Published in final edited form as:

Int J Behav Dev. 2017 ; 41(4): 482–490. doi:10.1177/0165025416687414.

Disciplinary Practices, Metaparenting, and the Quality of Parent–Child Relationships in African-American, Mexican-American, and European-American Mothers

George W. Holden, Carol Kozak Hawk, Margaret M. Smith, Jimmy Singh, and Rose Ashraf
Southern Methodist University

Abstract

Coercive responses to children's behavior are well recognized to be problematic for children's adjustment. Less well understood is how parental social cognition is linked to discipline. In this study we sought to link metaparenting — parents' thoughts about their parenting — to the use of coercive discipline. We predicted that mothers who engaged in more metaparenting, thus reflecting more deliberate parenting, would use corporal punishment less frequently and instead engage in non-coercive discipline. We also expected that mothers who engaged in more metaparenting would report closer relationships with their children. In order to assess a diverse sample, data were collected from approximately equal numbers of African-American, European-American, and Mexican-American mothers. Participants included 113 mothers with target children in three age groups, ranging from 2 to 12 years. The results indicated reports of corporal punishment as well as non-coercive discipline did not significantly differ across child sex and child age groups, but did differ significantly across race/ethnicity. Reports of frequency of metaparenting also differed across racial/ethnic groups; African-American mothers reported more metaparenting than European-American mothers on three of four subscales. Metaparenting was significantly related to reports of the mother-child relationship but in the opposite direction than predicted. Based on these results, future research directions linking parental social cognition to discipline are proposed.

Keywords

discipline; negative discipline; corporal punishment; metaparenting; African-American; Mexican-American; European-American

Parent-child disagreement is a frequent occurrence in most families. In a recent study of audio-recorded mother-child interactions in the home, the mean rate of conflict with young children was found to be 12.2 conflicts/hr (Holden, Williamson, & Holland, 2014). That rate of discord is not an outlier due to the methodology; it falls within a previously identified range of 3.5 to 15 times/hr identified in prior studies with young children (Dix, 1991). How a parent responds to a child in those conflictual interactions is well recognized as an important determinant for a variety of positive and negative outcomes for the child (e.g., Bugental & Grusec, 2006).

Problematic Discipline Practices

One category of parental responses to conflicts with children is labeled “harsh,” “power assertive,” or “coercive” discipline. This class of responses involves parents exerting their power over their children by threats or physical force (e.g., Towe-Goodman & Teti, 2008). The power can be expressed in a variety of ways, from culturally accepted forms of control, such as slapping a hand or spanking the bottom to abusive techniques, including choking or scalding a child (Straus, Hamby, Finkelhor, Moore, & Runyan, 1998). The most common exemplar of harsh or coercive physical discipline in American families is corporal punishment (e.g., Bender et al., 2007). This is defined as “noninjurious, open-handed hitting with the intention of modifying child behavior” (Gershoff & Grogan-Kaylor, 2016, p. 453). Spanking, paddling (i.e., spanking with an object), and slapping are the ways that parents typically administer corporal punishment in the United States (Regalado, Sareen, Inkelas, Wissow, & Halfon, 2004; Straus & Stewart, 1999).

Corporal punishment is common in the U.S. and many other countries (Lansford & Deater-Deckard, 2012; Runyan et al., 2010). In fact, UNICEF (2014) estimated that 60% of children around the world are spanked or hit in some fashion. Although parents of young children are most likely to engage in spanking, the discipline technique continues into adolescence; 33% of parents reported that they used it with their 12-yr-old children (Straus & Stewart, 1999). Despite its widespread use, there is considerable variability in who uses it and how often. Predictors include parental characteristics (e.g., disciplinary history, ethnic/racial group, religious affiliation), child characteristics (e.g., age, sex, disabilities), social cognitive processes (e.g., attitudes, attributions, perceived norms), and contextual characteristics (e.g., family structure, marital status, nationality).

