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ABSTRACT

The current study investigated the association between the acceptability of parent-child aggression, as demonstrated in a new analog measure, and self-reported support for spanking and mothers' child abuse potential. The connection between the analog of acceptability of parent-child aggression and attitudes toward children was also investigated. The Adult Adolescent Parenting Inventory - 2 (AAPI-2) Inappropriate Expectations Scale was designated as a measure of attitudes toward children and the Child Abuse Potential Inventory (CAPI) was used as a measure of abuse potential. The Attitudes Toward Spanking/Slapping My Child Scale (ATS) was the self-report measure of acceptability of parent-child aggression. Following a pilot evaluation, the analog ultimately contained eight video segments, three portraying physical discipline and five depicting child physical abuse. Participants were instructed to terminate the video when they considered the scene abusive, based on the idea that longer delay would reflect greater acceptance of parent-child aggression. The analog and self-report measures were administered to a sample of 70 mothers as part of a larger parenting study. Correlational analysis indicated there are significant relationships among mothers' child abuse potential, acceptability of parent-child aggression, and attitudes toward children. Mothers who endorsed attitudes that were more devaluing of children also showed more acceptability of parent-child aggression, when measured with the self-report (ATS) or the analog. The acceptability of parent-child aggression, either with the analog or self-report, was also associated with child abuse potential. Results indicate that the analog measure
does have a positive association with self-report. Unexpectedly, child abuse potential was not associated with participants’ distinction between abuse videos and discipline videos. Implications of this study include needing to understand factors that prompt some mothers to view all parent-child aggression as abuse whereas some mothers view all aggression as discipline. Findings support previous literature indicating that analog measures are a promising way to measure sensitive constructs that are subject to response bias.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In 2003, approximately 906,000 children in the United States experienced abuse or neglect, and 1,500 of those children died as a consequence (DHHS, 2005). Of those 906,000, 18.9% experienced physical abuse (DHHS, 2005). Furthermore, a great deal of evidence supports the conclusion that child abuse and neglect are significantly underreported (Ritchie & Ritchie, 1993). Child abuse and neglect are very prevalent in the United States. Taking underreporting into account, one can conclude many children in the United States experience the most extreme form of parental violence during their childhood.

Child physical abuse is defined by the National Clearinghouse on Child Abuse and Neglect (2000 as cited in Gershoff, 2002) as inflicting physical injury as a result of punching, beating, kicking, biting, burning, shaking or otherwise harming a child. Child physical abuse is also defined by the state of Utah as conduct that is nonaccidental that causes harm to a child’s physical health and welfare (DCFS, 2006). Some examples of physical injury include, but are not limited to, bruises, lacerations, fracture of bones, burns, intracranial bleeding, injury that causes disfigurement, or a combination of two or more physical injuries by the same person on one or more occasions (DCFS, 2006). The parent or caretaker does not have to have intended to hurt the child because the injury could have occurred from over-discipline or physical punishment.
Research has shown a link between the use of physical punishment in discipline and the incidence of physical abuse (Herrenkohl, Herrenkohl, & Egolf, 1983; Whipple & Richey, 1997). Children who are physically disciplined are at a higher risk for being physically abused by their parents (Herrenkohl et al., 1983; Whipple & Richey, 1997). The line between physical punishment and physical abuse is ambiguous. Physical abuse often occurs in the context of physical punishment that has been taken too far (Whipple & Richey, 1997). A parent may believe he or she is only physically disciplining his or her child and not realize when frequent and excessive spanking has crossed the line into child abuse (Whipple & Richey, 1997). A parent may be abusing his or her child and genuinely not recognize the abusive behavior (Whipple & Richey, 1997).

Child abuse potential is seen as on a continuum between physical discipline of one’s child at one end and physically abusing one’s child on the other end of the continuum (Milner, 1994). Whether a parent demonstrates a propensity to become abusive is seen as one’s abuse potential. A child that is physically disciplined is at a higher risk of being physically abused (Milner, 1994). For example, parents who physically discipline their child several times a week are seen as having a higher abuse potential than parents who only physically discipline their child on very rare occasions (Milner, 1994).

Physical punishment, including spanking, is very pervasive in this country. The use and endorsement of physical punishment in the United States remains high; 94% of American parents have reported spanking their children by the time a child is 3 or 4 years old (Straus & Stewart, 1999). Parents who spanked their toddler did so an average of three times a week (Straus & Stewart, 1999).
ages of 5-12, 28% had used an object such as a belt or hairbrush to hit the child (Straus & Stewart, 1999). These statistics seem to imply that ordinary parents, not emotionally disturbed or unstable parents, find parent-child aggression to be acceptable behavior (Lansdown, 2000; Straus & Stewart, 1999).

**Consequences of Abuse and Physical Discipline**

Research consistently demonstrates dangerous outcomes for child physical abuse (Malinosky-Rummell & Hansen, 1993; Straus, 2001). Many studies show a relationship between child physical abuse and emotional problems in later life. Outcomes of physical abuse include anxiety and depression, as well as symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (Ackerman, Newton, McPherson, Jones, & Dykman, 1998). Both males and females who had perpetrated violence in dating relationships were more likely to have experienced or witnessed physical abuse as a child, and the perpetrators more often used the same type of abuse they had experienced or witnessed (Bernard & Bernard, 1983). Other longitudinal studies are now able to suggest a causal relationship between child physical abuse and problems later in life. One longitudinal study found adults who had been physically abused as a child were more likely to have aggressive relationship patterns that persist into adulthood (Malinosky-Rummell & Hansen, 1993). Another longitudinal study found that adults that had been physically abused before the age of 5 were at a higher risk for being arrested as adolescents for violent offenses (Lansford et al., 2007). Furthermore, clearly the most devastating of consequences of physical abuse include serious injury or death (DHHS, 2005).

