2013

Mothers' use of corporal punishment and their capacity for parental reflective functioning

Deanna Marie Herndon

MOTHERS' USE OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AND THEIR CAPACITY FOR PARENTAL REFLECTIVE FUNCTIONING

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

Psychology:

Child Development

---

by

Deanna Marie Herndon

December 2013

MOTHERS' USE OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AND THEIR CAPACITY FOR PARENTAL REFLECTIVE FUNCTIONING

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

---

by

Deanna Marie Herndon

December 2013

Approved by:

[redacted]

Laura Kamptner, Ph.D., Chair, Psychology 11-22-13 Date

[redacted]

Amanda Wilcox-Herzog, Ph.D.

[redacted]

Eugene Wong, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

Many parents use corporal punishment on their children; this disciplinary method has a variety of negative consequences that manifest in childhood, adolescence, and adulthood. The belief that corporal punishment is necessary and beneficial is persistent, and it tends to be passed down to successive generations. The current study examined mothers' current disciplinary practices relative to the discipline practices they experienced as children, and their capacity for reflective functioning. It was expected that mothers who have a *higher* capacity for reflective functioning (and who were spanked as children) would be less likely to use corporal punishment on their children while parents who lack reflective capacity (and who were spanked as children) would be more likely to believe in corporal punishment and engage in it more frequently. While significant differences in parental reflective functioning between participants who spank and who do not spank their children were not found (likely due to the measures used in this study), other interesting findings were established. Mothers who were spanked as children but who have never spanked their child had more insight into the meaning behind their child's behavior than mothers who spank their

children. In addition, half of the participants who were spanked believe that being spanked had a negative effect on them as children, while the majority believe that being spanked has had a positive effect or no effect on them as adults. Since views on parenting (in general) can change if parents go through the process of reflecting on their own and their child's thoughts, feelings, desires, needs, experiences, and intentions (i.e., *parental reflective functioning*), it is proposed that programs should be developed to alter parents' views on and practice of corporal punishment by facilitating their capacity for reflective functioning as it relates to understanding the reasons behind their children's behavior and responding in ways that positively impact their child's well-being.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to express my heartfelt appreciation to Dr. Laura Kamptner for her time, guidance, support, and encouragement during this entire process. She has been an amazing mentor who has inspired me and taught me so much. I would also like to thank my grandfather who has supported me throughout my college career and especially through the process of working on my thesis. Thank-you to my family for having faith in my abilities and cheering me on the whole way through.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Corporal punishment has been a widely accepted means of discipline for young children throughout history, and it is deeply rooted in religious beliefs, moral beliefs, cultural beliefs, the legality of spanking children, and social policy (Benjet & Kazdin, 2003; Gershoff, 2002). In recent decades, it has been a hot topic in psychological research (Flynn, 1996; Gershoff, 2002; Kazdin & Benjet, 2003; Straus & Stewart, 1999). Currently, many parents in the U.S. use corporal punishment on infants, toddlers, and young children (Flynn, 1996; Gershoff, 2002; Straus & Stewart, 1999; Wissow, 2001). Several studies have shown that over 90% of parents physically punish their children (Flynn, 1996; Giles-Sims, Straus, & Sugarman, 1995), with 94% of American parents using corporal punishment on their 3-and 4-year olds (Straus & Stuart, 1999). In a national survey, 11% of parents reported having spanked a child six to eleven months old; 36% of parents reported having spanked a child 12 to 17 months old; and 59% reported having spanked a child 18 to 23 months old (Wissow, 2001). As far as public policy, U.S. law and public policies support the use of corporal punishment on children

(Gershoff, 2002) whereas 25 countries to date have outlawed it (Global Initiative, 2009).

Corporal punishment persists for a variety of reasons, and it is transmitted from generation to generation. However, studies suggest that parenting behaviors can be altered through education and by getting parents to think reflectively on how their past experiences of being parented affected them and influenced their parenting beliefs and practices (e.g., Reynolds, 2003; Slade, 2006; Thomas, 1996). The purpose of the current study is to examine the relationship between parents' capacity for reflective functioning, their childhood experiences of being disciplined, and their current disciplinary practices.

Negative Consequences of Corporal Punishment

Recently, the effectiveness of corporal punishment has been critically challenged by researchers. Additionally, many studies have found corporal punishment to have a variety of negative consequences, including an increase in externalizing behaviors in children, internalizing problems in children, impaired parent-child relationships, low moral internalization, risky behaviors in adolescence, poor developmental outcomes in cognition

and academic attainment, and various other problems in adulthood.

Externalizing Behaviors in Children

Parental use of corporal punishment has been found to be associated with childhood behavioral problems (i.e., "externalizing behaviors"), including antisocial behavior, aggression, oppositional behaviors, hyperactivity, and low impulse control (Aucoin, Frick, & Bodin, 2006; Eamon, 2001; Mulvaney & Mebert, 2007; Slade & Wissow, 2004).

Antisocial Behavior. Antisocial behavior has been defined by such indicators as cruelty, bullying, cheating, disobedience, destructiveness, lying, not feeling remorse after misbehaving, breaking things deliberately, being disobedient at school, and having trouble getting along with teachers (Eamon, 2001; Straus, Sugarman, & Giles-Sims, 1997). Many studies have found a link between parental use of corporal punishment and antisocial behavior in children, even when controlling for other variables such as the age and sex of the child, amount of nurturance by the parent, children's initial levels of antisocial behavior, ethnicity, and SES (Eamon, 2001; Grogan-Kaylor, 2004, 2005; Gunnoe & Mariner, 1997; Straus et al., 1997; Straus & Mouradian, 1998). Parental use of corporal punishment is strongly associated with antisocial

behavior from early in life through adolescence (Eamon, 2001; Gershoff, 2002; Straus, 1991).

Aggression. Corporal punishment has also been found to be positively related to aggression (e.g., Capaldi, Pears, Patterson, & Owen, 2003). For example, adolescents who experience corporal punishment have been found to be both physically and verbally aggressive toward their mothers, regardless of the adolescent's gender (Pagani et al., 2004). Also, children who experience frequent corporal punishment are more likely to be physically aggressive than children who experience low levels of corporal punishment or no corporal punishment at all (Aucoin et al., 2006). These findings appear to hold not only in the United States, but also in other countries. For example, Lansford et al. (2005) found that the use of corporal punishment on children from the ages of six to 17 years in a variety of countries (i.e., China, India, Italy, Kenya, the Philippines, and Thailand) was associated with high levels of physical aggression in children and adolescents.

Studies have found there are two conditions in which there are stronger associations between corporal punishment and child aggression: children who are 10-12 years of age (versus younger children) and boys (versus

girls) (Gershoff, 2002). The age factor may be due to these children having experienced more cumulative corporal punishment compared to younger children. The stronger association for boys than for girls may be due to boys receiving more corporal punishment compared to girls (Giles-Sims et al, 1995; Straus & Stewart, 1999) or because boys tend to exhibit externalizing problems such as aggression while girls are more likely to experience internalizing problems (Lewinsohn, Hops, Roberts, Seeley, & Andrews, 1993).

Low Impulse Control. The more children experience corporal punishment, the more likely they are to act impulsively, especially when mothers impulsively use corporal punishment on their children (Power & Chapieski, 1986; Straus & Mouradian, 1998). Impulsiveness refers to the inability to refrain from touching or moving breakable objects (Power & Chapieski, 1986, p. 271) and "behavior that is carried out with little or no forethought and control, hot-tempered actions, acting without planning or reflection, and failing to resist urges" (Straus & Mouradian, 1998, p. 354).

Conclusion. Many studies were able to single out the effects of corporal punishment because they controlled for a wide array of other variables that may increase

children's behavioral problems (e.g., parenting style, household income, child temperament, and maternal depression). Some studies have found that the more prolonged the use of corporal punishment and the more frequently parents use it, the greater the likelihood of behavior problems in children (Aucoin et al, 2006; Straus et al, 1997; Straus & Mouradian, 1998). Other studies, however, have found a nonlinear trend, in which any use of corporal punishment is associated with behavioral problems in children (i.e., all levels of frequency of corporal punishment from 'infrequently' to 'frequently' were associated with antisocial behavior) (Grogan-Kaylor, 2004). Either way, there appears to be a definite link between corporal punishment and externalizing behaviors in children. The effects of corporal punishment on children's externalizing behaviors also seem to be consistent over time (i.e., from early childhood to middle childhood to adolescence).

Internalizing Problems in Children

Studies show that frequent corporal punishment of children is associated with higher levels of internalizing problems (Eamon, 2001; Turner & Finkelhor, 1996). Internalizing problems refer to negative internal states such as general emotional distress, anger, depression,

anxiety, and low self-esteem (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1978; Wilkinson, 2009). Corporal punishment has been associated with higher scores on the Behavior Problems Index (BPI) scale (with internalizing problem indicators such as "worrying," "withdrawing," "crying," "sadness," and "anxiousness") in 4 to 9 year old children (Eamon, 2001) and in children ages 10 through 16, with feeling sad, feeling alone, feeling bad about school, feeling bad about their looks, and feeling that they were doing things wrong in the past month (Turner & Finkelhor, 1996). The use of corporal punishment on adolescents is associated with higher levels of psychiatric symptoms (i.e., obsessiveness, depression, anxiety, and paranoid ideation) and lower general well-being (i.e., mood, energy level, and satisfaction with life) (Bachar, Canetti, Bonne, DeNour, & Shalev, 1997).

Children who experience frequent corporal punishment have the highest scores on the BPI, but even children who experience low levels of corporal punishment still report feelings of distress (Turner & Finkelhor, 1996). The association between corporal punishment and psychological distress is evident regardless of the child's age, gender, and ethnicity (Eamon, 2001), and it has a harmful effect

on children even in the presence of a loving and supportive home (Turner & Finkelhor, 1996).

Depression and Anger. Studies repeatedly find that parental use of corporal punishment is associated with depression in children and adolescents (e.g., Aucoin et al., 2006; Gershoff, 2002; Maurer, 1974; McLoyd, Jayaratne, Ceballo, & Borquez, 1994; Rodriguez, 2003; Turner & Finkelhor, 1996). Children report feelings of sadness (the most common response of children ages 9 through 11) and anger (the most common response of children ages 5 through 7 and 12 through 14) after they were spanked (Dobbs & Duncan, 2004; Dobbs, Smith, & Taylor, 2006). Children who are spanked also reported that the pain causes them to feel anger; this was true even for children who were spanked occasionally and at low levels of intensity (Graziano, Hamblen, & Plante, 1996).

Anxiety. Corporal punishment is also related to high levels of anxiety in children (e.g., Gershoff, 2002). Anxiety typically brings about physical symptoms such as sweating, a rapid heartbeat, and perspiration (Wilkinson, 2009). It also produces elevated levels of the stress hormone cortisol (Bugental, Martorell, & Barraza, 2003). Toddlers whose mothers frequently use corporal punishment on them have elevated levels of cortisol when they are

separated from their mothers and in the company of a stranger when compared to infants whose mothers do not employ frequent corporal punishment (Bugental et al., 2003). High levels of cortisol in these young children demonstrate that they feel anxious more often than infants who don't experience corporal punishment. An association between parental use of corporal punishment and anxiety/stress in Chinese adolescents has also been found (Lau, Liu, Cheung, Yu, & Wong, 1999). These authors characterized anxiety/stress with such indicators as "feeling constantly under strain," "feeling anxious about puberty," and "feeling that parental expectations are too high."

Low Self-Esteem. Parental use of corporal punishment has also been found to be associated with low self-esteem in children and adolescents (e.g., Bryan & Freed, 1982; Litovsky & Dusek, 1985). Adolescents whose parents use corporal punishment on them are more likely to view themselves as worthless persons (Lau et al., 1999). Even children who experience infrequent corporal punishment (e.g., one to two instances in a three week period) have significantly lower scores on self-esteem and higher scores on sense of inadequacy compared to children who haven't experienced any corporal punishment in a three

week period (Aucoin et al., 2006). This finding was true for all children, regardless of their ethnicity and the warmth and responsiveness of their parents (Aucoin et al., 2006)

Impaired Parent-Child Relationships

Corporal punishment has also been found to impede the development of an emotionally-close relationship between parents and children (Gershoff, 2002). A warm, emotional relationship is optimal for children's psychological health and well-being (Cassidy, 2009). The pain from corporal punishment induces feelings of anxiety and fear in children, which then may cause children to be frightened and withdraw from their parent to avoid further pain (Aronfreed, 1961; Grusec & Goodnow, 1994). In fact, children have reported feeling fearful when their parents spank them (Dobbs & Duncan, 2004; Dobbs et al., 2006). Corporal punishment also may negatively affect parent-child relationships because it can bring about anger and resentment in children who feel that they are not being treated justly, which negatively affects the relationship between the parent and the child (Dobbs & Duncan, 2004; Dobbs et al., 2006; Snyder & Patterson, 1986). Corporal punishment impedes the development of trust between parents and children. Clearly, children who

are fearful or angry toward their parents are not likely to trust and feel close to their parents, which creates a strain in the parent-child relationship as well as impaired developmental outcomes across all domains (Thompson, 2002).

The quality of the parent-child attachment relationship is of pivotal importance because its security (or lack thereof) is evidence of a healthy and close relationship (or an unhealthy and insecure relationship). Attachment quality in infants and young children has, in fact, been found to be related to the use of corporal punishment. Fourteen-month-old infants who were spanked "in the past week," for example, have been found to be less securely attached to their mothers than infants who were not spanked (Coyl, Roggman, & Newland, 2002). In addition, when compared to securely attached preschool children, insecurely attached African-American preschool children are more likely to be spanked by their primary caregiver (Barnett, Kidwell, & Ho Leung, 1998). It is important to note that primary caregivers of insecurely attached children also tend to be more controlling of, and more verbally demeaning toward, their child (Barnett et al., 1998). These findings imply that corporal punishment tends to be used along with other coercive means of

raising children, and this type of caregiving impedes on healthy, secure attachments between caregivers and their children.

Low Moral Internalization

"*Moral internalization*" is defined by Grusec and Goodnow (1994) as "taking over the values and attitudes of society as one's own so that socially acceptable behavior is motivated not by anticipation of external consequences but by intrinsic or internal factors" (p. 4). These authors contend that power-assertive methods of discipline such as corporal punishment urge children to do the right thing in order to avoid being spanked, and that corporal punishment impedes children's desire to internalize their parents' values and take them on as their own. There are several reasons why corporal punishment doesn't initiate moral internalization: it doesn't teach children the rationale for doing or not doing something, it doesn't convey how the child's behavior impacted another person, and it may encourage children to simply not get caught in the future (Gershoff, 2002). In addition, feelings of fear and distress brought about by corporal punishment cause children to avoid their parents instead of learning and reflecting on what the parents are displeased with and

internalizing their parents' message (Grusec & Goodnow, 1994).

The amount of corporal punishment used by parents is negatively correlated with children's internalized standards: the higher the amount of corporal punishment, the less the child appears to have internalized what his or her parent was trying to teach him or her (Gershoff, 2002; Lytton, 1971). In fact, in Gershoff's (2002) meta-analysis, 85% of the studies found that corporal punishment was related to low moral internalization and low long-term compliance. Children who are temperamentally fearful or anxious appear to be even less likely to morally internalize their parents' socialization efforts when they are spanked (Kochanska, Aksan, & Joy, 2007).

Risky Behaviors in Adolescence

A link between parental use of corporal punishment and adolescents engaging in risky behaviors has also been found. For example, adolescents whose parents use corporal punishment on them during their teenage years are more likely to engage in behaviors that put their health in jeopardy, including abusing alcohol (Lau et al., 1999; Straus & Kaufman-Kantor, 1994), smoking cigarettes, and physically fighting with others (Lau et al., 1999). The link between corporal punishment and alcohol abuse appears

to be especially strong for male adolescents who are of low socioeconomic status (Straus & Kaufman-Kantor, 1994).

Poor Developmental Outcomes in Cognition and Academic Attainment

Research has linked parental use of corporal punishment to reduced cognitive ability in children and to low academic achievement in adolescents and adults (e.g., Aucoin et al., 2006; Straus & Paschall, 2006).

Because infants and children react to corporal punishment with fear and anxiety (Bugental et al, 2003; Turner & Finkelhor, 1996), they in turn produce elevated levels of the stress hormone cortisol (Bugental et al, 2003) which then leads to cognitive deficits (Straus & Paschall, 2006). Children whose parents frequently rely on the use of corporal punishment as a discipline strategy tend to have lower intelligence scores (especially on nonverbal items such as spatial skills and problem solving) compared to children whose parents rarely or never use corporal punishment (Aucoin et al., 2006; Power & Chapieski, 1986; Straus & Paschall, 2006).

The less corporal punishment parents use, the more cognitive stimulation they tend to provide for their children (Straus & Paschall, 2006). It can be assumed that parents who primarily use corporal punishment for

discipline are not using as many discipline strategies that employ verbal interactions with the child through the use of explaining or reasoning, which may contribute to why frequent corporal punishment is associated with decreased cognitive development in children (Straus & Paschall, 2006).

Chinese adolescents who reported being spanked in the past three months also demonstrate inferior academic performance (Lau et al., 1999). Adults who experienced high rates of corporal punishment (either as children or adolescents) have been found to have a lower probability of graduating from college (Straus & Mathur, 1995), and if in college, have below-average grades when compared to students who were spanked at medium and low frequencies (Bryan & Freed, 1982). These studies controlled for potential confounding factors that could also be related to academic attainment such as social class, witnessing violence between parents, and the participants' ages. The lowered probability of graduating from college and of earning below average grades were associated with high rates of corporal punishment, even when these other factors were taken into account.

Problems in Adulthood

Studies have not only found corporal punishment to be associated with problems in children and adolescents, but also with problems in adulthood, including depression, anxiety, substance abuse, higher rates of crime and violence, and marital and relationship difficulties.

Depression. Corporal punishment in childhood or adolescence has been associated with depression in adulthood (e.g., Straus, 2000; Straus & Kaufman-Kantor, 1994; Straus & Yodanis, 1996; Turner & Muller, 2004). (These studies have controlled for additional factors that have also been found to be associated with depression, e.g., socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and abuse so that a direct link between corporal punishment and depression in adulthood can be determined). Straus (2000) found that adults who were frequently spanked as adolescents were more likely to report depressive symptoms and suicidal thoughts than adults who were not frequently spanked as adolescents. Furthermore, even when there was only one occurrence of corporal punishment in adolescence, there was an increase in depressive symptoms. Straus proposes that corporal punishment causes stress in childhood and adolescence, which alters the structure and function of the brain, which in turn leads to depression in adulthood.

Another study found a link between corporal punishment in childhood and depression in young adults; however, the mediating factor in this study was self-esteem/sense of mastery (Turner & Muller, 2004). The more young adults were spanked when they were 13 years old, the more they reported a diminished sense of mastery and self-esteem. This lack of self-esteem was more strongly related to depression in young adulthood than was corporal punishment. This finding was especially true if their parent was angry when they spanked their child.