Parental use of coercive discipline is not simply a matter of academic curiosity; this type of discipline is commonly found to be associated with unintended problems. The types of problems range from child externalizing and internalizing symptoms to parent-child relationship distress and physical child abuse (e.g., Gershoff & Grogan-Kaylor, 2016; Grolnick, 2012). Thus, gaining a better understanding of why parents use coercive disciplinary techniques can lead to interventions designed to help parents reduce or eliminate their use of coercive discipline (e.g., Azar, Reitz, & Goslin, 2008; Holland & Holden, 2016). Consequently, the primary focus of this study was to better understand the relation between coercive discipline and parental social cognition.

Coercive Discipline and Social Cognition

Several different approaches have been used in an effort to link parental coercive discipline with social cognition processes. One strategy has been to link a single social cognitive variable with coercive discipline. To date, attributions have received the most research attention (e.g., Dix & Lochman, 1990; Irwin, Skowronski, Crouch, Milner, & Zengel, 2014; Park, Johnston, Colalilo, & Williamson, 2016). Other cognitive variables investigated to predict coercive punishment include attitudes (e.g., Sturge-Apple, Rogge, Peltz, Suor, & Skibo, 2015; Vittrup, Holden, & Buck, 2006), and views of its cultural normativeness (e.g., Lansford et al., 2005; Taylor, Hamvas, Rice, Newman, & DeJong, 2011).

A second approach utilizes social information processing theory, a model that integrates attributions, schemas, and social problem solving to understand adaptive and maladaptive interpersonal behavior (e.g., Weiss, Dodge, Bates, & Pettit, 1992). Using this theoretical approach, investigators have linked multiple aspects of social information processing to parental disciplinary behavior. Effective parenting involves multiple social cognitive processes including awareness of the individual child, one's own parenting, formulation of plans, appropriate problem solving, flexibility in responses, and frequent appraisals of the child (e.g., Azar, Okado, Stevenson, & Robinson, 2013; Eve, Byrne, & Gagliardi, 2014; Pas Montes, de Paul, & Milner, 2001; Rodriguez, Smith, & Silvia, 2016).

A third theoretical approach relates disciplinary responses to metacognition (Azar et al., 2008). The view is that parents who engage in more metacognition will engage in reasoned and deliberate discipline and therefore refrain from reactive and coercive discipline (e.g., Pinderhughes et al., 2000). Multiple social cognitive constructs have been investigated under this category, including awareness, reflective functioning, insightfulness, and mind-mindedness (e.g., Rutherford, Goldberg, Luyten, Bridgett, & Mayes, 2013). In a study that provides some support for the connection between parental metacognition and child behavior, Hughes (2016) discovered that mothers who exhibited more mind-mindedness had children who were less disruptive when they were 12 years old. These constructs affirm the importance of a common goal of parent education and behavioral parent training programs, which is to promote intentional and deliberate disciplinary practices, rather than automatic cognitive-affective reactive actions that may escalate conflict (e.g., Duncan, Coatsworth, & Greenberg, 2009; Mah & Johnston, 2008; Sanders, 2008).

One effort to quantify parental metacognition efforts has been labeled "metaparenting." Metaparenting was defined as effortful thinking that typically occurs before or after on-going interactions with children (Holden & Hawk, 2003). It serves the important function of helping children stay on positive developmental trajectories by becoming activated when a child starts to get off track. Then, metacognitive thoughts and problem solving are stimulated in order to return the child to a healthy pathway (Holden, 2010). It was conceptualized as an individual difference variable, rather than a relationship variable, that captures a wide range of effortful cognitions. Four components were identified: *Anticipating, Assessing, Problem Solving, and Reflecting*.

There are now at least four published empirical investigations into metaparenting (Hawk & Holden, 2006; Merrifield, Gamble, & Yu, 2015; Nicholson, Howard, & Borkowski, 2008; Tamm, Holden, Nakonezny, Swart, & Hughes, 2012). Three of these studies assessed links between metaparenting and discipline. In an initial study, a questionnaire was given to 116 college-educated, European-American mothers. In line with the metacognition and deliberate parenting hypothesis, mothers who engaged in more *Problem Solving* were less likely to report being either overreactive or lax with their children (Hawk & Holden, 2006). A second study, using a sample of fathers, found that higher levels metaparenting were associated with lower levels of child abuse potential (Nicholson et al., 2008). However, a third study using a sample of mothers of children with ADHD did not find that metaparenting was related to punitive parenting (Tamm et al., 2012).

