

YOUNG ADULTS' RECALLED EXPERIENCES OF POSITIVE DISCIPLINE AND
COERCIVE/POWER ASSERTIVE PUNISHMENTS, AND HOW THESE
RECOLLECTIONS RELATE TO HISTORY OF EXTERNALIZING
BEHAVIORS, CURRENT ATTACHMENT TO
MOTHER, AND DEPRESSION

by

EQUILLER NICOLE MAHONE

MARY ELIZABETH CURTNER-SMITH, COMMITTEE CHAIR
BRAD LIAN
MARIA HERNANDEZ-REIF

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Science in the Department of
Human Development and Family Studies
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2012

Copyright Equiller N. Mahone 2012
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

This study identified discipline and coercive/power assertive punishment techniques young adults recalled receiving during childhood. This study also examined the contribution of specific discipline and punishment techniques to young adults' history of externalizing behaviors, current attachment to mother, and depression. Participants in the study were undergraduate students enrolled in courses offered by the Department of Human Development and Family Studies and the Department of Psychology at The University of Alabama. Results revealed that African American and Caucasian participants recalled receiving different discipline and punishment techniques. Male and female participants recalled receiving different discipline and punishment techniques. Significant differences were that male participants recalled receiving physical aggression and love withdrawal at higher rates than female participants. All participants recalled receiving each discipline and punishment technique at a rate with unrelated consequences being the most frequently recalled. For males, verbal aggression, physical aggression, love withdrawal, and natural consequences were each related at the bivariate level of history of externalizing behaviors, depression, and current attachment to mother. For females, the pattern of discipline and punishment techniques that were statistically significant with the outcomes of history of externalizing behaviors, current attachment to mother, and depression are similar to the pattern of statistically significant bivariate correlations for males. Exploratory analyses were also completed to examine the relative contribution of childhood discipline and punishment variables to the explanation of young adult social functioning. Implications of these findings increasing parents' knowledge and practice of positive discipline techniques are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all who contributed to the process of completing this thesis. I am especially grateful to Dr. Mary Elizabeth Curtner-Smith, my advisor and chair of the thesis committee, for guiding me throughout each step of the research process. I would also like to thank Dr. Brad Lian for his assistance and insight during the analysis of my data, as well as Dr. Maria Hernandez-Reif for her input on this project. I am grateful for my mom, Shirley's, daily encouragement and my dad, Donald, for his belief that I could accomplish this task. I am appreciative for the support of my other family members, friends, and coworkers during this process as well.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PURPOSE, SIGNIFICANCE, AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS	13
III. METHODS	18
IV. RESULTS	25
V. DISCUSSION	44
REFERENCES	54
APPENDIX A. Demographics	60
APPENDIX B. Dimensions of Discipline	62
APPENDIX C. Personal and Relationships Profile: Selected Subscales and Items	65
APPENDIX D. Major Depression Inventory	67
APPENDIX E. Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA)	70

LIST OF TABLES

1. Means and Standard Deviations of Positive Discipline Techniques and Coercive/Power Assertive Punishments	24
2. Percentage of Recall of Positive Discipline Techniques and Coercive/Power Assertive Punishments by Ethnic Group	26
3. Percentage of Recall of Positive Discipline Techniques and Coercive/Power Assertive Punishments by Gender	26
4. Percentage of Participants who Could Recall Ever Receiving Each of the Positive Discipline Techniques and Coercive/Power Assertive Punishments	28
5. Correlations of Positive Discipline Techniques, Coercive/ Power Assertive Punishments, and Outcomes for Male Participants (n's range from 75-86)	29
6. Correlations of Positive Discipline Techniques, Coercive/Power Assertive Punishments, and Outcomes for Female Participants (n's range from 496-555)	31
7. Regression Model for Male Participants	33
8. Regression Model for Female Participants	38

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Discipline plays an important role in the social and emotional development of children (American Academy of Pediatrics, 1998). Child development and family relations experts who specialize in parent education define discipline as the system of teaching and nurturing that prepares children to achieve competence, self-control, self-direction, and responsibility, and it promotes children's ability to care for others (American Academy of Pediatrics, 1998; Telep, 2009). In this paper, parenting behaviors that fall into the category of positive discipline are differentiated from parenting behaviors that are considered coercive/power assertive punishment. Parenting behaviors under each broad category are described, and when possible, research findings linking each specific parenting behavior to child development outcomes is reviewed. Unfortunately, there is a paucity of research literature regarding how many common positive discipline techniques and coercive/power assertive punishments relate to child development outcomes. This paper reports the results of a survey of young adults who recalled specific positive discipline techniques and specific power assertive/coercive punishment techniques that they received during childhood. These discipline and punishment techniques were then examined as predictors of young adults' history of externalizing behaviors, current attachment to mother, and current depressive symptoms.

Positive Discipline

Discipline involves nurturing and guiding, and typically attempts to prevent problem behaviors and conflict by teaching children *how to* behave (Gengler, 2011; Milne, n. d.; Telep, 2009). The root word for discipline is disciple, which means to train or to teach (Dictionary.com Unabridged; retrieved May 28, 2012). One who teaches is expected to lead by example. Thus, positive discipline of children implies that parents teach children how to behave by (a) modeling desired behaviors and social reasoning skills, (b) engaging in inductive reasoning to help children solve social problems, (c) setting and enforcing appropriate consequences for the behavioral choices children make, and (d) guiding children by monitoring their whereabouts, peer associations, and activities. Most importantly, these positive discipline parenting behaviors are thought to be most effective when they are laden with positive affect rather than anger. When the parent-child relationship is characterized by a climate of positive affect, children are thought to engage in appropriate behaviors because they desire to do so rather than because they fear punishment from the parent (Telep, 2009). Positive discipline techniques that promote child choice and autonomy are characterized by parental explanations and minimal use of power. These techniques are generally found to be more effective at facilitating child moral internalization than methods that are reactive and harsh, which includes forms of psychological or physical coercive/power assertive punishments (Grusec & Goodnow, 1994; Kochanska & Thompson, 1997; Kuczynski & Hildebrandt, 1997).

Positive modeling. Positive modeling is one type of positive discipline technique. It involves parents modeling behavior that they want their children to imitate (National Mental Health Association, 2003). Children are most likely to imitate adults with whom they identify

and whom want to be like (Bandura, 1989). Children engage in imitated behavior willingly; therefore, this discipline technique is considered non-coercive.

Inductive reasoning. Inductive reasoning is another positive discipline technique. It refers to the reasoning and explanations given by parents so that children understand the consequences of their actions on self and others (Hoffman, 1979; Lopez, Bonenberger, & Schneider, 2001). Inductive reasoning techniques involve the use of clear communication and explanations for why the child is asked to behave a certain way. Inductive reasoning sets standards for the child to obey (McKinney, Milone, & Renk, 2011). Often, but not always, children will want to obey once they understand the reasons why they are asked to comply with a parental request. Thus, this discipline technique is non-coercive in its attempts to get children to behave in a way that is against their initial will. Children of parents who use inductive reasoning as the primary form of discipline often have higher internalization of norms, more guilt over antisocial behaviors, and higher levels of empathy, altruism, and moral reasoning (Lopez et al., 2001). Parents' use of inductive reasoning helps to avoid parent-child power struggles, which often escalates to parents' use of coercive/power assertive nonphysical and physical discipline with children (McKinney et al., 2011).

Natural and logical consequences. Natural and logical consequences are discipline techniques used in response to child misbehavior; however, they focus on teaching the child to engage in appropriate behavior the next time he or she encounters a similar situation (Dinkmeyer & McKay, 1989). Natural consequences occur naturally without the parent having to impose any penalty. An example of a natural consequence is when a child's toys are ruined because they are left outside in the rain. In this case, the consequence for not putting away the toys and leaving them outside is that they are ruined by the rain. A natural consequence is typically paired with a

discussion between the parent and child about how the problem (in this case, the ruined toys) could have been prevented by following the parent's initial request (in this case, to put the toys away). Another example of a natural consequence is when a child gets cold because she refused the parent's request to wear a jacket. The discussion that follows would focus on how the next time the child goes out, she should consider taking a jacket. When children experience natural consequences, they are more likely to comply the next time the parent makes the request.

A logical consequence differs from a natural consequence in that it requires the parent to impose a penalty that is logically tied to the misbehavior. An example of a logical consequence is when a child has to wear dirty jeans because she did not take her dirty clothes to the laundry room. When possible, it is best for the logical consequence to involve making restitution for the misbehavior. For example, a child who has to clean crayon markings off a wall because he marked on it is making restitution for his misbehavior. Another example of making restitution for the misbehavior is a child who has to perform extra chores to earn money to pay for something she broke. Regardless of whether a consequence involves making restitution for the misbehavior, consequences that relate either naturally or logically to the misbehavior are thought to be helpful because they teach children responsibility for their behavioral choices (Telep, 2009). In this way, natural and logical consequences differ greatly from punishment, which is why they are considered forms of positive discipline rather than punishment. Unfortunately, no studies specifically examining the effects of imposing natural and logical consequences relative to the effects of imposing other discipline or punishment techniques on children's compliance and behavior could be found. However, literature written by parent educators for the lay audience is replete with advice for parents to incorporate natural and logical consequences as part of a plan of discipline to teach children responsibility (c.f., Dinkmeyer & McKay, 1989).

Monitoring. Finally, parental monitoring is a child guidance strategy that is often associated with nonphysical discipline techniques; however, it is not a true discipline technique because it does not teach or nurture positive behaviors, nor is it necessarily performed in response to a negative child behavior. Instead, monitoring involves keeping track of a child's whereabouts, activities, and peer associations when the child is away from home or parents (Kerr, Stattin, & Burk, 2010). Monitoring is one way that parents provide structure for children. Structure refers to ways in which parents organize a child's environment to facilitate competence. Other structure building strategies include setting routines, rules, and consequences for times when children break rules (Grolnick & Pomerantz, 2009). Parental monitoring has been found to be one of the most important family-related factors that protect children and adolescents against psychological and social risk (Brookmeyer, Henrich & Schwab-Stone, 2005). One reason parental monitoring is so important is because it is effective in keeping youth away from delinquent peers and engaging in antisocial activities (Kerr et al., 2010). Findings from one study revealed that monitoring was related to lower incidences of delinquency, smoking, drug use, and other norm-breaking behaviors (Stattin & Kerr, 2000). In two other studies, monitoring and parental support were particularly effective in buffering the effects of exposure to violence on adolescent delinquency (Bacchini, Miranda & Affuso, 2010; Brookmeyer et al., 2005). Not only does monitoring provide structure, but it conveys the message to children that they are worthy of their parents' time and attention (Stattin & Kerr, 2000). For that reason, it is not surprising that parental monitoring has been associated with fewer depressive symptoms in studies using very large samples of adolescents (Bacchini et al., 2010; Hamza & Willoughby, 2011).

Redirection. Redirection is a strategy for guiding children's behavior that is often recommended by parent educators (Klein, 2008). The strategy works especially well with

toddlers and young children, but it can be used at times with older children and teens, too. It involves diverting a child's attention away from a problem or from problem behavior and directing him toward desirable behavior. For example, if a child is engaging in a problem behavior, it is helpful to suggest two to three alternative nonproblem activities from which he can choose. Although redirection is a commonly used strategy for guiding children, it is typically not examined in the research literature on childhood discipline and guidance.

Praise. Praising a child for engaging in desired behavior is a form of positive reinforcement (Heath, 2013). Heath described the conditions for which praise as a positive reinforcement would be effective. First, it must be heard or noticed by the child. Second, it must be consistently given until the desired behavior becomes a habit. Third, it should always maintain or increase the desired behavior. Fourth, what is reinforcing varies from one child to another. Nonetheless, most children find praise or social approval rewarding. To use praise, parents are advised to make eye contact, be physically close, smile, and describe the behavior that is being approved. Several studies have documented the effectiveness of parents' praise or positive reinforcement. For example, parental praise has been linked to children's healthy eating habits and exercise (Arrendondo et al., 2006), children's academic success (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2001), and engagement in extracurricular activities (Fletcher, Elder, & Mekos, 2000). Not all child development experts endorse the use of praise, especially when it is indiscriminant and given frequently. Critics of indiscriminant, overused praise claim that it undermines children's intrinsic desire to perform the behavior. Moreover, experts agree that the praise should focus on the behavioral process (e.g., "you should be proud of yourself for studying so hard") rather than on the end product ("I am so proud of you for making an A on the test").