Anxiety and Alcohol Dependence. In addition to depression, a high frequency of corporal punishment in childhood has been linked with anxiety in adults (e.g., Bryan & Freed, 1982). Adolescents and adults from the ages of 15 to 65 who reported receiving corporal punishment "often" and "sometimes" as children had higher rates of anxiety disorders when compared to adults who never experienced corporal punishment as children (MacMillan et al., 1999). In this study, the authors were careful to tease out the potential confounds of physical and sexual abuse, which made for a stronger case that corporal punishment itself was directly related to anxiety disorders in adulthood. In addition, alcohol abuse or dependence in adulthood has been found to be strongly

associated with a high frequency of corporal punishment in childhood (MacMillan et al., 1999; Straus & Kaufman-Kantor, 1994).

Aggression/Crime. Corporal punishment in childhood has also been linked to various antisocial behaviors in adults (e.g., MacMillan et al., 1999). A high frequency of corporal punishment during childhood has been directly related to aggression and delinquency in adulthood (Bryan & Freed, 1982) and to a higher probability of committing a crime and being arrested (Straus & Lauer, 1992); this was true for African-Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Euro-Americans, regardless of their socioeconomic status (Straus & Lauer, 1992). Straus (1991) maintains that corporal punishment is associated with a variety of crimes in adulthood, including assault on spouses, "street crime," and assault outside the family.

Marital Problems. It has been found that experiencing corporal punishment in childhood and adolescence is associated with problems in marriage, particularly in the physical assault of spouses. People who experienced corporal punishment during childhood are more likely to be physically or verbally aggressive with their spouse, more controlling of their spouse, and to have more difficulty

seeing things from their spouses' point of view (Cast, Schweingruber, & Berns, 2006).

Findings suggest that corporal punishment in childhood increases the probability of depression, causes people to approve of violence, and increases the likelihood of marital conflict (due to a lack of opportunities in childhood to gain knowledge of conflict resolution skills) (Cast, Schweingruber, & Berns, 2006; Straus & Yodanis, 1996; Turner & Muller, 2004). Furthermore, these three variables have all been shown to lead to physical assault on spouses (defined as slapping, shoving, and throwing things) (Straus & Kaufman-Kantor, 1994; Straus & Yodanis, 1996). These studies have been carried out on a nationally representative sample of participants and have been able to control for age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, current alcohol abuse, and the witnessing of violence between parents (all of which are risk factors of spousal assault). It is interesting to note that even when participants did not witness violence between their parents, being spanked as an adolescent increased their likelihood of assaulting their spouse; however, when combined with witnessing parental violence, it substantially increased the

likelihood of spousal assault (Straus & Kaufman-Kantor, 1994).

It has been proposed that corporal punishment teaches children that aggression and domination are effective means of dealing with relationship difficulties, and it has been additionally concluded that corporal punishment impedes a child's ability to become competent in learning interpersonal skills such as how to problem-solve effectively (Cast, Schweingruber, & Berns, 2006).

Summary

In conclusion, not only does corporal punishment not work beyond temporary compliance, it creates many long-term and enduring problems. Numerous studies have shown a strong association between corporal punishment and a range of detrimental outcomes and experiences; most of these studies have taken into account additional factors that influence child outcomes. Many studies have shown that children who experience severe and/or frequent corporal punishment are most strongly affected, but even children who experience less severe and/or frequent corporal punishment endure the negative consequences. The negative outcomes of corporal punishment obviously affect children during childhood in many ways, yet these negative consequences also last a lifetime and impact adults'

mental health and relationships with others (including future relationships with one's own children).

As the research becomes increasingly compelling and people become more aware of how corporal punishment negatively affects children and adults in a variety of ways, support for corporal punishment ought to diminish. However, parenting beliefs and behaviors do not easily change; this is especially true regarding the belief that corporal punishment is not only beneficial, but essential for children's well-being.

Why Corporal Punishment Persists

The beliefs, perspectives, and worldviews that people hold are persistent and highly resistant to change; these ways of thinking and viewing the world are called conceptual frameworks (McDevitt & Ormrod, 2008; Murphy, 2007; Thomas, 1996). Additionally, people tend to parent as they themselves were parented; this is referred to as the intergenerational transmission of parenting.

Pervasiveness of Conceptual Frameworks

Conceptual frameworks are often unconscious and emotionally-rooted (Thomas, 1996). Therefore, existing beliefs need to be thoroughly examined and then abandoned in order to be transformed into new beliefs (Thomas,

1996). This process can be distressing because it requires people to view their prior worldview and conceptions as deficient and wrong (Thomas, 1996). Perhaps personally-relevant beliefs such as the use of corporal punishment are so pervasive because these beliefs are self-defining: they represent a person's values and are associated with how people view themselves (Boninger, Krosnick, & Berent, 1995; Johnson & Eagly, 1989). The majority of people who hold the view that corporal punishment of children is beneficial and necessary were spanked as children and have internalized this discipline strategy as effective (Deater-Deckard, Lansford, Dodge, Pettit, & Bates, 2003). Therefore, when confronted with the message that corporal punishment is harmful and ineffective, these individuals respond with negative affect and resist the message by arguing against it. Presumably, this is because their belief (and therefore, their values and view of themselves) feels threatened.

In addition, prior knowledge and beliefs are tenacious; this is especially true regarding deep-seated personal beliefs that have personal significance (originating from personal parenting history, religion, and culture) such as parenting and discipline (McDevitt & Ormrod, 2008). When people are deeply committed to a

belief that is personally important and self-defining, they attend to information that confirms and sustains their current belief and disregard any conflicting information; this is called "confirmation bias" (Lord, Ross, & Lepper, 1979; McDevitt & Ormrod, 2008). People have an inclination to discard concepts that do not fit into their pre-existing beliefs and to regard new ideas as not worth contemplating (Mezirow, 1997). People are also likely to be motivated to resist any message that contradicts their belief (Borgida & Howard-Pitney, 1983; Pomerantz, Chaiken, & Tordesillas, 1995; Zuwerink & Devine, 1996). When people are confronted with messages that counter something they feel passionate about, they sometimes respond with anger and irritation and feel the need to defend their belief (Pomerantz et al., 1995; Zuwerink & Devine, 1996). When they feel that their belief is threatened, they put more effort into disputing the new idea than in making a case for their belief. These processes of "confirmation bias" and "selective judgment" may be large factors in why self-defining beliefs are so hard to change (Pomerantz et al., 1995). When people are confronted with the notion that corporal punishment of children is harmful and ineffective, they may resist the message because their existing belief that the discipline

practice is advantageous and even necessary for children's well-being is so strongly embedded in their worldview. Furthermore, even when attitudes do change, the old beliefs do not completely dissolve; they can still continue to influence behavior in certain situations, perhaps at an unconscious level (Dole & Sinatra, 1998; Petty, Brinol, Tormala, & Jarvis, 2006). This is especially true when engagement with the new concept only requires a low level of cognition (Dole & Sinatra, 1998). People who do change their belief about the negative consequences of corporal punishment still may continue to spank their children in certain situations, particularly if their original belief wasn't fully examined and reflected upon.

The Intergenerational Transmission of Corporal Punishment

People tend to parent their children how they themselves were parented; therefore, parenting practices tend to be transmitted from generation to generation. This is especially true when it comes to disciplining children (including the use of praise, rewards, reasoning, threat, and corporal punishment) (Covell, Grusec, & King, 1995). In particular, the practice of corporal punishment has been found to be passed down to successive generations

(Deater-Deckard et al., 2003; Muller, Hunter, & Stollak, 1995; Murphy-Cowan & Stringer, 1999).

Researchers' viewpoints differ in regard to how discipline strategies are transmitted. Some refer to a social learning model, some look at how parental beliefs regarding parenting practices are passed down, and some examine how parental beliefs about children's misbehavior are transmitted to succeeding generations.

Researchers who consider social learning to be the explanation for the intergenerational transmission of discipline have examined "harsh parenting" (defined as yelling, spanking, slapping, shoving, or hitting their child with an object) (Simons, Whitbeck, Conger, & Wu, 1991) and parental use of "severe" corporal punishment (Muller et al., 1995; Simons et al., 1991). According to social learning theory, children who repeatedly experience harsh discipline perceive it as normal and necessary, and they are socialized to be aggressive in response to their parents modeling physical aggression in their interactions with them (Muller et al., 1995). When adults demonstrate aggressive behavior, their children view that behavior as permissible; therefore, children's inhibitory responses are reduced and they have a higher likelihood of engaging in physically aggressive acts (Bandura, Ross, & Ross,

1961). The premise is that children who experience harsh discipline end up imitating these aggressive behaviors; furthermore, this type of discipline is expressed in a reflexive manner when children become parents and discipline their own children (Simons, Beaman, Conger, & Chao, 1992).

On the other hand, parental belief systems (rather than corporal punishment itself) as the mechanism for the transmission of parenting practices to successive generations focuses on parents' attitudes about the efficacy and appropriateness of corporal punishment (Deater-Deckard et al., 2003; Simons et al., 1992). For example, children whose parents believe that corporal punishment works as an effective discipline strategy and is beneficial for children's well-being will likely end up absorbing that parenting philosophy and transmitting the same message to their own children (Deater-Deckard et al., 2003).

Parental beliefs about the causes of their children's misbehavior may also be a determining factor in whether parents use corporal punishment, and these specific beliefs might also be passed down to successive generations (Grusec, 1991). For example, if parents feel that their child knew what he or she did was wrong or if

they believe the child had bad intentions, they are more likely to spank their child. This belief about the attributions of the child's misbehavior is what some researchers consider to be transmitted (Grusec, 1991).

In conclusion, the act of corporal punishment itself as well as parental beliefs concerning corporal punishment and children's misbehavior are transmitted from generation to generation. Some people may reflexively spank their own children as a result of learning this behavior from their parents in childhood, but others are likely affected on a deeper level (i.e., beliefs about discipline). Parenting beliefs appear to be largely formed by the type of parenting people are exposed to when they are children. Most parents don't typically discuss their parental beliefs with their children; rather, their parenting practices (such as corporal punishment) may indirectly convey their parenting philosophies and are inferred by children (Simons et al., 1992). The intergenerational transmission of corporal punishment is powerful and persistent, and for this reason, it is hard to convince people to parent differently from their parents and to not spank their children.

What Alters Parenting Behaviors

While beliefs and behaviors that parents hold regarding discipline and the use of corporal punishment tend to persevere and are resistant to change, there are instances of parents altering their parenting beliefs and behaviors. Certain circumstances have enabled professionals (e.g., government officials, parent educators, therapists) to influence parents to modify their existing perspectives and to transform the way they parent and discipline their children. First, several countries have been able to convince parents that corporal punishment should not be used on children under any circumstance; however, this transformation was gradual as it took several generations for the belief and practice to change. Second, parents have been found to go through stages of parent development in which they become more aware of how their child experiences the world and are better able to meet their child's emotional needs as they progress to higher levels. Finally, conceptual frameworks regarding discipline can also be changed if parents are encouraged and supported in the process of examining their existing beliefs, reflecting on how their past experiences affected them, and at the same time, reflecting on their child's current experience.

Sweden's Ban on the Use of Corporal Punishment on Children

In 1979, Sweden was the first country to ban the use of corporal punishment on children. This legal reform was not intended to carry criminal penalties; rather, it was intended to educate the public about the negative effects of corporal punishment and to set a standard that children should never be hit under any circumstances (Durrant, 1999; Ziegert, 1983). Two additional goals of the law were to provide children with the right to protection from harm and to alter the public's viewpoint over time about the acceptability of using corporal punishment (Ziegert, 1983). Since the law was passed, 34 more countries have followed the lead of Sweden in banning the use of corporal punishment on children: Finland (1983), Norway (1987), Austria (1989), Cyprus (1994), Denmark (1997), Latvia (1998), Croatia (1999), Bulgaria (2000), Germany (2000), Israel (2000), Iceland (2003), Romania (2004), Ukraine (2004), Hungary (2005), Greece (2006), Netherlands (2007), New Zealand (2007), Portugal (2007), Spain (2007), Chile (2007), Uruguay (2007)., Venezuela (2007), Togo (2007), Costa Rica (2008), Republic of Moldova (2008), Luxembourg (2008), Costa Rica (2008), Liechtenstein (2008), Albania (2010), Kenya (2010), Poland (2010), Republic of Congo

(2010), Tunisia (2010), and Honduras (2013) (Global Initiative, 2012; 2013).

The History of Sweden's Legislative Reform (1928-1979). The law that passed in 1979 was preceded by a series of legislative reforms that began back in 1928 (Durrant, 2003). In 1928, Sweden was the first country to abolish corporal punishment in secondary schools. Then in 1949, a new civil code called the *Parents' Code* was created; this code regulated family law to take children's well-being into consideration. However, at this time the *Parents' Code* still had a paragraph which condoned mild forms of corporal punishment on children. In 1957, another legislative reform gave children the same protection against assault as adults had been given (Durrant, 2003). This was an improvement in legislative reform, but the *Parents' Code* still made allowances for mild forms of corporal punishment and there was not a specific declaration in the law that made it illegal. In 1966, the paragraph that condoned mild forms of corporal punishment was taken out. After two highly publicized cases of child abuse in the 1970s, the Minister of Justice decided to appoint a Commission on Children's rights in order to re-examine and revise the existing *Parents' Code* (Durrant, 2003). The commission published a report in 1977 which

stated that the use of corporal punishment on children ought to be banned. In response, the government added a paragraph to the *Parents' Code* which specifically proclaimed that corporal punishment of children was against the law. The proposal was agreed upon by 98% of Parliament and was passed on July 1, 1979 (Durrant, 2003).

Each piece of reform that transpired between 1928 and 1972 helped create a slight change in public attitudes toward corporal punishment, and by the early 1980s, the public was now more inclined to accept the prohibition on corporal punishment.

Public Education Campaign. Once the new law was passed in 1979, the commission suggested a public education campaign to be carried out to educate the public about the new law; this public education campaign lasted for two years (Durrant, 2003; Gershoff & Bitensky, 2007). The new law was made known through television and newspapers and was printed on milk cartons. In addition, a 16-page pamphlet was created in all major languages spoken in Sweden, and the pamphlet was disseminated to every household, medical office, child care center, school, and social welfare office. Its purpose was to inform people about the new law and also to make clear the reasons to avoid corporal punishment and to educate people on the use

of other disciplinary strategies for raising children. The pamphlet also informed the public of local agencies that could be of assistance (e.g., child welfare centers, pediatricians, schools, child psychiatric clinics, social service centers) (Ziegert, 1983). By 1981, 99% of the population was informed about the law (Ziegert, 1983).

Outcomes in Sweden. To date, the prevalence of corporal punishment in Sweden has decreased from 51% of preschool children receiving it in 1980 to only 8% receiving it in 2000 (Durrant, 1999; 2003; Janson, 2005). Public support for corporal punishment has also decreased from 53% in the 1970s before the ban to 11% in 2000 (Durrant, 1999; Janson, 2005). In 2003, Swedish mothers of preschool-aged children reported what they would do in response to a variety of their child's transgressions (Durrant, Rose-Kransnor, Broberg, 2003). A large majority (80%) of the mothers believed that corporal punishment was detrimental and not necessary; an even larger majority (90%) believed that it was unproductive. These results indicate that legislative reform led to a gradual change in public attitudes that took place over two generations (Durrant, 2003). While before the ban it was the norm to spank children, it was now the norm not to use corporal punishment on children.

Since this ban has passed, child injuries due to assault have declined (Durrant, 1999). In fact, for 15 years, no children died in Sweden due to physical abuse (Durrant, 1999). Both externalizing behaviors and internalizing problems in children and adolescents have declined from 1979 to 1996 (Durrant, 2000). Specifically, the rate of youth participation in crime has dropped 20% since the 1970s; the percentage of youth who drink alcohol has gone down by 12%; the percentage of youth who have ever tried drugs has declined by 27%, and the percentage of youths who maintain drug use has more than halved; the suicide rate of young people decreased by 19% from 1970 to 1991 (Durrant, 2000).

Conclusion. Sweden's ban on corporal punishment was successful, but it occurred over a span of 50 years. Some researchers contend that the law itself may not be the single factor in the declining support for the use of corporal punishment (Durrant, 1999; 2000; Janson, 2005). The ban occurred prior to various additional social changes in Sweden that likely altered people's attitudes toward corporal punishment (i.e., "ongoing legislative reform, demographic shifts, and modifications to social policies") (Durrant, 1999, p. 446). It is also true that the ban on corporal punishment took place within a social

context of other progressive ways of treating and caring for children (e.g., highly effective maternal and child health care, recognition of children's rights, substantial parental leaves, high levels of parenting education, and a subsidized day care system) (Durrant, 2003; Janson, 2005). Even if the ban itself didn't single-handedly cause the decline in support for corporal punishment, the law still set a standard that Sweden is opposed to the corporal punishment of children. Actually, *after* the law was passed, attitudes rapidly changed (Durrant, 2003). The legislative reform very well may have contributed to the shifting of the public's attitudes.

Parent Development

Although parents have persistent beliefs about children and how they should be disciplined, parents have the potential to transform their parental beliefs as they progress through stages of "parent development" (Demick, 2002; Newberger, 1980; Thomas, 1996). Parental awareness is a component of parent development that refers to parents' perceptions of their child and beliefs about their role as a parent. There are four levels of parental awareness, with each level demonstrating increasingly complex and flexible ways of thinking about children (Newberger, 1980). Parents can be anywhere on a

developmental continuum from only focusing on their own needs in relation to their child, to conforming to traditional norms, to viewing the world through their child's perspective and meeting his or her needs appropriately (Demick, 2002; Thomas, 1996). Parents at "higher levels" of parental awareness have more positive interactions with their children, are more responsive and nurturing, and have children who are less likely to withdraw from them. In addition, these parents are more flexible in their thinking about the nature of child-related issues and are able to see the world through their children's eyes (Flick & McSweeney, 1985; Thomas, 1996). Parental awareness is not related to gender, race, or social class, but it does generally increase with age and is linked to years of experience as a parent (Thomas, 1996).

Parents' overall level of development (including cognitive development, epistemological development, psychosocial development, and self-concept development) influences their perceptions of children's development as well as the way they interact with and discipline their child (Bond & Burns, 1998). Parents who themselves have a variety of developmental competencies (i.e., higher levels of development in many domains) provide their children

with experiences that foster their development (Bond & Burns, 1998). Specifically, parents' cognitive development can affect their conceptions of the nature of child development and their choice of parenting practices (Pratt, Hunsberger, Pancer, Roth, & Santolupo, 1993). In order to take the perspective of their child, parents must be able to both differentiate between the two perspectives at once as well as integrate their child's perspective with their own. Considering their child's perspective includes inferring their child's disposition, abilities, emotions, anticipations, and possible responses; to do this requires somewhat advanced cognitive ability (Selman, 1971). In summary, parents who strive for individual growth and who progress in various development domains demonstrate more multifaceted ways of viewing their child's behavior and interacting with their child (Bond & Burns, 1998).

"Parenting schemas" or "scripts" are conceptions that parents hold regarding their role as a parent, what children need in general, and views of their individual child (Azar, Nix, & Makin-Byrd, 2005). These schemas are unconscious and are a product of cultural practices, childhood experiences of being parented, as well as experiences of being a parent; in fact, "Schemas are based

on core beliefs that, in many ways, define who we are" (Azaret et al., 2005, p. 94). Parenting schemas are not likely to completely change (Azar et al., 2005; Shulman, 2006); however, they can evolve and be modified over time if parents become aware of them (Azar et al., 2005; Shulman, 2006). Many parents can and do change, but the change does not come easily and requires insightful thinking.