Research has also demonstrated physical punishment to have negative outcomes (Straus, 2001). Studies have shown excessive physical discipline and spanking have been
linked to behavioral problems such as hyperactivity, aggression, and oppositional behavior (Gershoff, 2002). As the amount of physical punishment and spanking increases, problematic behaviors also escalate starting with hyperactivity, moving to oppositional behavior, and ending with physical aggression (Stormshak, Bierman, McMahon, & Lengua, 2000). Longitudinal studies have shown that children who experienced harsh physical discipline are more likely to perpetrate violence against an intimate partner in adulthood (Swinford, Demaris, Cernkovich, & Giordano, 2000), and adolescents who were spanked as children are more approving of spanking as a disciplinary method (Deater-Deckard, Lansford, Dodge, Pettit, & Bates, 2003). Another longitudinal study showed the severity of physical discipline in childhood was related to severity of assaultive behaviors in late adolescence (Herrenkohl, Egolf, & Herrenkohl, 1997). Finally, when a parent hits a child for misbehaving, the child is likely to learn that hitting is an acceptable way to resolve conflicts (Bandura, 1973; Gershoff, 2002). Based on this research, physical discipline and physical abuse have been associated with negative outcomes for children short-term and long-term.

Bans on Physical Punishment and Acceptability

Because of the problematic connection between physical punishment and physical abuse, some countries have chosen to completely ban the use of physical punishment. Of particular interest are the effects of these bans. For example, something Germany hoped to accomplish by implementing a ban on physical punishment is to provide parents new boundaries for interactions with their children (Bussmann, 2004). The new legislation intended to change attitudes parents held toward their children by conveying that behavior previously legal and socially acceptable, namely physical punishment, would
now be illegal and socially unacceptable (Bussmann, 2004). Since then, the prohibition of physical punishment in Germany has reduced the incidence of family violence against children (Bussmann, 2004).

Sweden was actually the first country to ban physical punishment in 1979 (Durrant, 1999). Physical punishment is now seen in Sweden as violence against children rather than discipline (Durrant & Janson, 2005). Since the ban was enacted, the child homicide rate and supportive attitudes toward physical punishment have decreased (Janson, 2005). Other studies have shown that, because of the ban in Sweden, the public’s ability to identify children who are at risk has improved (Janson, 2005).

Although child homicide from child abuse has become very uncommon in Sweden, the rates of prosecuting those who are abusing children have remained steady (Janson, 2005). The rates of prosecution may reflect a better relationship with social services that has developed because of the ban (Durrant, 1999). Other studies show the majority of Swedish youth now report having either never experienced or minimally experiencing physical punishment during their childhood (Durrant, 2000). Since the ban, rape and suicide among youth, involvement in crime, and reported use of alcohol and drugs have also decreased among youth (Durrant, 2000). The area where the ban in Sweden may have been most influential is a shift in attitudes (Durrant & Janson, 2005).

Yet others have questioned these positive interpretations of the Swedish ban. The correlations found since the ban cannot be interpreted as causal in part because there have been many social changes in Sweden over the last 25 years that could account for the positive changes (Durrant, 1999). Such social changes include demographic changes, legislative reform, and changes to social policies, as well as the changes in attitudes...
toward physical punishment over these years, which have been symbiotic (Durrant, 1999). Others have implied that the lower child homicide rates have always been true for Sweden; alternately, the positive statistics may be deliberately misleading or reflective of a confirmatory bias among researchers that hope to discourage physical discipline (Beckett, 2005).

Resistance toward such bans underscores Americans' strong support for parental physical discipline use (Beckett, 2005). In a study comparing college students in Sweden and the United States using self-report measures, U.S. students were more likely than their Swedish counterparts to endorse the use of physical punishment with children, reported experiencing at least one incident of physical abuse as children, opposed the 1979 Swedish ban, and indicated they have used physical punishment on children (Deley, 1988). Interestingly, when U.S. and Swedish students were told the ban had greatly decreased incidence of injury to children in Sweden, both groups reported significantly increased support for the ban (Deley, 1988).

Acceptability of Physical Discipline and Attitudes toward Children

Thus, the studies on the effects of the ban on physical punishment in Sweden have consistently shown a shift toward negative attitudes regarding the use of physical punishment (Deley, 1988; Durrant, 1999; Durrant & Janson, 2005). In contrast, parents in the U.S. who have favorable attitudes toward physical punishment, as well as attitudes that devalue children, are more likely to engage in physical punishment with their children (Jackson et al., 1999). Adults may not view children as human beings with the same rights as adults, but may view them as “human becomings” who have less defined rights than adults (Phillips & Alderson, 2003). Children typically assert their rights
through their parents, which complicates children’s ability to assert their right not to be harmed, especially when their parents are harming them (Levesque, 1996).

Comparisons have been drawn between physical punishment and domestic violence. Both physical punishment and domestic violence reflect beliefs that hitting is an acceptable way to gain compliance from someone who is weaker for not doing what is wanted, and both have historically received public approval (Lansdown, 2000). Not long ago, a man hitting his partner was considered acceptable, but now such behavior is not tolerated (Lansdown, 2000; Phillips & Alderson, 2003). Arguably, this shift from acceptability to unacceptability of domestic spousal violence reflects the attitudes society now holds toward spousal violence (Lansdown, 2000; Phillips & Alderson, 2003).

Conceptually, physical punishment and domestic violence purportedly both show a lack of respect for the person being hit and a belief that the person hitting is entitled to behave that way (Lansdown, 2000). Yet physical aggression against children is still socially acceptable whereas violence against adults is not (Lansdown, 2000). The approval or acceptance of physical discipline may be reflective of the attitudes one holds toward children.