Coercive/Power Assertive Punishment

A contrasting definition of discipline is “to punish or penalize in order to control” (Dictionary.com Unabridged; retrieved May 28, 2012). This definition suggests that parents focus on what the child has done wrong rather than on teaching correct, desired behavior. The goal of punishment is to ensure that the child will stop the misbehavior and not repeat it. Punishment is considered coercive because it attempts to compel children to act in a way that is against their will (Latham, 2008). Punishment is also considered power assertive because it relies on the powerful status of the parent to enforce consequences that are punitive and oftentimes unrelated to the misbehaviors. Punishment involves a penalty, which may be either physical pain, such as with spanking, or psychological pain, such as with shaming and other forms of verbal aggression, and love withdrawal. Alternatively, punishment may involve imposing a consequence that is unrelated to the misdeed such as taking away either a desired object or privilege until the child’s behavior is corrected, or sending a child to his or her room (Telep, 2009). Coercive/power assertive punishment techniques have been associated with children’s decreased feelings of confidence and assertiveness (Baumrind & Black, 1967; Lasky, 1993; Gershoff, 2002) and increased feelings of humiliation and helplessness (Baumrind & Black, 1967; Gershoff, 2002; Lasky, 1993). Lack of confidence and increased humiliation resulting from childhood punishments have been found to be associated with depression among young adults (Baumrind & Black, 1967; Gershoff, 2002; Lasky, 1993). Moreover, coercive/power assertive punitive parenting is associated with insecure attachment history for both males and females (Levy, Blatt, & Shaver, 1998).

Verbal aggression. Several punishment techniques fall into the category of coercive/power assertive punishment. The first, verbal aggression, involves attacking the self-

concept of another person (Carlyle, McClure, & Roberto, 2005; Infante & Wigley, 1986). It may also involve threatening a child with the use of physical force in order to gain the child's compliance (Roberto, Carlyle, & McClure, 2006). Parents who lack effective communication skills have been found to be more likely to resort to verbal aggression, which often escalated to physical aggression (spanking) to gain compliance from their children (Roberto et al., 2006). Murray Straus and Carolyn Field (2003) argued that verbal aggression is the most coercive, power assertive, and potentially damaging of all of the nonphysical coercive/power assertive punishments. The investigators defined verbal aggression as including shouting, yelling, or screaming at child; threatening to spank the child without actually doing it; swearing or cursing at child; calling child dumb or lazy or some other name like that; and saying you would send child away or kick him or her out of the house. Findings from their nationally representative study of American parents revealed that regardless of gender or race, nearly all American parents (90%) engage in one or more forms of psychological verbal aggression toward their children (Straus & Field, 2003). This finding was true for parents of children ages 2 to 17 years of age. The vast majority of parents surveyed admitted to using less severe forms of verbal aggression on their children (i.e., shouting yelling, or screaming), but nearly 10-20% of parents of young children and 50% of parents of teenagers admitted to using one or more of the more severe forms of psychological aggression (i.e., swearing or cursing at child, threatening to kick child out of house, and calling child names like dumb or lazy). Parents' verbal aggression, in particular, has been found to negatively impact children's relational satisfaction and closeness to parents (Carlyle et al., 2005). Because verbal aggression involves demeaning the character of the child, it is also likely to be related to increased child depression.

Love withdrawal. Love withdrawal is the second type of parental punishment technique that falls into the category of coercive/power assertive punishment. Love withdrawal is a punishment technique that involves withholding love and affection or attention from a child when the child misbehaves or fails at a task (Huffmeijer, Tops, Alink, Bakermans-Kranenbug & van Ijzendoorn, 2011). Parent's use of love withdrawal has been associated with low self-esteem and low emotional well-being which may hamper empathetic concern (Huffmeijer et al., 2011). By using love withdrawal, the parent communicates to the child that his or her love is conditional upon the child's performance (Huffmeijer et al., 2011). These findings resulted from a study which involved 391 females, and no race differences were found (Huffmeijer et al., 2011). Similar to verbal aggression, love withdrawal has the potential to be very damaging to a child's sense of felt security and self-concept, and may ultimately lead to children's feelings of depression. Parents' use of love withdrawal affects children's later psychological functioning because it creates a link between children's performance and relational consequences (Huffmeijer et al., 2011). That is, the message it conveys to the child is that love is conditional upon accomplishing an achievement or complying with parents' demands. Conditional love is inconsistent love, which has been found to foster insecure parent-child attachment relationships (Sroufe, 2005).

Unrelated consequences. The third type of coercive/power assertive punishment technique that falls into the category of coercive/power assertive punishments is called unrelated consequences. Unrelated consequences include taking away a desired object or privilege that is unrelated to the child's misdeed, grounding, and sending the child to his or her room. These techniques are also sometimes referred to as an illogical consequence because they do not logically relate to the misdeed, nor do they require the child to make restitution for the misdeed.

These techniques are potentially less damaging to the child's self-concept than parental verbal aggression or love withdrawal because they do not involve attacking or criticizing the child's sense of self or making the child feel unworthy of parental love.

Physical aggression. "Corporal punishment is the intentional use of physical force to inflict pain, but not injury, for the purpose of correcting or controlling a child's behavior" (Straus, Dodge, & Pettit, 1994, p. 4). When physical force is used to inflict pain in order to control a child's behavior, regardless of the severity of the pain, it is physical aggression. This type of physical aggression is widely endorsed by parents as a "sometimes necessary" form of discipline. Many believe that parents who do not use physical punishment with their children are too permissive. Moreover, most parents believe that children who do not receive physical punishment engage in higher rates of behavior problems. Two separate meta-analyses found some support for the belief that physical punishment is linked positively to immediate compliance (Gershoff, 2002; Larzelere & Kuhn, 2005). However, most researchers have found that physical punishment yields more negative outcomes for children than other forms of discipline. Parents may unintentionally promote antisocial behavior in their children by demonstrating to them that it is "ok" to express anger through harsh physical punishment methods (Grogan-Kaylor, 2004). The use of physical punishment has been found to increase behavior problems among most, but not all children (Bender et al., 2007; Eamon & Zuehl, 2001; Gershoff, 2002; Grogan-Kaylor, 2004; Straus & Donnelly, 2001; Straus et al., 1994). The National Survey of Families and Households found that physical punishment increased antisocial behaviors for children of some ethnic groups and decreased antisocial behavior for children in other ethnic groups (Grogan-Kaylor, 2004). For instance, some studies find that spanking is

linked to lower aggression among African American children but increased aggression among Caucasian children (Grogan-Kaylor, 2004).

Physical punishment has also been positively correlated with depression, low self-esteem, negative psychological adjustment, and poor relationships with parents and other adults with authority (Bender et al., 2007; Straus et al., 1994; Wu, 2007). For example, Bender et al. (2007) found that harsh physical punishment, which was defined as pushing, grabbing, or shoving, and hitting with a belt or similar object, was related to increased symptoms of depression and anxiety. These findings held true for both males and females, although the relationship was stronger for females. Also, the findings held for both Caucasian participants and African American participants. Recent investigations find that the pain of physical punishment can also cause children to experience feelings of fear, anxiety, and anger (Bugental & Goodnow, 1998; Gershoff, 2002; Grusec & Goodnow, 1994; Jordan & Curtner-Smith, 2011; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Saarni, Mumme, & Campos, 1998). These negative feelings can cause the child to become fearful and avoidant of the parent, which can deteriorate the attachment bond between parent and child (Azrin & Holz, 1966; Gershoff, 2002; Hirschi, 1969; Parke, 1977; Van Houten, 1983). Other research also found that the experience of physical punishment affects parent-child attachment bonds. For example, recollections of receiving physical punishment during childhood has been linked to lower attachment quality between young adults and their mothers, and this relation held for both males and females, and for both African American participants and Caucasian participants (Jordan & Curtner-Smith, 2011).

Variations in Parents' use of Positive Discipline and Coercive/Power Assertive Punishment by Gender and Race

Parents often have different expectations and limits for their sons' and daughters' behaviors, and parents often treat their sons and daughters differently when the children

misbehave (Lytton & Romney, 1991). For example, parents are more likely to use corporal punishment with their sons than with their daughters, and parents are more likely to enforce stricter curfews for daughters than for sons (Lytton & Romney, 1991). Gender differences in parents' use of other forms of positive discipline and coercive/power assertive punishment has yet to be examined.

Racial variations in parents' use of corporal punishment is a current topic of investigation. Many studies find that African American parents are more likely than Caucasian parents to endorse and use corporal punishment. Studies examining racial differences in the effects of corporal punishment on children have yielded mixed findings. Some studies found that African American children who receive corporal punishment engage in less externalizing behaviors than African American children who do not receive it, whereas Caucasian children who receive corporal punishment tend to engage in higher rates of externalizing behaviors than Caucasian children who do not receive it. Still, other studies found that both African American children and Caucasian children who receive corporal punishment engage in higher rates of externalizing behavior problems and depression (McLoyd & Smith, 2002; Stormshak, Bierman, McMahon, & Lengua, 2002).

CHAPTER II

PURPOSE, SIGNIFICANCE, AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Most empirical studies examining the effects of discipline and punishment on children focus on the effects of parents' harsh physical punishment. In comparison, relatively fewer studies have examined the effects of other forms of discipline and punishment, including harsh verbal aggression, mild coercive/power assertive punishment (e.g., taking away an unrelated privilege), and the various positive forms of discipline on children. Moreover, little is known about gender and racial variations in children's experiences with receiving either coercive/power assertive punishment or positive forms of discipline. This study identifies the prevalence of child discipline and punishment techniques that young adult participants recall receiving during childhood. The study also examines how these recalled discipline and punishment techniques received during childhood relate to young adults' history of child and adolescent externalizing behaviors, current attachment to their mothers, and current depressive symptoms. Variations in these relations by gender are examined.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. How do African American young adults compare to Caucasian young adults in their recall of their mothers ever using each positive discipline technique and each coercive/power assertive punishment technique?

2. How do male young adults compare to female young adults in their recall of their mothers ever using each positive discipline technique and each coercive/power assertive punishment technique?

3. Which positive discipline techniques and coercive/power assertive punishment techniques could young adult participants recall their parents using more frequently?

4. What is the relative contribution of each positive discipline technique and each coercive/power assertive technique to the explanation of variance in young adults' history of externalizing behavior, current attachment to mother and current depression? Do these relations vary by gender?

Findings from this study contribute to the growing body of research on positive discipline techniques and coercive/power assertive punishments used by parents, and how these techniques contribute to young adults' history of externalizing problems, current depressive symptom, and attachment to mothers. This information will be helpful to practitioners and family service providers who design and lead parent education programs.

This study draws from several theoretical frameworks, including coercion theory (Patterson, Reid, & Dishion, 1992), parental control theory (Grolnick & Pomerantz, 2009), social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1989), and attachment theory (Bretherton, 1992). Coercion theory, which was first developed by Gerald Patterson, provides a basis for better understanding parent-child interactions associated with serious child antisocial behavior. Coercion theory poses that a child's interpersonal interactional style is learned within the family and carries over to a child's interactions with others outside the family, including peers and teachers (Patterson, 1992). Coercive interactions develop between two people when one person engages in a negative behavior to get his way or to achieve a goal. To counter, the other person is equally negative.

The exchange of interactions increases in frequency and intensity until one partner gives in to the other partner. In some families, negative parent-child interactions dominate in intensity and frequency until parents resort to harsh forms of physical and verbal aggression to coerce the children into halting their negative behaviors. At other times in these families, parents give in to their children's demands in hopes that the children will stop their noxious behavior. Patterson finds that giving in to children's demands only trains the children to engage in noxious behaviors at a higher level of intensity the next time they have a goal or make a demand on their parents.