Reflective Thinking Fosters Conceptual Change

In order for personally-relevant attitudes and beliefs to change, conceptual change must be fostered through reflective thinking (Dole & Sinatra, 1998; McDevitt & Ormrad, 2008; Thomas, 1996). Conceptual change involves completely modifying one's current beliefs, ideas, perspectives, worldview, or ways of thinking by undergoing a major shift in the understanding of a concept (McDevitt & Ormrod, 2008; Murphy, 2007).

Transformative learning promotes conceptual change; it occurs when people's personal experiences are understood and made sense of through their beliefs, values, and assumptions (Merriam, 2004; Mezirow, 1997, 1998). While many people disregard concepts that are different than their existing beliefs, transformative learners have viewpoints that are more wide-ranging,

perceptive, incorporative of experience, and self-reflective (Mezirow, 1997). In order to be transformative learners, people must be able to critically reflect on their viewpoints and must have the ability to investigate and reflect on where these convictions come from and how their beliefs regulate the way they think, feel, and act (McDevitt & Ormrod, 2008; Mezirow, 1998; Thomas, 1996). This type of reflection is also called *premise reflection*; it is reflecting on one's assumptions about the self, one's culture, one's ethics, and one's feelings (Mezirow, 1998). In relation to parental use of corporal punishment, reflection must be focused on parents' own development and past experiences of being disciplined. Parents must become aware of the painful experiences of being spanked as a child so that they can identify how their child must feel (Shulman, 2006). Once they have reflected on where their current beliefs stem from, people must then become discontented with their existing conceptions in order for conceptual change to occur (Thomas, 1996). It is also beneficial for people to be exposed to others' viewpoints and beliefs and to reflect on others' perspectives, because exposure to alternative beliefs encourages people to identify and reflect upon their own beliefs (Thomas, 1996).

People need to be actively cognitively engaged with new material in order for transformative learning and conceptual change to take place (McDevitt & Ormrod, 2008). This means that people need to be at a certain level of cognitive development for them to be able to critically reflect and engage in introspective self-examination (Fonagy, Steele, Steele, Moran, & Higgitt, 1991; Merriam, 2004). This cognitive ability for critical self-reflection may be related to people's abilities to apply what they learn regarding parenting and discipline because it allows them to be able to challenge existing beliefs on parenting and to commit to changing parenting strategies; this requires self-examination and reflection of past and present experiences with parenting. On the other hand, a potential barrier to parents changing their beliefs about corporal punishment may be their inability to critically self-reflect.

Parental Reflective Functioning. While it is important that parents reflect on their assumptions and understand how their life experiences have shaped their beliefs, parents also need to be able to reflect on their child's mental states and intentions (this is referred to as "mentalizing"). Mentalizing involves the capability and willingness to empathize with another's subjective

experience (Fonagy et al., 1991; Slade, 2005). Also called parental reflective functioning, this refers to the ability of parents to view their children's behavior in relation to their mental states while at the same time understanding how their own internal experience influences their child's (Slade, 2005; 2006). People vary in their capacity for reflective functioning; they can be at different points along a continuum from low to high reflective functioning (King & Kitchener, 2004; Slade, 2006). Parents who demonstrate an ability to be highly reflective understand their own and their child's motivations and psychological states and have children who are more securely attached (Fonagy et al., 1991; Slade, Grienenberger, Bernback, Levy, & Locker, 2005; Reynolds, 2003). They have insight into their child's inner world, are open to new information about their child, and have a multifaceted view of their child as a whole person (Oppenheim & Koren-Karie, 2002). In response to their child's misbehavior, they are likely to attempt to gain insight into the underlying reason for their child's behavior and respond in ways that keep the parent and child connected and that are beneficial for the child's development and well-being. Parents who don't reflect on their child's mental experience lack insight into the

fundamental motivations behind their child's behavior (Oppenheim & Koren-Karie, 2002); therefore, it can be hypothesized that these parents are more likely to use a reflexive type of discipline (such as corporal punishment) with their child in response to misbehavior rather than using a more positive discipline strategy.

Interventions that have been successful in positively transforming parent-child relationships and getting parents to change their parenting behaviors have focused on enhancing parents' capacities to reflect on their own and their child's thoughts, feelings, desires, needs, experiences, and intentions (e.g., Reynolds, 2003; Slade, 2006; Slade et al., 2005; Thomas, 1996) as well as helping parents to understand the meaning behind their child's behaviors (Brems, Baldwin, & Baxter, 1993). Rather than simply teaching parents specific childrearing skills, interventions need to focus on helping parents to understand their child in meaningful ways and to encourage parents to reflect on how their own beliefs and mental states affect their own as well as their child's experience and behaviors (Slade, 2006). Concerning the topic of corporal punishment, interventions seeking to change parents' beliefs that corporal punishment is beneficial and necessary should, then, encourage parents

to reflect on their childhood experiences of being spanked and how this affected them while also getting parents to view their child's behavior in relation to their child's intentions, beliefs, and ways of viewing the world.

Summary and Purpose of Study

Research findings have demonstrated that the majority of people are spanked as children (Flynn, 1996; Straus & Mather, 1996) and also that corporal punishment has many negative consequences which last a lifetime (and impact future generations) (Gershoff, 2002; Straus, 2000). The intergenerational transmission of parenting has been shown to be strong (Grusec, 1991; Murphy-Cowan & Stringer, 1999), with adults being highly resistant to altering their beliefs, especially deep-rooted individual beliefs that have personal meaning such as parenting and discipline (McDevitt & Ormrod, 2008).

What appears in research to be effective in changing adult's beliefs regarding parenting *in general* is being actively engaged in self-reflection of their beliefs, behaviors, and circumstances, as well as making an effort to see the world through their *child's* eyes (Goyette-Ewing et al., 2003; McDevitt & Ormrod, 2008; Reynolds, 2003).

However, this has not been empirically examined in regards to changing people's minds about corporal punishment.

The purpose of the current study, then, was to empirically examine participants' current disciplinary practices relative to the discipline practices they experienced as children, and their current capacity for reflective functioning. Specifically, the first goal of this study was to assess participants' childhood experiences of being disciplined and the current disciplinary methods they use on their children. The second goal of this study was to assess participants' capacity for reflective functioning in relation to their current disciplinary practices. It was expected that participants who have a *higher* capacity for reflective functioning (and who were spanked as children) would be less likely to use corporal punishment on their children while participants who *lack* reflective capacity (and who were spanked as children) would be more likely to use corporal punishment on their children.

CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Participants

One hundred thirteen undergraduate female college students with at least one child between the ages of two and six years and who are not Child Development majors were recruited from a mid-sized southwestern university to participate in this study. Participants included 54.5% Hispanics, 20.5% Caucasians, 14.3% African-Americans, 2% Asians, 1% Native Americans, and 9% who identified as "other." Participants ranged from 20-54 years of age (M = 28.2 years). The highest level of education that participants' parents completed indicated that the sample came from primarily lower SES backgrounds: (for mothers: 31.9% did not complete high school, 25.7% graduated from high school, 4.4% completed trade school, 21.2% completed some college, 8.8% graduated from college with a B.A. or B.S. degree, 1.8% completed some post-graduate work, and 8% have a graduate or professional degree; for fathers: 41.1% did not complete high school, 23.2% graduated from high school, 5.4% completed trade school, 15.2% completed some college, 10.7% graduated from college with a B.A. or

B.S. degree, 1.8% completed some post-graduate work, and 2.7% have a graduate or professional degree).

Measures

A questionnaire comprised of the following measures was used.

Reflective Functioning

Three measures were used to assess participants' reflective functioning. The first measure, designed for use in the current study, assessed parents' ability to take the perspective of their child. It consisted of a series of four scenarios, with each scenario describing a situation with their child "misbehaving." Participants were asked to list reasons as to why their child may be "misbehaving" (and to circle what they thought was the *most likely* reason). Next, participants were asked to list how they might respond to their child (and what their *most likely* response would be) (Appendix A). This measure assessed participants' capacity to reflect on potential reasons behind their child's behavior as measured by how many reasons they could list. The reason they circled as the most likely reason for the behavior further demonstrated how reflective they are. For example, if their most likely reason was because "he is naughty" or

"she is being manipulative," this indicated a lack of understanding of their child's motivations and psychological states (i.e., parental reflective functioning). On the other hand, if their most likely reason was because "he was feeling frustrated and was having a hard time managing his emotions" or "she may be overstimulated," this indicated that they view their child's behavior in relation to the child's mental states and developmental capabilities. Participants' answers as to how they would respond to their child misbehaving in each scenario provides insight into their capacity for reflective functioning as determined by whether they tend to respond to their child's misbehavior in ways that keep the parent and child connected and that are beneficial for the child's development and well-being. Parents who are low in reflective functioning are more likely to spank their child in response to their child's misbehavior (or use other punitive discipline strategies) since they lack insight into the underlying reason for their child's behavior (Slade, 2005).

The second measure used to assess mothers' reflective capacity is the Balanced Emotional Empathy Scale (BEES) (Mehrabian, 1996) which examines mothers' capacity for emotional empathy and their ability to experience another

person's emotional experience along with them, (which is an aspect of parental reflective functioning) (Appendix B). The BEES is a self-report measure adapted from the original Emotional Empathetic Tendency Scale (EETS) (Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972); it is a more balanced and up-to-date assessment of empathy (Mehrabian, 1996). This 30-item questionnaire includes 15 positively-worded items (i.e., empathetic responses) and 15 negatively-worded items (i.e., responses which do not demonstrate empathy) and has a 9-point response format that ranges from -4 for "very strong disagreement" to +4 for "very strong agreement." Samples of positively-worded items include, "The sadness of a close one easily rubs off on me," and "I get a strong urge to help when I see someone in distress." Samples of negatively-worded items include, "I am not affected easily by the strong emotions of people around me," and "I have difficulty knowing what babies and children feel." A total score for each participant is derived by adding each participant's negatively-and positively-worded responses and then subtracting the number of negatively-worded responses from the number of positively-worded responses. Cronbach's alpha for internal consistency in the BEES is .87 with a test-retest reliability index of .79 (Mehrabian, 1997).

The third measure used to assess mothers' reflective capacity is the Meta-Parenting Profile Questionnaire (MPQ) (Hawk & Holden, 2006), which is a 24-item self-report questionnaire in which participants responded on a 5-point Likert scale (for the "frequency" questions, 1 = *never/rarely* and 5 = *constantly*; for the "extent" questions, 1 = *not at all* and 5 = *completely*). This measure examines mothers' capacity to assess (6 items), anticipate (5 items), reflect (6 items), and problem solve (7 items) before or after interactions with and situations involving their children (Appendix C). The reflecting items in the questionnaire measured mothers' assessments of their child's behaviors, as well as their own parenting behaviors and previous parent-child interactions. Cronbach's alpha for internal consistency in the MPQ ranges from .64 to .77 with a test-retest reliability index ranging from .61 to .80 (Hawk & Holden, 2006).

Mothers' Current Discipline Practices

Participants also answered an 11-item questionnaire about their current discipline practices with their child (created for use in the current study) (Appendix D). Specifically, participants were asked what type of discipline practices they use and how often, whether they spank their child (as well as how often and how severely),

the ages of the child(ren) they spank, if they feel guilty about spanking their child, and if they ever wonder how their child feels about being spanked. The last question is for participants who were spanked as children and do not currently spank their child; they were asked to write about when and why they made that decision.

Demographics

Participants provided information on their age, ethnic background, highest level of education their parents completed, their major, if they have taken any college level child development or early childhood education classes (as well as how many), and their experiences being disciplined in childhood (Appendix E).

Procedures

Questionnaire packets were distributed to volunteer participants during their regular class sessions. Completed questionnaires were returned to the experimenter in a sealed manila envelope so that complete anonymity was insured.

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Content analyses were first performed on participants' responses to the child behavior scenarios. One purpose of the child behavior scenarios was to identify the reasons participants gave as to *why* they thought their child would behave a certain way in particular scenarios in order to assess how insightful they were about the meaning behind their child's behavior. In addition, participants were asked *how* they would respond to the child's behavior to assess how participants discipline their child.

The first scenario asked participants to imagine that their two year old child bit them. Participants were asked to list as many reasons they could think of (up to five) as to why their child might do this; they also were asked to indicate *the most likely* reason for this behavior. The complete results of this content analysis are outlined in Appendix F; a summary of these results is shown below in Table 1. In general, the majority of participants thought their child would bite them because the child was feeling a negative emotion or the child was trying to manipulate

them or get something from them (e.g., the child was seeking attention or wanted to have his or her way).

Table 1. Participants' Reasons as to Why Think Their Two-Year-Old Child Would Bite Them

Reason (N = 113)	Total Responses	*Most* Likely Reason
Child is feeling a negative emotion	31%	35%
Child being manipulative/Controlling	14%	23%
Child is feeling tired, hungry, ill, etc.	10%	8%
Child observed/Learned behavior	9%	9%
Reflective of limits in child's development	8%	10%
Playing	7%	13%
For no reason/Not on purpose	3%	1%
Child being bad/Naughty	1%	0
Aggression	1%	1%

Next, participants were asked to list up to five ways they might respond to their two year old child biting them. The complete results of this content analysis are outlined in Appendix G; the summary of these results is shown below in Table 2. In general, about half of the participants indicated that they would threaten, yell, punish, or physically hurt the child. Another 41% of participants responded that they would attempt to discuss

the behavior with their child in some manner or would teach them why biting is not ok.

Table 2. How Participants Would Respond to Their Two-Year-Old Child Biting Them

Participants' Responses (N = 113)	Total Responses	*Most* Likely Response
Threaten/Yell/Punish/Physically hurt	48%	41%
Any attempt to discuss/Teach	41%	51%
Constructive actions	5%	6%
Other	4%	2%
Ignore/Do nothing	2%	1%

The second scenario asked participants to imagine that their three year old child has a tantrum at the store. Participants were to list as many reasons they could think of (up to five) for why their child might do this. They also were asked to indicate *the most likely* reason for this behavior. The complete results of this content analysis are outlined in Appendix H; a summary of these results is shown below in Table 3. In general, about half of the participants thought their child would have a tantrum because the child either wanted something, didn't want something, or was trying to manipulate or control them in some way. Another 38% of participants thought

their child would have a tantrum because of the child's physical state of being tired or hungry, or because the child felt distressed or frustrated.

Table 3. Participants' Reasons as to Why Their Three-Year-Old Child Would Have a Tantrum at the Store

Reason (N = 113)	Total Responses	*Most* Likely Reason
Wants something/Doesn't want something	32%	49%
Child being manipulative/Controlling	23%	19%
Child is feeling tired, hungry, ill, etc.	23%	11%
Child is feeling a negative emotion	15%	11%
Child being bad/Naughty	5%	5%
Child observed/Learned behavior	2%	4%
Reflective of limits in child's development	1%	1%
For no reason/Not on purpose	1%	1%

Next, participants were asked to list up to five way(s) they might respond to their three year old child having a tantrum in the store. The complete results of this content analysis are outlined in Appendix I; results are summarized below in Table 4. In general, results showed that about a third of participants stated they would respond by threatening, yelling, punishing, or physically hurting the child. Another third responded that they would attempt to discuss the behavior with their

child in some manner, teach the child why having tantrums is not okay, nurture the child, or distract the child.

Table 4. How Participants Would Respond to Their Three-Year-Old Child Having a Tantrum at the Store

Participants' Responses (N = 113)	Total Responses	*Most* Likely Response
Threaten/Yell/Punish/Physically hurt	30%	21%
Any attempt to discuss/Teach	19%	22%
Remove Attention/Ignore/Do nothing	14%	13%
Leave store/Take to car/Go home	14%	21%
Nurture child/Distract/Constructive	12%	18%
Give in to child	8%	2%
Other	2%	2%
Attempt to bribe	2%	0

The third scenario asked participants to imagine that their four year old child told them, "I hate you!" Participants were to list as many reasons they could think of (up to five) for why their child might say this. They also were asked to indicate *the most likely* reason for their child to say this. The complete results of this content analysis are outlined in Appendix J; a summary of these results is shown below in Table 5. In general, results showed that 38% of participants thought their child would say this due to the child feeling a negative

emotion. Another 37% of participants thought their child would say it because they either wanted something, didn't want something, or the child was trying to manipulate or control the parent.

Table 5. Participants' Reasons as to Why Think Their Four-Year-Old Child Would Say "I Hate You!"

Reason (N = 113)	Total Responses	*Most* Likely Response
Child is feeling a negative emotion	38%	41%
Wants something/Doesn't want something	27%	36%
Child being manipulative/Controlling	10%	4%
Child observed/Learned behavior	10%	7%
Child being bad/Naughty	4%	4%
Reflective of limits in child's development	4%	4%
Child was disciplined	4%	2%
Child is feeling tired, hungry, ill, etc.	2%	1%
Aggression	.3%	0
For no reason	.3%	0

Next, participants were asked to list up to five way(s) they might respond to their four year old child telling them, "I hate you!" The complete results of this content analysis are outlined in Appendix K; a summary of these results is shown below in Table 6. In general, about half of the participants said they would respond by attempting to discuss the behavior with their child in

some manner or to teach them why saying that phrase was not ok. Another third of participants stated they would respond by being dismissive of what the child said, punishing the child, "give child a talking to," threatening, yelling, or physically hurting the child.

Table 6. How Participants Would Respond to Their Four-Year-Old Child Saying "I Hate You!"

Participants' Responses (N = 113)	Total Responses	*Most* Likely Response
Any attempt to discuss/Teach	47%	63%
Dismissive of child/Remove Attention/Ignore	16%	16%
Take away privilege or toy/Punish	13%	5%
Nurture child/Tell love child	8%	10%
Give a talking to/Threaten/Yell	6%	4%
Other	6%	1%
Physically hurt child	4%	1%

The fourth scenario asked participants to imagine that their five year old child took apart an expensive toy that now won't work. Participants were asked to list as many reasons they could think of (up to five) for why their child might do this. They also were asked to indicate *the most likely* reason for their child to say this. The complete results of this content analysis are outlined in Appendix L; a summary of these results is

shown below in Table 7. In general, results showed that half of the participants thought their child would take apart the toy because he or she was curious about how the toy worked or was experimenting with it in some way.

Table 7. Participants' Reasons as to Why Think Their Five-Year-Old Child Would Take Apart an Expensive Toy

Reason (N = 113)	Total Responses	*Most* Likely Response
Reflective of child's desires/intentions	49%	70%
Child is feeling a negative emotion or state	16%	12%
Child being manipulative/Controlling	10%	3%
For no reason (including "accident")	8%	7%
Child being bad/Naughty	7%	0
Reflective of limits in child's development	6%	7%
Aggression	2%	1%
Child observed/Learned behavior	2%	0

Next, participants were asked to list up to five way(s) they might respond to their five year old child taking apart an expensive toy that now won't work. The complete results of this content analysis are outlined in Appendix M; results are summarized below in Table 8. In general, results showed that about half the participants would respond by attempting to discuss the behavior with their child in some manner or to help the child put the

toy back together. Another third of participants would respond by not replacing the toy or punishing the child in some way.