Coercive Discipline, Metaparenting, and the Parent-Child Relationship

In this study we sought to better understand the relation between parents' discipline and metacognition by assessing the relations between four variables: coercive discipline (as manifested in corporal punishment), non-coercive discipline, metaparenting, and the quality of the parent-child relationship. Based on the view that metaparenting is an individual difference variable, we expected that parents who engage in more metaparenting would be less likely to use coercive discipline but instead use non-coercive discipline, in contrast to parents who engage in less metaparenting. Further, we expected use of coercive discipline would relate to the quality of the parent-child relationship. Specifically, we predicted that mothers who engaged in more frequent use of coercive discipline, compared with other mothers, would report more problems in their parent-child relationship (e.g., Gershoff & Grogan-Kaylor, 2016). Figure 1 captures the theorized conceptual relations between these four variables.

To learn more about the extent to which metaparenting was related to child age, we included three age groups (2–3 years, 5–6 years, & 11–12 years). We selected these age groups to assess metaparenting across a wide child age span and because children at each of those ages may be going through school-related transitions. Times of developmental transitions provide good opportunities to assess metacognition because those times are likely to be accompanied by enhanced levels of parent social cognition, according to Goodnow (1988).

Coercive Discipline and Racial/Ethnic Groups

Coercive disciplinary practices have frequently been investigated in the two largest minority groups in the United States, African-American and Hispanic/Latino parents. However, the findings are not consistent. Although a majority of studies find that African-American parents rely on corporal punishment more than other groups (e.g., Berlin et al., 2009), the evidence is mixed. As Lansford (2010) reviewed and others have pointed out (e.g., Vittrup & Holden, 2010), there are considerable inconsistencies and conflicting results across studies. For example, with regard to frequency of use, some investigators report that African-American parents use corporal punishment more frequently than other racial/ethnic groups (e.g., Evans, 2015; Grogan-Kaylor & Otis, 2007), whereas other studies find no differences in spanking in general (Polaha, Larzelere, Shapiro, & Pettit, 2004) or spanking with the hand (e.g., Combs-Orme, 2008; Lansford, Wager, Bates, Dodge, & Pettit, 2012; Mulvaney & Mebert, 2007). In some cases, the results can be accounted for by the confounding socioeconomic status (MacKenzie, Nicklas, Waldfogel, & Brooks-Gunn, 2013). In other cases, it may be due to the multiple determinants of corporal punishment, the heterogeneous nature of the behavior within groups, the sample size, or the part of the country sampled.

In at least three studies Hispanic-American parents have been found to report less physical punishment than European-American or African-American parents (Guzzo & Lee, 2008; Taylor, Manganello, Lee & Rice, 2010). Another study found that Hispanic-American fathers did not differ on this variable from African-American or non-Hispanic white fathers born in the United States (Lee, Altschul, Shair, & Taylor, 2011). One reason for discrepant findings is the grouping together of all Hispanic parents. This category can include parents

from Mexico and other central American countries, as well as parents from South America, the Caribbean, Spain, and other countries. To avoid creating a heterogeneous group of parents, we limited our Hispanic sample to Mexican-American mothers.

With the goal of testing whether there were racial/ethnic group difference in the relation between discipline, metaparenting, and quality of relationships, we sought to recruit a sample that included approximately equal representation from European-American, African-American, and Mexican-American mothers. Prior studies of metaparenting have been largely limited to European-Americans, which comprised 87% of Hawk and Holden's (2006) sample, 82% of Merrifield et al.'s (2015) sample of mothers and 83% of the fathers, and 78% of Tamm et al.'s (2012) sample. Only one sample has been heterogeneous. Nicholson et al.'s (2008) sample consisted of 40% non-white fathers. In addition, another limitation in the generalizability of the samples is that a majority of parents in prior samples have been college-educated.

The characteristics of the prior samples of parents raises the question of whether metaparenting is engaged in with equal frequency in non-college educated and non-white samples. When parental social cognition has been studied in minority groups, the variables have included Latino values and goals (Halgunseth, Ispa, & Rudy, 2006), Mexican-American parents' perceptions of neighborhood dangers (e.g., White, Zeiders, Gonzales, Tein, & Roosa, 2013), as well as African-American mothers' expectations (Sharp & Ispa, 2009) and beliefs about negative emotions (Nelson, Leerkes, O'Brien, Calkins, & Marcovitch, 2012). To date, no study has systematically assessed deliberate parenting in different ethnic/racial groups.