Parental attitudes toward their children have also been found to be a central factor in determining which parents are at risk for problems with their children (Thompson et al., 1999). One study found that parents who had a propensity toward being abusive also had attitudes that devalued children (Thompson et al., 1999). Another study found a mother’s approval of physical punishment was the only predictor of the use of maternal physical punishment (Ateah & Durrant, 2005). This latter study suggested that changing attitudes toward the acceptability of physical punishment should be the target of
prevention programs (Ateah & Durrant, 2005). Interestingly, given the findings of these studies, relatively little empirical research has been conducted on parents’ attitudes on the value of children.

**Methodological Complications**

The literature on attitudes pertaining to child abuse and physical discipline thus far has relied largely on self-report measures (Degarmo, Reid, & Knutson, 2006). Self-report measures are used because a researcher is unlikely to witness parental physical abuse or physical discipline first hand (Degarmo et al., 2006). The concern with all self-report measures is that the person, intentionally or otherwise, may provide socially acceptable responses rather than true responses (Fazio & Olson, 2003; Degarmo et al., 2006). Response bias is of particular concern when the questions being asked are associated with possible child physical abuse. Parents may be concerned that true responses on self-report measures could result in legal trouble, or even cause them to lose custody of their children (Degarmo et al., 2006). The endorsement of physical discipline is also considered controversial, and response bias may be reflected in self-report measures when a parent is even being asked only about physical discipline (Degarmo et al., 2006). Self-report measures are not necessarily a reliable way to obtain accurate information on physical discipline and physical abuse practices.

One way to reduce the likelihood of a person providing socially acceptable responses, rather than true responses, is to use analog measures rather than self-report measures. An analog measure is an indirect measure of a particular construct (Fazio & Olson, 2003). An analog measure gives an estimate of the construct being tested without having to ask the participant directly. Using an analog measure, the participant would not
know what the analog is trying to measure, which should reduce the likelihood of the person deducing socially acceptable answers. Although challenging to construct, analog measures have been shown to be effective for measuring a person’s true attitudes (Fazio & Olson, 2003). The concept behind analog measures involves a continuum of the extent of conscious processing of responses. Analog measures run on a continuum from direct to indirect measures. Self-report measures are examples of direct measures because the participant will consciously know what construct is being measured (Fazio & Olson, 2003). Indirect analog tasks minimize conscious processing on the part of the participant. The participant will have difficulty consciously recognizing what construct is being measured (Fazio & Olson, 2003). Arguably, to measure a person’s true attitudes, indirect measures would be most effective (Fazio & Olson, 2003).

The magnitude of the correlation between analog measures and self-report measures will depend on how direct the analog measure is and how subject to response bias the construct being measured is (Fazio & Olson, 2003). For example, if the analog measure is a relatively direct measure of prejudice, a construct which is likely to be susceptible to response bias, one would expect a high correlation with a self-report measure (Fazio & Olson, 2003). However, if the analog measure is relatively indirect, then one would expect the correlation with a self-report measure to be comparatively low, indicating the self-report measure has been subject to response bias and the indirect analog measure would be a more accurate assessment of the person’s true beliefs or behaviors (Fazio & Olson, 2003).

An example of how analog measures can be used in this field involves one of the first studies to assess physical abuse by means of an analog (Passman & Mulhern, 1977).
This study involved the hypothesis that a parent's punitive discipline responses would be a function of the relationship with the child and situational stress (Passman & Mulhern, 1977). A mother was asked to participate in a laboratory task while her child concurrently participated in another laboratory task. The mother worked at a computer monitor to earn points while simultaneously monitoring her child's performance on a puzzle task. The mother needed to do her own work and help her child learn the puzzle by applying response consequences to the child's mistakes. The hypothesis was if the mother applied harsh response consequences to her child's mistakes, she was more likely to use harsher consequences in everyday life. The premise was that the harshness of the consequences was an analog of severe discipline. The results of this study showed that situational stress caused an increase in the application of consequences to one's child; because parental behavior was directly observable and experimentally controlled, a causal relationship between situational stress and more punitive punishment was identified by means of this analog measure (Passman & Muhern, 1977). This analog study also proposed physical abuse occurs within the context of severe discipline, helping to change the way physical abuse is viewed (Degarmo et al., 2006).

**Purpose of Study and Research Questions**

The attitudes one holds toward the approval or acceptability of parent-child aggression should be associated with a person's child abuse potential. These attitudes toward physical discipline and physical abuse may be more accurately measured with an analog task because respondents will not be as consciously aware of the intent of the task.

The purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship between a parent's acceptance of physical punishment and physical abuse (on an analog task) and
the attitudes the parent holds toward children, as well as the parent's child abuse potential. Mothers engaged in an analog measure to identify whether a video clip was physically abusive and completed self-report questionnaires measuring acceptability of physical discipline, abuse potential, and attitudes toward children. The video clips used were judged by social workers as being considered physical abuse or physical punishment. Following a preliminary evaluation of an abbreviated version of the analog task with a pilot sample of college students, the analog was investigated with a community sample of mothers.

Research Question 1

The study first evaluated whether the newly designed analog was associated with self-report. A modest positive association between the analog task (which falls in the middle of the continuum between direct and indirect measures) and self-report on the acceptability of spanking was predicted. Specifically, the overall acceptability of parent-child aggression, and the distinction between abuse versus discipline, were expected to be related to mothers' self-reports of acceptability of spanking.

Research Question 2

The study also considered whether acceptability of parent-child aggression on the analog was associated with child abuse potential. A relationship between the analog task of acceptability of parent-child aggression and physical child abuse potential was anticipated. People who are slower to identify an abusive scenario were expected to evidence higher child abuse potential. Parents who are less able to distinguish between physical discipline and physical abuse videos were also believed to be more likely to
demonstrate an elevated child abuse potential.

Research Question 3

Finally, the study investigated the link between acceptability of parent-child aggression and attitudes toward children. A relationship between the attitudes one has toward children and responding on the analog task was hypothesized. Parents who have attitudes that devalue children were expected to take longer to identify an abusive video clip, as well as a poorer ability to distinguish between physical discipline and physical child abuse.
CHAPTER 2

PILOT STUDY

Purpose

The purpose of the pilot study was to determine if the analog measure of the acceptability of parental aggression would demonstrate a relationship with a self-report measure of the same construct as well as with a child abuse potential measure appropriate for non-parents. This pilot study provided preliminary support for further evaluation of the new analog task with a sample of mothers.