Table 8. How Participants Would Respond to Their Five-Year-Old Child Taking Apart an Expensive Toy

Participants' Responses (N = 113)	Total Responses	*Most* Likely Response
Discuss with/Teach/Help	55%	71%
Take away privilege/Don't Replace/Punish	29%	17%
Other	6%	5%
Give a talking to/Threaten/Yell	6%	5%
Physically hurt child	2%	1%
Nothing	2%	1%

Overall, the reasons participants gave for their child's behavior varied depending on the scenario. The most common reasons stated were that the child was feeling a negative emotion, the child wanted something, and the child was being manipulative or controlling. As for how participants would respond, responses again varied depending on the behavior described in the scenario. The two most common responses were to threaten/yell/punish or attempt to discuss the behavior with the child.

Analyses

The first goal of this study was to examine participants' childhood experiences of being disciplined and the current disciplinary practices they use on their children.

The majority (88%) of participants were spanked as children. Of those who were spanked, 75% currently spank their child and 25% do not. Twelve percent of participants were not spanked as children. Of those who were not spanked, 14% currently spank their child and 86% do not (Table 9).

Table 9. Participants' Current Discipline Practices Relative to Disciplinary Practices They Experienced as Children

(N = 113)	Were Spanked As a Child (88%)	Were Not Spanked As a Child (12%)
Currently Spanks	75%	14%
Does Not Currently Spank	25%	86%

Participants were also asked about which discipline methods were used on them when they were children. They were asked to indicate as many practices as applied. Results are shown below in Table 10. A high percentage of

participants were spanked, lost privileges, or were lectured to; 30% were given a "time out."

Table 10. Participants' Responses to Which Discipline Methods Were Used on Them When They Were Children

Parent Response (N = 113)	Percent
Spanking/Hitting	88%
Loss of Privileges/Put on Restriction	79%
Talk to/Lectured	68%
Time Out	30%
Other	6%

Participants were also asked about which discipline method was used *most often* on them when they were children. Results are shown below in Table 11. Thirty-seven percent of participants experienced being spanked, 31% lost privileges, and 24% were lectured to the most often.

Table 11. Participants' Responses to Which Discipline Method Was Used on Them Most Often When They Were Children

Parent Response (N = 113)	Percent
Spanking/Hitting	37%
Loss of Privileges/Put on Restriction	31%
Talk to/Lectured	24%
Other	5%
Time Out	2%

Participants were also asked about which discipline methods they have ever used on their children. They were asked to indicate as many practices as applied. Results are shown below in Table 12. Eighty-eight percent of participants have talked with/discussed their child's behavior with the child; 81% have taken away their child's privileges/put them on restriction; 80% have put their child on a time out; 73% have spanked their child; and 66% have lectured/given their child a talking to.

Table 12. Participants' Responses to Which Discipline Practices They Have Ever Used (All That Apply)

Parent Response (N = 113)	Percent
Talk with/Discuss	88%
Loss of Privileges/Put on Restriction	81%
Time Out	80%
Spanking/Hitting	73%
Lecture/Give a Talking to	66%
Other	7%
Ignore	2%

Participants were next asked about which discipline methods they use most often on their children. They were to indicate up to three practices. Results are shown below in Table 13. Sixty-three of participants talk with/discuss their child's behavior, 51% put their child on a time out, 50% take away their child's privileges/put them on restriction, 42% lecture/give their child a talking to, and 18% spank their child most often.

Table 13. Participants' Responses to Which Discipline Practices They Use Most Often (Up to Three)

Parent Response (N = 113)	Percent
Talk with/Discuss	63%
Time Out	51%
Loss of Privileges/Put on Restriction	50%
Lecture/Give a Talking to	42%
Spanking/Hitting	18%
Ignore	.9%
Other	.9%

In summary, the majority of the participants were spanked as children. In fact, spanking was the discipline method used most often on them. Of those who were spanked, the majority currently spank their child. While they do spank their child in response to misbehavior, the types of discipline methods they use most often are talking with their child, taking away privileges, and putting them in time out. Of those who were not spanked, most do not spank their child.

The second goal of this study was to empirically examine participants' capacity for reflective functioning in relation to their current disciplinary practices. It was expected that participants who have a *higher* capacity for reflective functioning (and who were spanked as

children) would be less likely to use corporal punishment on their children. Conversely, it was expected that participants who *lacked* reflective capacity (and who were spanked as children) would be more likely to believe in corporal punishment and engage in it more frequently. To test this hypothesis, several analyses were conducted.

First, a t-test was computed to compare the scores on the two parental reflectiveness measures (i.e., the BEES and the MPQ) of participants who spank vs. those who do not spank their children (both groups of parents were spanked as children). It was expected that parents who spank their children would score lower than the parents who have never spanked their children on these measures. Surprisingly, there were no significant differences between these two groups for either of these measures (Table 14).

Table 14. T-Test Comparing Participants Who Have versus Never Have Spanked Their Child on Measures of Reflective Functioning

Variables (N = 99)	Never Spanked Child (n = 16) M	Have Spanked Child (n = 83) M	t	p
1) Empathy (BEES)	206.21	205.96	.545	.587
2) Parental Reflectiveness (MPQ)	87.71	89.84	.225	.822

Second, parental reflective functioning and spanking were assessed by the "types" of reasons participants gave for their child's behaviors in the scenarios. Reflective responses indicated an ability to view things from their child's perspective. Responses classified as "reflective" included those that showed an awareness of a number of factors including limits in the child's development, the child's negative emotion, the child's intentions, or the child's physical state (e.g., feeling hungry, tired, or uncomfortable). "Non-reflective" responses, by contrast, included those that described the child as being bad/naughty, manipulative/controlling, aggressive, or wanting something (or not wanting something). Other "non-reflective" responses included describing the child as learning/observing the behavior before, "just playing,"

reacting to being disciplined, or that the child did it for "no reason." The total number of responses of participants who have spanked vs. have never spanked their children were then examined. (Both groups of parents were spanked as children). As Table 15 shows, participants who have never spanked their child gave about 40% more reflective responses than participants who have spanked their child. There was little difference between the means for non-reflective responses between participants who have vs. have never spanked their child. Participants who have never spanked their child gave about 50% more reflective responses than non-reflective responses. There was not much difference between the means for reflective and non-reflective responses of participants who have spanked their child.

Table 15. Means of Total Reflective and Non-Reflective Responses from Participants Who Have Spanked Their Child vs. Who Have Never Spanked Their Child

(N = 99)	Have Spanked Child (n = 83) M	Never Spanked Child (n = 16) M
1) Reflective Responses	5.5	9.2
2) Non-Reflective Responses	3.8	4.3

Third, a t-test was computed to compare the *number of reasons* participants who have never spanked vs. those who spank their child came up with for their child's behavior in the scenarios (based on the assumption that the more responses participants came up with for the reasons behind their child's behavior, the more reflective they were). As Table 16 shows, there were no significant differences between these two groups on this measure.

Table 16. T-Test Comparing Participants Who Were Spanked as Children and Who Have/Never Have Spanked Their Child in Relation to How Many Responses They Gave for Their Child's Behavior

(N = 99)	Never Have Spanked Child M	Have Spanked Child M	t	p
How Many Responses for Child's Behavior	13.21	13.06	.164	.870

Finally, a t-test was computed to test the hypothesis that participants who are more reflective (as measured by the BEES and MPQ measures) would have more negative feelings toward spanking their child compared to those who are less reflective. As Table 17 shows, participants who scored higher on the BEES measure (i.e., were more

empathetic) indicated significantly more negative feelings toward spanking their child as a result of having been spanked themselves than participants who scored lower on the BEES. For the MPQ measure of parental reflectiveness, there was no significant difference in reflective capacity between those who had a positive or neutral feeling toward spanking their child and those who had a negative feeling toward spanking their child.

Table 17. T-Test Comparing Participants Who Were Spanked as Children and How They Feel About How Being Spanked as a Child Affects Their Attitude Toward Spanking Their Child

Variables (N = 99)	Positive Feeling Toward Spanking Child/No Effect M	Negative Feeling Toward Spanking Child M	t	p
1) Empathy (BEES)	193.46	214.41	-3.95	.000
2) Parental Reflectiveness (MPQ)	88.89	89.26	-.16	.871

Overall, then, there were few significant differences in reflective functioning between parents who have never spanked their children and parents who have spanked their children. However, parents who scored higher on the *empathy* measure did hold more negative feelings toward

spanking their child (although this was not true for parents who scored higher on the *parental reflective functioning* measure).

Additional Analyses

An open-ended question asked participants who were spanked as children and who do not currently spank their child(ren) why they made that decision. A content analysis performed on the participants' responses showed that participants who were spanked as children and who have chosen to never spank their own child made the decision due to their belief that spanking has a negative effect on children, that spanking doesn't work, and that there are better ways to discipline children (Table 18). Participants who were spanked as children and who have chosen to stop spanking their own child made the decision primarily because it made them feel guilty for doing so or that they felt that spanking does not work and that there are better ways to discipline (Table 19).

Table 18. Participants' Responses to Why They Have Never Spanked Their Child (If They Were Spanked as a Child)

Participants' Responses (N = 16)	Percent
Negative effect on child/Harmful	35%
Better ways to discipline	25%
Doesn't work/Not an effective method of discipline	20%
Wouldn't feel right	15%
Being educated in child development has played a major role	5%

Table 19. Participants' Responses to Why They Have Stopped Spanking Their Child (If They Were Spanked as a Child)

Participants' Responses (N = 9)	Percent
Felt Guilty/Felt horrible/Didn't feel right	31%
Better ways to discipline	23%
Doesn't work/Not an effective method of discipline	15%
Took a parenting class	15%
I realized I was turning to be like my parents	8%
It harmed my relationship with my child	8%

Participants were also asked a series of open-ended questions about how being spanked made them feel as a child, and what effect being spanked had on them as a child, as an adult, and as a parent. A content analysis was performed on these responses; results are shown below.

First, when asked how they felt when they were spanked as children, 86% of participants responded that they felt a negative emotion (e.g., sad, angry, humiliated, unloved, afraid, and confused) (Table 20). Of the participants' negative emotions, a third of them specifically felt sad/disturbed, upset, or emotionally hurt. Twelve percent of participants responded that being spanked as a child had a *positive* effect by making them feel that they wanted to behave and that they deserved it.

Table 20. Participants' Responses to How Being Spanked Made Them Feel as a Child

Participants' Responses (N = 99)	Percent
Negative:	86%
Disturbed/Upset/Sad/Terrible/Hurt Emotionally	36%
Infuriated/Angry/Mad/Frustrated/Resentful	19%
Humiliated/Embarrassed/Ashamed/Like a bad child/Inferior	12%
Unloved/That my parents hated me/Lonely	8%
Scared/Afraid/A little fearful of that parent	6%
Confused/Didn't understand why/Shocked	3%
I wanted to rebel even more/I felt like hitting my parents	1%
Positive:	12%
Made me want to behave/I understood what I did wrong/I deserved it	12%
Don't Recall Feeling Anything	3%
Never wanted to be punished again/Never wanted to get spanked	1%

The second open-ended question asked participants what effect being spanked had on them as children. Results of the content analysis are shown below in Table 21. In general, 42% of participants responded that being spanked as a child had a *positive* effect by making them better behaved, teaching them a lesson, or teaching them to respect authority. Another 46% responded that being spanked as a child had a *negative* effect on them (e.g., made them afraid of making mistakes, made them feel

unloved, sad, gave them low self-esteem, made them aggressive, made them misbehave more, made them feel confused, or made it hard for them to show love or affection).

Table 21. Participants' Responses to What Effect Being Spanked Had on Them as a Child

Participants' Responses (N = 99)	Percent
Negative:	46%
Scared to do something wrong/Afraid of making mistakes/Terrified	14%
Not loved/Felt disconnected from my parents/Lonely	11%
Sad/ Hurt/Emotional effects/Harmed me	6%
Low self-esteem/Low self-respect/Too critical of self	5%
Told myself I would never do it to my children	4%
Made me more aggressive/Thought it was ok to hit anyone	2%
Made me not care about my actions/I would misbehave more	2%
Confusion	1%
Hard for me to love or show affection	1%
Positive:	42%
Made me behave/I learned my lesson/It worked for me	39%
I learned to respect parent/made me respect authority	3%
No Effect	12%
I don't like to get into physical fights	1%

The third open-ended question asked what effect being spanked as a child had on participants as adults. Results of the content analysis are shown below in Table 22. In general, 37% of participants responded that being spanked as a child has had a *positive* effect on them as an adult (e.g., made them a better person, taught them to respect authority, or gave them self-control); 36% responded that it had little to no effect on them as an adult and that they grew up fine; 28% responded that it had a *negative* effect on them as an adult by making them feel fearful, guarded, antisocial, hurt, have low self-esteem, made them anger easily, gave them bad memories, and prevented them from having a close relationship with their parents.

Table 22. Participants' Responses to What Effect Being Spanked Has on Them as an Adult

Participants' Responses (N = 99)	Percent
Positive	37%
Made me a better person/I respect authority/I have self-control	37%
No Effect/ Very little effect	36%
Negative	28%
Anger/Mad/Get angry easily	4%
Fearful/More Anxiety/Tension	4%
Tension toward parents/not having a close relationship with parents	4%
I don't like violence/I don't like to hit or get into physical fights	4%
Guarded/Don't fully trust anyone/Cynical mind	3%
Low self-esteem/High self-consciousness	3%
Hurt/Feel sad when I look back	2%
Antisocial/Aggressive	2%
Bad memories/I cannot forget it	2%

The fourth open-ended question asked what effect being spanked has had on participants as a parent. Results of the content analysis are shown below in Table 23. In general, the most common responses from participants indicated that it gave them a negative feeling toward spanking their child. For example, they responded that they did not want to make their child feel how they themselves felt as children, they believe that alternative

methods are better, or they spank their child (but not as hard/often as they themselves were spanked and only when it is necessary). Twenty-three percent of participants responded with a positive feeling about spanking their child as a result of being spanked. For example, they responded that they spank their child because it was done to them and was effective. Fourteen percent of participants responded that being spanked as a child didn't really affect their parenting style.

Table 23. Participants' Responses to What Effect Being Spanked Has on Them as a Parent

Participants' Responses (n = 99)	Percent
Negative feeling/belief about spanking own child	33%
Positive feeling/belief about spanking own child	23%
Spanks child with reservations	15%
Little/No effect/Doesn't affect parenting style	14%
Feels that alternative methods are better	13%
I'm not sure/I don't know	2%

The final open-ended question asked participants who currently spank their child(ren) if they feel guilty after spanking their child. The content analysis performed on the participants' responses resulted in their specific

replies outlined in Appendix N. In general, 74% of participants said they do feel guilty after spanking their child for various reasons; 27% said they don't feel guilty.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

The first goal of the present study was to assess participants' childhood experiences of being disciplined and the current disciplinary methods they use on their children. The majority of the participants (88%) were spanked as children. Of the participants who were spanked, the majority (75%) currently spank their child. This finding validates past research on the high prevalence of the use of corporal punishment (Flynn, 1996; Giles-Sims, Straus, & Sugarman, 1995; Straus & Mather, 1996) as well as the high likelihood that those who were spanked as children do the same to their own children (Deater-Deckard, Pettit, Lansford, Dodge, & Bates, 2003; Muller, Hunter, & Stollak, 1995; Murphy-Cowan & Stringer, 1999). It is interesting to note that while most of the participants indicated that they spank their child, the types of discipline methods they use most often included talking with their child, taking away privileges, and putting them in time out. In the child behavior scenarios, participants' two most common responses to their child's misbehavior were to threaten/yell/punish or attempt to discuss the behavior with the child. It appears as though

participants use a variety discipline strategies and that spanking their child is not the main discipline method used. Since participants themselves experienced being spanked more often than experiencing other disciplinary methods in childhood, it is encouraging that there appears to be a slight decrease in resorting to spanking as a primary disciplinary method from the past generation to the present, at least in the current sample.

The second goal of the present study was to assess participants' capacity for reflective functioning in relation to their current disciplinary practices. The primary hypothesis was that parents who have a *higher* capacity for reflective functioning (and who were spanked as children) would be less likely to use corporal punishment on their children while parents who *lack* reflective capacity (and who were spanked as children) would be more likely to believe in corporal punishment and engage in it more frequently.

Overall, the results did not support the expectation that there would be significant differences in parental reflective functioning between participants who spank and who do not spank their children. One reason as to why no differences in reflective functioning between those who do and do not spank their children were found may be that

parental reflective functioning is a very complex, difficult trait to assess, especially in pen-and-paper format. It is typically assessed through an extensive interview (e.g., the Parent Development Interview) in which the interviewer must be fully trained (Slade, 2005). The parental reflective functioning measure used in the current study (the MPQ) assessed participants' levels of assessing, anticipating, reflecting, and problem-solving as it relates to their children. While these processes are *related* to parental reflective functioning, it may be that this measure was not designed in a manner that picked up on participants' true behaviors in regard to reflecting on their own and their children's intentions and mental states. Most participants in the current study scored high on this measure (as did those in the original publication of the MPQ) (Hawk & Holden, 2006); this suggests that the MPQ may not accurately assess genuine parental awareness of participants' children's state of mind. The BEES measure, by contrast, specifically examined participants' capacity for empathy. In actuality, empathy is just one component of parental reflective functioning but does not encompass it in its entirety. Empathy merely involves feeling another person's emotions (Mehrabian, 2000). Parental reflective functioning, on the other hand,

requires an "interrelationship between minds" in which parents view their children's behavior in relation to their mental states and intentions while at the same time understanding how their own thoughts, feelings, desires, and past experiences influence that of their child's as well as their parenting beliefs and behaviors (Slade, 2005; 2006). Therefore, when their child "misbehaves," parents who engage in reflective functioning consider not only how their child may be feeling or what they may need, but also consider how their own emotions or behavior may be impacting their child's internal state, and consequently his or her behavior. Simply because someone may be empathetic toward their child, then, doesn't necessarily mean they are reflective of why they parent the way they do or that they have insight into their child's mental experiences.

It is suspected that if the Parent Development Interview (Slade et al., 2005) was used to examine parents' capacity for reflective functioning, significant differences would have been found between the levels of reflection of participants who do not spank than participants who spank.

While significant differences in parental reflective functioning (as measured by the MPQ and BEES measures)

were not found, there were several findings that did suggest differences in reflective functioning between participants who spank and who do not spank their children.

First, in the child behavior scenarios, participants who have never spanked their child listed about 40% more reflective reasons for their child's "misbehavior" than participants who have spanked their child. The responses of the former group indicate an awareness of the underlying reason for their child's behavior (e.g., limits in their child's development, the child's negative emotion, the child's intentions, or the child's physical state), which suggests that they may function at a higher level of parental reflective functioning. Also, participants who have never spanked their child gave about 50% more reflective responses than non-reflective responses for the child behavior scenarios, suggesting that they were more likely to consider their child's perspective than simply view their child as being bad/naughty, manipulative/controlling, aggressive.

Second, participants who scored higher on the empathy scale (BEES) did have significantly more negative feelings/beliefs about spanking their child (regardless of whether they currently spanked their child or not). This

finding suggests some support that those who have the ability to identify with another's subjective experience may be more sensitive to how spanking may negatively affect their child.