Parental control theory explains how parents exert control over their children, and how that control affects child development (Gray & Steinberg, 1999). Contemporary studies of parental control have recognized that some parenting behaviors that were once referred to as control, such as monitoring, limit setting, and parental involvement in children's decision making, are best conceptualized as structure and are thought to have beneficial effects on children. In contrast, parents' psychological control refers to parental attempts to control children's behaviors through pressure, intrusion, domination, shaming/humiliation, excessive guilt induction, and love withdrawal. Parents' psychological control undermines children's psychosocial development by interfering with their ability to become independent and develop a healthy sense of self and personal identity (Steinberg, 1990). Albert Bandura (1989) developed social cognitive learning theory, which proposed that people can learn a new behavior simply by observing a role model. The likelihood that a child will imitate the modeled behavior depends on the observed consequences to the model and on characteristics of the model such as perceived power and status, nurturance, and similarity in terms of gender, race, and age. Finally, attachment theory purported that infants and their primary caregivers (usually the mother) form very strong and enduring emotional bonds (Bowlby, 1968). The attachment bond ensures the

survival of the infant by motivating the adult to care for the child. There are four key components to the attachment system: (a) the child seeks proximity to the caregiver when frightened or distressed; (b) the caregiver provides a safe, secure base from which the child can explore the surrounding world; (c) the child maintains proximity to the caregiver; thereby keeping her safe, and (d) the child becomes distressed upon separation from the caregiver. Attachment bonds vary in quality depending on the responsiveness and warmth of the caregiver. An attachment bond is formed in early in life; nonetheless, it continues to exert an influence on development throughout the individual's life course. The secure attachment bond, fostered by consistently warm and responsive caregiving, is ideal and provides a child with a sense of felt security that gives him the confidence to explore new environments and situations. Thus, a secure infant-caregiver bond promotes exploration and later independence. Insecure bonds, which are either anxious-resistant or anxious-avoidant in quality, are fostered by inconsistent (sometimes warm, sometimes hostile and frightening) parenting or consistently neglectful parenting, respectively. Children who develop either type of insecure parent-child attachment bond later lack the confidence to explore new environments and situations, and master new skills that promote success in most areas in life. Moreover they are at-risk for poor psychosocial adjustment in the form of externalizing problems and internalizing problems (Sroufe, 2005).

Taken together, these theories suggest that frightening, controlling, and/or coercive, aggressive parental behaviors do little to teach children socially competent behaviors. These theories also suggest that frightening, controlling/coercive parental behaviors typically only deter negative externalizing child behaviors when children are under surveillance by the authority figure. Additionally, frightening, aggressive parenting behaviors are theorized to model aggression and coercion as a way to solve social problems. Finally, these theories suggest that

parental behaviors that convey withdrawal of love and withdrawal of positive parental attention will decrease children's sense of felt security, result in less secure parent-child attachment bonds, and increase the likelihood of child depression. In contrast, parental behaviors that are perceived as conveying warmth and understanding, and that teach children how to make good choices for their behaviors should be more effective in promoting positive, prosocial child behaviors.

Finally, children whose parents are warm, nurturing, and consistently responsive are likely to develop a sense of felt security, develop secure attachment bonds with their parents, engage in fewer externalizing behaviors, and are unlikely to experience depression when compared to children whose parents lack warmth and nurturance and are inconsistent in their provision of care.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

This study used an online survey entitled “The University of Alabama Family Relationships Survey,” which was administered to young adult university students. The University of Alabama Family Relationships Survey contained four questionnaires: The Dimensions of Discipline Survey (DDI; Straus & Fauchier, 2011), an abbreviated form of the Personal Relationships Survey (PRP; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy & Sugarman, 1996), the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) and The Major Depression Inventory (MDI; Beck, Ward, & Mendelson, 1961).

Study Procedures

Participants were recruited from courses offered by the Department of Human Development and Family Studies and the Department of Psychology at The University of Alabama. Researchers visited the classrooms of potential participants and explained the purposes of the study, answered any questions, and obtained written informed consent. Also, researchers provided the URL address to the online survey entitled “The University of Alabama Family Relationships Survey.” Students who participated received extra credit for their course. Students who chose not to participate could complete a different activity to obtain extra credit.

Participants completed the online survey on a computer in the privacy of their home or at another computer of their choice. It took participants approximately 1 hour to complete the survey. Participants actually completed two separate surveys: one with the questionnaire, and

another with identifiers for the purpose of subject pool credit. Any identifying information needed to assign subject pool credit was separated from the data. Participants who opted not to answer some of the questions or who refused to participate at any point after starting the survey still received full credit.

Participants

Participants included 644 young adults between 18 to 35 years of age. There were 8 African American male participants (nearly 1%), 80 Caucasian male participants (nearly 12%), 64 African American female participants (nearly 10%), and 492 Caucasian female participants (77%). Thus, the sample was comprised of mostly Caucasian females.

Measures

Recalled discipline was assessed with the Dimensions of Discipline Inventory (DDI; Straus & Fauchier, 2011). The DDI contains 26 items that ask the participant about his or her parent's use of punishment (physical and nonphysical) and discipline behaviors when the participant was 10 years old. Item responses include 0 = "Never," 1 = "Not in that year, but in another year," 2 = "1-2 times in that year," 3 = "3-5 times in that year," 4 = "6-9 times in that year," 5 = "Monthly (10 to 14 times in that year)," 6 = "A few times a month (2-3 times a month)," 7 = "Weekly (1-2 times in a week)," 8 = "Several times a week (3-4 times)," 9 = "Daily (5 or more times a week)," and 10 = "Two or more times a day."

Specific parental discipline behaviors are categorized into two broad categories: positive discipline techniques and coercion/power assertive punishment. The positive discipline techniques category included positive modeling, inductive reasoning, natural consequences, logical consequences, parental monitoring, redirection, and praise. The coercion/power assertive

punishment category included the parental behaviors of verbal aggression, love withdrawal, unrelated consequences, forced apology, and physical aggression.

Positive modeling. Positive modeling was measured by a single item which read, “How often did your mother show or demonstrate to you the right thing to do?” Possible responses ranged from 0 = “never” to 10 = “two or more times a day.” Possible responses for positive modeling ranged from 0 to 10. In this study, scores for positive modeling ranged from 0 to 10.

Inductive reasoning. Inductive reasoning was measured by a single item which read, “How often did your mother explain the rules to you to try to prevent you from repeating misbehavior?” Possible responses ranged from 0 to 10. In this study, scores for inductive reasoning ranged from 0 to 10.

Natural consequences. Natural consequences also was measured by one item, which read, “How often did your mother let you misbehave so that you would have to deal with the results?” Possible responses ranged from 0 to 10. In the current study, scores for natural consequences ranged from 0 to 10.

Logical consequences. Logical consequences was measured by the single item which read, “How often did your mother make you do something to make up for some misbehavior; for example pay for a broken window?” Possible responses ranged from 0 to 10. In the current study, scores for logical consequences ranged from 0 to 9.

Monitoring. Monitoring was measured by three items which included, “How often did your mother check on you to see if you were misbehaving?”; “How often did your mother check on you so that she could tell you that you were doing a good job?”; and “How often did your mother tell you that she was watching or checking to see what you were doing?”. Possible scores

ranged from 0 to 30. In this study, scores for monitoring ranged from 0 to 30, and the Cronbach alpha for the monitoring scale was .74.

Redirection. Redirection was measured by the single item, “How often did your mother give you something else you might like to do instead of what you were doing wrong?” Possible responses ranged from 0 to 10. In the current study, scores for redirection ranged from 0 to 10”

Praise. Praise was measured by the single item, “How often did your mother praise you for finally stopping bad behavior or for not behaving well?” Possible responses ranged from 0 to 10. In the current study, scores for praise ranged from 0 to 10.

Verbal aggression. Verbal aggression was measured by two items which included, “How often did your mother shout or yell at you when you behaved badly?” and “How often did your mother call you lazy, sloppy, thoughtless or some other name like that?” Possible scores ranged from 0 to 20. In this study, scores ranged from 0 to 20. The Cronbach alpha for this scale was .58.

Love withdrawal. Love withdrawal was measured by three items which included, “How often did your mother try to make you feel ashamed or guilty?”, “How often did your mother deliberately not pay attention when you misbehaved?”, and “How often did your mother hold back affection by acting cold or not giving hugs or kisses?” Possible scores ranged from 0 to 30. In this study, scores ranged from 0 to 25. The Cronbach alpha for this scale was .55.

Unrelated consequences. Unrelated consequences was measured by seven items which included, “How often did your mother take away your allowances, toys, or other privileges because of misbehavior?”, “How often did your mother give you money or other things for finally stopping bad behavior or for behaving well?”, “How often did your mother give you extra chores as a consequence?”, “How often did your mother withhold your allowances, toys, or other

privileges until you did what she wanted you to do?”, “How often did your mother ground you or restrict your activities outside of the home because of misbehavior?”, “How often did your mother put you in “time out” or send you to your room?”, and “How often did your mother send you to bed without a meal?” Possible scores ranged from 0 to 70. In this study, scores ranged from 0 to 48. The Cronbach alpha for this scale was .74.

Forced apology. Although forced apology was not reviewed in the above review of research literature on discipline or punishment of children, it is included here because it appears to be a commonly used parenting strategy when a child offends another child either by hurting that offended child or by taking away or damaging the offended child’s possessions. A study of 186 mothers of young children identified the strategy of “Make child apologize” as one of several logical consequences for a misbehavior which mothers would choose as their first response to their child’s misbehavior (Socolar, Winsor, Hunter, Catellier, & Kotch 1999); however, many child development and parenting experts advise parents not to make a child apologize. Steven Stosny, a clinical psychologist who specializes in working with families that engage in emotionally abusive processes, claimed that when children are forced to apologize as part of punishment, they experience the act as humiliation or submission rather than as reconciliation (2011). He further stated that humiliated children are focused on their own negative feelings of humiliation or shame which interferes with their ability to understand the feelings of the offended child who is hurt (Stosny, 2011). Moreover, children who are humiliated into an apology may be more likely to resent the offended child. Thus, the forced apology can impact a child who has misbehaved in a way that is opposite from what the parents intended. Because a forced apology is forced rather than willingly given, we categorized it as a coercive parenting strategy. It is measured by the single item, “How often did your mother make you

apologize or say you were sorry for the misbehavior?”. Possible scores for forced apology ranged from 0 to 10. In this study, scores for forced apology ranged from 0 to 10.

Physical aggression. Physical aggression was measured by four items on the DDI questionnaire. They were, “How often did your mother shake or grab you to get your attention?”, “How often did your mother spank, slap, smack, or swat you?”, “How often did your mother use a paddle, hairbrush, belt or other object?”, and “How often did your mother wash your mouth out with soap, put hot sauce on your tongue, or do something similar?” Possible scores ranged from 0 to 50. In this study, scores for physical aggression ranged from 0 to 29. The Cronbach alpha for this scale was .72.

History of externalizing behavior. Young adults’ history of externalizing behavior was assessed by their responses to 11 items taken from three subscales on the Personal and Relationship Profile questionnaire (PRP; Straus et al., 1996). The three subscales in the PRP that were used included the Criminal Behavior Subscale, the Antisocial Personality Subscale, and the Substance Abuse Subscale. A sample item from the Criminal Behavior subscale is “Since age 15, I hit or threatened to hit someone who is not a member of my family.” A sample item from the Antisocial Personality subscale is “I often lie to get what I want,” A sample item from the Substance Abuse subscale is “Sometimes I can’t remember what happened the night before because of drinking.” For all items, responses ranged from 1 = “strongly disagree” to 4 = “strongly agree”. A total History of Externalizing Behavior score was derived by summing across all 11 items. Possible scores ranged from 11 to 44. In this study, scores ranged from 11 to 35. The Cronbach alpha for history externalizing behavior was .76.

Depression. Participants also completed The Major Depression Inventory (MDI; Beck et al., 1961). The MDI consists of 12 items. For each item, participants indicated how often they

experienced the behavior or feeling referenced in that item during the past 2 weeks. Item responses ranged from 0 = “at no time” to 5 = “all of the time”. Sample items include “Have you felt low in spirits or sad?” and “Have you had trouble sleeping at night?”. Possible scores ranged from 0 to 60. In this study, scores ranged from 0 to 50. The Cronbach alpha was .92.