Participants

The pilot study was conducted at the University of Utah. Participants included 52 college students (26 male and 26 female) recruited from the subject pool managed through the Department of Educational Psychology. The mean age of the participants was 22.96 years ($SD = 6.03$), 84.3% of participants identified as White, 82.7% of the participants did not live with a partner, and only 4 of the participants had children.

Measures

Movie Video Acceptability of Parent-Child Aggression (MVA-PCA)

Four movie clips were trialed in this pilot study. Physical abuse scenes were extracted from three different movies: “This Boy’s Life,” “Bastard Out Of Carolina,” and “The Divine Secrets of the Ya Ya Sisterhood.” Additionally, an early scene from
“Mommie Dearest” was selected to depict nonabusive physical discipline. Six social workers anonymously and independently judged the videos, confirming that only “Mommie Dearest” would be classified as physical discipline whereas the remaining three would meet the definition of abuse. Each movie segment is 90 seconds in length, and the four clips were randomly presented in a computer program. The participants were asked to stop the video clip if and when they felt the clip had become abusive. Scores were based on the delay in responding. Most importantly, although participants were directly queried regarding their assessment of when a scene had become abusive, participants who consider parent-child aggression acceptable are likely to engage in some conscious processing regarding the socially appropriate response. This processing time would result in a delay longer than those who more automatically consider such parental behavior unacceptable. Indeed, the very process of pausing and determining the socially acceptable response will compromise response time. The initial physical contact during each scene between the parent and the child was determined. The length of time after this point constituted the delay score. The average of the delay scores across the four videos yielded a MVA-PCA Total score. Difference scores were also computed between the average delay on the three abuse videos and the discipline video (Mommie Dearest) for an MVA-PCA Discipline – Abuse Difference score.

Attitudes toward Spanking/Slapping My Child Questionnaire (ATS, Holden, 2001; see Appendix A).

The ATS measures attitudes respondents hold toward spanking young children. The questionnaire has 10 items that are measured on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree). The items ask for
agreement with statements concerning the appropriateness of spanking. Scores thus range from 10-70, with higher scores indicating more positive attitudes toward spanking (Holden, 2001). Cronbach’s alpha ranges from .89 to .91, with an average test-retest correlation during a 3-week period at .76 (Ateah & Durrant, 2005). The correlation between scores and reported amount of spanking during one week was .73, supporting construct validity (Holden, 2001).

The Adult Adolescent Parenting Inventory – 2 (AAPI-2, Bavolek and Keene, 1999).

The AAPI-2 is a self-report questionnaire designed to assess the parenting and child-rearing attitudes of adults and adolescent parent and pre-parent populations, considered an assessment of abuse potential appropriate for nonparents (Conners, Whiteside-Mansell, Deere, Ledet, & Edwards, 2006). The AAPI-2 has 40 items each using a 5-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, with lower scores indicating greater abuse potential (ranging from 40-200). The AAPI-2 assesses five domains: 1) inappropriate expectations of children; 2) parental lack of empathy toward children’s needs; 3) strong belief in the use of corporal punishment as a means of discipline; 4) reversing parent-child role responsibilities; and 5) oppressing children’s power and independence (Conners et al., 2006). An example item includes, “Parents’ needs are more important than children’s needs” (Conners et al., 2006). For all 40 items the alpha reliability has been reported as .85, with significant associations observed with related measures (Conners et al., 2006).
Procedures

Students from the subject pool participating in this pilot received course credit. After obtaining informed consent, the experimenter directed the student to a computer. Students then completed the video analog, the AAPI-2, and the ATS using computer administration. The protocol took about 45 minutes to complete.

Results/Discussion

Descriptive statistics on measures can be located in Table 1 and the results of the correlations can be seen in Table 2. A person who does not recognize an abusive video clip quickly is more likely to have endorsed positive attitudes toward spanking (ATS) and have increased child abuse potential scores (AAPI). Another correlation of particular interest was the association of increased abuse potential with a greater perceived difference between all abuse videos and the discipline video, with a resultant significant correlation. Cronbach’s alpha for the analog measure based on the four video clips was .77, for the ATS, .94, and for the AAPI-2, .87. With these promising results with a non-parent population, it was determined more meaningful results would likely be found using more video clips with a parent sample that has more experience with children than a college student population.
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics on Scores for the MVA-PCA, ATS, and AAPI-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Description</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MVA-PCA Total (seconds)</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>10.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVA-PCA Discipline-Abuse Difference Score (seconds)</td>
<td>-22.70</td>
<td>15.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay Score: TBL (seconds)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay Score: MD (seconds)</td>
<td>-11.64</td>
<td>18.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay Score: YaYa (seconds)</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay Score: BOC (seconds)</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>17.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAPI-2 Total</td>
<td>152.91</td>
<td>16.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATS Total</td>
<td>32.67</td>
<td>12.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* TBL = This Boy’s Life, MD = Mommie Dearest, BOC = Bastard out of Carolina, YaYa = The Divine Secrets of the YaYa Sisterhood.
Table 2. Correlations between Videos and ATS and AAPI-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATS Total Score (r)</th>
<th>AAPI Total Score (r)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MVA-PCA Total Average Delay (seconds)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay Score: TBL (seconds)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay Score: MD (seconds)</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay Score: BOC (seconds)</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay Score: YaYa (seconds)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between MD &amp; TBL (seconds)</td>
<td>.27a</td>
<td>-.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between MD &amp; YaYa (seconds)</td>
<td>.26a</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between MD &amp; BOC (seconds)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference Score: MD-All Abuse Videos Delays (seconds)</td>
<td>.26a</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. TBL = This Boy’s Life, MD = Mommie Dearest, BOC = Bastard out of Carolina, YaYa = The Divine Secrets of the YaYa Sisterhood.
*p ≤ .05; **p ≤ .01;
a marginally significant
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Participants