In addition to the two original goals of this study, additional findings emerged from the open-ended questions. A large majority of participants (86%) indicated that they felt a negative emotion (angry, sad, afraid, humiliated, and unloved) when they were spanked as a child, which is in line with past research (Dobbs, Smith, & Taylor, 2006). In response to the question of how being spanked affected them as a child, about half of the participants said it had a negative effect while the other half said it had a positive effect. It is noteworthy that while most participants felt a negative emotion during or after being spanked, only half said that it negatively affected them as children. In response to the question of how being spanked affected them as an adult, more participants believed it had a positive effect on them (37%) than a negative effect (28%), while 36% believed that being spanked had little to no effect. It appears as though participants may not be as aware of how being spanked has affected them (especially how it affects them as adults). As research clearly shows, there are many negative

consequences of corporal punishment (e.g., Aucoin et al., 2006; Gershoff, 2002; Grusec & Goodnow, 1994; Straus & Mouradian, 1998; Straus & Paschall, 2006; Wilkinson, 2009); it is interesting that so many participants are not aware of how it has impacted them. Perhaps this is because the idea that spanking keeps children "disciplined" and is necessary is so prevalent and is strongly embedded in their worldview. This conceptual framework is a product of generations of religious beliefs, cultural views, and societal beliefs of how children ought to be disciplined (Benjet & Kazdin, 2003). As stated previously, conceptual frameworks and parenting schemas such as this are very resistant to change because they are deeply personal and self-defining (Azar et al., 2005; Boninger, Krosnick, & Berent, 1995; McDevitt & Ormrod, 2008). To say that being spanked had a negative effect on them may imply that they are somehow deficient and that their parents did something to harm them. For this reason, participants may be rationalizing that being spanked "kept them in line" and "made them a better person" while being unaware of how it affected them.

When asked what effect being spanked as a child has had on them as a parent, more participants responded with a negative feeling or belief about spanking their own

child (33%) (e.g., they don't spank their child, they wish they didn't spank their child, it hurts them to spank their child, alternative disciplinary methods work better) than with a positive feeling or belief (23%) (e.g., they spank because it was done to them and it was effective, they believe it made them a good parent and to teach their child right from wrong) while 14% didn't feel that being spanked as a child has had any effect on them as a parent. Responses with negative beliefs/feelings toward spanking didn't necessarily mean the participant doesn't spank; it simply meant they did not hold a positive view. Research shows that even when attitudes change, previous beliefs still tend to affect behavior (Dole & Sinatra, 1998; Petty, Brinol, Tormala, & Jarvis, 2006). So, even though quite a few participants don't necessarily like spanking their child, they still do so on occasion (or as one participant stated, "It makes me not want to do it to my kids, but sometimes I find myself wanting to do it because that is what I was shown to do in frustrating parental situations"). In addition, when asked if they ever feel guilty when spanking their child, 74% of participants said that they do. This was an interesting finding because so many participants believed that being spanked did not

affect them negatively, but they still feel some sort of apprehension when it comes to spanking their child.

Participants who were spanked as children and who do not currently spank their child indicated that they do not spank their child primarily because it doesn't work and there are better ways to discipline. Participants who have spanked but have stopped also indicated that they discontinued the practice because they felt bad for hurting their child. One participant said she realized she was turning out to be like her parents, while another participant said it was harming her relationship with her son. Participants who have *never* spanked believe that it causes negative effects/is harmful and wouldn't feel right. One participant stated, "I never wanted them to feel the way I did as a child." These responses show some level of parental reflective functioning and insight into their children's mental experience.

Limitations

There were several limitations to the current study. As stated before, the main suspected reason that differences in reflective functioning between those who do and do not spank their children were not found is likely due to the fact that parental reflective functioning is

normally assessed by the Parent Development Interview (PDI) in which participants provide parental narratives about their relationship with their children (Slade, 2005). This clinical interview requires the researcher to be trained in how to conduct and score the PDI (Slade, 2005). While the parental reflective functioning measure used in the current study (the MPQ) examined such things as participants' ability to consider what is occurring with them and their child, how they meet their child's needs, how much they plan ahead for circumstances involving their child, how often they reflect on their behavior, and their problem-solving as it relates to their child, it did not specifically tap into participants capacity for parental reflective functioning. In addition, since the BEES measure exclusively examined participants' capacity for empathy, it most likely did not assess the more complex aspects of parental reflective functioning.

Another limitation to the current study is that the measures involved self-report. Unfortunately, participants are more likely to misrepresent their responses in order to make themselves look good (or perhaps to prevent feeling guilty or that they are a bad parent). While a large majority indicated that they spank their children (75%), the types of discipline they reported to use most

often were talking with their child, taking away privileges, or putting them in time out. Their most common responses in the child behavior scenarios were to threaten, yell, or attempt to discuss the behavior with the child. It appears as though participants may resort to spanking their children more often and frequently than they actually reported.

Future Research

Since research shows that parents who are strong in reflective functioning have children who are more securely attached (Fonagy et al., 1991; Reynolds, 2003; Slade et al., 2005), in response to their child's misbehavior, they should be more likely to attempt to gain insight into the underlying reason for their child's behavior and respond in ways that keep the parent and child connected and that are beneficial for the child's development and well-being rather than using corporal punishment. Future research ought to examine the disciplinary practices of parents who score high in reflective functioning on the Parent Development Interview. By understanding the reasons for their child's behavior as well as having insight into how being spanked as a child affected them as a child and parent, they would probably be more likely to use

disciplinary methods other that spanking and to respond in ways that support their child's development. If future research can show that reflective parents are more likely to not spank, it would give us greater understanding of the relationship between parental reflective functioning and the discontinuation of the intergenerational transmission of the disciplinary practice of corporal punishment.

Future research can look at how parents who do not spank their child were affected by being spanked as children. If these parents are more aware of how being spanked has had a negative effect on them as both children and adults, it will provide further support for the notion that parents who are able to reflect on how their childhood experiences have influenced them are more likely to consider how spanking will harm their child as well, and will therefore not continue the disciplinary practice.

Future research can also examine the reasons given for why parents who were spanked as children do not spank their own children. Perhaps the parents who do not spank because they understand why their child is behaving a certain way, they don't want their child to feel how they themselves felt as children, or they don't want to harm the parent/child relationship are more reflective than the

parents who do not spank simply for the reason that they know it has negative consequences. If these parents have higher levels of parental reflective functioning, it may be that we can help other parents to be more reflective through parenting classes so that they are less likely to spank their children as well. By understanding *why* parents don't continue the intergenerational transmission of parenting (which is typically what happens), we may better understand how to influence other parents not to continue the cycle of corporal punishment.

Implications

While people's perspectives on corporal punishment are highly resistant to change, some parents do alter their beliefs and behaviors in regard to corporal punishment (as have 25% of participants in the current study). When Sweden (in addition to many other countries) passed a law banning the practice of corporal punishment on children, people's views changed from condoning spanking before the ban to a decline in support of spanking. This decline, however, was gradual and occurred over a span of 50 years. Since the negative consequences of corporal punishment are widespread and impact future generations, we are in need of something that alters

parents' beliefs and practice of spanking in a shorter period of time.

As parents progress through stages of "parent development," they have the potential to alter their parental beliefs (Demick, 2002; Newberger, 1980; Thomas, 1996). Parents who are at higher levels of parent development tend to be more aware of their child's internal experiences, view the world through their child's perspective, and meet his or her emotional needs (Demick, 2002; Thomas, 1996). Many parents can and do change, but the change does not come effortlessly and requires insightful thinking. Only when people critically reflect on their beliefs about parenting (as well as where their beliefs come from and how their beliefs regulate how they feel and their behaviors) can they truly change the way they parent (McDevitt & Ormrod, 2008; Thomas, 1996).

Several interventions have been successful in getting people to change their parenting practices. These interventions (e.g., parent education programs) have focused on increasing parents' ability to reflect on their own and their child's thoughts, feelings, desires, needs, experiences, and intentions (e.g., Reynolds, 2003; Slade, 2006; Slade et al., 2005; Thomas, 1996) as well as facilitating parents' capability in understanding the true

meaning behind their child's behaviors (Brems et al., 1993). The programs that get parents to increase their levels of parent awareness and think about their children's behavior (i.e., to view behavior as a result of physiological/psychological state or due to a limit in their development or ability) and to respond to the meaning behind their behavior are more likely to have a greater impact than programs that simply focus on parenting skills (Brems et al., 1993; Slade et al., 2005). Additionally, it has been suggested that programs encourage parents to contemplate on how certain parenting practices they experienced as children have affected them so that they can become aware of their internal motivations that influence their parenting practices; people can only be reflective with their children when they are aware of how their own childhood issues may manifest in their interactions with their children (Brems et al., 1993; Shulman, 2006).

If it is true that reflective parents are more likely to alter their attitudes toward corporal punishment (i.e., deciding to not continue the intergenerational cycle of corporal punishment), it is highly likely that parenting programs aimed at getting parents to stop spanking their children would be most successful if they promoted

parental reflective functioning and supported parents in reflecting on how corporal punishment has negatively affected them. Most parents discipline their children the same way they were disciplined, and they do so on an unconscious level (Covell et al., 1995; Deater-Deckard et al., 2003). Interventions need to be put into place that assist parents through the process of thoroughly examining their beliefs and where they come from while also educating them of the harmful effects of corporal punishment. In addition, some parents may need to be taught how to tune into their child's internal psychological experience (rather than only focusing on their behaviors) so that they can better identify the underlying motivations for their child's behavior and react in ways that positively impact their child's well-being, enable them to be more responsive and nurturing to their children, and keep the parent and child connected.

Programs should educate parents about children's development, especially when it comes to parents expectations for behavior in toddlers and young children (Gershoff & Bitensky, 2007). Parents need to understand that young children do not yet have the capability to express themselves with words or to control their impulses

and strong negative emotions. They are not "misbehaving;" they simply are not developmentally able to sit still for long periods of time or resist from lashing out when they feel angry, for example. It is also important to educate parents about developmentally-appropriate ways to set limits with children so that they don't resort to spanking.

Conclusions

Because corporal punishment is so prevalent and since the negative consequences of corporal punishment are detrimental to children's well-being and continue on to succeeding generations, it is imperative that this discipline practice come to an end. This will likely only happen by not only educating people about the harmful effects, but by altering beliefs by promoting their capacity for reflective functioning. Doing so will most definitely have a positive impact on children, future generations, and society at large.

APPENDIX A

CHILD BEHAVIOR SCENARIOS

CHILD BEHAVIOR SCENARIOS

Instructions: On the following pages there are four different situations that parents of young children often find themselves in with their child(ren). Please list your answers for each question.

Scenario 1: Your 2-year-old child bites you.

A. Why do you think your child did this? (Please list as many reasons that you can think of):

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

4) _____

5) _____

B. Please circle the reason above for "A" that you feel is the ***most likely*** reason.

C. How would you respond to your 2-year-old child biting you? (Please list as many ways that you can think of):

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

4) _____

5) _____

D. Please circle the response above for "C" that indicates how you would ***most likely*** respond.

<u>Scenario 2</u>: Your 3-year-old child has a tantrum in the middle of the grocery store.

A. Why do you think your child did this? (Please list as many reasons that you can think of):

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

4) _____

5) _____

B. Please circle the reason above for "A" that you feel is the ***most likely*** reason.

C. How would you respond to your 3-year-old child doing this? (Please list as many ways that you can think of):

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

4) _____

5) _____

D. Please circle the response above for "C" that indicates how you would ***most likely*** respond.

<u>Scenario 3</u>: Your 4-year-old child tells you, "I hate you! You're mean!"

A. Why do you think your child said this? (Please list as many reasons that you can think of):

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

4) _____

5) _____

B. Please circle the reason above for "A" that you feel is the ***most likely*** reason.

C. How would you respond to your 4-year-old child saying this? (Please list as many ways that you can think of):

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

4) _____

5) _____

D. Please circle the response above for "C" that indicates how you would ***most likely*** respond.

<u>Scenario 4</u>: Your 5-year-old child took apart an expensive toy and now it doesn't work.

A. Why do you think your child did this? (Please list as many reasons that you can think of):

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

4) _____

5) _____

B. Please circle the reason above for "A" that you feel is the ***most likely*** reason.

C. How would you respond to your 5-year-old child doing this? (Please list as many ways that you can think of):

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

4) _____

5) _____

D. Please circle the response above for "C" that indicates how you would ***most likely*** respond.

Developed by Deanna Marie Herndon

APPENDIX B

THE BALANCED EMOTIONAL EMPATHY SCALE

THE BALANCED EMOTIONAL EMPATHY SCALE

Instructions:

Please use the following scale to indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each of the statements below. Record your numerical answer to each statement in the space provided preceding the statement. Try to describe yourself accurately and in terms of how you are generally (that is, the average of the way you are in most situations -- not the way you are in specific situations or the way you would hope to be).

very strong agreement	strong agreement	moderate agreement	slight agreement	neither agreement nor disagreement	slight disagreement	moderate disagreement	strong disagreement	very strong disagreement
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

_____ 1. I very much enjoy and feel uplifted by happy endings.
_____ 2. I cannot feel much sorrow for those who are responsible for their own misery.
_____ 3. I am moved deeply when I observe strangers who are struggling to survive.
_____ 4. I hardly ever cry when watching a very sad movie.
_____ 5. I can almost feel the pain of elderly people who are weak and must struggle to move about.
_____ 6. I cannot relate to the crying and sniffling at weddings.
_____ 7. It would be extremely painful for me to have to convey very bad news to another.
_____ 8. I cannot easily empathize with the hopes and aspirations of strangers.
_____ 9. I don't get caught up easily in the emotions generated by a crowd.
_____ 10. Unhappy movie endings haunt me for hours afterward.
_____ 11. It pains me to see young people in wheelchairs.
_____ 12. It is very exciting for me to watch children open presents.
_____ 13. Helpless old people don't have much of an emotional effect on me.
_____ 14. The sadness of a close one easily rubs off on me.
_____ 15. I don't get overly involved with friends' problems.
_____ 16. It is difficult for me to experience strongly the feelings of characters in a book or movie.
_____ 17. It upsets me to see someone being mistreated.
_____ 18. I easily get carried away by the lyrics of love songs.
_____ 19. I am not affected easily by the strong emotions of people around me.
_____ 20. I have difficulty knowing what babies and children feel.
_____ 21. It really hurts me to watch someone who is suffering from a terminal illness.
_____ 22. A crying child does not necessarily get my attention.

_____ 23. Another's happiness can be very uplifting for me.
_____ 24. I have difficulty feeling and reacting to the emotional expressions of foreigners.
_____ 25. I get a strong urge to help when I see someone in distress.
_____ 26. I am rarely moved to tears while reading a book or watching a movie.
_____ 27. I have little sympathy for people who cause their own serious illnesses (e.g., heart disease, diabetes, lung cancer).
_____ 28. I would not watch an execution.
_____ 29. I easily get excited when those around me are lively and happy
_____ 30. The unhappiness or distress of a stranger are not especially moving for me.

Albert Mehrabian (cited in reference section)

Mehrabian, A. (2000). Manual for the balanced emotional empathy scale (BEES). (Available from Albert Mehrabian, 1130 Alta Mesa Road, Monterey, CA 93940).

APPENDIX C

THE META-PARENTING QUESTIONNAIRE

THE META-PARENTING QUESTIONNAIRE

Think of one of your children who is between the ages of two and six years old while answering the following questions. Please circle your answer for each question.

Child's age and gender: ____years _____months; ____Female ____Male

1. In general, how often do you consider, or think about, what is occurring with you and your child? (*Examples include considering how or what your child is doing, how you're feeling as it relates to parenting, the quality of your interactions with your child, or how the surroundings might affect your child*).
   Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

2. Some parents always know exactly where their child is and what their child is doing. Other parents monitor less. To what extent do you monitor your child?
   Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

3. How often do you consider whether your child's friends may be a positive or negative influence?
   Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

4. How often do you consider the extent to which activities away from home influence your child (activities at school, in the neighborhood, at church, etc)?
   Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

5. How often do you think about how your child is developing compared with her/his peers?
   Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

6. How often do you think about how well your parenting meets your child's needs?
   Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

7. In general, how often do you think ahead about things related to your child or your parenting? (*Examples include planning ahead for when you take your child to a difficult event or talking with your child about the consequences of future behavior.*)
   Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

8. How often do you think about your child's safety when you and your child are away from home in a public place (e.g., at a store or mall)?
   Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

9. When you were thinking about moving to your current home (or when you prepare to move to your next home), to what extent did you (or will you) consider child-related issues (e.g., safety, quality of schools, parks, children in the neighborhood)?
   Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Completely

10. To what extent do you plan ahead for situations in which your child might get bored (for example, bring toys or books for use in the car while you're running errands)?
    Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Completely

11. To what extent do you think about activities that will happen the next day?
    Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

12. In general, how often do you have concerns, worry, or think about things that have already happened with your child? (*Examples include thinking about a problem that occurred [our trip to the grocery store was a nightmare], or thinking about an event that went well [s/he really liked playing at the park], or thinking about your parenting decisions [I don't think that disciplinary response worked very well].*)
    Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

13. How often do you have concerns about why your child behaves the way s/he does?
    Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

14. How often do you have concerns about your parenting behaviors or the decisions you've made as a parent?
    Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

15. To what extent are you a different parent than you thought you'd be?
    Never thought about it _____ (check here OR choose from below)

Not at all different	A little different	Different	Quite different	Completely different

16. To what extent is your parenting similar to how you were parented?
    Never thought about it _____ (check here OR choose from below)

Not at all similar	A little similar	Similar	Quite similar	Completely similar

17. How often have you changed your mind about a parenting decision after thinking about it for a while?

    Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

18. In general, how often have you identified and attempted to solve a problem you're having with your child or with your parenting? (*Examples include making a plan or strategy to better handle a problem that occurred or asking someone else how they deal with a specific issue.*)

    Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

19. How often do you talk with your spouse/partner about things that are happening with your child? (If no partner, how often do you talk with a particular close friend about your child?)

    Less than once a month Several times a month Several times a week Several times a day Many times a day

20. How often do you talk with your friends about things that are happening with your child?

    Less than once a month Several times a month Several times a week Several times a day Many times a day

21. When you're having a problem with your child, how often do you develop a strategy to deal with the problem? Check here if no problems ____.

    Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

22. How often do you stick with a problem-solving strategy you planned? Check here if no problems ____.

    Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

23. How often do you think your problem-solving strategies are effective? Check here if no problems ____.

    Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

24. How often have you modified a problem-solving strategy to make it more effective when it wasn't working well? Check here if no problems ____.

    Never/Rarely Sometimes Usually Often Constantly

Hawk, C. K., & Holden, G. W. (2006). Meta-parenting: An initial investigation into a new parental social cognition construct. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 6,* 21-42.

APPENDIX D

MOTHERS' CURRENT DISCIPLINE PRACTICES

MOTHERS' CURRENT DISCIPLINE PRACTICES

Instructions: Think of one of your children who is between the ages of two and twelve years old while answering the following questions.