Summary

To review, three goals guided the present study. First, we sought to link reported disciplinary practices to metaparenting. We expected that mothers who engaged in more metaparenting would report less coercive disciplinary responses. The second goal was to test the relations between metaparenting and quality of the parent-child relationship. We predicted that mothers who engaged in more metaparenting, devoting more time to thinking about their children and parenting, would report closer relationships with their children. Indeed, metaparenting thoughts reflect attention and involvement, something unlikely to be present in an uninvolved parent (e.g., Nelson, Padilla-Walker, Christensen, Evans, & Carroll, 2011). The third goal was to assess whether the relations between the coercive discipline, metaparenting, and relationship quality differed across three racial/ethnic groups. Given that there is no prior research on deliberate parenting in the minority groups, we did not generate any hypotheses.

Method

Participants

A total of 113 mothers with a target child in one of three child age groups provided complete data. The age groups were: toddlers (2- to 3-year-olds), transition to school (5- to 6-year-olds), and early adolescence (11- to 12-year-olds). Approximately half (52%) of the target

children were males. Mothers averaged 37 years old ($SD = 6.60$, range 20 to 55) and had an average of 2 children ($M = 2.32$, $SD = 1.06$, range 1 to 7). Maternal education varied considerably, from high school or less (8.9%), some college (22%), college graduate (45%), to holding graduate degrees (23.9%). The sample was approximately evenly divided among mothers who reported they belonged to one of three racial/ethnic groups: African-American (26.4%), Mexican-American (34.6%), and European-American (39.0%). Most (81.9%) of the mothers were currently married and another 8.2% lived with a partner. The average family income was about \$78,000 ($SD = \$48,000$).

Materials

Four questionnaires were utilized for this study: a basic demographic survey, a parental discipline scale, a survey assessing metaparenting, and an assessment of the quality of relationship between the mother and child. The demographic survey included five categories of educational attainment (ranging from less than high school to a graduate degree), five categories for marital status (never married, married, separated, divorced, & widowed), and four categories for employment status (home maker, student, working part-time, & working full-time).

Parental Discipline—Disciplinary practices were assessed with the 11-item Parental Responses to Child Misbehavior (PRCM) scale (Holden, Coleman, & Schmidt, 1995). Disciplinary responses were listed and for each response, mothers indicated how frequently they used the response in an average week. Responses were rated on a 7-pt scale ranging from 1 = Never to 7 = Nine (or more) times/week. Two subscales on the PRCM were utilized: the corporal punishment subscale and the non-coercive discipline subscale. The corporal punishment subscale consisted of 3 items (spank with hand, spank with object, slap with hand) and yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .64. That low alpha was due to the lack of association between spank with object and slap with hand $r(111) = .03$, ns . In contrast, spank with hand and spank with object and spank with hand and slap were significantly correlated, $r(111) = .48$ & $.40$, $ps < .01$, respectively. However, we included all three items because we sought to assess maternal use of corporal punishment, in whatever form it took. The non-coercive discipline subscale contained 6 items (reason, negotiate, diversion, ignore, time out & withdrawal of privileges) and the internal consistency with this sample was adequate, $\alpha = .77$. The two remaining items on the PRCM (threaten & yell in anger), were correlated $r(110) = .51$, $p < .001$, but not included in either subscale because they did not fit with the focus of this study. The PRCM has been used in multiple studies (e.g., Huang, Caughy, Lee, Miller, & Genevro, 2009) and has strong psychometric properties including concurrent and predictive validity (Holden et al., 1995; Vittrup et al., 2006).

