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This study assessed prospective, bidirectional associations between maternal endorsement of spanking and children’s internalizing and externalizing behavior problems in low-income urban African American and Hispanic (N = 592) families drawn from the Three City Study. Children in sample families were followed from early childhood through middle childhood with 3 sets of interviews and assessments at ages 3, 4, and 9 years. Cross-lagged path analyses tested longitudinal bidirectional associations between parental endorsement of spanking and children’s internalizing and externalizing problems, with multi-group comparisons employed to test group differences between race/ethnic groups. African American and Hispanic mothers showed similar endorsements of spanking. Results suggest that associations between spanking endorsement and child functioning were due primarily to parenting effects, with spanking predicting changes in children’s behaviors, rather than child evocative effects, with limited evidence of child behaviors predicting changes in parental spanking. Maternal spanking endorsement predicted short-term decreases in children’s internalizing problems in early childhood, but over the longer term spanking was associated with increased internalizing and externalizing problems for both African American and Hispanic children in middle childhood among economically disadvantaged families.
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There is consensus in the literature that spanking is adversely associated with child functioning, particularly children’s aggressive behaviors and conduct problems (Gershoff, 2002). Despite strong bodies of research and recommendations from the American Academy of Pediatrics (1998) discouraging such behavior, spanking and other forms of corporal punishment continue to be widely endorsed disciplinary tactics. In fact, recent statistics show that nearly 80% of American preschool children are slapped or spanked (Zolotor, Theodore, Runyan, Chang, & Laskey, 2011). Given the dichotomy between the recommendations of professional organizations and the practices of parents, continued examination of parents’ use of spanking and associations with children’s socioemotional functioning is clearly warranted.

Much of the research on the repercussions of spanking focuses on children’s externalizing behaviors and is based on propositions from social learning theory that parents’ use of physical discipline will teach children behavioral scripts of aggressiveness which they will then employ themselves (Deater-Deckard & Dodge, 1997). That is, research has presumed that correlations between spanking and children’s behaviors derive from a causal link in which parental spanking leads to increases in children’s externalizing behavior problems. Recently, studies on parental spanking have begun to employ transactional theoretical models (Berlin et al., 2009; Gershoff, Lansford, Sexton, Davis-Kean, & Sameroff, 2012; Lansford et al., 2011; Maguire-Jack, Gromskes, & Berger, 2012) arguing that associations between parent and child behaviors may be driven at least in part by the influence of child characteristics and behaviors on parenting practices (Bell, 1968; Sameroff, 2009). Using both nationally representative and low-income community samples with infants to early adolescents, studies employing transactional models show some support for reciprocal relations between corporal punishment and children’s externalizing problems (Berlin et al., 2009; Gershoff et al., 2012; Lansford et al., 2011; Lansford, Wager, Bates, Dodge et al., 2012; Lansford, Wager, Bates, Pettit et al., 2012; Maguire-Jack et al., 2012). These studies generally reveal that, across periods of time ranging from 3 to 4 years, spanking is both predicted by children’s early externalizing problems and predictive of later externalizing problems. Although
the increasing use of longitudinal cross-lagged models represents a methodological improvement over unidirectional ordinary least square regression analyses (MacKenzie, Nicklas, Waldfogel, & Brooks-Gunn, 2012; Taylor, Manganello, Lee, & Rice, 2010), there remain important conceptual limitations of the extant literature linking parental spanking and child functioning.

One limitation of the existing literature on spanking is the lack of attention to children’s internalizing problems. Whereas social learning theory proposes that spanking leads to children’s increased use of aggression, attachment and emotional security theories suggest that children who experience harsh parenting may generalize their negative representations of parent–child interactions to themselves and to other interpersonal situations, thereby developing less emotional security and greater levels of sadness or anxiety (Davies, Harold, Goeke-Morey, & Cummings, 2002). This model proposes that parental spanking may lead to an increase in children’s internalizing problems. There is less of a theoretical rationale for child evocative effects in this realm, although it is plausible that children who exhibit behaviors such as sullenness, fearfulness, or a lack of response to parental requests or overtures may increase parental frustration, eventually evoking harsher disciplinary techniques from parents. Surprisingly few studies have addressed either the role of children’s internalizing problems in evoking corporal punishment or the role of the spankings in predicting heightened internalizing problems. The limited research addressing these issues shows that spanking predicted higher internalizing problems in both early childhood and early adolescence (Christie-Mizell, Pryor, & Grossman, 2008; Maguire-Jack et al., 2012; McKee et al., 2007). Children’s anxiety has been associated with lower parental warmth (Moore, Whaley, & Sigman, 2004), but also with lower, rather than higher, rates of parental spanking (Grogan-Kaylor & Otis, 2007). Only one study to date has explored relations between spanking and internalizing problems in cross-lagged models; in this diverse low-income sample, internalizing problems were not found to evoke increased parental spanking (Maguire-Jack et al., 2012). Together, this literature suggests that spanking will promote but not respond to internalizing problems, but the sparse evidence on reciprocal associations between spanking and internalizing behaviors warrants further examination.