Your child's age: _____

Your child's gender: _____

Please answer the following questions as they relate to this child:

1. When your child misbehaves, which of the following discipline practices have you ever used? (check all that apply):
   _____ Time-out
   _____ Spanking/hitting
   _____ Loss of privileges
   _____ Put on restriction/grounded
   _____ Talk to/lecture
   _____ Other (please explain: _____)

2. Which of the following discipline practices do you use ***most often***? (choose up to 3):
   _____ Time-out
   _____ Spanking/hitting
   _____ Loss of privileges
   _____ Put on restriction/grounded
   _____ Talk to/lecture
   _____ Other (please explain: _____)

3. Approximately what percentage of the time do you use each of the following discipline practice with your child? (total should equal 100%)
   Time-out _____%
   Spanking/hitting _____%
   Loss of privileges _____%
   Put on restriction/grounded _____%
   Talk to/lecture _____%
   Other _____% (please explain: _____)

4. How often do you spank your child?
   _____ Never
   _____ Once or twice
   _____ A few times a year
   _____ Many times a year
   _____ Weekly or more

5. If you spank your child, how severely do you spank your child?
   _____ Not hard
   _____ A little hard
   _____ Medium
   _____ Quite hard
   _____ Very hard
   _____ Not applicable

6. What are the ages of the child(ren) you spank? _____

7. How old was your child when you were first spanked him or her?
   _____

8. Up to what age do you (or will you) spank your child(ren)?
   _____

9. Do you ever feel guilty after spanking your child? _____
   Why or why not?

10. Do you ever wonder how your child feels about being spanked?
    _____yes _____no

11. If you were spanked as a child and do not currently spank your child, when and why did you make that decision?

Developed by Deanna Marie Herndon

APPENDIX E

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Your age: _____

2. Your sex (circle one): male female

3. What is your ethnic background? (check one):
   _____ Asian
   _____ Black
   _____ Caucasian
   _____ Hispanic
   _____ Native American
   _____ Other: (_____)

4. What is the highest level of education your mother completed? (check one):
   _____ did not finish high school
   _____ graduated from high school
   _____ trade school
   _____ some college (includes A.A. degree)
   _____ graduated from college (B.A. or B.S. degree)
   _____ some post-graduate work
   _____ graduate or professional degree (specify: _____)

5. What is the highest level of education your father completed? (check one):
   _____ did not finish high school
   _____ graduated from high school
   _____ trade school
   _____ some college (includes A.A. degree)
   _____ graduated from college (B.A. or B.S. degree)
   _____ some post-graduate work
   _____ graduate or professional degree (specify: _____)

6. When you misbehaved and were disciplined as a child, which of the following were used by your parents/caregivers? (check all that apply):
   _____ Time-out
   _____ Spanking/hitting
   _____ Loss of privileges
   _____ Put on restriction/grounded
   _____ Talked to/lectured
   _____ Other (please explain: _____)

7. Which of the following discipline methods was used most often? (choose one):
   _____ Time-out
   _____ Spanking/hitting
   _____ Loss of privileges
   _____ Put on restriction/grounded
   _____ Talked to/lectured
   _____ Other (please explain: _____)

8. Were you ever spanked as a child?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

   If yes, how often? (choose one):
   _____ Rarely
   _____ Sometimes
   _____ Often
   _____ Very Often

9. How severely were you spanked? (choose one):
   _____ Not hard
   _____ A little hard
   _____ Medium
   _____ Quite hard
   _____ Very hard

10. How old were you when you were first spanked?: _____

11. How old were you the last time you were spanked?: _____

12. How did it make you feel when/after you were spanked as a child?

13. What effect do you think being spanked had on you as a child?

14. What effect do you think being spanked as a child has on you as an adult?

15. What effect do you think being spanked as a child has on you as a parent?

16. Your major _____

17. Have you taken any classes in Early Childhood Education or Child Development at a community college? _____

18. # of Early Childhood Education or Child Development classes you have had: _____

Developed by Deanna Marie Herndon

APPENDIX F

CHILD BEHAVIOR SCENARIO 1: REASONS WHY TWO YEAR OLD BITES MOTHER

Child Behavior Scenario 1: Reasons Why Two Year Old Bites Mother

Child Being Bad/Naughty:
acting out; throwing tantrum; being malicious; thought he would get away with it; impatient

Child Being Manipulative/Controlling:
to get attention (from me); wants attention; cry for attention; looking for my attention; a crazy way of getting attention; didn't get way; didn't get what he wanted; wanted his toy back; to get something she wants; wanted something he could not have; she wants something and I didn't give it to her; wants his way; he wants a toy I am holding; he wants something I took away; to prove child can control the situation; manipulative; testing boundaries; to see how I will react; wants to see my reaction; to get a response; to see what happens; to cause me pain

Reflective of Limits in Child's Development:
doesn't know other ways (or how) to express self; trying to communicate something is wrong; can't verbally express; didn't know how to express his feelings; a way of expressing feelings; does not have adequate language skills; can't communicate needs; is speech delayed and can't communicate; a way to communicate her needs; coping mechanism; way of communicating; cannot communicate well; "He has so much love to show and this is how he expresses his love" experimentation; must be experimenting; exploration; out of discovery; curiosity; lack of understanding in the world around him; out of discovery; learning about the reactions of others; to see what happens if he does it; curiosity to see what happens; he is trying it out lack of understanding of consequences; doesn't know it's wrong; doesn't know better; impulse; learning motor skills; lack of routine

Reflective of Child's Negative Emotions/Feelings *(child's negative emotion/feeling identified or implied by parent)*:
upset; frustrated; he might be frustrated because he can't tell me what's wrong; mad; unhappy; distressed; fussy; nervousness; anxiety/anxious about something; angry/angry at me/out of anger; mad because she is in trouble; irritated/irritable; jealousy; scared; a way of expressing fear; overexcited; overwhelmed; uncontrolled happiness; emotional; he is mad at me; mad at another child; something disappointed him; not happy with being disciplined; expressing disagreement; he is frustrated and therefore aggressing being too hyper; he may have lost his mind problems with another child; someone is bothering her not attached to me much; he might not like me; doesn't like me very much right now; not paying enough attention to him defense mechanism; to defend herself; (self) defense; natural instinct

Reflective of Child's Physical State:
teething; growth of teeth; in pain (teeth); wants to use new teeth; trying out the teeth; new molars likes the feel of it; sensory-seeking; wants to see what it feels like; tired; hungry

Aggression

Child Observed/Learned Behavior:
has seen other children do it; saw another child do this and get away with it; saw another kid do it and thinks it's ok; someone modeled that behavior; "copy cat"; imitating other children; learned it from another child; following others' leads; mimicking; mocking others' behaviors; copying someone else; someone told him to do so; copying animal-like behavior; watching house animal; saw it on t.v.; bad influence (t.v.); someone bit her/first; personally has experienced being bitten before; it was done to my child first; he was bit by another child at school and is repeating the behavior; parent play bites; she does what she's taught (my husband and I nibble on her playfully)

For No Reason/Not on Purpose:
just for the heck of it; just did it; just because he wanted to
by accident; by mistake; didn't really think about it; instant/automatic reaction; thought it was food; he was trying to pull himself up using his mouth to grasp in addition to his hands; maybe I put my fingers in or near his mouth
he had too much candy-didn't know what he was doing

Playing:
thinks it's a game; wants to play; he may be playing; she thinks it's a way/form of playing around; he is horse playing; being playful; being too playful; pretending to be an animal; comedy; thinks it's funny; trying to be funny; some kids think it's funny

Developed by Deanna Marie Herndon

APPENDIX G

CHILD BEHAVIOR SCENARIO 1: RESPONSES TO TWO YEAR OLD WHO BIT MOTHER

Child Behavior Scenario 1: Responses To Two Year Old Who Bit Mother

Physically Hurt Child:
bite back (to teach a lesson); bite back but not to harm; bite back slightly/lightly/gently; depending on how many times he's been asked to stop, spank him; spanking (if occurs again); spank; pop him; spank her butt; pop on the diaper; slap hand; slap his wrist; spank hand; hit him on his hand; pop her on the hand; pop in the mouth; hit his mouth lightly; hit him/her on the mouth; swat child's mouth; smack her mouth; smack in mouth with two fingers; respond with a soft flick to the mouth; give him tight pressure among the joints and give tight hugs; give her chili

Take Away a Privilege or Toy/Punish:
take away favorite toy; take toys away; take away a toy so she knows she did something wrong; take something away; take away something he likes; don't allow child to play with a certain toy; deny him what he wants; take her "prized possession" away; put him on thinking time; stop him and put in time out; place her on timeout and tell her to think about what she did; time out; put her in a time out of some sort; send to room; put him in his room for a time out/cool down; make her do chores; discipline him; punishment; give him proper punishment that is age appropriate

Give a Talking to/Threaten/Yell:
raise my voice and lecture; scold him/her; firmly express disapproval verbally; tell her not to do it; tell him "no"; tell him "no" in a strong voice; sternly/firmly say "no!"; tell him/her to stop; "no biting"; look her in the eyes and say, "no, you don't do that"; "you do not bite!";"you can't bite!"; signify to him to never do that; let her know she is not to bite; tell her she must not bite people; tell her I'm going to hit her if she keeps doing it; warn her if he doesn't stop, he'll get a spanking; "I'll bite you back"; verbal warning; tell his dad in front of him; correct him; "bad boy"; yell/scream (at him/her)

Ignore/Do Nothing:
ignore; ignore it; immediately stop all interaction with him; do nothing; silence; I would allow it

Any Attempt to Discuss/Teach:
ask child to stop; ask him what he is doing; ask child why did it; ask why he felt he had to bite; ask what is wrong; ask how would feel if someone bit him; ask who or where she saw that; ask who did that to her; ask her if she is frustrated; "are you frustrated?"; "are you mad at me honey?"; ask him how he is feeling; ask her what she really wants; "do you want to tell me something?"; ask my child if trying to get attention; ask child if teeth hurt; ask my child if in pain; "what made you think it was alright to bit me?"; talk about why she did it; show him what teeth are for; tell him that teeth are not for biting; talk to child;

talk to him about not biting; talk to him and tell why it is not right for him to do that; teach her that biting is not the right thing; let her know it's not right; explain it's not correct; tell him it is not ok to bite; tell her in a neutral tone that biting is not ok; verbalize that it's not ok to bite mommy; tell/explain why not appropriate to bite; tell him it's not good to be biting and why; immediately explain to her understanding why it's wrong; discuss why biting is wrong; tell why shouldn't bite; reasons why we don't bite; tell him he can't bite people; explain that people don't bite and only animals do that; "even if others bite, don't do it; explain that we can't play like that because it hurts; tell it's not nice; explain why biting isn't nice/isn't good; explain to her that she's not doing something good; talk to her about how it's bad; explain why we don't bite others; immediately explain how it's wrong; let him know that what he did was wrong; tell her that's not a good choice; stop child and explain why they shouldn't do it; tell/explain not to do it again ; show T.V. show about biting; get down to eye level and tell him "no bite"; get down to his level and tell him that biting hurts; tell him how I feel with him biting me; tell him he hurt me; "I don't like that"; tell her biting hurts; show him where he bit me; show her teeth marks and tell her when she does that, it hurts me; show him what he has done; express pain so he know it hurt; say, "ouch, that really hurt my leg"; say, "ouch!"; "owie"; explain that I understand that he is frustrated but biting isn't the way; tell him how to control his anger; talk about other ways to express frustrations; tell child there are other ways to communicate; teach child words he can use; tell him to use his words; help child find other ways to say things; "gentle touches"; grab hand and demonstrate appropriate touch; take his hand and show him how to touch; say, "I see you are trying to get my attention-next time, you can tap my leg"; figure out cause of problem and work on a solution; tell him people don't want to be friends with people who bite; show her to apologize

Constructive Actions:
remove him from situation; comfort; observe actions first then try to meet her needs; pay attention to why child is doing it; find out reason why did it; distract him with something else; give him one of his toys; bring a toy to his attention; try to see what he wants; try to identify if he is hungry; try to feed her; give her a cracker or something else she can bite; give her something else to bite on; teething ring; give pain reliever to relieve teeth pain; find her a different way to express her frustration

Other:
I would laugh; I would smile; cry; I would be mad; I would get upset; pretend to cry; pretend to bite him; tickle my child; would not bite him back; would not "play" bite; be informal yet inquisitive

Developed by Deanna Marie Herndon

APPENDIX H

CHILD BEHAVIOR SCENARIO 2: REASONS WHY THREE YEAR OLD HAS A TANTRUM

Child Behavior Scenario 2: Reasons Why Three Year Old Has A Tantrum

Child Being Bad/Naughty
he/she is spoiled; maybe he is being spoiled too much; being/is a brat; not enough discipline; because he knows he can (get away with it); does not understand "no"; didn't accept "no" as the only answer; haven't been taught how to behave; acting out; as stated-having a tantrum

Child Being Manipulative/Controlling:
to get attention; to get attention from others; acting out to get attention; wants to get attention; she's not getting my attention at the moment; always gets what he wants, but I said "no" and he has a tantrum to get what he wants; it's a way for him to get what he wants; thinks it is a successful way of getting what he wants; she believes this will get her what she wants; to get the toy/candy he wants; has done it in the past to get way; to get his way; he thinks he can have his way; thinks that a tantrum will help get her way; trying to get his way; wants everything his way mommy gives in when she does this; "Child wearing me down so I'll give in to her demands"; she thinks this will make e give in; wants me to give in; testing boundaries; to see how much of an influence he has upon me; to get my reaction; for a reaction; to prove child can control the situation; "Child showing he is the boss and knows he will get away with it"; to show who is in charge; she has learned to manipulate her parents; to get another adult to feel sorry for her (pity) trying to embarrass me; he is trying to upset me; to annoy me; to end my patience; to focus attention on me; he knows I won't do anything like punish him at the store

Reflective of Limits in Child's Development:
trying to communicate something is wrong; can't communicate needs; wanting to communicate her wants; doesn't know other ways to express self; is how she expresses when feeling frustrated; he doesn't know how else to handle it; lack patience; needs more practice with delayed gratification when he wants something and can't have it

Reflective of Child's Negative·Emotions/Feelings *(child's negative emotion/feeling identified or implied by parent:)*
upset; frustrated; mad; distressed; angry; over stimulated; overwhelmed; bored; cranky; sad; grumpy; scared; irritated; annoyed; having a bad day; tired and acting out; not fun to be in store for one and a half hours; have been at store too long and child wants to leave store; child has some mental problems; getting disciplined in store; too many things and people so he is probably overwhelmed; nervous in social environment need for attention; I'm not paying enough attention to her

Reflective of Child's Physical State:
tired; sleepy; he is tired and wants to go home; didn't get enough sleep; hungry; thirsty; ill/sick; feels bad; feels uncomfortable; hurt himself/pain; because her knees hurt; restless (from being in cart/wants out of cart)

Wants Something/Doesn't Want Something *(Excluding Attention) (parental recognition of emotional reaction not present)*:
wants something; wants something specific; she wants me to buy her something; not getting what wants; because doesn't get what she wants; wanting her own way; wants to touch/look at something but I won't allow; wants something but we said "no"; wants to walk but I said "no"; I refuse to buy her something; just wants something really bad; wants everything he asks for wanted to ride in cart that looks like a car; he wanted to grab everything; may want to run around store; wants to run, play, touch; wanted to push cart; wants to be picked up and carried; wants to be liberated from my grasp; wants to leave store; he starts touching everything and we tell him, "do not touch"; not used to hearing "no"; he doesn't like what I am telling him; didn't get way; she never wanted to go to the store; doesn't like to go to store; probably doesn't want to be there; wants to be somewhere else; doesn't want to hold my hand; no longer wants to walk; doesn't want to stay inside shopping cart' just plain not getting her way; he may not be getting his way child noticed the things he put in cart are no longer there; older brother took something away; something was taken from her; I didn't take her to the toy section

Child Observed/Learned Behavior:
has seen other children do it; she saw another child do it and get what wanted; watched other kids do this and nothing happened; saw it on t.v.; mimicking; follows others' behaviors

For No Reason:
just for the heck of it; just because

Developed by Deanna Marie Herndon

APPENDIX I

CHILD BEHAVIOR SCENARIO 2: RESPONSES TO THREE YEAR OLD HAVING A TANTRUM

Child Behavior Scenario 2: Responses To Three Year Old Having A Tantrum

Physically Hurt Child:
pick her up and spank her; spank him/her; if he continued, I would spank him; hit him; pop him; grab him; grab him by his arm; spank on the hand; swat to the behind; pop him on the butt to make him stop

Take Away a Privilege or Toy/Punish:
take privileges away; take away "prized possession" at home; will not buy toys; no candy for him after dinner; can't watch cartoons; 15 minutes no T.V.; refuse to take to store; time out at home; give time out in store; sit him down in cart as a time out; make her sit in basket; put her in the shopping cart; leave the store as a punishment; make him do chores; take disciplinary action; discipline him/her; discipline in car; discipline in store; have dad discipline child; punish him; punish her once we get home

Give a Talking to/Threaten/Yell:
scold her (for her behavior); reprimand him; "you don't do this"; give him a serious look and say, "you better stop behaving like that right now"; firmly explain she is misbehaving and wrong; tell him in a stern voice to calm down; get upset and tell him that's not ok; tell him/her to be quiet; tell him/her to behave; tell her to "knock it off"; "no!"; tell him "no" and signify as bad behavior; continue to tell him no; (look in eyes and) tell to stop; tell him to "stop!"; tell him to get off the floor; tell him to stop and threaten to go home; tell him I will leave him there if he doesn't stop; tell him I'm leaving; tell him he will get a spanking if he doesn't stop; count to three; tell him I'm going to count to three and he needs to get up and stop or else; tell to stop or else; warn child will go on time out at home; warn him; tell him in a stern voice to "wait until we get home"; "you're going to get punished"; threaten consequences when home; threaten to take away privileges; threaten her with a time out or nap; let him know he will not get what he wants if he continues; tell him an opportunity will be taken away if he doesn't stop; "you are crying for no reason"; grab child's hand so can see I'm in charge and I'm the boss; scream/yell at him; scream at her to stop

Remove Attention/Ignore/Nothing:
don't pay attention; walk away (so she thinks I'm gone); leave him alone; leave her and ignore her; allow to proceed and ignore her; ignore tantrum; ignore and let cry; ignore the behavior, be indifferent; ignore the tantrum but not my child; ignore him and finish my shopping; keep walking; keep shopping; continue to shop; push along through the store; let him stay there for awhile; let her finish/throw her tantrum; have his tantrum until he gets over it

Any Attempt to Discuss/Teach:
ask what is wrong; ask for reasons; ask if frustrated; ask him to please calm down; ask child to stop/be quiet; ask her to use her words instead of screaming; tell child to be patient; give her a choice to stop or leave; talk; talk to him in a calm voice; talk to him/her; talk to him outside the store/in restroom; talk it out; have a talk with him; discuss why upset; express the emotions he is experiencing; try to reason with child; talk and see what child wants; try to find out exactly what she wants; tell her as soon as she stops, we can decide what she wants; "that's not good for you"; "I already got you some"; "we have some at home"; explain why can't buy it; explain why she isn't getting it; tell her I don't have enough money; explain don't have money to buy toy and will have to wait until next time; "next time when I have more money, you can either have this or that"; get down on child's level and explain why don't act that way/why not ok; tell shouldn't behave that way; explain why shouldn't do that; explain the consequences of his actions; talk and explain what he did wrong; explain that it is wrong; once home, tell behavior was wrong; let her know it's inappropriate/ unacceptable; remind him of what is acceptable and expected at the store; pull aside and explain why this behavior is not good; take her outside and talk to her about being good; tell her it's not ok; 'we don't buy treats every time we go to the store, only sometimes; explain we need to finish and we are almost done; let her know we are leaving; tell him to be patient and soon we will be out of there; tell him he'll be home soon; tell him others are looking at him

Nurture Child/Distract/Constructive (*Positive Actions*):
put cart to the side and take him to the car for a break; go outside so child can calm down; calm him/her down; try to calm him down by hugging him; hug him; hold her in my arms so she can stop; comfort; pick him up and comfort him; carry and comfort, but continue to shop; carry her; try to console him; pay attention to him; take him to the toy section (that will relax him); take him out of the area; sympathize with her feelings; let child play it out; remain calm; be patient with her; hold her and try replacing something; distraction; distract child with toy/something else; try to get his attention by distracting him; entertain him with something else; take her outside to play; give something else to play with; give something to make her stop crying; carry around the store and show all the pretty colors; have child help find items on list; give her a snack; give him a toy; bring books/toys for entertainment; get cart that is half cart, half car so it is fun; get down to her level and say that everything is ok; find out why she is throwing tantrum

Leave Store/Take to Car/Go Home:
rap up shopping trip; pick her up and walk out of the store/carry her outside; if uncontrollable, leave the store; take by hand and walk out of store; take out of store; leave store; leave store with child; leave store immediately; remove

from store until calms down; take him outside to car; take him/her outside until he stops/quits; go home; take her home (without any groceries)

Give In:
give in; give in to please her; give him/her what she wants; give him the object; cater to her; cave in to what she wants; agree to what child wants; get him/her candy; buy it; buy her whatever she is crying for; buy him what he/she wants (so he'll stop crying)

Attempt to Bribe:
bribe her; bribe child to stop (will buy something if stops); tell him he can have something from the store; offer a toy or candy for silence/good behavior; tell child if good, get's something, if not, nothing; tell him that if he behaves I will take him to Chucke Cheese; if he stops tantrum, he can have a snack

Other:
don't buy toy; don't buy him anything; do not give in to him; do not give him his way; make eye contact with child; make sure child doesn't do it again; stop shopping and wait until he is done; make him stay; take into bathroom; negative reinforcement

Developed by Deanna Marie Herndon

APPENDIX J

CHILD BEHAVIOR SCENARIO 3: REASONS WHY FOUR YEAR OLD SAYS "I HATE YOU!"