Metaparenting—The Metaparenting Profile Questionnaire (MPQ, Hawk & Holden, 2006) is a self-report instrument designed to measure deliberate childrearing cognitions. Responses were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = Never/Rarely to 5 = Constantly). Based on findings from Hawk and Holden (2006), additional questions were added to elicit a fuller understanding of metaparenting thoughts. The 41-item scale included four subscales. *Anticipating* contained 9 items (e.g., "To what extent do you plan ahead for situations in which your child might get bored?"). *Assessing* included 12 items (e.g., "How often do you

think about how your child is developing compared with her/his peers?”). *Problem solving* contained 11 items (e.g., “When you’re having a problem with your child, how often do you develop a strategy to deal with the problem?”). *Reflecting* consisted of 9 items (e.g., “How often have you modified a problem solving strategy to make it more effective when it wasn’t working well?”). The internal consistency in this sample was .90 for the overall scale and the subscale alphas were adequate except for one subscale: *anticipating* (.76), *assessing* (.82), *problem solving* (.63), and *reflecting* (.80).

Quality of the Parent-Child Relationship—The quality of the mother-child relationship was assessed with the Personal Relationship subscale from the Parent-Child Relationship Scale (Furman & Gibson, 1995). This 15-item subscale included questions about intimacy, nurturance, similarity, and companionship, and thus focused on perceptions of closeness. Questions include: “How much do you and this child do nice things for each other?,” “How much are you and this child alike?,” and “How much do you and this child go places and do things together?” Each question was answered on a 5-pt Likert-type scale (1 = hardly at all to 5 = extremely much). The internal consistency of the subscale was high for this sample, $\alpha = .88$. This scale has been used by other investigators to assess family relationships and found to have good internal consistency (e.g., Piffner & McBurnett, 2006).

Procedure

To recruit an ethnically diverse sample of mothers, we adopted two approaches. First, potential participants were sent letters based on a database established from newspaper birth announcements. In addition, names and addresses were obtained from a local company that provided, for a fee, a mailing list of parents. The mailing lists were more successful in securing white, rather than minority, participants: about 70% of the white participants were recruited from mailing lists but only about 15% of the minority participants. The second approach used was to distribute flyers about the study to local churches, community organizations, cultural centers, child-care facilities, and libraries. Following participation, mothers were invited to refer other potential participants.

The procedure involved having the mothers come to a university research lab. After signing the informed consent, mothers completed the paper and pencil surveys. On average, it took about 30 minutes. A subsample of the participants then stayed to participate in an interview, but those data are not included here. Participants received a \$30 gift card for their time.

Analyses

Data were analyzed in several ways. Group differences based on child sex and age, racial/ethnic groups, marital status, and education were analyzed with ANOVAs. Regression analyses were used to assess associations between socioeconomic status and discipline, metaparenting, and relationship quality. To compute socioeconomic status, a composite variable was created based on z scores of the mothers’ education, employment status, and family income, as recommended by Cowan et al. (2012) and Hoffman (2003). To assess whether the relations between the variables varied based on racial/ethnic group, a multi-group structural equation (SEM) model was employed.

Results

The primary goal of this study was to examine links between reported disciplinary practices, metaparenting, and the quality of the mother-child relationship. The secondary goal was whether the relations varied across three racial/ethnic groups. Below we begin with the preliminary analyses, followed by the results from the discipline, metaparenting, and relationship quality variables. Last, racial/ethnic analyses will be presented.

Preliminary analyses were conducted to determine whether there were child sex differences on the discipline and metaparenting scales as well as racial/ethnic between group differences on the background characteristics. No significant child sex differences were found on the corporal punishment or non-coercive discipline subscales, $F(1, 108) = 1.91, p = .15$ & $F(1, 97) = 1.47, p = .23$, respectively, or on the total metaparenting score, $F(1, 108) = .16, p = .85$. Consequently, sex of child will not be considered further. We also conducted preliminary analyses to test whether the three ethnic/racial groups differed significantly on their demographic characteristics. On four background variables (sex of child, age of child, age of parent, & number of children) there were no group differences. However the groups did differ on the five other variables. Family income differed significantly by racial/ethnic groups, $F(2, 106) = 7.82, p < .001$, such that European-Americans (*Median* = \$ 89,000, *SD* = \$70,626) reported significantly higher incomes than African-Americans (*Median* = \$ 61,500, *SD* = \$34,366) and the Mexican-Americans (*Median* = \$62,500, *SD* = \$34,793). The two minority groups did not differ. There were also significant associations between racial/ethnic groups and education attained, $\chi^2(8, N = 113) = 16.52, p = .04$, Cramer's $V = .27$, occupation, $\chi^2(6, N = 111) = 15.99, p < .01$, Cramer's $V = .27$, and between racial/ethnic groups and marital status, $\chi^2(8, N = 113) = 19.38, p < .01$, Cramer's $V = .29$. Additionally, we tested for mothers' socio-economic status effects using regression analyses. Socio-economic status did not have a significant relationship with scores on the two discipline subscales (e.g., corporal punishment subscale: $\beta = -.03, t[169] = -.35, p = .73$) or with metaparenting, so will not be considered further.