A second limitation of the extant research considers the developmental timing of reciprocal associations between spanking and children’s functioning. On the whole, research on spanking and corporal punishment has studied children ranging in age from infancy through adolescence, but there is limited consensus about when spanking is most salient for children or the extent to which the consequences of spanking might last over time. The lack of converging evidence on this issue may be reflected in the short time periods across which many studies of parental spanking occur, primarily spanning 1 to 4 years and focusing on links from infancy to early childhood (Berlin et al., 2009; Maguire-Jack et al., 2012) or across middle childhood (Gershoff et al., 2012; Lansford et al., 2011; Lansford, Wager, Bates, Pettit, & Smith, 2002). Only one study by Lansford and colleagues (2004) explored long-term associations between spanking and children’s functioning in a community sample by computing early childhood (kindergarten) and late childhood (Grades 6 and 8) parental physical discipline composite variables. Results revealed that more physical discipline experienced in both early and late childhood predicted higher externalizing behaviors when youth were in 11th grade, with a stronger association for White in comparison with African American youth. Although this study explored long-term associations and racial/ethnic group differences, it neither addressed bidirectional associations between spanking and child behaviors, nor considered children’s internalizing problems. In short, the extant literature has not adequately explored how bidirectional links between spanking and children’s internalizing and externalizing problems evolve throughout early and into middle childhood, which are the primary developmental periods in which parents engage in spanking (Zolotor et al., 2011).

Relatively, one of the ongoing debates in the literature on corporal punishment addresses whether there are cultural or racial/ethnic differences in parents’ endorsement of spanking or in associations with children’s functioning. Some studies find that spanking predicts heightened child externalizing across multiple racial/ethnic groups including European Americans, African Americans, and Hispanics (Berlin et al., 2009; Gershoff et al., 2012; McLoyd & Smith, 2002); other studies have reported null effects or protective associations with externalizing problems in African American children (Christie-Mizell et al., 2008; Deater-Deckard, Dodge, Bates, & Pettit, 1996; Horn, Joseph, & Cheng, 2004; Stacks, Oshio, Gerard & Roe, 2009; Lansford et al., 2011; Lansford et al., 2012; Whaley, 2000) and Hispanic children (Slade & Wissow, 2004; Stacks et al., 2009). This literature suggests that parents’ reasons for spanking and the repercussions of spanking may differ across racial/ethnic groups.

Differences in parents’ use of spanking or in associations with children’s functioning may be driven by a variety of factors, including cultural beliefs and contextual forces. For example, Pinderhughes, Dodge, Bates, Pettit, and Amaldo (2000) found that African Americans more strongly endorsed spanking as a parenting technique than Whites (see also MacKenzie, Nicklas, Waldfogel, & Brooks-Gunn, 2011; Taylor, Hamvas & Paris, 2011). Similarly, results from two nationally representative studies showed that African American parents more strongly endorsed and frequently used spanking than White or Hispanic parents (Grogan-Kaylor & Otis, 2007; Slade & Wissow, 2004). On the other hand, these studies and others indicated that rates of spanking between White and Hispanic parents were not significantly different (MacKenzie et al., 2011). In an attempt to explain these findings, some have argued that African American parents’ endorsements of spanking are driven by beliefs that stricter, physical discipline will help to prepare children to face discrimination and that within a context in which such parenting behaviors are seen as more normative, spanking may have less of a negative influence on children’s behaviors (Thomas & Dettlaff, 2011). Much less attention has been paid to reasons for spanking among Hispanic families, but some research suggests that acculturative and nativity may play a role, with native-born U.S Hispanic mothers showing a higher propensity to spank (MacKenzie et al., 2011). However, there is limited evidence from prior literature on whether parents from different racial/ethnic groups differ in other reasons for spanking, such as in response to children’s characteristics or behaviors.