Data collection occurred as part of a larger parenting study, in which 72 mothers were recruited from various locations throughout Utah. Recruitment was primarily conducted at locations and events in the Wasatch Front where families had attended. Most of the recruitment took place at the South Towne Exposition Center located in Sandy, Utah. Events at the Expo center included the Home Decorating Show, Spring Home and Garden Festival, and Scrapbook USA. A few flyers were handed out at churches. Some recruitment took place by participant referral. Parents in this study were asked to identify a target child to think about during the current study. All parents had to be the primary caregiver for 2 or more years of the target child. Only mothers were recruited for this study given the challenges of recruiting enough fathers to be able draw meaningful conclusions. Because 2 participants were determined to be extreme outliers (greater than three standard deviations above the mean) on two critical measures (one on the MVA-PCA and one on the Child Abuse Potential Inventory), they were removed from further analysis.

Based on this sample of 70 mothers, a mean age of 36.7 years ($SD = 6.6$ years) was reported. With regard to ethnicity of participants, 89.9% reported White, non-
Hispanic; 5.8% Hispanic/Latino; 2.9% American Indian/Alaskan; and 1.4% Asian. The majority of the sample were biological parents (95.5%) with an average of 3.5 children (between 1-7 children) ranging in age up to 13 years. The majority of participants, 91.37%, were in a relationship with a partner. The mean annual family income of the participants was $71,491 ($D = $62,599), with a median income of $60,000 that is probably more representative of the sample due to non-normality. Most of the participants, 95.8%, had graduated from high school and 83.1% had education beyond the high school level. See Table 3 for a summary of demographics.

Measures

In addition to questions about general demographics (see Appendix B), the ATS was again administered as a self-report measure of acceptability of parent-child aggression (see Pilot Study).

Movie Video Acceptability of Parent-Child Aggression (MVA-PCA)

The analog used in the pilot was expanded to nine 90-second video clips depicting either child physical discipline or child physical abuse, including the four video clips from the pilot study. In addition, five new video clips were incorporated from: “Shine,” “Before Women Had Wings,” “Goodnight Mr. Tom,” “Joe the King,” and the television show “Medium.” Altogether, six of the nine videos depict physical abuse and three present physical discipline. Upon reviewing the video clips, the “Medium” video clip was determined to have less than 3 seconds of available time for participant response. This video did not have enough variability for meaningful results and the “Medium” video was thus dropped from further consideration.
### Table 3. Summary of Sample Demographic Characteristics ($N = 70$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$M (SD)$ or %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Family Income (Median)</strong></td>
<td>60,000 (62,599)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Age (years)</strong></td>
<td>36.71 (6.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Children</strong></td>
<td>3.46 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age of Target Child (years)</strong></td>
<td>8.91 (2.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic-Latino</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship with Child</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Parent</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Parent</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoptive Parent</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Graduate</strong></td>
<td>98.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Beyond High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational/Some College</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A new group of 10 social workers (with an average of 9.65 years of experience as social workers) were recruited anonymously to judge the movie videos, classifying them as abuse versus discipline. All of the abuse videos were judged as abusive (100% agreement). Although 100% of social workers considered “Goodnight Mr. Tom” discipline only, 90% judged “Joe the King” and “Mommie Dearest” as discipline only.

Participants were instructed to stop the video if or when they believe the scene had become physically abusive. Delay is viewed as the indirect measure of a person’s acceptability of parental aggression. Scoring was conducted as described in the pilot study, based on delay scores. Delay scores were averaged across the eight videos to determine overall acceptability of parent-child aggression (MVA-PCA Total Average Delay) as well as additional average scores for abuse videos only (MVA-PCA Abuse Only Delay) and average scores for discipline videos only (MVA-PCA Discipline Only Delay). Difference scores were also computed between abuse average and discipline average delay subtotals (MVA-PCA All Discipline-All Abuse Difference).

The Child Abuse Potential Inventory (CAPI, Milner, 1986)

The CAPI consists of 160 statements on which a parent must agree or disagree. The CAPI is intended to screen for parents who are at risk for physically abusing their children. The CAPI assesses rigidity, intrapersonal, and interpersonal factors identified in those individuals who are physically abusive. Of the 160 items, only 77 are variably weighted to yield the Abuse Scale and its 6 underlying factors. The other items in the CAPI serve as measures of distortion biases and experimental scales; the higher one’s score on the Abuse Scale, the higher the abuse potential, with 166 considered the clinical cut-off score. The Abuse Scale in the CAPI has been shown to have high internal
consistency, with split-half reliability ranging from .96 for control groups to .98 for abuse samples. Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficients range from .92 for control groups to .95 for abuse groups. The CAPI has also been shown to have good stability with .90 after one week and .83 after 1 month (Milner, 1986). Studies have shown the predictive validity at 89.2% for confirmed child abusers and 99% for controls (Milner, 1994).