Discipline

Maternal reports of discipline were evaluated on the two PRCM subscales of corporal punishment and non-coercive techniques. The two subscales were significantly correlated, $r(112) = .24, p < .01$, indicating that mothers who engaged in one type of discipline also used the other type. Specifically, that associated indicated that mothers who used corporal punishment used non-punitive approaches more frequently than other mothers. There were no significant child age group differences on the two discipline scales, as assessed by a one way (child age group) ANOVA. In contrast to predictions, maternal reports of coercive discipline were not significantly associated with the metaparenting or the perceptions of the closeness of their relationship with their children. See Table 1 for the descriptive statistics of each variable and the correlations between the variables.

Metaparenting

The metaparenting subscales were all significantly interrelated, with coefficients ranging from .33 (*problem solving* and *reflecting*) to .70 (*anticipating* and *assessing*). Neither the subscales nor the total score differed significantly as a function of child age.

When correlating the total metaparenting score and quality of relationship, a negative relation was found, $r(111) = -.21, p < .05$. In contrast to our hypothesis, this association indicated that mothers who reported more metaparenting indicated that their relationships with their children were less close than the other mothers. Examination of the subscale scores (Table 1), indicated that three of the four subscales were significantly correlated with relationship quality; only *reflecting* was not.

Racial/Ethnic Group Differences and the Model

We next turn to the question of whether there were racial/ethnic group differences in the relations among the variables. To test for ethnic/racial group differences on discipline and metaparenting, we conducted two one-way ANOVAs. There was a significant group effect on the corporal punishment subscale, $F(2,110) = 3.07, p < .05$. European-American mothers reported engaging in more corporal punishment than Mexican-Americans, but neither group differed significantly from African-Americans. A significant effect was also observed for non-coercive discipline, $F(2,110) = 3.83, p < .05$. Here African-American mothers reported using non-coercive discipline less frequently than Mexican-Americans; neither group differed from European-Americans.

When comparing the racial/ethnic groups on the metaparenting, four significant differences were found. African-Americans, compared with European-Americans, reported significantly more metaparenting as assessed by the total score, $F(2,110) = 4.43, p < .01$, more anticipating, $F(2,110) = 4.92, p < .01$, and more assessing, $F(2,110) = 6.62, p < .01$. Both African-Americans and Mexican-Americans reported significantly more reflecting than the European-Americans, $F(2,110) = 4.91, p < .01$.

A significant racial/ethnic group difference was also found on reports of the quality of parent-child relationship. Mexican-Americans indicated they had the closest personal relationship with their children, $F(2,110) = 3.42, p < .05$. Follow-up tests (Bonferroni corrected) indicated that Mexican-American mothers differed significantly from African-American mothers, and that European-American mothers fell in between. The means, divided by racial/ethnic group, can be found in Table 2.

To test whether the three racial/ethnic groups differed with regard to the relations between the study variables, a multi-group path analysis model was used (Figure 1). A model in which all parameters were constrained to be equal was compared to a model in which all parameters were freely estimated among the three groups. The chi-square difference test indicated that the model in which all paths were constrained to be equal did not significantly worsen the fit of the model, $\chi^2(10, N = 113) = 7.15, p = .71$. Therefore, there was no evidence of racial/ethnic differences in the relation between metaparenting, corporal punishment, non-coercive discipline, and relationship quality.