Furthermore, it remains unclear whether the more limited associations between spanking and children’s behavior problems among African American families can be explained by norms associated with race/ethnicity per se (Gershoff et al., 2012; MacKenzie et al., 2012; Mosby, Rawls, Meehan, Mays & Pettinari,
families identified as African American (n = 270) or Hispanic (n = 311), excluding White and other race/ethnicities (n = 55) because these subsamples were too small to analyze separately.

**Measures**

**Spanking.** Mothers’ endorsement of spanking was assessed at each wave with two items from the Parent Styles Scale (Shumow, Vandell, & Posner, 1998), “sometimes the child needs a good spanking to help him/her understand” and “I spank the child when he or she has done something really wrong” (1 = definitely true to 4 = definitely false). Items were strongly correlated within wave (r = .62 to .66, all p < .001) and were reversed and averaged such that higher scores indicate a greater endorsement of spanking. It is important to acknowledge that this measure taps into mothers’ endorsement and engagement in spanking but does not address the numerical frequency (in terms of times per month, e.g.) that mothers spank their children. Reports on spanking frequency (“During the past 12 months, how often have you spanked or hit [child]? 1 = almost every day to 6 = never”) were collected in the first two waves only, and hence could not be used in our longitudinal analyses. Correlations between this variable and our combined spanking endorsement variable were also strongly significant (r = .38 to .46, p < .001), supporting the validity of the spanking endorsement variable.

**Children’s functioning.** Children’s internalizing and externalizing problems were assessed at each wave using maternal reports on the age-appropriate full version of the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; Achenbach, 1991, 1992; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001), a well-validated and commonly used measure of children’s functioning. The CBCL externalizing subscale (α1–3 = .90 to .95) captures aggression, destructive behaviors, and rule breaking, and the internalizing subscale (α1–3 = .83 to .95) captures anxiety, depression, withdrawal, and somatic complaints. Standardized scores (t-scores) for each subscale were used as continuous measures of children’s internalizing and externalizing functioning.

**Covariates.** Child and maternal demographic characteristics were included as covariates in all analyses. Child characteristics included child’s age coded in months and child’s gender (1 = male, 0 = female). Race/ethnicity was designated by mothers and coded as African American (1) or Hispanic (0). Maternal marital status was coded using two indicators to delineate married (1) or cohabiting (1) versus single (0). Maternal educational attainment was coded as a continuous variable (1 = less than 8th grade to 8 = college degree or higher). Other family characteristics, such as income and employment, were not significantly associated with variables of interest in this economically disadvantaged sample and were excluded from final models.

**Statistical Methods**

Prospective cross-lagged structural equation models, alternately termed cross-lagged path or autoregressive models, between spanking and children’s internalizing and externalizing problems were tested using Mplus 6.0 (Muthén & Muthén, 2010). Path models can simultaneously analyze multiple concurrent and prospective associations between numerous variables, allowing assessment of bidirectional links between maternal spanking and...
children’s functioning across the three waves of data (Asher, 1983). Hence, these models incorporate temporality and reverse causation, and also allow for the modeling of continuity within constructs, thus helping to control for potential bias due to unmeasured influences from genetic or environmental forces not assessed in the current study.

There was a moderate amount of missing data on the primary constructs of interest, ranging from 1%–4% in Wave 1 to 25% in Wave 3, and a minimal amount of missing data on covariates, ranging from 0% to 1%, levels that are deemed acceptable to use in methods that appropriately address missing data (Enders, 2010). Little’s Chi Square test suggested that the data were missing completely at random, \( \chi^2 = 84.46, df = 84, p = .47 \). In order to address missing data concerns, analyses were estimated using full information maximum likelihood estimation (FIML), which produces unbiased parameter estimates using all of the observed information for each case and is preferred over multiple imputation in structural equation modeling (Enders, 2010). Analyses also employed population weights that adjust for sample stratification and differential response, making the sample representative of African American and Hispanic low-income children and families living in low-income neighborhoods in Boston, Chicago, and San Antonio.