**The Adult Adolescent Parenting Inventory – 2 (AAPI-2; Bavolek and Keene, 1999)**

The AAPI-2 was administered as in the pilot. Although the purpose of using the AAPI-2 in the pilot study was to measure a student’s abuse potential, its purpose for this study was to extract a subscale to examine a person’s attitudes toward children. A separate measure of attitudes toward children could not be identified. A recent study found limited support for the particular factor structure proposed by the AAPI-2 developer (Conners et al., 2006). This same study found that the AAPI-2 appears to measure attitudes that relate to harsh or neglectful parenting in low-income families, supporting the overall AAPI-2 scores as indicative of abuse potential (Conners et al., 2006). However, the five-factor structure proposed by the test author was not confirmed. Moreover, the Inappropriate Expectations scale of the AAPI-2 seems like an appropriate measure of attitudes toward children. Items in the Inappropriate Expectations scale include, “Children nowadays have it too easy,” and “Good children always obey their parents.” Indeed, none of the items on the Inappropriate Expectations Scale involve any developmental issues, raising questions about the labeling of the scale. Based on a 5-point Likert format, the 7-item scale in the recent psychometric analysis obtained a moderate internal consistency at .64 (Conners et al., 2006). Low scores (ranging from 5-
Procedures

The larger parenting study focused on parental and child attributions of discipline and child abuse potential. Parents interested in participating in the larger parenting study made an appointment for a researcher to come to their house and administer the protocol. After signing a consent form, participants were provided a laptop computer with a computer program for the larger parenting study containing the analog task (the video clips), the CAPI, the AAPI-2, and the ATS. For the current study, the analog task took place at the beginning of the larger study, approximately 10 minutes into the protocol. The AAPI-2 and ATS were presented approximately 5 minutes after the videos with the CAPI questions (questions that are not self-evident in terms of assessing abuse potential) halfway through the protocol. Because participants were given a number with no identifying information (ID numbers are never linked to participants), the computerized administration ensures a person’s anonymity by loading responses into a larger database. This anonymity should encourage participants to answer honestly. Embedding this study in the larger parenting study also served to diffuse the connection of the analog task in particular to the self-report measures. For the larger study, the protocol took approximately 90 minutes to 2 hours to administer. Participants were paid $30 for the investment of their time in the larger study.
**Statistical Plan and Power Analysis**

Spearman correlations were conducted following consideration of demographic characteristics and simple descriptive statistics. A power analysis was conducted based on results obtained from the pilot study. The correlation between the MVA-PCA Total and AAPI-2 Total scores was .376. A power analysis indicated that for power of .8 at the .05 alpha level, a minimum sample of 53 would be required. A power of .9 at the .05 alpha level would require an $N = 70$. 
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RESULTS

All statistical analyses were run using SPSS 15.0 for Windows. Based on the eight videos of the MVA-PCA, reliability analysis indicated a Cronbach’s alpha of .77. Normative means for the CAPI Abuse Scale and AAPI-2 Inappropriate Expectations Scale are 91.0 (Milner, 1986) and 21-22 (Bavolek & Keene, 1999) respectively. No data is available for a normative mean for the ATS. The present sample means thus fall within normal limits, confirming the community sample representation of these participants. Considerations of descriptive statistics are first presented in Table 4, determining the need for covariates, followed by a presentation of the correlational analysis.

Descriptive Analyses

The MVA-PCA Abuse Only Delay score was negatively correlated with the number of children ($r = -0.25$, $p \leq 0.05$). This finding indicates that the more children a mother has, the more quickly she stops an abuse video. Controlling for number of children did not alter any of the subsequent findings.

A mother’s overall acceptability of parent child aggression (MVA-PCA Total Average Delay) was not significantly correlated with her age, number of children, or annual family income (all $p > 0.05$). MVA-PCA Discipline Only Delay scores and MVA-
PCA Abuse Only Delay scores were also not significantly correlated with a mother’s age, number of children, or annual family income (all $p > .05$ with the exception as noted above). MVA-PCA All Discipline-All Abuse was not significantly correlated with a mother’s age, number of children, or annual family income (all $p > .05$). The AAPI-2 Inappropriate Expectations Scale, the CAPI Abuse Scale, and the ATS, were similarly not significantly correlated with a mother’s age, number of children, or annual family income (all $p > .05$). Overall, these three demographic variables did not appear to be substantively related to a mother’s attitude toward children, abuse potential, or acceptability of parent-child aggression. Unfortunately, there was inadequate variability in the categories of ethnicity, mother’s relationship to child, and marital status, which prohibits consideration of such variables’ connections to the outcome measures.

**Correlational Analyses Among Measures**

The correlations for the ATS, AAPI-2 Inappropriate Expectations Scale, CAPI Abuse scale, and videos are outlined in Table 5. Consistent with the first hypothesis, the MVA-PCA Total Average Delay was positively correlated with the ATS ($r (70) = .30, p < .05$), indicating a person who took longer to stop the videos also reported more positive attitudes toward spanking. Confirming the second hypothesis, MVA-PCA Total Average Delay and CAPI Abuse Scale were significantly positively correlated ($r (70) = .30, p < .05$), indicating a person who took longer to stop videos also reported a higher abuse potential. Similarly, the MVA-PCA Abuse Only Delay ($r (70) = .27, p < .05$) and Discipline Only Delay ($r (70) = .27, p < .05$) scores were positively correlated with the CAPI Abuse Scale, indicating longer delays in stopping either type of video was associated with an elevated abuse potential. With regard to the
third hypothesis, the MVA-PCA Total Average Delay was negatively correlated with the AAPI-2 Inappropriate Expectations Scale ($r (70) = -.50, p < .01$), indicating greater delay in terminating the video was related to endorsed attitudes that were more devaluing of children. Comparable results were observed with the MVA-PCA Abuse Only Delay ($r (70) = -.50, p < .01$) and Discipline Only Delay ($r (70) = -.41, p < .01$) correlations with the AAPI-2 Inappropriate Expectations Scale. Contrary to expectations, there were not significant correlations between a person’s ability to distinguish between abuse videos and discipline videos and either a person’s attitudes toward children or child abuse potential (all $p \geq .05$).

Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations for all Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAPI-2 Inappropriate Expectations Scale</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPI Abuse Scale</td>
<td>73.11</td>
<td>60.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATS Total</td>
<td>27.73</td>
<td>12.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVA-PCA Total Average Delay (seconds)</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>10.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVA-PCA Discipline Only Delay (seconds)</td>
<td>16.58</td>
<td>16.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVA-PCA Abuse Only Delay (seconds)</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVA-PCA All Discipline – All Abuse Difference (seconds)</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>12.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Correlations between MVA-PCA Scores, the AAPI-2 Inappropriate Expectations Scale, the CAPI Abuse Scale, and the ATS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MVA-PCA Total Average Delay (r)</th>
<th>MVA-PCA Discipline Only Delay (r)</th>
<th>MVA-PCA Abuse Only Delay (r)</th>
<th>MVA-PCA All Disc-All Abuse Difference (r)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAPI Inappropriate Expectations Scale</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPI Abuse Scale</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATS Total</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .01
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DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to examine the relationships among a mother's acceptability of parent-child aggression, child abuse potential, and the attitudes one holds toward children. Studies have demonstrated that acceptance of parent-child aggression, including physical discipline and physical abuse, increases the likelihood a child will be physically disciplined or physically abused (Ateah & Durrant, 2005; Jackson et al., 1999; Whipple & Richey, 1997). The current study also investigated a newly designed analog measure of acceptability of parent-child aggression.

Because physical discipline and physical abuse of one's child is a highly sensitive subject, the reporting of such behaviors is subject to a person, consciously or otherwise, providing socially acceptable answers on a self-report measure (Degarmo et al., 2006). Indirect analog measures may be more effective in assessing a person's true responses by reducing the likelihood of providing biased answers because the participant is not directly aware of what construct is being measured (Degarmo et al., 2006; Fazio & Olson, 2003; Passman & Mulhern, 1977). One can expect a higher correlation between direct analog measures and self-report measures. With an indirect analog measure, one would expect to see lower correlations with self-report measures (Fazio & Olson, 2003). In addition to the analog measure, this study administered the Child Abuse Potential Inventory (CAPI) as a measure of abuse risk, the Attitudes Toward Spanking/Slapping My Child (ATS) as

**General Findings**

The results of the current study identified a significant association between the analog measure and the self-report measures of acceptability of parent-child aggression and child abuse potential. Internal consistency across the eight videos was acceptable at .77. Moreover, the analog task was also correlated with attitudes that are more devaluing of children. In other words, mothers who took longer to stop a video clip of an abuse scene or a discipline scene endorsed more positive attitudes toward spanking, a greater child abuse potential, and devaluing attitudes toward children, all consistent with the proposed hypotheses.

Participants who distinguished between abuse videos and discipline videos were expected to score lower on abuse potential, to report attitudes less supportive of spanking, and to endorse attitudes that value children. However, response latency was comparable for both the abuse and discipline videos; in fact, findings indicate that participants who were quick to stop an abuse video were also quick to stop a discipline video. Alternatively, participants who continued with a discipline video also let an abuse video run longer. Thus, contrary to expectations, the ability to distinguish abuse from discipline was not significantly correlated with child abuse potential, self-reported support for spanking, or attitudes toward children. These findings may indicate that some mothers actually do not make a distinction between physical discipline and physical
abuse; both abuse and discipline are viewed as parent-child aggression. Conversely, some mothers may not make a distinction between abuse and discipline, wherein both are seen as discipline. This finding is consistent with previous research that has demonstrated that parents often are not able to distinguish between physical discipline and physical abuse, and that child physical abuse most often occurs in the context of physical discipline being taken too far (Whipple & Richey, 1997).

Finally, the findings indicated that parent age, number of children, and annual family income did not substantively affect the general findings. The only exception was mothers who had more children were more likely to stop an abuse video. Otherwise, mothers’ age, number of children, or annual family income were not significantly associated with child abuse potential, beliefs in spanking, or attitudes toward children.

Overall, the findings of this study were generally consistent with prior research and help confirm theories that propose parent-child aggression is best seen on a continuum (Degarmo et al., 2006). The unexpected finding involved that distinguishing between videos, abuse versus discipline, was not associated with abuse risk in this sample of mothers. This promising finding may indicate that parents may have begun to conceptualize all physical contact as aggression consistent with theories regarding parent-child aggression. Because children who are physically punished are more likely to be physically abused (Herrenkohl et al., 1983; Whipple & Richey, 1997), understanding the factors that lead mothers to see all physical discipline as aggression may be helpful in social policy initiatives designed to reduce parent-child aggression.
Limitations and Future Directions

One of the constructs this study aimed to assess was parents' attitudes toward valuing children. Interestingly, no such specific measure was identified. Nonetheless, this study did suggest that the attitudes one has toward children covary with the way children may be treated. Because no direct measure of attitudes toward children could be found, the AAPI-2 Inappropriate Expectations Scale was used based on its face validity. However, a psychometrically sound measure of attitudes toward children may have allowed for more meaningful conclusions. Future research should consider developing an instrument that could more thoroughly assess this construct.

Another limitation in this study is the demographic characteristics of the sample. This group of mothers consisted of mostly middle socioeconomic status participants. The majority of participants were White biological mothers of the target child, with at least a high school education. The demographics of this sample are thus limited and should be reexamined in a more ethnically diverse, lower-income group. Additionally, religiosity was not measured in this study but could potentially have had an influence on the outcomes. There is a strong religious influence (LDS) in the region sampled which may have influenced the findings. Overall, a larger, more diverse sample would increase the generalizability of the interpretations and conclusions. Research has shown there are cross-cultural differences in the way physical discipline is viewed by parents and children (Javo, Rønning, Heyerdahl, & Rudmin, 2004; Slade & Wissow, 2004). Future research should consider examining how parent-child aggression, as measured by the analog, also differs across countries. Replicating this study with a cross-cultural sample would allow
even broader generalizability and speak to the cultural differences that are involved with the way physical discipline is viewed and implemented.

In addition, this study was part of a larger study in which participants committed up to two hours. These measures in the current study done independently would have taken about 20-30 minutes to complete, although the larger context of the study enabled the specific components of this study to be diffused. However, people who are willing to make a 2-hour time commitment may evidence more motivation that is characteristic of volunteer samples, although participants were paid for their time and effort.

