2009 1201
26. Langer SL, Romano JM, Mancl L, Levy RL: Parental cata- 1202
strophizing partially mediates the association between 1203
parent-reported child pain behavior and parental protective 1204
responses. *Pain Res Treat* 2014:751097, 2014 1205
27. Levy RL, Langer SL, Walker LS, Romano JM, Christie DL, 1206
Youssef N, DuPen M, Ballard SA, Labus J, Welsh E, Feld LD, 1207
Whitehead WE: Twelve month follow-up of cognitive 1208
behavioral therapy for children with functional abdominal 1209
pain. *JAMA Pediatr* 167:178-184, 2013 1210
28. Levy RL, Langer SL, Walker LS, Romano JM, Christie DL, 1211
Youssef N, DuPen MM, Ballard SA, Welsh EM, Jeffery RW, 1212
Young M, Coffey MJ, Whitehead WE: Cognitive-behavioral 1213
therapy for children with functional abdominal pain and 1214
their parents decreases pain and other symptoms. *Am J Gastro-* 1215
enterol 105:946-956, 2010 1216
29. Logan DE, Claar RL, Guite JW, Kashikar-Zuck S, Lynch- 1217
Jordan A, Palermo TM, Wilson AC, Zhou C: Factor structure 1218
of the children's depression inventory in a multisite sample 1219
of children and adolescents with chronic pain. *J Pain* 14: 1220
689-698, 2013 1221
30. Logan DE, Simons LE, Carpino EA: Too sick for school? 1222
Parent influences on school functioning among children 1223
with chronic pain. *Pain* 153:437-443, 2012 1224
31. McCormick M, Reed-Knight B, Lewis JD, Gold BD, 1225
Blount RL: Coping skills for reducing pain and somatic symp- 1226
toms in adolescents with IBD. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 16: 1227
2148-2157, 2010 1228
32. McCracken LM, Gauntlett-Gilbert J: Role of psychologi- 1229
cal flexibility in parents of adolescents with chronic pain: 1230
Development of a measure and preliminary correlation ana- 1231
lyses. *Pain* 152:780-785, 2011 1232
33. Palermo TM, Chambers CT: Parent and family factors in 1233
pediatric chronic pain and disability: An integrative 1234
approach. *Pain* 119:1-4, 2005 1235
34. Palermo TM, Valrie CR, Karlson CW: Family and parent 1236
influences on pediatric chronic pain: A developmental 1237
perspective. *Am Psychol* 69:142-152, 2014 1238
35. Palermo TM, Wilson AC, Peters M, Lewandowski A, 1239
Somhegyi H: Randomized controlled trial of an Internet 1240
delivered family cognitive behavioral therapy intervention 1241
for children and adolescents with chronic pain. *Pain* 146: 1242
205-213, 2009 1243
36. Piaget J: Intellectual evolution from adolescence to 1244
adulthood. *Hum Dev* 15:1-12, 1972 1245
37. Piira T, Hayes B, Goodenough B, von Baeyer CL: Effects of 1246
attentional direction, age, and coping style on cold-pressor 1247
pain in children. *Behav Res Ther* 44:835-848, 2006 1248
38. Schreiber JB, Stage FK, King J, Nora A, Barlow EA: 1249
Reporting structural equation modeling and confirmatory 1250
factor analysis results: A review. *J Educ Res* 99:323-337, 2006 1251
39. Sieberg CB, Williams S, Simons LE: Do parent protective 1252
responses mediate the relation between parent distress and 1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259

1260	child functional disability among children with chronic pain? <i>J Pediatr Psychol</i> 36:1043-1051, 2011	1326
1261		1327
1262		1328
1263	40. Simons LE, Claar RL, Logan DL: Chronic pain in adolescence: Parental responses, adolescent coping, and their impact on adolescent's pain behaviors. <i>J Pediatr Psychol</i> 33:894-904, 2008	1329
1264		1330
1265		1331
1266		1332
1267	41. Simons LE, Kaczynski KJ: The fear avoidance model of chronic pain: Examination of the pediatric application. <i>J Pain</i> 13:827-835, 2012	1333
1268		1334
1269		1335
1270		1336
1271	42. Simons LE, Sieberg CB, Kaczynski KJ: Measuring parent beliefs about child acceptance of pain: A preliminary validation of the Chronic Pain Acceptance Questionnaire, parent report. <i>Pain</i> 152:2294-2300, 2011	1337
1272		1338
1273		1339
1274		1340
1275	43. Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS: <i>Using Multivariate Statistics</i> , 5th ed. Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 2007	1341
1276		1342
1277		1343
1278	44. Walker LS, Levy RL, Whitehead WE: Validation of a measure of protective parent responses to children's pain. <i>Clin J Pain</i> 22:712-716, 2006	1344
1279		1345
1280		1346
1281		1347
1282	45. Walker LS, Williams SE, Smith CA, Garber J, Van Slyke DA, Lipani A: Parent attention versus distraction: Impact on symptom complaints by children with and without chronic functional abdominal pain. <i>Pain</i> 122:43-52, 2006	1348
1283		1349
1284		1350
1285		1351
1286		1352
1287		1353
1288		1354
1289		1355
1290		1356
1291		1357
1292		1358
1293		1359
1294		1360
1295		1361
1296		1362
1297		1363
1298		1364
1299		1365
1300		1366
1301		1367
1302		1368
1303		1369
1304		1370
1305		1371
1306		1372
1307		1373
1308		1374
1309		1375
1310		1376
1311		1377
1312		1378
1313		1379
1314		1380
1315		1381
1316		1382
1317		1383
1318		1384
1319		1385
1320		1386
1321		1387
1322		1388
1323		1389
1324		1390
1325		1391