Figure 1 presents our conceptual model. The model was specified to include both internalizing and externalizing problems, with the two domains of children’s functioning permitted to covary within each wave. The primary paths of interest in the models are the cross-lagged paths linking maternal spanking and children’s functioning between Waves 1 and 2 and Waves 2 and 3. Long-term cross-lagged paths linking Wave 1 and Wave 3 spanking and socioemotional functioning were examined but were not statistically significant and diminished the quality of model fit and consequently were not included in the final models. In line with past literature, models allowed longitudinal short- and long-term within-construct paths for spanking and children’s behaviors respectively (Berlin et al., 2009; Lansford et al., 2011, 2012; Maguire-Jack et al., 2012). Models also included covariates as predictors of both mother and child behaviors at all waves, allowing covariate paths to vary over the waves. These varying paths were included because associations might shift over time as children develop due to sleeper effects, reemergence of earlier patterns of behaviors, or newly emerging or heightened correlations (e.g., differences between male and female children’s externalizing problems may grow over time; Miner & Clark-Stewart, 2008). Allowing covariate paths to vary also significantly improved model fit.

The first SEM analysis assessed the cross-lagged path model for the full sample. Model fit was assessed using the chi-square statistic, which is sensitive to sample size; the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), a relative fit index in which values closer to 1.00 considered a good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999); the comparative fit index (CFI), an incremental fit index in which values close to or greater than .95 demonstrate a superior fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999); the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), related to the complexity of the model and thus sensitive to the number of estimated parameters, in which values less than .05 suggest a superior fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1993); and the standardized root-mean-square residual, an absolute fit index in which values less than .06 indicate strong fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). The second SEM analysis incorporated multiple group modeling techniques (Byrne, 2001) to test whether parameter estimates for the cross-lagged paths (between spanking and children’s internalizing and externalizing problems) were significantly different across racial/ethnic groups. For these models, chi-square difference tests were conducted to identify statistically significant group differences using the Satorra-Bentler scaled chi-square test (Satorra & Bentler, 2001), which allows for difference
testing in nested models that have been estimated using population weights.

Results

Table 1 presents weighted descriptives for the full sample as well as for the African American (41%) and Hispanic (59%) subsamples, with significant subgroup differences indicated with superscripts. Children averaged 3 years 5 months in Wave 1, 4 years 10 months in Wave 2, and 9 years 3 months in Wave 3, and half were male. The majority of mothers (59%) were single, 35% were married, and 6% cohabiting with a partner. Mothers’ average education level was a high school degree, and most families were poor, with an average income 85% of the federal poverty line (data not shown). African American mothers had higher levels of education and were more likely to be single, whereas Hispanic mothers had higher rates of marriage.

Turning to the primary variables of interest, Table 1 indicates that within this urban economically disadvantaged sample, maternal endorsement of spanking did not differ significantly between African American and Hispanic families. Children’s internalizing and externalizing scores were generally similar as well, with the exception that African American children received higher reports of both internalizing and externalizing problems in Wave 2 than their Hispanic peers. Table 2 presents bivariate correlations between all study variables.

Cross-Lagged Path Model Assessing Spanking and Children’s Behaviors

The full sample cross-lagged path model found that the data fit well with the conceptualized model, $\chi^2(16) = 43.78$, $p < .001$, CFI = .96, TLI = .77, RMSEA = .06, SRMR = .04. Table 3 presents the unstandardized and standardized estimates for the path coefficients of interest (covariate results available upon request), with the standardized estimates also shown in Figure 1. Covariances between internalizing and externalizing problems were strong, ranging from .47 to .77 across the waves (all $p < .001$). Results indicated significant continuity within both spanking endorsement and internalizing/externalizing problems. Adjusting for this within-construct continuity, results revealed that Wave 1 spanking was not significantly associated with Wave 2 externalizing, but Wave 2 spanking predicted increased externalizing problems at Wave 3 with a 1 standard deviation (SD) shift in spanking predicting a 0.22 SD increase in externalizing problems from Wave 2 to Wave 3 ($\beta = .22$, $p < .01$), reflecting a small negative longer-term effect of maternal spanking. No child evocative effects emerged, with children’s externalizing problems not significantly predicting mothers’ later spanking endorsement. Turning to cross-lagged paths with children’s internalizing problems, adjusting for the significant continuity in both children’s and maternal behaviors, results showed that higher spanking endorsement at Wave 1 predicted decreased internalizing problems at Wave 2 ($\beta = -.14$, $p < .05$), whereas spanking at Wave 2 predicted an increase in children’s internalizing problems at wave 3 ($\beta = .24$, $p < .01$). Again, no significant child evocative effects were found.