Attachment to mother. Participants also completed an assessment of their current attachment to mother, the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). The IPPA consists of 25 items. Item responses ranged from 1 = “Almost never to never true” to 5 = “Almost always or always true.” The scale is scored by reverse scoring the negatively worded items and then summing the response values. This assessment measures the degree of mother and young adult mutual trust, quality of communication, and the extent of alienation. A sample item from the Trust subscale is, “My mother trusts my judgment.” A sample item from the Communication subscale is, “My mother helps me to talk about my difficulties.” Finally, a sample item from the Alienation subscale, which would be reversed scored, is, “I don’t get much attention from my mother.” A total Attachment to Mother score is derived by summing across all 25 items. Higher scores reflect stronger attachment to mother. Possible scores range from 25 to 125. In this study, scores ranged from 31 to 125. The Cronbach alpha was .95.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

For all analysis in this study, means, standard deviations, correlations, and regression models were calculated using SPSS for Windows, 18.0. The first table presents the means and standard deviations for all positive discipline techniques and all coercive/power assertive punishments examined in the study. As can be seen in Table 1, there is a great deal of variability in all of the variables. Four variables, natural consequences, logical consequences, love withdrawal, and physical aggression, have standard deviations that are greater than their means. This may reduce the predictive value of these four variables.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Positive Discipline Techniques and Coercive/Power Assertive Punishments

Discipline Techniques and Coercive/Power Assertive Punishments	M (SD)
Positive Modeling (1 item)	5.57 (2.89)
Inductive Reasoning (1 items)	5.21 (2.45)
Natural Consequences (1 item)	1.44 (1.97)
Logical Consequence (1 item)	1.60 (1.77)
Monitoring (3 items)	12.58 (7.18)
Redirection (1 item)	2.47 (2.34)
Praise (1 item)	4.26 (2.83)
Verbal Aggression (2 items)	5.19 (4.07)
Love Withdrawal (3 items)	3.37 (4.12)
Unrelated Consequences (7 items)	16.46 (9.07)
Forced Apology (1 item)	4.87 (2.48)
Physical Aggression (4 items)	5.32 (5.52)

Note. $N = 644$.

Recall of Positive Discipline Techniques and Coercive/Power Assertive Punishments by Ethnic Group

The first research question guiding this study was, “How do African American young adults compare to Caucasian young adults in their recall of their mothers ever using each positive discipline technique and each coercive/power assertive punishment technique?” Table 2 reports the percentages of the discipline techniques and coercive/power assertive punishments that African American participants and Caucasian participants recalled ever receiving. African American and Caucasian participants recalled receiving discipline techniques at different rates. The significant differences were that Caucasian participants recalled receiving higher rates of logical consequences, monitoring, praise, love withdrawal, and forced apology than African American participants. No significant differences were found between African American participants and Caucasian participants’ rates of receiving Inductive reasoning, natural consequences, redirection, verbal aggression, unrelated consequences, positive modeling, and physical aggression.

The second research question guiding this study was, “Are female young adults more likely to recall certain positive discipline techniques and coercive/power assertive punishments than male young adults?” Table 3 reports the percentages of the discipline techniques and coercive/power assertive punishments that male and female participants recalled receiving. As expected, differences were found in the prevalence of discipline and punishments that males and females recalled receiving as a child. The significant differences were that male participants recalled receiving logical consequences, physical aggression, and love withdrawal at higher rates than female participants. No other differences were found in the rates of verbal aggression,

unrelated consequences, inductive reasoning, positive modeling, monitoring, redirection, praise, forced apology, and natural consequences.

Table 2

Percentage of Recall of Positive Discipline Techniques and Coercive/Power Assertive Punishments by Ethnic Group

Discipline Techniques and Punishments	African American (N=75)	Caucasian (N=545)	Sig.
Positive Modeling	97%	95%	Ns
Inductive Reasoning	96%	97%	Ns
Natural Consequences	37%	48%	Ns
Logical Consequences	43%	63%	$\chi^2(1) = 10.94, p < .01$
Monitoring	88%	97%	$\chi^2(1) = 6.81, p < .01$
Redirection	62%	68%	ns
Praise	76%	88%	$\chi^2(1) = 8.23, p < .01$
Verbal Aggression	92%	86%	ns
Love Withdrawal	47%	65%	$\chi^2(1) = 9.09, p < .01$
Unrelated Consequences	96%	98%	Ns
Forced Apology	87%	98%	$\chi^2(1) = 21.94, p < .01$
Physical Aggression	88%	78%	Ns

Table 3

Percentage of Recall of Positive Discipline Techniques and Coercive/Power Assertive Punishments by Gender

Discipline Techniques and Punishments	Females (N=555)	Males (N=86)	Sig.
Positive Modeling	96%	94%	Ns
Inductive Reasoning	97%	97%	Ns
Natural Consequences	45%	54%	Ns
Logical Consequences	56%	80%	$\chi^2(1) = 17.53, p = .01$
Monitoring	95%	98%	Ns
Redirection	66%	75%	ns
Praise	87%	86%	Ns
Verbal Aggression	86%	93%	Ns

Table 3 (con't)

Discipline Techniques and Punishments	Females (N=555)	Males (N=86)	Sig.
Love Withdrawal	62%	74%	$\chi^2(1) = 5.06, p = .02$
Unrelated Consequences	98%	99%	Ns
Forced Apology	96%	95%	Ns
Physical Aggression	77%	88%	$\chi^2(1) = 4.79, p = .03$

The third research question was “Which positive discipline techniques and coercive/power assertive punishments could young adult participants recall their parents using more frequently?” Table 4 presents the percentage of participants who could recall ever receiving each positive discipline technique and punishment. The percentage of participants who recalled receiving each of the discipline and punishment techniques indicated that parents utilize a variety of discipline and punishment techniques with their children. Unrelated consequences was the most frequently used discipline technique as evidenced by 98% of participants being able to recall receiving it. Natural consequences were the least frequently used by parents as evidenced by 47% of participants being able to recall receiving it. Logical consequences, love withdrawal, and redirection were moderately used as evidenced by 60-67 % of participants being able to recall ever receiving these forms of discipline or punishments.

Relationships Between Positive Discipline Techniques, Coercive/Power Assertive Punishments and Young Adult Males’ History of Externalizing Behavior, Current Attachment to Mother, and Current Depression

The fourth research question was, “What is the relative contribution of each positive discipline technique and each coercive/power assertive punishment to the explanation of variance in young adults’ history of externalizing behavior, current depression, and current attachment to mother? Do these relations vary by gender? To address this question, separate correlational analyses were first performed on the study variables. These analyses were

performed separately for males and females. The results of these analyses allowed the investigator to examine the study variables multicollinearity and patterns of bivariate correlations.

Table 4

Percentage of Participants who Could Recall Ever Receiving Each of the Positive Discipline Techniques and Coercive/Power Assertive Punishments

Discipline Techniques and Punishments	Percent
Unrelated Consequences	98%
Inductive Reasoning	97%
Forced Apology	96%
Monitoring	95%
Positive Modeling	95%
Verbal Aggression	87%
Praise	87%
Physical Aggression	79%
Redirection	67%
Love Withdrawal	64%
Logical Consequences	60%
Natural Consequences	47%

Note. $N = 644$.

Table 5 presents the bivariate correlations for the male participants only. These bivariate correlations are between the seven positive discipline techniques, the five coercive/power assertive punishments, and the outcomes of history of externalizing behaviors, current attachment to mother and depression. Among the intercorrelations for the positive discipline variables and the coercive/power assertive punishments, only five of the correlation coefficients ranged between .51 and .60. Thus, these variables did not present an excessively high degree of multi-collinearity.

Verbal aggression, love withdrawal, and natural consequences were each related at the bivariate level to history of externalizing behaviors, current attachment to mother, and depression. All significant correlations were in the expected direction except for the correlations

Table 5

*Correlations of Positive Discipline Techniques, Coercive/Power Assertive Punishments, and Outcomes for Male Participants
(n's range from 75-86)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1) Externalizing Behaviors		-.38**	.29**	-.20 +	-.14	.23*	.13	-.06	-.06	-.12	.37**	.16	.10	-.09	.15	-.32**
2) Attachment			-.48**	.19	.20	-.28*	-.08	.06	.11	.15	-.38**	-.41**	-.07	.07	-.26*	.04
3) Depression				-.22*	-.22*	.30**	.14	-.09	.03	-.07	.29**	.30**	.07	-.13	.30**	-.04
4) Positive Modeling					.35**	.07	.20	.53**	.27*	.41**	-.06	-.05	.30**	.38**	.10	.21
5) Inductive Reasoning						-.10	.24*	.17	.27*	.10	.07	.01	.36**	.11	.27*	.16
6) Natural Consequences							.45**	.33**	.20	.20	.41**	.44**	.42**	.21*	.39**	-.17
7) Logical Consequences								.26*	.24*	.27*	.26*	.26*	.59**	.19	.31**	-.13
8) Monitoring									.22	.27*	.05	0	.35**	.47**	.21	.07
9) Redirection										.44**	.10	.18	.35**	.02	.13	.07
10) Praise											-.09	-.07	.24*	.44**	-.01	-.05
11) Verbal Aggression												.57**	.39**	-.04	.60**	.08
12) Love Withdrawal													.36**	.02	.51**	.15
13) Unrelated Consequences														.29**	.55**	-.02
14) Forced Apology															.12	-.11
15) Physical Aggression																.01
16) Race																

* $p \leq .05$, two-tailed. ** $p \leq .01$, two-tailed. For race; 0 = Caucasian; 1 = African American

between natural consequences and the outcomes. Physical aggression was unrelated to history of externalizing behaviors and logical consequences was related to history of externalizing behaviors, but not in the direction expected.

Relationships Between Positive Discipline Techniques, Coercive/Power Assertive Punishments and Young Adult Females' History of Externalizing Behavior, Current Attachment to Mother, and Current Depression

Table 6 presents the bivariate correlations for female participants. These bivariate correlations are between the seven positive discipline techniques, the five coercive/power assertive punishments, and the outcomes of history of externalizing behaviors, current attachment to mother, and depression. Among the inter-correlations for the positive discipline variables and the coercive/power assertive punishments, only three of the correlation coefficients ranged between .51 and .58. Thus, these variables did not present an excessively high degree of multicollinearity.

For females, the pattern of discipline and punishment variables that were statistically significant with the outcomes of history of externalizing behaviors, current attachment to mother, and depression was strikingly similar to the pattern of statistically significant bivariate correlations for males. Natural consequences and logical consequences were statistically significantly related to all three outcome variables, but in the opposite direction than what was expected.