Discussion

This study was designed to identify links between coercive discipline, metaparenting, and the quality of the mother-child relationship in three racial/ethnic groups. The mothers, despite having boys and girls spanning a 10 year age range, self-identifying as a member of one of three different ethnic/racial groups, and coming from a range of socio-economic conditions and educational backgrounds, reported surprisingly similar experiences in the use of discipline techniques, the frequency of metaparenting, and the closeness of their relationship with their children. For example, maternal reports of the use of coercive and non-coercive discipline did not significantly differ across child sex or age. The results did indicate that parent-child conflicts, as indicated by how frequently mothers were resorting to use of discipline, continues to be a common occurrence in lives of families, even through pre-adolescence (Straus & Stewart, 1999).

Reports of metaparenting indicated mothers were also frequently engaged in metacognitive thoughts about their children. Although metaparenting in the mothers did not differ significantly as a function of child age or sex, there were significant race/ethnicity group differences. Indeed, one of the goals of this study was to systematically assess reports of this form of deliberate social cognition in three racial/ethnic groups of mothers. In fact, most of the group differences found concerned the reports of metaparenting between the three racial/ethnic groups. Specifically, African-American mothers differed significantly from European-American mothers on three of the four subscales. African-American mothers reported engaging in *anticipating*, *assessing*, and *reflecting* more frequently than did European-American mothers. In our sample, Mexican-American mothers also reported significantly more *reflecting* than European-American mothers, but otherwise did not differ from the two groups of mothers.

Although we did not assess the content of their metaparenting, it is reasonable to suspect that the differences in metacognition are a consequence of mothers' minority status. The research into race socialization indicates that minority parents have an extra socialization burden to deal with—rearing a minority child. For example, Camino (1989) found that African-American women reported “worriation” regarding “family members, their care, and the upkeep of the household” (p. 300). Investigations into minority families has revealed these parents have additional considerations to be aware of, including promoting a child's ethnic or racial identity, monitoring the child's self-esteem, and pre-arming a child for coping with discrimination, for example (e.g., Hughes, 2003; Lesane-Brown, 2006). These types of considerations have been labeled “race socialization.” Consequently, it is not surprising to find that African-American mothers reported they engage in more intentional thought about their children than European-American mothers.

The other ethnic/racial group difference we found concerned reports of the closeness of the mother-child relationship. The Mexican-American mothers in our sample indicated that they enjoyed a significantly closer relationship with their children than the African-American mothers reported. This finding reflects the common Latino value and goal of *familismo*, the desire to maintain close family relationships (e.g., Halgunseth et al., 2006). However, that

feeling of closeness was not related to either disciplinary practices or deliberative thinking in our sample.

Associations between the Variables

When we investigated the associations between discipline, metaparenting, and quality of relationship, several interesting findings emerged. First, we did not find support for the predicted relations between coercive discipline, metaparenting, and quality of mother-child relationship. We did learn that metaparenting was linked to mothers' perception of the quality of their relationship with their children. However, that association was in the opposite direction of our prediction. We expected that thinking about one's children would promote (or reflect) close relationships. Instead, mothers who reported more metaparenting viewed their relationship with their children as less close than mothers who engaged in less metaparenting. A likely explanation is that mothers who have close relationships with their children may enjoy more synchronous interactions with their children and are not prompted by the children's behavior to engage in as much metacognition as other mothers (see Harrist & Waugh, 2002). There less need to expend cognitive energy in the childrearing domain when the relationship is positive and cooperative. It is a different situation when rearing a challenging child. Such children elicit more thinking, and apparently especially such thoughts as *assessing* the conditions that precipitated the problematic behavior, *problem solving* for possible solutions, and *anticipating* future difficulties.

This unexpected result prompted us to reconsider the nature of metaparenting. Based on this study, it appears that metaparenting may better reflect a relationship variable rather than an individual difference variable, such as extraversion or intelligence. The fact that education was not significantly related to metaparenting also provides a clue indicating that the variable is not simply a function of the mothers' mental abilities. The child's behavior and, for African-American mothers, the context of being a member of a minority group, likely serve to elicit more metaparenting than in other mothers.