Because child physical abuse often takes place in the context of physical discipline going too far (Herrenkohl et al., 1983; Whipple & Richey, 1997), future research should examine the differences between people who do not distinguish between abuse and discipline, either seeing both as “discipline” or both as “abuse.” Understanding the characteristics that are the same or different between these groups will enable policy makers, educators, doctors, and mental health professionals to create education programs and support for parents, which in turn may reduce the incidence of parent-child aggression to benefit parents and children alike. Although participants were not asked directly, because this sample was fairly educated, it is possible some of the participants may have had parenting education. Examining differences due to experience with parenting education may clarify the role of prevention on acceptance of physical aggression toward children and potentially relate to why some parents see all parent-child aggression as discipline whereas others see it all as abuse.

Future research should also involve looking at fathers as well as mothers, to evaluate potential differences between the way mothers and fathers view physical
discipline, physical abuse, and the attitudes one holds toward children. Acceptance of parent-child aggression may involve the amount of time a parent spends with a child, the attachment a parent has with the child, or gender identification/differences with a child. Perhaps a father is more likely to physically discipline a son because he wants him to be strong, or a mother is more nurturing and less physically aggressive toward a daughter because she expects that her daughter will be the primary caregiver of her own children. Future evaluation of such nuances regarding gender differences would be an interesting area for further research.

**Implications and Conclusions**

The implications of the current study include the need to understand the characteristics that allow some mothers to view physical discipline as abuse, and some mothers to view physical abuse as discipline. Studies consistently demonstrate the negative outcomes of physical child abuse (Malinosky-Rummell & Hansen, 1993; Straus, 2001) and physical discipline (Straus, 2001; Gershoff, 2002). Research has also demonstrated a link between the use of physical discipline and physical abuse (Herrenkohl, 1983; Whipple & Richey, 1997). The current study implies that there are differences in way some mothers view physical discipline and abuse, and these characteristics are not related to age, number of children, or annual family income, with the exception that mothers who had more children were more likely to stop an abuse video sooner. The current study also implies that attitudes that devalue children mirror a mother’s acceptance of parent-child aggression. Findings from this study are also consistent with previous literature suggesting that the use of analog measures may be a
good strategy in measuring more sensitive constructs that are susceptible to response bias (Degarmo et al., 2006; Fazio & Olson, 2003).

Acceptance of parent-child aggression appears associated with child abuse risk, suggesting that altering such acceptance may reduce abuse risk, as has been speculated previously (Ateah & Durrant, 2005). Moreover, acceptance of parent-child aggression appears to reflect attitudes that devalue children. Identifying characteristics in parents who view all parent-child aggression as potentially abusive could inform education and support programs to strengthen these characteristics in an attempt to reduce the incidence of child physical abuse and foster attitudes that value children.

Finally, characteristics that help reduce the incidence of child physical abuse need further study. There are no simple answers as to why some children are physically abused and why others are not. Because the negative consequences of physical abuse and physical discipline are consistently demonstrated, understanding the dynamics of why physical abuse takes place is vitally important. Changing the devaluing attitudes one holds toward children and changing the attitudes one holds toward physical discipline and physical abuse may be one step toward reducing the incidence of these behaviors.
APPENDIX A

ATTITUDES TOWARD SPANKING/SLAPPING MY CHILD

QUESTIONNAIRE
Using rating scale below, rate how much you currently agree or disagree with each statement.

1 strongly disagree
2 moderately disagree
3 slightly disagree
4 neither
5 slightly agree
6 moderately agree
7 strongly agree

1. Spanking is a normal part of parenting.
2. Sometimes a spank is the best way to get a child to listen.
3. A spank is not an effective method to change a child’s behavior for the long term.
4. Spanking is never necessary to instill proper moral and social conduct in a child.
5. Sometimes the only way to get a child to behave is with a spank.
6. One of the best ways for a child to learn “no” is to spank him/her after disobedience.
7. If a child is spanked for a misbehavior, he or she should always be spanked for that misbehavior.
8. When all is said and done, spanking is harmful for a child.
9. I believe it is the parent’s right to spank their children if they think it is necessary.
10. Overall, I believe spanking is a bad disciplinary technique.
APPENDIX B

BACKGROUND INFORMATION
Welcome!! You have just begun the computer program for the “Thinking about Parenting Study.” Each question or item will show on the computer screen one at a time along with your possible answer choices. Please try to answer every question but you can hit the SKIP button if you choose to skip a question. If you would like to stop the program completely and withdraw from the study, hit the QUIT button. If you make a mistake, hit the BACK button to return to the last question.

Don’t spend too much time thinking about any one question. Give the first, natural answer that comes to you. Of course, the questions and answers are too short to cover all the information you might need, but give the best, closest, or most true answer. In any questions asking you about a specific child, think about the child who is also participating in the study. Remember all your responses CANNOT BE TRACED back to you and are anonymous. So, please answer honestly because only honest answers will help us understand parenting.

1. What is your age? ______
2. Are you: Male Female
3. Which group best describes you?
   - White, not of Hispanic origin
   - Hispanic/Latino
   - Black/African American
   - Native American/Native Alaskan
   - Asian
   - Pacific Islander
   - Other
4. How many children are you raising in your home now? ______
   What are their ages? Child 1 _____ years, Child 2 _____ years, ....Child 10
5. How old is your child participating in the study? ______
6. Are you currently living with a spouse/partner? Yes No
7. Did you graduate high school?
   8a. If yes, do you have
       a) vocational training or some college
       b) college degree
       c) some graduate school/graduate degree
8b. If no, what was the highest grade you completed?
9. Did your spouse/partner graduate high school?
   9a. If yes, does your spouse/partner have
       a) vocational training or some college
       b) college degree
       c) graduate school
9b. If no, what was the highest grade your spouse/partner completed?
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