The Relative Contribution of Each Positive Discipline Technique and Each Coercive/Power Assertive Punishment to the Explanation of Variance in Young Adult Males' History of Externalizing Behavior, Current Attachment to Mother, and Current Depression

To examine the relative contribution of each of the positive discipline and coercive/power assertive punishment variables, two sets of hierarchical multiple regression analyses were performed. One set of analyses was for young adult males and the other set of analyses was for

Table 6

*Correlations of Positive Discipline Techniques, Coercive/Power Assertive Punishments, and Outcomes for Female Participants
(n's range from 496-555)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1)Externalizing		-.37**	.33**	-.21**	.01	.18**	.16**	-.06	-.01	-.11*	.25**	.17**	.18**	.04	.23**	.10*
2)Attachment			-.35**	.33**	.13**	-.11*	-.07	.05	.11*	.23**	-.45**	-.41**	-.11*	.00	-.30**	-.09*
3) Depression				-.15**	.02	.13**	.11**	-.06	.00	-.09*	.23**	.21**	.15**	-.00	.15**	.03
4) Positive Modeling					.43**	.10*	.12**	.46**	.27**	.49**	-.06	-.09*	.22**	.36**	-.03	.02
5) Inductive Reasoning						.14**	.18**	.36**	.29**	.36**	.08	.01	.38**	.41**	.08	-.04
6)Natural Consequences							.23**	.14**	.21**	.11*	.26**	.25**	.36**	.15**	.21**	-.02
7)Logical Consequences								.26**	.24**	.02	.22**	.26**	.45**	.26**	.23**	-.06
8)Monitoring									.27**	.14**	.17**	.14**	.38**	.51**	.17**	-.03
9)Redirection										.30**	.07	.09*	.37**	.30**	.14**	.10*
10)Praise											-.11*	-.03	.19**	.37**	-.06	-.07
11)Verbal Aggression												.58**	.42**	.21**	.54**	.09*
12)Love Withdrawal													.34**	.18**	.42**	-.06
13)Unrelated Consequences														.44**	.47**	-.05
14) Forced Apology															.23**	-.14**
15) Physical Aggression																.17**
16) Race																

* $p \leq .05$, two-tailed. ** $p \leq .01$, two-tailed. For race; 0 = Caucasian; 1 = African American

young adult females. Each set contained three multiple regression analyses. For both males and females, the dependent variable for the first regression analysis was history of externalizing behaviors. The dependent variable for the second regression analysis was current attachment to mother, and the dependent variable for the third regression analysis was depression. For both males and females, the independent variables entered on Step 1 for all three regression analyses were the positive discipline techniques (positive modeling, inductive reasoning, natural consequences, logical consequences, monitoring, redirection, and praise). The independent variables entered on Step 2 were the same positive discipline techniques entered on Step 1 plus a set of coercive/power assertive punishments (verbal aggression, love withdrawal, unrelated consequences, forced apology, and physical aggression). Few studies have compared the relative contribution of childhood discipline variables and punishment variables to the explanation of young adult social functioning; the analyses were considered exploratory and the level of significance was set at .10.

Table 7 presents the results of the three hierarchical multiple regression analyses for young adult males. In the first regression analysis in which history of externalizing behavior problems was the dependent variable, the full set of positive discipline variables in Step 1 statistically significantly explained 16% of the variance. The addition of the coercive/power assertive variables to the model on Step 2 failed to explain a statistically significant amount of additional variance.

A comparison of the standardized Betas revealed that among just the positive discipline variables on Step 1, only natural consequences made a unique contribution to the explanation of variance in young adult males' history of externalizing behaviors. In this case, as young adult males recalled receiving more natural consequences, their reports of having a history of

Table 7

Regression Model for Male Participants

Parenting Techniques	Externalizing Behaviors			Attachment			Depression		
	B	(SE)	Beta	B	(SE)	Beta	B	(SE)	Beta
Step 1									
Constant	23.24	1.91		94.25	4.82		18.09	2.96	
Positive Modeling	-.29	.29	-.15	.23	.70	.05	-.33	.48	-.10
Inductive Reasoning	-.16	.29	-.07	1.08	.70	.19	-.96	.44	-.26*
Natural Consequences	.83	.39	.28*	-2.40	.93	-.33*	1.65	.60	.34**
Logical Consequences	.30	.40	.10	.05	.95	.01	.44	.62	.09
Monitoring	-.02	.12	-.02	.14	.28	.06	-.10	.19	-.07
Redirection	-.18	.30	-.08	.28	.70	.05	.17	.45	.05
Praise	-.20	.28	-.09	.69	.67	.13	-.54	.45	-.15
Step 2									
Constant	21.25	2.22		99.68	5.61		16.77	3.57	
Positive Modeling	-.20	.29	-.10	.24	.68	.04	-.30	.49	-.09
Inductive Reasoning	-.24	.30	-.12	1.34	.72	.24 +	-1.08	.47	-.29*

Table 7 (con't)

Parenting Techniques	Externalizing Behaviors			Attachment			Depression		
	B	(SE)	Beta	B	(SE)	Beta	B	(SE)	Beta
Natural Consequences	.60	.45	.20	-1.09	1.03	-.15	1.15	.71	.24
Logical Consequences	.17	.44	.06	.03	1.01	.00	.58	.69	.12
Monitoring	-.01	.13	-.01	.08	.30	.04	-.09	.20	-.06
Redirection	.23	.32	-.10	.48	.75	.09	.21	.51	.06
Praise	-.13	.33	-.06	.24	.76	.05	-.42	.54	-.12
Verbal Aggression	.59	.23	.40*	-.67	.53	-.19	.23	.34	.09
Love Withdrawal	-.18	.19	-.15	-.79	.46	-.25 +	.07	.29	.04
Unrelated Consequences	.04	.12	.06	.06	.25	.04	-.13	.17	-.13
Forced Apology	-.08	.38	-.03	-.21	.89	-.04	.09	.59	.02
Physical Aggression	-.12	.16	-.11	.00	.38	.00	.30	.26	.18

Note: Externalizing Behaviors: adj R² = .16+ for Step 1 ($p < .10$); R² - change = .08 for Step 2 (ns). Attachment: adj R² = .19 for Step 1 ($p < .05$); R² - change = .11 for Step 2 (ns). Depression: adj R² = .26 for Step 1 ($p < .01$); R² - change = .04 for Step 2 (ns). + $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

externalizing behaviors increased. When all positive discipline variables and all coercive/power assertive variables were entered into the regression equation on Step 2, only verbal aggression made a unique contribution to the explanation of variance in history of externalizing behaviors. Young adult males who recalled receiving more verbal aggression reported having a higher history of externalizing behaviors than young adult males who recalled receiving less verbal aggression.

In the second regression analysis in which current attachment to mother was the dependent variable, the full set of positive discipline variables in Step 1 statistically significantly explained 19% of the variance. The addition of the coercive/power assertive variables to the model on Step 2 failed to explain a statistically significant amount of additional variance. A comparison of the standardized Betas revealed that in the model with only positive discipline variables on Step 1, natural consequences was the only variable that made a unique contribution to the explanation of variance in current attachment to mother. In this case, young adult males who recalled receiving fewer natural consequences reported stronger current attachment to their mothers. When all positive discipline variables and all coercive/power assertive variables were entered into the regression equation on Step 2, only inductive reasoning and love withdrawal made unique contributions to the explanation of variance in young adult males' current attachment to their mothers. In this case, young adult males who recalled receiving more inductive reasoning and less love withdrawal reported a stronger current attachment to their mothers than young adult males who recalled receiving less inductive reasoning and more love withdrawal.

In the third regression analysis in which depression was the dependent variable, the full set of positive discipline variables in Step 1 statistically significantly explained 26% of the

variance. The addition of the coercive/power assertive variables to the model on Step 2 failed to explain a statistically significant amount of additional variance. A comparison of the standardized Betas revealed that in the model with only positive discipline variables on Step 1, inductive reasoning and natural consequences were the only variables that made unique contributions to the explanation of variance in depression. In this case, young adult males who recalled receiving more inductive reasoning reported fewer symptoms of depression. Conversely, young adult males who recalled receiving more natural consequences also reported more symptoms of depression. When all positive discipline variables and all coercive/power assertive variables were entered into the regression equation on Step 2, only inductive reasoning made a unique contribution to the explanation of variance in young adult males' depression symptoms. In this case, young adult males who recalled receiving more inductive reasoning experienced less depressive symptoms than young adult males who recalled receiving less inductive reasoning.

In sum, as a group, the positive discipline variables were predictive of each dependent variable (history of externalizing behaviors, current attachment to mother, and depression), but the coercive/power assertive punishments failed to explain additional variance after controlling for the amount of variance explained by the positive discipline variables. Additionally, verbal aggression was particularly strong at predicting young adult males' history of externalizing behaviors. Inductive reasoning also predicted both young adult males' current attachment to mother and depression symptoms. Love withdrawal also was predictive of young adult males' current attachment to mothers. Finally, natural consequences was predictive of all three young adult male outcomes, but not in the expected direction.

Relationships Between the Positive Discipline Techniques, the Coercive/Power Assertive Punishments and Young Adult Females' History of Externalizing Behavior, Current Attachment to Mother, and Current Depression

Table 8 presents the results of the three hierarchical multiple regression analyses for young adult females. In the first regression analysis in which history of externalizing behavior problems was the dependent variable, the full set of positive discipline variables in Step 1 statistically significantly explained 10% of the variance. The addition of the coercive/power assertive variables to the model on Step 2 explained an additional 4% of the variance in history of externalizing behaviors.

A comparison of the standardized Betas revealed that among the positive discipline variables entered on Step 1, positive modeling, inductive reasoning, natural consequences, and logical consequences made unique contributions to the explanation of variance in young adult females' history of externalizing behaviors. In this case, as young adult females recalled receiving more positive modeling, their reports of having a history of externalizing behaviors decreased. In contrast, as young adult females recalled receiving more inductive reasoning, more natural consequences, and more logical consequences, their reports of having a history of externalizing behaviors increased. When all positive discipline variables and all coercive/power assertive variables were entered into the regression equation on Step 2, positive modeling, natural consequences, monitoring, verbal aggression, and unrelated consequences made unique contributions to the explanation of variance in history of externalizing behaviors. Young adult females who recalled receiving more positive modeling and more monitoring reported having a lower history of externalizing behaviors than young adult females who recalled receiving less positive modeling and less monitoring. In contrast, young adult females who recalled receiving more verbal aggression and more unrelated consequences reported having a higher history of

Table 8

Regression Model for Female Participants

Discipline Techniques	Externalizing Behaviors			Attachment			Depression		
	B	(SE)	Beta	B	(SE)	Beta	B	(SE)	Beta
Step 1									
Constant	17.00	.58		98.88	2.13		13.42	1.35	
Positive Modeling	-.30	.09	-.19**	1.904	.34	.32**	-.59	.22	-.16**
Inductive Reasoning	.22	.10	.12*	.02	.37	.00	.40	.23	.09 +
Natural Consequences	.39	.11	.17**	-1.31	.40	-.15**	.70	.25	.14**
Logical Consequences	.36	.13	.14**	-.59	.48	-.06	.42	.30	.07
Monitoring	-.04	.03	-.06	-.26	.13	-.11*	-.07	.08	-.04
Redirection	-.08	.10	-.04	.60	.36	.08 +	-.01	.23	.00
Praise	-.07	.09	-.04	.58	.33	.10 +	-.13	.21	-.04
Step 2									
Constant	15.86	.62		107.60	2.11		10.87	1.47	
Positive Modeling	-.26	.09	-.17**	1.38	.31	.23**	-.44	.22	-.12*
Inductive Reasoning	.14	.10	.08	.10	.35	.01	.33	.24	.08

Table 8 (con't)

Discipline Techniques	Externalizing Behaviors			Attachment			Depression		
	B	(SE)	Beta	B	(SE)	Beta	B	(SE)	Beta
Logical Consequences	.21	.13	.08	.21	.45	.02	.15	.31	.02
Monitoring	-.08	.04	-.12*	-.01	.12	-.01	-.11	.08	-.08
Redirection	-.14	.10	-.07	.60	.33	.07 +	-.03	.23	-.01
Praise	-.04	.09	-.03	.30	.30	.05	-.00	.21	.00
Verbal Aggression	.13	.07	.12+	-1.30	.24	-.30**	.43	.16	.17**
Love Withdrawal	-.04	.07	-.03	-.95	.22	-.22**	.19	.15	.07
Unrelated Consequences	.06	.03	.12*	.02	.11	.01	.11	.07	.10
Forced Apology	.08	.11	.05	-.24	.36	-.04	-.22	.24	-.05
Physical Aggression	.05	.05	.06	-.05	.16	.02	-.08	.11	-.04

Note: Externalizing Behaviors: adj R² = .10 for Step 1 ($p < .01$); R² - change = .04 for Step 2 ($p < .01$). Attachment: adj R² = .15 for Step 1 ($p < .01$); R² - change = .18 for Step 2 ($p < .01$). Depression: adj R² = .06 for Step 1 ($p < .01$); R² - change = .04 for Step 2 ($p < .01$). + $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

externalizing behavior problems than young adult females who recalled receiving less verbal aggression and fewer unrelated consequences.

In the second regression analysis in which current attachment to mother was the dependent variable, the full set of positive discipline variables in Step 1 statistically significantly explained 15% of the variance. The addition of the coercive/power assertive variables to the model on Step 2 explained an additional 18% of the variance in young adult females' current attachment to mothers. A comparison of the standardized Betas revealed that in the model with only positive discipline variables (Step 1), positive modeling, natural consequences, monitoring, redirection, and praise all made unique contributions to the explanation of variance in current attachment to mother. In this case, as young adult females recalled receiving more positive modeling, more redirection, and more praise, their current attachment to their mothers was stronger. In contrast, as young adult females recalled receiving more natural consequences and more monitoring, their current attachment to mother was lower.