Differences Between African American and Hispanic Families

Multiple group path analyses were conducted to test for differences in associations between maternal spanking endorsement and children’s behaviors across African American and Hispanic families. Following Byrne’s instructions (2001), a comparison of the unconstrained and fully constrained models using the Satorra-Bentler scaled chi-square test (Satorra & Bentler, 2001) revealed a statistically significant difference, $\Delta \chi^2 = 85.71$, $\Delta df = 62$, $p < .05$, indicating that African American and Hispanic families differed at the model level. Subsequent analyses focused solely on the cross-lagged paths of interest, constraining one path at a time to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Combined sample (N = 581)</th>
<th>Black (n = 270)</th>
<th>Hispanic (n = 311)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M%</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanking1</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanking2</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanking3</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child functioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing problems1</td>
<td>30–91</td>
<td>51.36</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>52.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing problems2</td>
<td>30–82</td>
<td>48.87</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>51.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing problems3</td>
<td>33–84</td>
<td>53.04</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>54.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing problems1</td>
<td>30–92</td>
<td>51.85</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>53.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing problems2</td>
<td>30–80</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>50.01b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing problems3</td>
<td>33–86</td>
<td>52.48</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>50.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates (Wave 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child age</td>
<td>24–60</td>
<td>41.32</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>41.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male gender</td>
<td>0–1</td>
<td>50.39</td>
<td>53.48</td>
<td>50.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0–1</td>
<td>41.24</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>41.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal education</td>
<td>1–8</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother cohabit</td>
<td>0–1</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother married</td>
<td>0–1</td>
<td>34.73</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>34.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Matched superscripts within a row indicate sig differences ($p < .05$) between African American and Hispanic subgroups.
identify the sources of invariance. The final columns of Table 3 present coefficients from the models allowing paths to vary across groups. Results indicated that among both African Americans and Hispanics, spanking at Wave 2 predicted increased externalizing behaviors among children at Wave 3, with the paths of a similar size (0.18 and 0.28 SDs) according to the nonsignificant Satorra-Bentler Scaled $\chi^2$ difference test. On the other hand, only among African Americans did we find child evocative effects, with child externalizing at Wave 1 predicting an increase in spanking at Wave 2 ($\beta = .28, p < .01$), a path that was not significant among Hispanics ($\beta = -.01, ns$). Constraining this path to be equivalent indicated a difference that did not meet standard levels of statistical significance according to the Satorra-Bentler Scaled $\chi^2(\Delta \chi^2 = 3.01, \Delta df = 1, p < .10)$.

Turning to the paths related to internalizing, results revealed that only among Hispanics was spanking at Wave 1 predictive of decreased internalizing problems among children at Wave 2 ($\beta = -.23, p < .01$), with a nonsignificant path among African

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation Table</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Spanking$^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Spanking$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Spanking$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Externalizing prob$^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Externalizing prob$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Externalizing prob$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Internalizing prob$^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Internalizing prob$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Internalizing prob$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Child age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Male gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Mother cohabiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mother married</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. ** $p < .01$. ** $p < .01$.
Americans (β = .03, ns). Again, the Satorra-BentlerScaled χ² indicated that this difference did not meet standard significance levels (Δχ² = 2.69, Δdf = 1, p < .10). Among both groups the models showed that Wave 2 spanking predicted heightened internalizing problems at Wave 3, with nonsignificant differences between the coefficients. Child evocative effects related to internalizing behaviors were not found in either group, with no significant differences in paths.

Discussion

The current study adds to the literature on the implications of corporal punishment in diverse families in the U.S., both replicating and extending prior research that has reported associations between parental spanking and children’s heightened behavior problems. This research extends prior work in four arenas. First, by considering both child evocative and parenting effects in longitudinal bidirectional models, results provided evidence that maternal endorsement of spanking is associated with changes in child functioning but does not, overall, appear to occur in response to children’s behaviors. That is, higher levels of children’s internalizing and externalizing problems did not predict increased maternal endorsement of spanking over time in the full sample. These findings are in contrast to numerous other studies on the reciprocal relations between spanking and children’s externalizing which have found evidence of child evocative effects in diverse samples (Gershoff et al., 2012; Lansford, Wager, Bates, Dodge et al., 2012; Lansford, Wager, Bates, Petit et al., 2012; Maguire-Jack et al., 2012). However, Berlin et al. (2009) also studied a solely low-income and racially diverse sample and failed to find significant evocative effects of child externalizing on parental spanking, suggesting, perhaps, that socioeconomic status may play a role in such relationships.