Child Behavior Scenario 3: Reasons Why Four Year Old Says "I Hate You!"

Child Being Bad/Naughty:
he/she is spoiled; he is a brat; dramatic; throwing a fit; another form of a tantrum; she really is learning about tantrums; disobedient; using it as a form of rebellion; no respect for me; doesn't like the word "no" and wants "yes" to all she asks; has not been taught manners; acting out; she is spoiled, so yells when she doesn't get what she wants; I caught her in a lie

Child Being Manipulative/Controlling:
to get attention; looking for attention; did not get attention he wanted; wants emotional attention; wants some attention now; to prove she can control the situation; to manipulate me; manipulating to get way; trying to get his way; she wants everything her way; to see if he gets his way; to make me change my mind about what I said; just acting out because did not get way; because I won't cater to his wants; "wants me to baby him"; to get a reaction (out of me); to see what type of response I will have; trying to get a emotional rise; has seen a reaction from it previously; to test me; he wants to exercise his boundaries; trying to hurt me; wants to hurt me/my feelings; he wants to hurt me like I hurt him; to upset me and make me feel bad

Reflective of Limits in Child's Development:
he's young/immature; too ignorant to know about hatred; doesn't know the true meaning of the words; trying to express self; vocabulary isn't that big and it's the only thing he can think of; didn't know what else to say; lack of language; doesn't know how to explain/express what he really feels; confused feelings/don't understand what is going on; trying to express feelings; not able to express feelings so saying, "I hate you" is an easy way to settle thing; coping mechanism; needs more conversation

Reflective of Child's Negative Emotions/Feelings *(child's negative emotion/feeling identified or implied by parent)*:
upset; frustrated; mad; mad at me; sad; distressed; angry; she's really angry; out of anger; over stimulated; irritated; overwhelmed; jealous; emotional; disappointed (in me); very upset in the moment; to express her emotions after I did something she didn't like; expressing her feelings; is upset and says whatever comes to mind; withholding too much anger; expressing anger toward me; mad at previous action; dealing with his emotions; jealous at the attention her sibling is getting; I took side of sibling; believes I am not being fair/feels discipline was unfair; feels any punishment is unfair; didn't agree with what I said/did/my action; he didn't like what I told him; feels I boss her around; upset at discipline; doesn't feel listened to; doesn't feel loved (and wants reassurance); wants to feel loved; does not feel understood; he thinks I am mean; at the time, that's how he feels; "genuinely hates me"; he really

does hate me; I've done something that made her hate me; because he has lost his mind; "I'm not giving him my full attention"; I was probably being mean; I probably hurt her feelings; not getting the attention she needs

Reflective of Child's Physical State:
tired; hungry
Aggression

Child Observed/Learned Behavior:
heard someone else (parent/sibling/peer/friend) say it (and get what they wanted); heard that phrase before; heard other people using the same words; she probably heard someone say that when they were upset; heard it somewhere and repeated it; copying what she heard; words that are often used in the household; mimicking; heard/saw it on t.v.; could have learned it from t.v.; the t.v. shows she watches could influence her words; outside influence; someone told him to tell me so; maybe someone told him bad things about me; her dad brainwashed her to hate me allowed to speak this way

Wants Something/Doesn't Want Something *(Excluding Attention) (parental recognition of emotional reaction not present)*:
didn't get way/what wanted; couldn't do what wanted; we don't do what they want; we don't let them get away with things; I didn't let him go somewhere; he wants something; something didn't go her way; can't make it to the park today; I can't do what she asked in the moment; wanted a candy and I said no; wanted to keep playing; I didn't agree with her; wanted to go somewhere; I took away something; got something taken away; I put away toys/made child clean room; responsibility: i.e., chores; told him to do something; child told no t.v./games;I turned the t.v. off; not able to watch cartoon; was told "no"; I won't let him eat all the cookies he wants; I put away his toy; made him clean room; he probably wanted to play late and I put him to bed

Child Was Disciplined:
had to discipline child; he was disciplined, and he hates being disciplined; he got grounded; putting her in a timeout; because he is in punishment; he just got punished; I yelled at him; he just lost his privileges; responding to a consequence he did not like; I spanked him

For No Reason

Developed by Deanna Marie Herndon

APPENDIX K

CHILD BEHAVIOR SCENARIO 3: RESPONSES TO FOUR YEAR OLD SAYING "I HATE YOU!"

Child Behavior Scenario 3: Responses To Four Year Old Saying "I Hate You!"

Physically Hurt Child:
spank him/her; give her a spanking; pop him; hit his mouth; swat to the behind

Take Away a Privilege or Toy/Punish:
take privileges away; take his favorite toy away; remove a toy; "no more games for today"; "go sit down and think about what you said"; send her to room (to think about what she said); put him in his room for a time out; sit him in time out; give a time out; put her in the corner; make her do chores around the house; depending on how frequent this behavior is, take disciplinary action; discipline him; punish him/her

Give a Talking to/Threaten/Yell:
tell him he needs to respect his elders; lecture him about saying things he doesn't mean; tell her to never say that she hates anyone; tell child not to say that no matter what; "do not say that!"; "don't say that to me again"; hey, you don't say that"; "don't say that to mommy"; tell her she shouldn't ever say that to me again; "don't talk to me that way"; make/have him apologize; "that was very mean"; "if you say that again, you are going on time out"; "if you don't like it, you are going on time out"; yell back; yell at him for saying that; "I hate you sometimes too"; tell her I hate her back

Dismissive of Child's Experience/Remove Attention/Ignore:
dismiss what he said; tell child he needs to go to bed so he can grow stronger; tell her to get a job and move out; distract him; "I know what's best for you!"; "thank you"; "it's fine"; "I don't care"; "ok"; "get over it"; "too bad"; "you still aren't getting it"; "hate has to do with the devil";tell her she will change her mind later; "you don't hate me"; tell him he doesn't mean it; "you don't mean it-your just upset"; "you are just saying that to me right now because you are mad"; tell him he's just upset; "you will get over it"; I would give him space; leave the room; leave her alone; leave him be; don't talk to him until he's done with his attitude; I don't react; avoid responding; silence; say nothing; ignore it; ignore outburst; ignore what was said; ignore the bad behavior; ignore her until she says sorry

Any Attempt to Discuss/Teach:
try to figure out why she said it; "why are you saying this?"; find out why he hates me; discuss why he thinks I'm mean; allow to cool off then ask to explain why feeling that way; ask the reason; ask him why; ask her why she said that; ask child why upset; "is something bothering you?"; ask him what's wrong with him; ask child why doesn't love/hates me; "are you mad at me?"; "what did I do?"; ask child where he heard that; ask if he know what it means; ask if he would like me saying that to him; ask how he'd feel if I told him those

words; ask, "why do you think that mommy does not think that?"; ask later what she hates and discuss options for fixing those; "what is the reason you said those words?"; have a conversation with him; have a discussion about the real problem; talk to him about why he feels that way; talk to child; talk it out; talk to him about the situation; explain nicely in a low voice; explain the situation; explain why he can't have what he wants; explain that she still will not get her way; explain reasons why she doesn't hate me; explain why it's not ok; explain why shouldn't say it; explain why we don't use that way of expressing ourselves; "that is very disrespectful"; explain the consequences; explain what he did wrong; talk and help her understand what she did wrong; have a talk and tell her what is right and wrong; explain it's not right to talk to me like that; tell him it's not ok to say those things; let him know why he didn't get his way; "do you know that's not nice?"; "that's not nice to say"; "that's not nice to say to your mother"; let her know that those are not nice words; make sure he understands it's not nice to tell mommy that/say that; explain its mean to say things like that; tell him the word hate is mean; explain/tell child what hate means; explain how hate is a strong and hurtful word; have discussion about hate; explain the meaning of hate; make sure he understands the meaning of his words; communicate and discuss what those words mean and how it made me feel; explain the emotions and why I took my actions; explain emotions; talk about others' feelings; explain that those words hurt/are hurtful; express hurt; tell him how much it hurt; tell child it hurt my feelings/makes me sad; tell him that I'm not mean and that he is being hurtful; "please stop"; use an 'I message'; calmly tell him I don't like that, please don't speak to me like that; ask child to replace 'hate' with a different feeling; ask her to express her feelings without those words; let her know she can express herself by saying a different word like 'dislike'; "those are strong words to say"; tell child, "I understand you are upset but those aren't the words we use"; brainstorm other words to use; help her with expressing her feelings; try rephrasing his thoughts; "It's ok to be mad at me-sometimes, we get upset"; tell her it's ok to disagree and we won't always agree; help him open up and tell me why he is so upset; talk with child and work on a solution; try to settle disagreement with child; would say that hating me won't get him his way; talk her out of saying that; explain that she doesn't hate me and that she is just angry at me which is ok to express; "Sorry you feel that way"; realize she's upset, leave her alone, then ask her about it at a later time; tell him to take a deep breath and tell him what's wrong; "it looks like you are really upset right now-I am going to leave the room for a bit"

Nurture Child/Tell Love Child:
give him a lot of attention; hug him to demonstrate my affection; hug her and reassure her that she's loved; let him know he is loved; tell him I love him; "well, I love you"; tell her I love her anyways; "I love you very much"; "mommy loves you no matter what";"mommy loves you and wants to help you"; "that's

ok, I still love you"; "it's ok, you don't always have to love me, but I love you"; "I love you even when you hate me"; "well I don't hate you"

Other:
look child eye to eye; "think about what you just said"; be really sweet and buy him a toy; give him/her what s/he wanted; get upset with him; I would cry and be hurt; I would probably cry; probably cry in my room and let it go; cry because I'm a horrible parent; cry; act upset; act like feelings are hurt; tell his dad; tell her father; apologize; I would first consider his feelings without diminishing my authority

Developed by Deanna Marie Herndon

APPENDIX L

CHILD BEHAVIOR SCENARIO 4: REASONS WHY FIVE YEAR OLD TAKES APART TOY

Child Behavior Scenario 4: Reasons Why Five Year Old Takes Apart Toy

Child being Bad/Naughty:
vengeful; destructive; spoiled; being defiant; inconsiderate; impatient; she is a bad girl (who doesn't take care of her things); just being bad; the child is mean; he likes to destroy toys; troublemaker; "just plain destructive"; was being careless; careless about toys; doesn't appreciate toys; doesn't value what she has because she has too much; rebellion; to rebel; knows he can get away with it; trying to break it; he wanted to break it

Child Being Manipulative/Controlling:
to get attention; to test my reaction; wanted to test me; didn't get way; on purpose to get a new toy; wants a new toy; so I will buy her another one; to get back at someone; to get back at his sister; to get/make me mad; to hurt me/payback; wanted to destroy something to get back at me; take the toy away from him

Reflective of Limits in Child's Development:
learning cause and effect; developing motor skills; too complex of a toy for her; doesn't understand/know the value; doesn't know it costs a lot of money; didn't know better; lack of understanding of consequences; she's a child and doesn't know how much the toy costs; didn't realize it was so expensive; meaningless to him; because they are kids and that is what kids do; it's normal for kids to be curious; need to learn; I left him alone to play with something I should have been involved with; adults were not paying attention; I left him alone too long

Reflective of Child's Negative Emotions/Feelings/Physical state *(child's negative emotion/feeling/state identified or implied by parent)*:
upset; frustrated; angry; to get rid of anger; mad; mad at me; sad at something; was upset and took out feelings on toy; distressed; boredom; the toy bored her; tired and restless

Reflective of Child's Desires/Intentions:
experimentation; she wanted to experiment; exploring; exploring the mechanics of the toy; she's curious and likes to take things apart; curiosity; curious about the toy; being curious about its contents; curious/wondering/interested in how it works; wants to see how it works; wants to see how the toy actually works; wants to know how it works; wanting to know what is inside it; pretending/trying to fix it; trying to put t back together; trying to be a "mechanic"; into mechanics; maybe she wants to be an engineer when she grows up; child is mechanically inclined; wanted to use toy differently from original use; she wanted to see what else it could do; do something different; trying to make something else; wanted to use the parts

for something else; has another approach; being creative; trying to change batteries; wanted to make a puzzle; trying to keep busy; desire to do something independently; think independently; impressed by it; "for fun"; it's fun taking things apart; didn't know he couldn't put it back together; she never liked the toy in the first place; didn't like toy; doesn't like toy anymore; didn't want anymore; needs a new toy

Aggression:
has aggressive tendencies; to take out aggression; playing rough with toy; too rough on toy; not taking care of toys; just being a boy; he's a boy and boys break toys

Child Observed/Learned Behavior:
mimicking daddy; saw parent doing it (fixing something); has seen someone working on things around the house; saw someone else do it and thinks he can get away with it; was with friends and they were doing it so he thought it was ok to do it too; saw it on t.v.

For No Reason (Including "Accident"):
no reason; accident; it just happened; playing (around); no intentions for it not too work; did not mean to; didn't know; didn't know what he was doing; maybe she thought that's how you play with a toy; "he probably thought it was like a lego"

Developed by Deanna Marie Herndon

APPENDIX M

CHILD BEHAVIOR SCENARIO 4: RESPONSES TO FIVE YEAR OLD TAKING APART TOY

Child Behavior Scenario 4: Responses To Five Year Old Taking Apart Toy

Physically Hurt Child:
spank him/her; give a spanking; a spank; a little spanking

Take Away a Privilege or Toy/Don't Replace Toy/Punish:
take privileges away; may lose some privileges; no T.V. or Wii; don't allow child to play outside with friends; give a 'toy timeout'; don't buy expensive toys; take all of his expensive toys away; will not be getting another expensive toy in a long time; throw it away while she watches; remove the toy from him; take it away; no toys for some time; take away her toys because she is breaking them; seize all toys until he is able to respect his things; take all toys and punish him; take away another toy as punishment; take away other toys until she knows how to take care of them; punish her by taking away another toy; take child's favorite toys away; take apart or break a favorite toy; punish her by not buying toys; won't buy any toys for a while; not buying another toy for two weeks; give child old toys; throw toy away; don't replace it; won't get another one; won't buy another one again; work for money to replace toy; have him earn the next expensive toy; grounded; have consequences; make him/tell him to put it back together; make him clean up the mess; have to do chores to pay for it; send him to room; time out; if constant, time out; discipline him/her; punish; punishment; punish harshly

Give a Talking To/Threaten/Yell:
scold; tell him that it's not good and not to do it again; tell him that it's his loss; "are you happy now?"; "how do you like that?"; "oh well, no more toys"; "no more toys"; "look what you did"; "OMG, what did you do?"; tell him he won't get more toys if he does it again; threaten to not buy anymore toys; tell him to wait until his dad gets home; flip out/yell at him/her; scream at him; yell at him and tell that was bad

Discuss With/Teach/Help:
discuss; ask for an explanation; talk to him and see why he took it apart; "what are you trying to do?"; "do you like to take things apart?"; "what was your plan?"; "did you want to see what was inside?"; "why did you do that?"; "did you mean to?"; ask how he feels; ask child why did that; ask him why not nice to toys; ask what's wrong and if she'd like to talk about it; ask her if she wants to play with something else; ask if he found what he was looking for; ask if it was a good decision; ask her not to do it again, as it cost a lot of money; ask why he didn't ask for help; tell child needs to ask an adult next time; tell to ask dad to help next time; "if something is wrong, you need to talk to me; explain the danger; explain the situation; explain that he broke it; explain what he has done; talk to him about what he did; explain how toy won't work now; let him know he broke it so he can no longer play with it; "now you don't have your toy

anymore"; explain that the toy is now broken; explain why toy isn't working; explain how the toy works and now it won't because she took it apart; explain that this toy cannot be taken apart; explain that not all toys are able to be put back together; teach him that everything isn't meant to be taken apart; show her toys that can and cannot be taken apart; explain that toys are played with certain ways; explain that there are certain things we cannot touch; explain why he shouldn't take apart toys; explain that taking things apart when you don't know how breaks things; explain to him that taking a toy apart is not a good idea; explain that we do not dismantle our toys because then we won't be able to play with them anymore; explain he will have no more toys if he keeps doing this; remind her if she breaks it, she will not get a new one; explain why we do not destroy toys; explain to him that taking good care of his toys is important; explain that it's good to explore, but it's expensive and can't explore expensive toys; tell her that we paid money for it and it's not good to take it apart; tell her that it costs a fortune; explain the value of things to child; explain that the toy is expensive and we can't buy another one; explain that money doesn't grow on trees, so he can't do that anymore; make her understand it could have value; explain the toy cost a lot; explain why it's not ok to break things that I spend my money on; tell her that isn't nice; tell him that it is not ok what he did; tell him not to break his things; explain to him not to touch things that don't belong to him; remind him that we don't take toys apart; tell him what's wrong with breaking it; teach him the right and wrong; explain why it was wrong and why I am angry; tell child I'm upset that he did that; tell him to go play with something else because I'm upset he took apart the toy; tell him he needs to be more careful; talk to child about playing more carefully; "maybe you need an anger management class"; show child movie that teaches empathy & caring for toys; "remember when you first bought the toy and how bad you wanted it?"; tell her to play with another toy; buy her a new one; buy another one; buy a different toy he might be interested in; tell her we will go to the store, return the toy, and buy a toy she likes;"I'm sorry your toy doesn't work anymore; "it's ok"; tell her it's ok, we can fix it; help him repair it; "let's see if we can put it back together"; try to make it work; try to put toy back together; help put together again; try to teach her to put it back together; tell him to fix the toy so he can play with it again; "can I watch/help you take it apart?"; make something out of the parts; find a use for its parts; provide with toys for that specific purpose; buy things meant to break and put back together; buy her inexpensive toys to investigate upon; buy things for him to take apart; shop for toys that are safe for him to take apart; play with her to see what she is looking for in this toy; I would see why he did it then react to it

Nothing:
nothing; leave as is; no response; she can continue to play with the toy if she wishes

Other:
get upset; would be upset; I'd be upset because of the monetary value; I would be upset but I would understand; I would get/be mad; get angry; I would be angry at him; I wouldn't get upset, kids take things apart; not get mad; I would be very surprised; laugh; report to father; find out whose toy it was; play a game with her; "what are you going to play with now?"; I would ask my mother; distraction

Developed by Deanna Marie Herndon

APPENDIX N

RESPONSES TO QUESTION IF PARTICIPANTS FEEL GUILTY AFTER SPANKING THEIR CHILD

Responses To Question If Participants Feel Guilty After Spanking Their Child

Response	Total Responses
Yes Guilty- Hurts Child	27%
Yes Guilty- Made Decision Not to do it at Some Point/Regret it	18%
Yes Guilty- Hurts Parent	16%
No Guilty- Rationalizing (e.g., don't use often/don't spank hard/last resort)	15%
No Guilty- It Works/Is Warranted	12%
Yes Guilty- Rationalizing (e.g., will teach him that doing wrong things causes consequences)	7%
Yes Guilty- Doesn't Work/Better Ways	6%

APPENDIX O

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Human Subjects Review Board
Department of Psychology
California State University,
San Bernardino

PI: Kampner, Laura & Herndon, Deanna

From: Donna Garcia

Project Title: Changing Parents' Perspectives About the Use of Corporal Punishment

Project ID: H-11WI-02

Date: Friday, February 11, 2011

Disposition: Administrative Review

Your IRB proposal is approved. This approval is valid until 2/11/2012.