When all positive discipline variables and all coercive/power assertive variables were entered into the regression equation on Step 2, positive modeling, redirection, verbal aggression, and love withdrawal each made unique contributions to the explanation of variance in young adult females' current attachment to their mothers. In this case, young adult females who recalled receiving more positive modeling and redirection and less verbal aggression and love withdrawal reported a stronger current attachment to their mothers than young adult females who recalled receiving less positive modeling, less redirection, and more verbal aggression and love withdrawal.

In the third regression analysis in which depression was the dependent variable, the full set of positive discipline variables in Step 1 statistically significantly explained 6% of the

variance. The addition of the coercive/power assertive variables to the model on Step 2 explained an additional variance 4% of the variance.

A comparison of the standardized Betas revealed that in the model with only positive discipline variables on Step 1, positive modeling, inductive reasoning, and natural consequences were the only variables that made unique contributions to the explanation of variance in depression. In this case, as young adult females recalled receiving more positive modeling, they reported fewer depression symptoms. Conversely, as young adult females recalled receiving more inductive reasoning and more natural consequences, their reports of depressive symptoms increased. When all positive discipline variables and all coercive/power assertive variables were entered into the regression equation on Step 2, only positive modeling and verbal aggression made unique contributions to the explanation of variance in young adult females' depression symptoms. In this case, young adult females who recalled receiving more positive modeling and less verbal aggression reported fewer depressive symptoms than young adult females who recalled receiving less positive modeling and more verbal aggression.

In sum, as a group, the positive discipline variables were predictive of each dependent variable (history of externalizing behaviors, current attachment to mother, and depression), but the coercive/power assertive punishments were only able to explain additional variance in current attachment to mother and depression. Positive modeling and verbal aggression were especially predictive of all three young adult outcomes (history of externalizing behaviors, current attachment to mother, and depression) in the expected directions. In contrast, inductive reasoning, natural consequences, and unrelated consequences were predictive of one or more outcomes but in the opposite direction from what was expected. Monitoring was related to a

lower history of externalizing behavior problems, yet it was also related to lower current attachment to mother.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Several findings emerged from this study which merit discussion. First, for both males and females, more of the variables were predictive of current attachment to mother and depressive symptoms than history of externalizing behavior problems. Regarding the predictive ability of the individual variables, recollections of parents' verbal aggression appeared to impact young adults, both males and females, very negatively. That is, for young adult males, it was the strongest predictor of having a history of externalizing behavior problems. For young adult females, recollections of parents' verbal aggression were related to all three outcomes, but it appears to be especially damaging to young adult females' current attachment to their mothers. This finding is consistent with previous research which also found that parents' verbal aggression impacted children's relational satisfaction and closeness to parents (Carlyle et al., 2005). Straus and Field (2003) argued that verbal aggression has the potential of being the most damaging of all of the punishments. Their findings from a national survey found that nearly all parents admit to engaging in mild verbal aggression with younger children, and half of all parents admit to engaging in more serious verbal aggression with adolescent children. More severe verbal aggression involves calling a child names which demean the child's character; therefore, it is not surprising that the present study found that young adult females' recollections of parents' use of verbal aggression was related to a greater number of depressive symptoms as well as lower current attachment to their mothers.

Another coercive/power assertive punishment that was related to both male and female young adults' current attachment to their mothers was recollections of parents' use of love withdrawal. Love withdrawal involves withholding love, affection, and attention from a child, thus making the quality of parenting inconsistent. This finding lends further support to attachment theory, which purports that parents' inconsistency in providing attention, love, and affection puts parents and their children at risk for developing an insecure attachment relationship (Huffmeijer et al., 2011).

Young adults' recollections of their parents engaging in physical aggression (physical punishment) were not related to any of the outcomes at the multivariate level. This was likely due to shared variance between physical aggression and one or more of the other independent variables, especially parents' use of verbal aggression. At the bivariate level, however, both male and female young adults' recollections of parents' use of physical aggression was related to two of the outcomes, current attachment to mother and depressive symptoms. Parents' use of physical aggression was also related to history of externalizing behaviors, but only for females. For males, the correlation between parents' use of physical aggression was not significant at .05 level of statistical significance ($r = .15$, $p = .18$, two-tailed test). The bivariate correlations between parents' use of physical aggression and lower current attachment to mother was about the same for males and for females ($r = -.26$ for males and $r = -.30$ for females). These findings are consistent with other previous investigations which link parents' use of corporal punishment to lower parent-child attachment (Gershoff, 2002; Jordan & Curtner-Smith, 2011). The correlation between parents' use of physical aggression and depressive symptoms was stronger for males than for females ($r = .30$ for males; $r = .15$ for females). It is likely that males in this sample were more often the recipients of parents' physical aggression than females given that

previous investigations found that parents are much more likely to use physical punishment with boys than with girls (Gershoff, 2002; Straus & Donnelly, 2001). This difference may account for why the correlation between parents' use of physical aggression and depressive symptoms was stronger for males than for females. All in all, findings from the present study were similar to the findings of other investigations which linked physical punishment to depression, antisocial behavior, and poor relationships with parents and other adults with authority (Bender et al., 2007; Straus et al., 1994; Wu, 2007).

Several positive discipline techniques were related to young adults' outcomes. For example, positive modeling was related to stronger current attachment to mother and fewer depressive symptoms for young females. More than likely, parents who engage in higher rates of positive modeling are also warm and affectionate, which fosters stronger parent attachments and helps children feel more secure and accepted. Increased felt security reduces children's susceptibility to depressive symptoms. These findings are consistent with social cognitive learning theory which suggests that children are more likely to identify with and imitate a model whom they perceive as warm and approachable (Bandura, 1989).

Positive modeling was also predictive of a lower history of externalizing behavior problems for females, but not for males. It is possible that the small sample of young adult males relative to the large sample size of young adult females could explain this difference in findings. On the other hand, it is surprising that none of the positive discipline techniques predicted a lower history of externalizing behaviors for the males. This is likely because of the way that history of externalizing behaviors was measured. Recall that this construct was measured by asking participants about their history of criminal behavior, history of antisocial behavior, and history of alcohol and substance abuse. The males in this small sample of middle- to upper-class

university students are not likely to have a history of criminal or antisocial behaviors. The variability in this variable reflects the participants' use of alcohol and drugs. The restricted range of variability and the small sample of males together make it difficult to find statistically significant relationships between history of externalizing behaviors and any of the discipline and punishment variables, especially in a multiple regression analysis. In addition, it is possible that recollections of parents' discipline and punishments received at age 10 have a very weak relationship to history of alcohol consumption among a population of university students for whom alcohol consumption is common.

Some of the positive discipline variables were related to both male and female young adult outcomes but not in the directions that were expected. This was especially the case for natural and logical consequences, and these relationships were found in the multiple regression analyses as well as the bivariate analyses. It is difficult to measure various forms of consequences for children's transgressions without also knowing the actual child transgressions for which the consequences were imposed. This is because to accurately classify the type of consequence imposed requires knowledge of the child's transgression. For example, a logical consequence for a child who refuses to clean her room is not to allow her to leave the house and go out with friends until she cleans her room. In this study, a participant who may have received this consequence for this transgression would have received a higher score for unrelated consequences rather than logical consequences. This is because the item, "How often did your mother ground you or restrict your activities outside of the home because of misbehavior?" is in the scale for unrelated consequences. The only item assessing logical consequences is one that asks participants if they ever had to make up for or make restitution for bad behavior. Making restitution is certainly a logical consequence, but many daily transgressions do not require

making restitution. For example, not allowing a child to have a dessert because she did not eat some of her dinner is a logical consequence that does not require making restitution. Also regarding the problematic nature of measuring consequences is that in this study, the single-item measure for natural consequences was, “How often did your mother let you misbehave so that you would have to deal with the results?” Without knowing the circumstances of the misbehavior, the item fails to distinguish between parents who let their children misbehave because they are permissive and parents who let their children misbehave because they want the child to experience the natural consequence which they hope will reinforce the desired behavior.

Inductive reasoning also was differentially related to young adult male and young adult female outcomes. For males, more recollections of parents’ use of inductive reasoning were related to stronger current attachment to mother and fewer depression symptoms. These findings were expected given that parents who use inductive reasoning tend to be empathic themselves and are likely to engage in parenting behaviors that foster stronger parent-child attachment bonds thereby lowering sons’ susceptibility to depressive symptoms. For young adult females in this study, more recollections of parents’ use of inductive reasoning was related to stronger history of externalizing behaviors and an increase in depressive symptoms. This runs counter to theories about how inductive reasoning should deter children’s externalizing behaviors and is, therefore, difficult to explain. Inductive reasoning is intended to help children understand why there are rules and how breaking a rule or violation affects other people. Parents whose children continue to break a rule even after the parents have engaged the child in inductive reasoning may need to use a combined strategy involving both inductive reasoning and an appropriate consequence. Unfortunately, the data for the current study were not able to test combined effects of various forms of positive discipline strategies for children who continue to misbehave. This study also

found that for females, recollections of parents' use of inductive reasoning was related to increased depressive symptoms. Although speculative, it is possible that inductive reasoning that focuses too much on how the misbehavior was harmful to others may induce unhealthy levels of guilt, particularly in females, which may later place the girls at risk for depressive symptoms. Again, unfortunately, there was no way to test this theory with the data in the present study.

Another major finding from this study was that young adults recalled that their parents relied on a variety of positive discipline techniques and coercive/power assertive punishments. In this study, the dominant recollections of parents' responses to child misbehavior were positive discipline techniques. That is, positive modeling was recalled by 95% of participants, inductive reasoning was recalled by 97% of participants, and monitoring was recalled by 95% of participants. Punishments, particularly the more harsh and severe forms of punishments, were recalled by far fewer participants than the positive discipline techniques. For example, verbal aggression was recalled by 87% of participants, physical aggression was recalled by 79% of participants, and love withdrawal was recalled by 64% of participants. A high percentage of participants (98%) could recall their parents using unrelated consequences. This is probably because the category encompasses a wide variety of consequences for punishments. As previously mentioned, consequences are difficult to accurately categorize without knowing the actual transgression for which the consequence was imposed. Thus, some consequences that should be identified as logical or natural were probably identified by participants as unrelated. Additionally, many parents of the participants may have lacked knowledge about the difference between natural and logical consequences versus unrelated consequences. Parents may have been more likely to impose unrelated consequences because they believed that imposing a nonphysical consequence, regardless of the type, was preferable to administering corporal punishment.

Unfortunately, racial variations in how the positive discipline techniques and coercive/power assertive punishments relate to the young adult outcomes could not be adequately examined. This was due to the small sample of minority participants in this study. Nonetheless, a comparison was made between the percentage of Caucasian young adults who could ever recall each positive discipline technique and each coercive/power assertive punishment versus the percentage of African American young adults who could ever recall each positive discipline technique and each coercive/power assertive punishment. There were differences between the two ethnic groups on 5 of the 12 discipline techniques and punishments. In particular, more Caucasian young adults could recall ever receiving logical consequences, monitoring, praise, love withdrawal, and forced apology than African American young adults. There were no differences in the percentages of young adults who could ever recall the more harsh, severe forms of punishment, such as verbal aggression and physical aggression. Although parental warmth was not measured directly in this study, the lack of differences between the two groups on positive discipline techniques such as positive modeling, inductive reasoning, natural consequences, and redirection combined with the lack of differences in recall for verbal aggression and physical aggression suggests that the young adults across both ethnic groups were fairly similar in receiving parental warmth and affection. This finding runs counter to what was expected. Other studies examining variations in parenting and family processes in minority families find that minority parents, particularly African American parents, use corporal punishment more frequently than Caucasian parents (Straus & Donnelly, 2001).