Second, this study added to the literature by addressing both children’s internalizing and externalizing behavior problems in the same model, adjusting for the covariation between these related arenas of functioning. Third, by considering associations among maternal spanking and children’s functioning over both shorter and longer prospective time periods from early through middle childhood, our research highlighted the complexity of developmental timing in these associations. Our results revealed that mothers’ endorsement of spanking when children were 3 years of age predicted small but statistically significant short-term declines in internalizing problems by age 4, suggesting that spanking may serve as a relatively brief deterrent to young children’s emotional problems (Jaffee et al., 2004; Snyder, Cramer, Afrank, & Patterson, 2005). However, these short-term benefits were cancelled out by larger longer-term effects in which higher spanking endorsement at age 4 predicted increased internalizing problems and externalizing problems by age 9.

These results both replicate other studies finding negative links between corporal punishment and children’s problem behaviors (Gershoff, 2002), and support social learning (Bandura, 1977), social control (Hirschi, 1969), and emotional attachment (Davies et al., 2002) theoretical models arguing that the use of physically hurtful and power-assertive parenting may control children’s behavior in the short term, but also provides models of aggressive behaviors, limits internalization of positive interpersonal skills, and restricts emotional connections to parents and others among young children. During early childhood, when children’s social scripts, emotional regulation, and social skills are developing rapidly, the use of corporal punishment may be particularly important, with long-term consequences for children’s healthy functioning (National Research Council and Institute of Medicine, 2000). These findings also extend prior literature, in which only a handful of studies have assessed potential associations between parents’ spanking and children’s internalizing problems, finding positive prospective links in early childhood (Maguire-Jack et al., 2012) and early adolescence (Christie-Mizell et al., 2008). And yet the switch in directionality of results related to children’s internalizing in the current study leaves open questions of the relative role of developmental timing versus shorter- and longer-term effects of parent spanking, important issues for future research to address.

The fourth contribution of this research was consideration of racial/ethnic differences in a representative sample of low-income urban families. The sampling framework, which limited the sample solely to low-income families in concentrated poverty urban neighborhoods, eased concerns regarding economic resources and contextual forces differentially influencing both the endorsement and effects of parental spanking behaviors. Overall, our results suggest that maternal spanking endorsement was similarly normative and was related to children’s functioning in a largely parallel manner across African American and Hispanic groups, replicating other research studies which have used sophisticated methods as well as representative and large-scale samples to address race/ethnic differences in this arena (Berlin et al., 2009; Gershoff et al., 2012; Lansford et al., 2011). Two distinct patterns in associations between parental spanking and children’s behaviors emerged, however. The first indicated that spanking predicted short-term decreases in children’s internalizing problems only within Hispanic, not African American families. The second difference indicated a child evocative effect only among African Americans, in which higher levels of young children’s externalizing problems induced short-term increases in maternal spanking. No child evocative effects emerged for children’s internalizing behaviors. Other research has found spanking to be more culturally normative among African Americans than among other racial and ethnic groups (Durant, 2008; Gershoff et al., 2012; MacKenzie et al., 2012; Pinderhughes et al., 2000), which may explain why spanking behaviors increased in response to children’s externalizing behaviors in this racial subgroup, as parents use a culturally accepted parenting technique to try to stem children’s misbehaviors. However, our results suggest that this response was not productive; among African American families, early heightened externalizing problems among children predicted increased parental spanking, which in turn led to greater growth in children’s externalizing behaviors. This pattern suggests the importance of identifying strategies to interrupt this chain of escalating problems behaviors by engaging pediatricians and other child health and development professionals to encourage more productive parental responses (American Academy of Pediatrics, 1998).