Good luck with your research!

Donna M. Garcia, Chair
Psychology IRB Sub-Committee

REFERENCES

Achenbach, T. M., & Edelbrock, C. M. (1978). The classification of child psychopathology: A review and analysis of empirical efforts. *Psychological Bulletin, 86,* 1275-1301.

Aronfreed, J. (1961). The nature, variety, and social patterning of moral responses to transgression. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63,* 223-240.

Aucoin, K. J., Frick, P. J., & Bodin, S. D. (2006). Corporal punishment and child adjustment. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 27,* 527-541.

Azar, S. T., Nix, R. L., & Makin-Byrd, K. N. (2005). Parenting schemas and the process of change. *Journal of marital and Family Therapy, 31,* 45-58.

Bachar, E., Canetti, L., Bonne, O., DeNour, A. K., & Shalev, A. Y. (1997). Physical punishment and signs of mental distress in normal adolescents. *Adolescence, 32,* 945-958.

Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1961). Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63,* 575-582.

Barnett, D., Kidwell, S. L., & Ho Leung, K. (1998). Parenting and preschooler attachment among low-income urban African American families. *Child Development, 69,* 1657-1671.

Benjet, C., & Kazdin, A. E. (2003). Spanking children: The controversies, findings, and new directions. *Clinical Psychology Review, 23,* 197-224.

Bond, L. A. & Burns, C. E. (1998). Investing in parents' development as an investment in primary prevention. *Journal of mental Health, 7,* 493-503.

Boninger, D. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Berent, M. K. (1995). Origins of attitude importance: Self-interest, social identification, and value relevance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68,* 61-80.

Borgida, E., & Howard-Pitney, B. (1983). Personal involvement and the robustness of perceptual salience effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45,* 560-570.

Brems, C., Baldwin, M., & Baxter, S. (1993). Empirical evaluation of a self psychologically oriented parent education program. *Family Relations, 42,* 26-30.

Bryan, J. W., & Freed, F. W. (1982). Corporal punishment: Normative data and sociological and psychological correlates in a community college population. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 11,* 77-87.

Bugental, D. B., Martorell, G. A., & Barraza, V. (2003). The hormonal costs of subtle forms of infant maltreatment. *Hormones and Behavior, 43,* 237-244.

Capaldi, D. M., Pears, K. C., Patterson, G. R., & Owen, L. D. (2003) Continuity of parenting practices across generations in an at-risk sample: A prospective comparison of direct and mediated associations. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 31,* 127-142.

Cassidy, J. (2008). The nature of a child's ties. In J. Cassidy, & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), Handbook *of Attachment: Theory, research, and clinical application* (2nd ed., pp. 3-22). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Cast, A. D., Schweingruber, D., & Berns, N. (2006). Childhood physical punishment and problem solving in marriage. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21,* 244-261.

Covell, K., Grusec, J. E., & King, G. (1995). The intergenerational transmission of maternal discipline and standards for behavior. *Social Development, 4,* 32-43.

Coyl, D. D., Roggman, L. A., & Newland L. A. (2002). Stress, maternal depression, and negative mother-infant interactions in relation to infant attachment. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 23,* 145-163.

Deater-Deckard, K., Lansford, J. E., Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., & Bates, J. E. (2003). The development of attitudes about physical punishment: An 8-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Family Psychology, 17,* 351-360.

Demick, J. (2002). Stages of parental development. In M. Bornstein (Ed.) *Handbook of Parenting: Vol 3: Being and becoming a parent* (2nd ed., pp. 389-413). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Dobbs, T., & Duncan, J. (2004). Children's perspectives on physical discipline: A New Zealand example. *Child Care in Practice, 10,* 367-379.

Dobbs, T. A., Smith, A. B., & Taylor, N. J. (2006). "No, we don't get a say, children just suffer the consequences": Children talk about family discipline. *The International Journal of Children's Rights, 14, 137-156.*

Dole, J. A., & Sinatra, G. M. (1998). Reconceptualizing change in the cognitive construction of knowledge. *Educational Psychologist, 33,* 109-128.

Durrant, J. E. (1999). Evaluating the success of Sweden's corporal punishment ban. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 23,* 435-448.

Durrant, J. E. (2003). Legal reform and attitudes toward physical punishment in Sweden. *International Journal of Children's Rights, 11,* 147-173.

Durrant, J. E., Rose-Kransnor, L., & Broberg, A. G. (2003). Physical punishment and maternal beliefs in Sweden and Canada. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 34,* 585-604.

Eamon, M. K. (2001). Antecedents and socioemotional consequences of physical punishment on children in two-parent families. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 6,* 787-802.

Flick, L. H., & McSweeney, M. (1985). *Parental awareness: A social cognitive explanation of adolescent mother-child interaction*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association, Washington, DC.

Flynn, C. P. (1996). Normative support for corporal punishment: Attitudes, correlates, and implications. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 1,* 47-55.

Fonagy, P., Steele, M., Steele, H., Moran, G. S., & Higgitt, A. C. (1991). The capacity for understanding mental states: The reflective self in parent and child and its significance for security of attachment. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 12,* 201-218.

Gershoff, E. T. (2002). Corporal punishment by parents and associated child behaviors and experiences: A meta-analytic and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin, 128,* 539-579.

Gershoff, E. T., & Bitensky, S. H. (2007). The case against corporal punishment of children: Converging evidence from social science research and international human rights law and implications for U.S. public policy. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 13,* 231-272.

Giles-Sims, J., Straus, M. A., & Sugarman, D. B. (1995). Child, maternal, and family characteristics associated with spanking. *Family Relations, 44,* 170-176.

Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children. (2012). *Global report: Ending legalized violence against children*. Retrieved October 20, 2013, from http://www.endcorporalpunishment.org/pages/pdfs/reports/GlobalReport2012.pdf

Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children. (2013). *Honduras country report*. Retrieved October 20, 2013, from http://www.endcorporalpunishment.org/pages/frame.html

Goyette-Ewing, M., Slade, A., Knoebber, K., Gilliam, W., Truman, S., & Mayes, L. (2003). Parents first: A developmental parenting program. Yale Child Study Center. Unpublished Manuscript.

Graziano, A. M., Hamblen, J. L., & Plante, W. A. (1996). Subabusive violence in child rearing in middle-class American families. *Pediatrics, 98,* 845-848.

Grogan-Kaylor, A. (2004). The effect of corporal punishment on antisocial behavior in children. *Social Work Research, 28,* 153-162.

Grogan-Kaylor, A. (2005). Corporal punishment and the growth trajectory of children's antisocial behavior. *Child Maltreatment, 10,* 283-292.

Grusec, J. E. (1991). *The intergenerational transmission of discipline techniques and associated belief systems.* Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of Society for research in Child Development, Seattle, 1991.

Grusec, J. E., & Goodnow, J. J. (1994). Impact of parental discipline methods on the child's internalization of values: A reconceptualization of current points of view. *Developmental Psychology, 30,* 4-19.

Gunnoe, M. L., & Mariner, C. L. (1997). Toward a developmental/contextual model of the effects of parental spanking on children's aggression. *Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine, 151,* 768-775.

Hawk, C. K., & Holden, G. W. (2006). Meta-parenting: An initial investigation into a new parental social cognition construct. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 6,* 21-42.

Janson, S. (2005). Response to Beckett, C. (2005) 'The Swedish myth: The corporal punishment ban and child death statistics.' *Journal of Social Work, 35,* 1411-1415.

Johnson, B. T., & Eagly, A. H. (1989). Effects of involvement on persuasion: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 106,* 290-314.

Kazcin, A. E., & Benjet, C. (2003). Spanking children: Evidence and issues. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 12,* 99-103.

King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (2004). Reflective judgment: Theory and research on the development of epistemic assumptions through adulthood. *Educational Psychologist, 39,* 5-18.

Kochanska, G., Aksan, N., & Joy, M. E. (2007). Children's fearfulness as a moderator of parenting in early socialization: Two longitudinal studies. *Developmental Psychology, 43,* 222-237.

Lansford, J. E., Chang, L., Dodge, K. A., Malone, P. S., Oburu, P., Palmerus, K., et al. (2005). Physical discipline and children's adjustment: Cultural normativeness as a moderator. *Child Development, 76,* 1234-1246.

Lau, J. T. F., Liu, J. L. Y., Cheung, J. C. K., Yu, A., & Wong, C. K. (1999). Prevalence and correlates of physical abuse in Hong Kong Chinese adolescents: A population-based approach. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 23,* 549-557.

Lewinsohn, P. M., Hops, H., Roberts, R. R., Seeley, R. J., & Andrews, J. A. (1993). Adolescent psychopathology: Prevalence and incidence of depression and other DSM-HI-R disorders in high school students. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 102,* 133-144.

Litvosky, V. G., & Dusek, J. B. (1985). Perceptions of child rearing and self-concept development during the early adolescent years. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 14,* 373-388.

Lord, C. G., Ross, L., & Lepper, M. R. (1979). Biased assimilation and attitude polarization: The effects of prior theories on subsequent considered evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37,* 2098-2109.

Lytton, H. (1971). Correlates of compliance and the rudiments of conscience in two-year-old boys. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 9,* 242-251.

MacMillan, H. L., Boyle, M. H., Wong, M. Y., Duku, E. K., Fleming, J. E., & Walsh, C. A. (1999). Slapping and spanking in childhood and its association with lifetime prevalence of psychiatric disorders in a general population sample. *Canadian Medical Association, 161*,. 805-809.

Maurer, A. (1974). Corporal punishment. *American Psychologist, 29,* 614-626.

McDevitt, T. M., & Ormrod, J. E. (2008). Fostering conceptual change about child development in prospective teachers and other college students. *Child Development Perspectives, 2,* 85-91.

McLoyd, V. C., Jayaratne, T. E., Ceballo, R., & Borquez, J. (1994). Unemployment and work interruption among African-American single mothers: Effects on parenting and adolescent socioemotional functioning. *Child Development, 65,* 562-589.

Mehrabian, A. (2000). Manual for the balanced emotional empathy scale (BEES). (Available from Albert Mehrabian, 1130 Alta Mesa Road, Monterey, CA 93940).

Merriam, S. B. (2004). The role of cognitive development in Mezirow's transformational learning theory. *Adult Education Quarterly, 55,* 60-68.

Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. *New Directions for Adult & Continuing Education, 74,* 5-12.

Mezirow, J. (1998). On critical reflection. *Adult Education Quarterly, 48,* 185-198.

Muller, R. T., Hunter, J. E., & Stollak, G. (1995). The intergenerational transmission of corporal punishment: A comparison of social learning and temperament models. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 19,* 1323-1335.

Mulvaney, M. K., & Mebert, C. J. (2007). Parental corporal punishment predicts behavior problems in early childhood. *Journal of Family Psychology, 21,* 389-397.

Murphy, P. K. (2007). The eye of the beholder: The interplay of social and cognitive components in change. *Educational Psychologist, 42,* 41-53.

Murphy-Cowan, T., & Stringer, M. (1999). Physical punishment and the parenting cycle: A survey of Northern Irish parents. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 9,* 61-71.

Newberger, C. M. (1980). The cognitive structure of parenthood: Designing a descriptive measure. *New Directions for Child Development and Adolescent Development, 1980,* 45-67.

Oppenheim, D., & Koren-Karie, N. (2002). Mothers' insightfulness regarding their children's internal worlds: The capacity underlying secure child-mother relationships. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 23,* 593-605.

Pagani, L. S., Tremblay, R. E., Nagin, D., Zoccolillo, M., Vitaro, F., & McDuff, P. (2004). Risk factor models for adolescent verbal and physical aggression toward mothers. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28,* 528-537.

Petty, R. E., Brinol, P., Tormala, Z. L., & Jarvis, W. B. (2006). Implicit ambivalence from attitude change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90,* 21-41.

Pomerantz, E. M., Chaiken, S., & Tordesillas, R. S. (1995). Attitude strength and resistance processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 408-419.

Power, T. G., & Chapieski, M. L. (1986). Childrearing and impulse control in toddlers: A naturalistic investigation. *Developmental Psychology, 22,* 271-275.

Pratt, M. W., Hunsberger, B., Pancer, S. M., Roth, D., & Santolupo, S. (1993). Thinking about parenting: Reasoning about developmental issues across the lifespan. *Developmental Psychology, 29,* 585-595.

Reynolds, D. (2003). Mindful parenting: A group approach to enhancing reflective capacity in parents and infants. *Journal of Child Psychotherapy, 29,* 357-374.

Rodriguez, C. M. (2003). Parental discipline and abuse potential effects on child depression, anxiety, and attributions. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65,* 809-817.

Selman, R. L. (1971). Taking another's perspective: Role-taking development in early Childhood. *Child Development, 42,* 1721-1734.

Shulman, S. (2006). "Wondering" and beyond: Discussion of Arietta Slade's "Reflective parenting programs." *Psychoanalytic Inquiry, 26,* 658-667.

Simons, R. L., Beaman, J., Conger, R. D., & Chao, W. (1992). Gender differences in the intergenerational transmission of parenting beliefs. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 54,* 823-836.

Simons, R. L., Whitbeck, L. B., Conger, R. D., & Wu, C. (1991). Intergenerational transmission of harsh parenting. *Developmental Psychology, 27,* 159-171.

Slade, A. (2005). Parental reflective functioning: An introduction. *Attachment and Human Development, 7,* 269-281.

Slade, A. (2006). Reflective parenting programs: Theory and development. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry, 26,* 640-657.

Slade, A., Aber, J. L., Bresgi, I., Berger, B., & Kaplan (2004). *The parent development interview - Revised.* Unpublished Protocol. The City University of New York.

Slade, A., Grienenberger, J., Bernback, E., Levy, D., & Locker, A. (2005). Maternal reflective functioning, attachment, and the transmission gap: A preliminary study. *Attachment & Human Development, 7,* 283-298.

Slade, A., Sadler, L., De Dios-kenn, C., Webb, D., Currier-Ezepchick, J., & Mayes, L. (2005). Minding the baby: A reflective parenting program. *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 60,* 74-100.

Slade, E. P., & Wissow, L. S. (2004). Spanking in early childhood and later behavior problems: A prospective study of infants and young toddlers. *Pediatrics, 113,* 1321-1330.

Snyder, J., & Patterson, G. R. (1986). The effects of consequences on patterns of social interactions: A quasi-experimental approach to reinforcement in natural interaction. *Child Development, 57,* 1257-1268.

Straus, M. A. (1991). Discipline and deviance: Physical punishment of children and violence and other crime in adulthood. *Social Problems, 38,* 133-154.

Straus, M. A. (2000). Corporal punishment of children and adult depression and suicidal ideation. In M. A. Straus (Ed.) *Beating the devil out of them: Corporal punishment in American families and its effects on children* (2nd ed., pp. 59-77). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publications.

Straus, M. A., & Kaufman-Kantor, G. K. (1994). Corporal punishment of adolescents by parents: A risk factor in the epidemiology of depression, suicide, alcohol abuse, child abuse, and wife beating. *Adolescence, 29,* 543-562.

Straus, M. A., & Lauer, S. (1992). *Corporal punishment of children and crime in ethnic group context.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology.

Straus, M. A., & Mathur, A. K. (1995, April). *Corporal punishment of adolescents and academic attainment.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Pacific Sociological, San Francisco, CA.

Straus, M. A., & Mouradian, V. E. (1998). Impulsive corporal punishment by mothers and antisocial behavior and impulsiveness of children. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 16,* 353-374.

Straus, M. A., & Paschall, M. J. (2009). Corporal punishment by mothers and development of children's cognitive ability: A longitudinal study of two nationally representative age cohorts. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, & Trauma, 18,* 459-483.

Straus, M. A., & Stewart, J. H. (1999). Corporal punishment by American parents: National data on prevalence, chronicity, severity, and duration, in relation to child and family characteristics. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 2,* 55-70.

Straus, M. A., & Yodanis, C. L. (1996). Corporal punishment in adolescence and physical assaults on spouses in later life: What accounts for the link? *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58,* 825-841.

Straus, M. A., Sugarman, D. B., & Giles-Sims, J. (1997). Spanking by parents and subsequent antisocial behavior of children. *Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine, 151,* 761-767.

Thomas, R. (1996). Reflective dialogue parent education design: Focus on parent development. *Family Relations, 45,* 189-200.

Thompson, R. A. (2002). Early Attachment and Later Development In J. Cassidy, & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical application* (pp. 3-22). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Turner, H. A., & Finkelhor, D. (1996). Corporal punishment as a stressor among youth. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58,* 155-166.

Turner, H. A., & Muller, P. A. (2004). Long-term effects of child corporal punishment on depressive symptoms in young adults. *Journal of Family Issues, 25,* 761-782.

Wilkinson, P. (2009). Conceptualization about internalizing problems in children and adolescents. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva, 14,* 373-381.

Wissow, L. S. (2001). Ethnicity, income, and parenting contexts of physical punishment in a national sample of families with young children. *Child Maltreatment, 6,* 118-129.

Ziegert, K. A. (1983). The Swedish prohibition of corporal punishment: A preliminary report. *Journl of Marriage & Family, 45,* 917-926.

Zuwerink, J. R. & Devine, P. G. (1996). Attitude importance and resistance to persuasion: It's not just the thought that counts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70,* 931-944.