Even fewer differences were found for the percentages of males versus females in their recall of ever receiving positive discipline versus coercive/power assertive techniques. The few differences in recall were that males could recall more instances of ever receiving logical

consequences, love withdrawal, and parents' physical aggression. Finding that young adult males could recall ever receiving more physical aggression from parents than young adult females is consistent with previous investigations that find that boys are more often the recipients of corporal punishment than girls (Gershoff, 2002; Straus & Donnelly, 2001).

Several limitations of this study should be noted. The sample size of male young adults was much smaller in comparison to the sample size of female young adults. Therefore, it is difficult to draw strong conclusions regarding gender differences between the statistical models. Likewise, the sample size of African American young adults was much smaller relative to the sample size of Caucasian young adults. Thus, meaningful comparisons of how the discipline variables and how the punishment variables related to the outcome variables by race and gender could not be performed. In particular, the number of African American males in the sample was so small ($n=8$), that plans to analyze the data for gender and race interactions were dropped. Future research that includes a larger subsample of African American young adults, both male and females, is needed. Another limitation is that some of the parenting variables relied on single-item measures (e.g., positive modeling, inductive reasoning, natural consequences, logical consequences, redirection, praise, and forced apology). In general, single-item measures tend to be less reliable and include more measurement error of a construct than multiple-item measures. In addition, the measurement of consequences without knowing the misdeeds for which the consequences were imposed is problematic and potentially allow for measurement error. Future research focusing on refining the measures of discipline techniques and punishments is needed so that all assessments include multiple-item scales. An additional limitation is that this study relied on participants' recall of parenting they received at age 10. It may be difficult for individuals to accurately recall their misbehaviors and consequences to those misbehaviors

which happened so long ago. Future research may involve assessing parents' positive discipline techniques and coercive/power assertive punishments and relating them to assessments of their 10-year-old children's externalizing behaviors, internalizing behaviors, and parent-child attachment quality. Special effort could be made to assess parents' use of combined strategies to deterring externalizing behaviors (e.g., the use of both inductive reasoning and either logical or natural consequences).

Another major limitation of these data is that because they are correlational in nature, causality cannot be inferred. The findings presented here suggest that parenting at age 10 years affects young adults' outcomes. However, it is possible that the quality of parent-child attachment, level of externalizing behaviors, and depression prior to when participants were 10 years old influenced the discipline techniques and punishments given by their parents. Given the exploratory nature of this study, the small subsample sizes, and the measurement issues for some of the discipline techniques and punishments employed, replication of the study is advisable. Nonetheless despite these limitations, this study demonstrates some fairly strong links between recollections of parents' use of positive discipline and coercive/power assertive punishments to young adults' history of externalizing behaviors, current attachment to their mothers, and depressive symptoms.

Findings from this study fill some gaps in the literature on parents' use of positive discipline and coercive/power assertive punishments. First, this study hopes to move the field forward by differentiating between positive discipline techniques and coercive/power assertive punishments, which have differential effects on child outcomes. Second, this study provides additional information about the frequency with which parents use discipline techniques and punishments. Most of what is known about parents' responses to children's misbehaviors focuses

on parents' use of corporal punishment or harsh physical discipline. Few studies have examined parents' use of positive discipline techniques of redirection, natural and logical consequences, and inductive reasoning, even though these techniques are routinely taught in parent education programs.

Findings from this study have implications for parent educators and practitioners who work with families with children. Specifically, the findings provide evidence for why parents should avoid certain coercive power assertive punishments and adopt certain positive discipline techniques. In particular, a major effort in parent education programs should focus on informing parents of the potentially damaging effect of verbal aggression and love withdrawal on their children, as well as physical aggression. Also, parents could be taught how to develop and impose natural and logical consequences for their children's transgressions so that they do not rely on unrelated consequences. Finally, and not surprisingly, this study found that parental positive modeling and praise were related to positive young adult outcomes. Thus, parent educators are encouraged to continue to inform parents about the benefits of modeling and praising their children for engaging in desired behaviors.

REFERENCES

- American Academy of Pediatrics. (1998). *American Academy of Pediatrics: Guidance for effective discipline*. Retrieved September 5, 2011 from <http://aappolicy.aappublications.org/cgi/content/full/pediatrics;104/4/723>
- Armsden, G. C., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment: Individual differences and their relationships to psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16*, 427-454.
- Arredondo, E. M., Elder, J. P., Ayala, G. X., Campbell, N., Baquero, B., & Duerkson, S. (2006). Is parenting style related to children's healthy eating and physical activity in Latino families? *Health Education Research, 21*, 862-871.
- Azrin, N. H., & Holz, W. C. (1966). Punishment. In W. K. Honig (Ed.), *Operant behavior* (pp. 380-447). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Bacchini, D., Miranda, M.C., & Affuso, G. (2010). Effects of parental monitoring and exposure to community violence on antisocial behavior and anxiety/depression among adolescents. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(2), 269-292.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Perceived self-efficacy in the exercise of personal agency. *The Psychologist: Bulletin of the British Psychological Society, 2*, 411-424.
- Baumrind, D., & Black, A. E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. *Child Development, 38*, 291-327.
- Beck, A. T., Ward, C., & Mendelson, M. (1961). Beck Depression Inventory (BDI). *Archives of General Psychiatry, 4*(6), 561-571.
- Bender, H. L., Allen, J. A., McElhaney, K. B., Antonishak, J., Moore, C. M., Kelly, H. O., & Davis, S. M. (2007). Use of harsh physical discipline and developmental outcomes in adolescence. *Development and Psychopathology, 19*, 227-242.
- Bowlby, J (1968). Effects on behavior of disruption of an affectional bond. *Eugenics Society Symposia, 4*, 94-108.

- Bretherton, I. (1992). The origins of attachment theory: John Bowlby & Mary Ainsworth. *Developmental Psychology, 28*(5), 759-775.
- Brookmeyer, K. A., Henrich, C. C., & Schwab-Stone, M. (2005). Adolescents who witness community violence: Can parent support and prosocial cognitions protect them from committing violence? *Child Development, 76*(4), 917-929.
- Bugental, D. B., & Goodnow, J. J. (1998) Socialization processes. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & N. Eisenberg (Volume Ed.) *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (vol. 3, pp. 389-462). New York: Wiley.
- Carlyle, K., McClure, L., & Roberto, A. (2005). *The relationship between parents' use of verbal and physical aggression and children's relational satisfaction and closeness with their parents*. Conference Papers—International Communication Association; 2005 Annual Meeting, New York, NY, 1-29, New York, New York City: Sheraton.
- Dinkmeyer, D., & McKay, G. (1989). *Systematic training for effective parenting: The parent's handbook* (3rd ed.). Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Services.
- Eamon, M. K., & Zuehl, R. M. (2001). Maternal depression and physical punishment as mediators of the effect of poverty on socioemotional problems of children in single-mother families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 71*, 218-226.
- Fletcher, A. C., Elder, G. H., Jr., & Mekos, D. (2000). Parental influences on adolescent involvement in community activities. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 10*, 29-48.
- Gengler, C. (2011). *Discipline vs. punishment*. Retrieved May 28, 2012, from <http://www.extension.umn.edu/distribution/familydevelopment/00090.html>
- 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.
- Gray, M. R., & Steinberg, L. (1999). Unpacking authoritative parenting: Reassessing a multidimensional construct. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61*, 574-587.
- Grogan-Kaylor, A. (2004). The effect of corporal punishment on antisocial behavior in children. *National Association of Social Workers, 28*, 153-162.
- Grolnick, W. S. & Pomerantz, E. M. (2009). Issues and challenges in studying parental control: Toward a new conceptualization. *Child Development & Perspectives, 3*(3), 165-170.
- 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.

- Hamza, C., & Willoughby, T. (2011). Perceived parental monitoring, adolescent disclosure, and adolescent depressive symptoms: A longitudinal examination. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *40*, 902-915.
- Heath, P. (2013). *Parent-child relations: Context, research, and application* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1979). Development of moral thought, feeling and behavior. *American Psychology*, *34*(10), 958–965.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., Battiato, A. C., Walker, J. M., Reed, R. P., DeJong, J., & Jones, K. P. (2001). Parental involvement in homework. *Educational Psychologist*, *36*(3), 195-209.
- Huffmeijer, R. Tops, M., Alink, L. R., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van Ijzendoorn, M. H (2011). Love withdrawal is related to heightened processing of faces with emotional expressions and incongruent emotional feedback. *Biological Psychology*, *86*, 307-313.
- Infante, D. A., & Wigley, C. J. (1986). Verbal aggressiveness: An interpersonal model and measure. *Communication Monographs*, *53*, 61-69.
- Jordan, E. F., & Curtner-Smith, M. E. (2011). *Multiple indicators of corporal punishment and current attachment to mother*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, Orlando, FL, November 17, 2011.
- Kerr, M., Stattin, H., & Burk, W. (2010). A reinterpretation of parental monitoring in longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *20*, 39-64.
- Klein, A. S. (2008). Guiding young children: 21 strategies. *Early Childhood News: The Professional Resource for Teachers and Parents*. Retrieved from http://www.earlychildhoodnews.com/earlychildhood/article_view.aspx?ArticleID=8 on June 11, 2012.
- Kochanska, G., & Thompson, R. (1997). The emergence and development of conscience in toddlerhood and early childhood. In J. E. Grusec & L. Kuczynski (Eds.), *Parenting strategies and children's internalization of values: A handbook of theoretical and research perspectives* (pp. 53-77). New York: Wiley.
- Kuczynski, L. & Hildebrandt, N. (1997). Models of conformity and resistance in socialization theory. In J. E. Grusec & L. Kuczynski (Eds.), *Parenting and the internalization of values: A handbook of contemporary theory* (pp. 227-252). New York: Wiley.
- Larzelere, R. E. & Kuhn, B. R. (2005). Comparing child outcomes of physical punishment and alternative disciplinary tactics: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, *8*(1), 1-37.
- Lasky, M. R. (1993). Family genesis of aggression. *Psychiatric Annuals*, *23*, 494-499.

- Latham, G. I. (2008). Coercion: The real parent trap, part 1 (of 2). *Behaviorology Today*, 2, 36-38.
- Levy, K. N., Blatt, S. J., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Attachment styles & parental representations. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 74(2), 407-419.
- Lopez, N. L., Bonenberger, J. L. & Schneider, H. G. (2001). Parental disciplinary history, current levels of empathy, and moral reasoning in young adults. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 3(1), 193-204.
- Lytton, H. & Romney, D. M. (1991). Parents' differential socialization of boys and girls: Meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109(2), 267-296.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen & E. M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Socialization, personality, and social development* (vol. 3, pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.
- McKinney, C., Milone, M. C., & Renk, K. (2011). Parenting and Late Adolescent Emotional Adjustment: Mediating Effects of Discipline and Gender. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 42, 463-481.
- McLoyd, V., & Smith, J. (2002). Physical discipline and behavior problems in African American, European American, and Hispanic children: Emotional support as a moderator. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 40-53.
- Milne, D. (n. d.). Discipline vs. punishment. Retrieved May 28, 2012, from <http://extension.missouri.edu/extensioninfonet/article.asp?id=2100>
- National Mental Health Association. (2003). *The strengthening families fact sheet*. Retrieved September 20, 2011 from http://www.mhatexas.org/mhatexasMAIN/10._%20Effective_Discipline_Techniques_For_Parents_Alternative_to_spanking.pdf
- Parke, R. D. (1977). Some effects of punishment on children's behavior—Corporal punishment revisited. In E. M. Hetherington & R. D. Parke (Eds.), *Contemporary readings in child psychology* (pp. 208-220). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. B. & Dishion, T. J. (1992). *Antisocial boys*. Eugene, OR: Castalia.
- Roberto, A. J., Carlyle, K. E. & McClure, L. (2006). Communication and corporal punishment: The relationship between parents' use of verbal and physical aggression. *Communication Research Reports*, 23, 27-33.
- Saarni, C., Mumme, D. L., & Campos, J. J. (1998). Emotional development: Action, communication, and understanding. In W. Damon (Editor-in-chief) and N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 237-309). New York: Wiley.