Limitations

Prior to concluding, it is important to acknowledge limitations of this research. First and foremost, although the analytic models incorporated cross-lagged longitudinal path modeling, often referred to as causal modeling (Asher, 1983), the data in this study...
were correlational, and hence results cannot be construed as truly causal. Second, measures were all drawn from maternal reports, leading to concerns over reporter bias and unmeasured heterogeneity. Thus, for example, mothers who had a strong belief in and frequently engaged in corporal punishment may have reported their children’s behaviors as more extreme as a mechanism to explain or justify their use of spanking. Yet, it is important to note that the use of prospective longitudinal modeling, adjusting for continuities over time in both spanking and children’s functioning and for related child and family factors, limits the likelihood that results were biased by unmeasured factors. As noted by methodologists, assessment of within-person change controls for time-invariant unmeasured factors that might bias measured relationships (Duncan, Magnuson, & Ludwig, 2004; Johnson, 2005). It is also important to reiterate that the measures of spanking assessed mothers’ endorsement and engagement in spanking but did not address the exact frequency of spanking behavior. Similarly, we did not have measures of fathers’ spanking. Other research has suggested the importance of fathers’ disciplinary practices (Coley, Carrano, & Lewin-Bizan, 2011; DeGarmo, 2010; Eiden, Edwards, & Leonard, 2007) and the need for future research to more carefully track children’s exposure to spanking from all caregivers over time.

Finally, it is important to reiterate that, although drawn from a representative sample of low-income African American and Hispanic families in concentrated poverty neighborhoods in three cities, results cannot necessarily be generalized to other cultural or geographic groups or to families with greater economic and social resources. Although one of our primary goals was to assess racial/ethnic differences in parental spanking while better controlling for different economic and neighborhood contexts, the results from our study may differ from what would be found with more economically and socially advantaged African American and Hispanic populations. Moreover, the analytic sample in this study was not large enough to separately consider poor European American families nor to address variability in subgroups of Hispanic families which derived from different regions of origin with varying lengths of residence in the U.S. (primarily families of Mexican, Dominican, and Puerto Rican ancestry, ranging from newer immigrants to multigenerational residence in the mainland U.S.). Subgroups of the highly diverse U.S. Hispanic population may have unique cultural norms and parenting behaviors (De Von Fiquerosa-Moseley, Ramey, Keltner, & Lanzi, 2006), an important issue to address in future research on parental spanking and children’s behaviors.

Conclusion

In conclusion, our results provide support for the American Academy of Pediatrics’ recommendations that parents desist from using spanking as a disciplinary tactic due to its lack of long-term effectiveness in controlling children’s behavior and potential for harm to children’s well-being (American Academy of Pediatrics, 1998). Even among families living in poverty, in poor and often dangerous neighborhoods—contexts in which parents often feel that stricter parental control is necessary to ensure the safety of their children (Taylor et al., 2011)—results suggest that as children age into middle childhood, maternal endorsement of spanking is associated with increased levels of both internalizing and externalizing behavior problems among African American and Hispanic children.

References


Received March 19, 2013
Revision received October 21, 2013
Accepted October 22, 2013

### Members of Underrepresented Groups:
**Reviewers for Journal Manuscripts Wanted**

If you are interested in reviewing manuscripts for APA journals, the APA Publications and Communications Board would like to invite your participation. Manuscript reviewers are vital to the publications process. As a reviewer, you would gain valuable experience in publishing. The P&C Board is particularly interested in encouraging members of underrepresented groups to participate more in this process.

If you are interested in reviewing manuscripts, please write APA Journals at Reviewers@apa.org. Please note the following important points:

- To be selected as a reviewer, you must have published articles in peer-reviewed journals. The experience of publishing provides a reviewer with the basis for preparing a thorough, objective review.

- To be selected, it is critical to be a regular reader of the five to six empirical journals that are most central to the area or journal for which you would like to review. Current knowledge of recently published research provides a reviewer with the knowledge base to evaluate a new submission within the context of existing research.

- To select the appropriate reviewers for each manuscript, the editor needs detailed information. Please include with your letter your vita. In the letter, please identify which APA journal(s) you are interested in, and describe your area of expertise. Be as specific as possible. For example, “social psychology” is not sufficient—you would need to specify “social cognition” or “attitude change” as well.

- Reviewing a manuscript takes time (1–4 hours per manuscript reviewed). If you are selected to review a manuscript, be prepared to invest the necessary time to evaluate the manuscript thoroughly.

APA now has an online video course that provides guidance in reviewing manuscripts. To learn more about the course and to access the video, visit [http://www.apa.org/pubs/authors/review-manuscript-ce-video.aspx](http://www.apa.org/pubs/authors/review-manuscript-ce-video.aspx).