- Socolar, R. R. S., Winsor, J., Hunter, W. M., Catellier, D., & Kotch, J. B. (1999). Maternal disciplinary practices in an at-risk population. *Archives of Pediatric Adolescent Medicine, 153*, 927-934.
- Sroufe, A. L. (2005). Attachment and development: A prospective, longitudinal study from birth to adulthood. *Attachment & Human Development, 7*(4), 349-367.
- Stattin, H., & Kerr, M. (2000). Parental monitoring: A reinterpretation. *Child Development, 71*(4), 1072-1085.
- Steinberg, L. (1990). Autonomy, conflict, and harmony in the family relationship. In S. Feldman & G. Elliot (Eds.), *At the threshold: The developing adolescent* (pp. 255-276). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stosny, S. (2011, February 11). Compassionate parenting: Still having Tiger Mom nightmares? *Anger in the Age of Entitlement*. Retrieved from <http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/anger-in-the-age-entitlement/201102/compassionate-parenting>
- Stormshak, E. A., Bierman, K. L., McMahon, R. J., & Lengua, L. J. (2002). Parenting practices and child disruptive behavior problems in early elementary school. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 29*, 17-29.
- Straus, Z., Dodge, K. A., & Pettit, G. S. (1994). Spanking in the home and children's subsequent aggression toward kindergarten peers. *Development and Psychopathology, 6*, 445-461.
- Straus, M. A., & Donnelly, D. (2001). *Beating the devil out of them: Corporal punishment in American families and its effects on children*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Straus, M. A., & Fauchier, A. (2011). *Manual for the Dimensions of Discipline Inventory (DDI)*. Durham, NH: Family Research Laboratory, University of New Hampshire. Retrieved June 11, 2012 from <http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/>
- Straus, M. A., & Field, C. J. (2003). Psychological aggression by American parents: National data on prevalence, chronicity, and severity. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65*, 795-808.
- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues, 17*(3), 283-316.
- Telep, V. (2009). *Discipline for young children—Discipline and Punishment: What is the difference?* Retrieved May 28, 2012, from <http://pubs.ext.vt.edu/350/350-111/350111.html>
- Van Houten, R. (1983) Punishment: From the animal laboratory to the applied setting. In S. Axelrod & J. Apsche (Eds.), *The effects of punishment on human behavior* (pp. 13–14). New York: Academic.

Wu, C-I. (2007). The interlocking trajectories between parenting practices and adolescent depressive symptoms in Taiwan. *Current Sociology*, 55, 579-597.

Appendix A
Demographics

1. Your sex: Male
 Female
2. Your racial/ethnic identification Asian
 African-American/Black
 Caucasian/White
 Native American/Pacific Islander
 Hispanic/Latino
 More than one race
 Other

Appendix B

Dimensions of Discipline Questionnaire

We would like to find out what your mother did to correct your misbehavior. Circle your response. Please use this answer key:

- 0= Never 1= Not in that year, but in another year 2= 1-2 times in that year
 3= 3-5 times in that year 4= 6-9 times in that year
 5=Monthly (10 to 14 times in that year) 6= A few times a month (2-3 times a month)
 7= Weekly (1-2 times in a week) 8= Several times a week (3-4 times)
 9= Daily (5 or more times a week) 10= Two or more times a day

What did your mother do to correct your misbehavior when you misbehaved (minor or severe) at age 10:

1. How often did your mother explain the rules to you to try to prevent you from repeating misbehavior?
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2. How often did your mother take away your allowances, toys, or other privileges because of misbehavior?
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3. How often did your mother put you in "time out" or send you to your room?
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
4. How often did your mother shout or yell at you?
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
5. How often did your mother shake or grab you to get your attention?
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
6. How often did your mother give you something else you might like to do instead of what you were doing wrong?
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
7. How often did your mother try to make you feel ashamed or guilty?
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
8. How often did your mother deliberately not pay attention when you misbehaved?
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
9. How often did your mother spank, slap, smack, or swat you?
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
10. How often did your mother use a paddle, hairbrush, belt or other object for discipline purposes?
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
11. How often did your mother praise you for finally stopping bad behavior or for behaving well?
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

12. How often did your mother hold back affection by acting cold or not giving hugs or kisses?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
13. How often did your mother send you to bed without a meal?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
14. How often did your mother tell you that they were watching or checking to see if you did something?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
15. How often did your mother give you money or other things for finally stopping bad behavior or for behaving well?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
16. How often did your mother show or demonstrate to you the right thing to do?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
17. How often did your mother let you misbehave so that you would have to deal with the results?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
18. How often did your mother give you extra chores as a consequence?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
19. How often did your mother make you do something to make up for some misbehavior; for example pay for a broken window?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
20. When you behaved badly, how often did your mother tell you that you were lazy, sloppy, thoughtless, or some other name like that?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
21. How often did your mother withhold your allowances, toys, or other privileges until you did what they wanted you to do?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
22. How often did your mother check on you to see if you were misbehaving?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
23. How often did your mother check on you so that they could tell you that you were doing a good job?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
24. How often did your mother make you apologize or say you were sorry for misbehavior?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
25. How often did your mother wash your mouth out with soap, put hot sauce on your tongue, or something similar?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
26. How often did your mother ground you or restrict your activities outside of the home because of misbehavior?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Appendix C

Personal and Relationships Profile: Selected Subscales and Items

PRP Antisocial Personality

1. I feel sorry when I hurt someone.
1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Agree 4-Strongly Agree
2. I often do things that other people think are dangerous.
1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Agree 4-Strongly Agree
3. I don't think about how what I do will affect other people.
1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Agree 4-Strongly Agree
4. I often lie to get what I want.
1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Agree 4-Strongly Agree
5. I have trouble following the rules at work or in school.
1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Agree 4-Strongly Agree

PRP Criminal Behavior

1. Since age 15, I have physically attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them.
1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Agree 4-Strongly Agree
2. Since age 15, I hit or threatened to hit someone who is not a member of my family.
1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Agree 4-Strongly Agree
3. Since age 15, I have stolen money (from anyone, including family).
1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Agree 4-Strongly Agree

PRP Substance Abuse

1. When I am drinking I usually have five or more drinks at a time.
1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Agree 4-Strongly Agree
2. I worry that I have an alcohol problem.
1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Agree 4-Strongly Agree
3. Sometimes I can't remember what happened the night before because of drinking.
1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Agree 4-Strongly Agree

Appendix D
Major Depression Inventory

These questions ask about how you have been feeling over the last TWO weeks.

1. Have you felt low in spirits or sad?
5- All of the time 4-Most of the time 3- More than half of the time
2- Less than half of the time 1-Some of the time 0-At no time
2. Have you lost interest in your daily activities?
5- All of the time 4-Most of the time 3- More than half of the time
2- Less than half of the time 1-Some of the time 0-At no time
3. Have you felt lacking in energy and strength?
5- All of the time 4-Most of the time 3- More than half of the time
2- Less than half of the time 1-Some of the time 0-At no time
4. Have you felt less self-confident?
5- All of the time 4-Most of the time 3- More than half of the time
2- Less than half of the time 1-Some of the time 0-At no time
5. Have you had a bad conscience or feelings of guilt?
5- All of the time 4-Most of the time 3- More than half of the time
2- Less than half of the time 1-Some of the time 0-At no time
6. Have you felt that life wasn't worth living?
5- All of the time 4-Most of the time 3- More than half of the time
2- Less than half of the time 1-Some of the time 0-At no time
7. Have you had difficulty concentrating, e.g., when reading the newspaper or watching TV?
5- All of the time 4-Most of the time 3- More than half of the time
2- Less than half of the time 1-Some of the time 0-At no time

time

8. Have you felt very restless?

5- All of the time

4-Most of the time

3- More than half of the time

2- Less than half of the time

1-Some of the time

0-At no time

9. Have you felt subdued or slowed down?

5- All of the time

4-Most of the time

3- More than half of the time

2- Less than half of the time

1-Some of the time

0-At no time

10. Have you had trouble sleeping at night?

5- All of the time

4-Most of the time

3- More than half of the time

2- Less than half of the time

1-Some of the time

0-At no time

11. Have you suffered from reduced appetite?

5- All of the time

4-Most of the time

3- More than half of the time

2- Less than half of the time

1-Some of the time

0-At no time

12. Have you suffered from increased appetite?

5- All of the time

4-Most of the time

3- More than half of the time

2- Less than half of the time

1-Some of the time

0-At no time

Appendix E
Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA)

1. My mother respects my feelings.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
2. I feel my mother does a good job as a mother.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
3. I wish I had a different mother.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
4. My mother accepts me as I am.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
5. I like to get my mother's point of view on things I'm concerned about.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
6. I feel it's no use letting my feelings show around my mother.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
7. My mother can tell when I'm upset about something.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
8. Talking over my problems with my mother makes me feel ashamed or foolish.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
9. My mother expects too much from me.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
10. I get upset easily around my mother.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
11. I get upset a lot more than my mother knows about.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
12. When we discuss things, my mother cares about my point of view.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
13. My mother trusts my judgment.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true

14. My mother has her own problems, so I don't bother her with mine.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
15. My mother helps me to understand myself better.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
16. I feel my mother helps me to understand myself better.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
17. I feel angry with my mother.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
18. I don't get much attention from my mother.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
19. My mother helps me to talk about difficulties.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
20. My mother understands me.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
21. When I am angry about something, my mother tries to be understanding.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
22. I trust my mother.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
23. My mother doesn't understand what I'm going through these days.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
24. I can count on my mother when I need to get something off of my chest.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true
25. If my mother knows something is bothering me, she asks me about it.
1-Almost never or never true 2-Not very often true 3-Some times true
4-Often true 5-Almost always or always true

Office for Research
Institutional Review Board for the
Protection of Human Subjects

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA
R E S E A R C H

October 20, 2011

Equiller Mahone
Human Development & Family Studies
College of Human Environmental Sciences
Box 870160

Re: IRB # EX-11-CM-077 "Young Adult's Recalled Experiences of
Nonphysical Discipline and Related Outcomes"

Dear Ms. Mahone:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted
approval for your proposed research.

Your protocol has been given exempt approval according to 45 CFR part
46.101(b)(4) as outlined below:

*(4) Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents,
records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources
are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator
in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through
identifiers linked to the subjects.*

Your application will expire on October 19, 2012. If your research will
continue beyond this date, complete the relevant portions of Continuing
Review and Closure Form. If you wish to modify the application,
complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. When the
study closes, complete the appropriate portions of FORM: Continuing
Review and Closure.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this
proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely _____



Carpartato T. Myles, MSM, CIM
Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office for Research Compliance
The University of Alabama

358 Rose Administration Building
Box 870127
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0127
(205) 348-8461
FAX (205) 348-7189
TOLL FREE (877) 820-3066

SEP 14 2011 PM 02:40

IRB Project #:

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS
REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

I. Identifying information

	Principal Investigator	Second Investigator	Third Investigator
Names:	Equiller Mahone	Dr. Mary Elizabeth Curtner-Smith	
Department:	Human Development	Human Development	
College:			
University:	University of Alabama	University of Alabama	
Address:		224 Child Development Research Center	
Telephone:	(334) 695-8263	(206) 595-0333	
FAX:			
E-mail:	emahone@crimson.ua.edu	mcurtner@ches.ua.edu	

Title of Research Project: Young Adult's Recalled Experiences of Nonphysical Discipline and Related Outcomes

Date Submitted: 09/14/11
Funding Source:

Type of Proposal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Renewal Please attach a renewal application	<input type="checkbox"/> Completed	<input type="checkbox"/> Exempt
Please attach a continuing review of studies form					
Please enter the original IRB # at the top of the page					

UA faculty or staff member signature: _____

II. NOTIFICATION OF IRB ACTION (to be completed by IRB):

Type of Review: _____ Full board _____ Expedited Exempt

IRB Action:

Rejected Date: _____

Tabled Pending Revisions Date: _____

Approved Pending Revisions Date: _____

Approved-this proposal complies with University and federal regulations for the protection of human subjects.

Approval is effective until the following date: 10/19/2012

Items approved: Research protocol (dated 10/20/11)

Informed consent (dated _____)

Recruitment materials (dated _____)

Other (dated _____)

Approval signature: I U Date 10/20/2011