Limitations and Future Directions

Several limitations need to be acknowledged. All the data were self-reports coming from one informant—mothers. Although metaparenting by definition requires self-reported thoughts, future efforts should include methods of corroborating the reports, such as using partners as informants to report on problem-solving discussions and perhaps relating metaparenting to observed behavior. Another limitation is the data were collected at one time point, so causal relations between discipline, metaparenting, and relationship quality could not be determined. A third drawback to our study was the sample size. Our participants totaled 113 mothers but they not equally divided across SES or educational attainment. It may be that our study was underpowered and a larger sample would reveal more group differences (e.g., Lansford et al., 2012). Fourth, we focused exclusively on the reported quantity of MP and did not evaluate its content nor quality. Engaging in metaparenting does not necessarily mean that the assessments of the child are accurate or the problem-solving thoughts are constructive. For example, mothers could engage in a problem-solving rumination, which would not reflect constructive metacognitive activity (Nolen-Hoeksema, Wisco, & Lyubomirsky, 2008).

Future studies can build on what was learned in this study by investigating metaparenting in parents at high risk for engaging in harsh parenting. Child temperament and behavior should also be carefully assessed to better understand the causal relations between child behavior and metaparenting. In particular, it is likely that more challenging children are likely to require more evaluation, problem solving, and reflecting than other children. However, to date, the one study that did attempt to link metaparenting with children's temperament did not find significant relations (Merrifield et al., 2015).

Another future research direction is to improve the measurement of metaparenting and examine its relation with other metacognition constructs. Most notably, the internal consistency of the problem solving subscale was low and requires further development to be psychometrically stronger. More broadly, the survey used here assessed metaparenting across contexts. However, it is likely that metaparenting varies between specific contexts. By grounding the questions in age-appropriate domains (e.g., problem behaviors, screen-time, school experiences) and specifying more of the possible content of metaparenting, it may help parents recall their thoughts and deliberations. Such a detailed instrument would then be able to answer the question of metaparenting's relation to race socialization. Just as different measures of executive functioning yield different results (e.g., Deater-Deckard et al., 2012), studies into how reports of metaparenting converge with other constructs of metacognition, such as reflective functioning, mindfulness, or mind-mindedness, are needed.

Practical significance

This study examined parental thinking as it related to parental discipline, the parent-child relationship, and racial/ethnic groups. The conclusion is that mothers report engaging in this mental activity quite frequently, and especially so for African-American mothers. Although in this study we were not able to link the frequency of metaparenting to disciplinary responses, deliberate parenting should be recognized as an important area to study because this type of social cognition is more amenable to intervention than automatic and reactive thoughts (Azar et al., 2008; Goodnow, 1988). Indeed, deliberate parenting is a key way that parents are able to successfully navigate the challenging experience of effectively disciplining children.

Acknowledgments

George W. Holden, Margaret Smith, and Rose Ashraf, Southern Methodist University; Carol K. Hawk, Austin Community College; Jimmy Singh, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health.

This research was funded by NICHD grant R03 HD044674. We thank Akihito Kamata for his assistance with data analysis. We also thank the research assistants who worked on this study.

References

- Azar ST, Okado Y, Stevenson MT, Robinson LR. A preliminary test of a social information processing model of parenting risk in adolescent males at risk for later physical child abuse in adulthood. *Child Abuse Review*. 2013; 22:268–286. DOI: 10.1002/car.2244
- Azar ST, Reitz EB, Goslin MC. Mothering: Thinking is part of the job description: Application of cognitive views to understanding maladaptive parenting and doing intervention and prevention work. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*. 2008; 29:295–304. DOI: 10.1016/j.appdev.2008.04.009

- Bender HL, Allen JP, McElhaney KB, Antonishak J, Moore CM, Kelly HO, Davis SM. Use of harsh physical discipline and developmental outcomes in adolescence. *Development and Psychopathology*. 2007; 19:227–242. DOI: 10.1017/S0954579407070125 [PubMed: 17241492]
- Berlin LJ, Ispa JM, Fine MA, Malone PS, Brooks-Gunn J, Brady-Smith C, ... Bai Y. Correlates and consequences of spanking and verbal punishment for low-income White, African American, and Mexican American toddlers. *Child Development*. 2009; 80(5):1403–1420. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01341.x [PubMed: 19765008]
- Bugental, DB., Grusec, JE. Socialization processes. In: Eisenberg, N., Damon, W., Lerner, RM., editors. *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3, Social, emotional, and personality development*. 6. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc; 2006. p. 366–428.
- Camino LA. Nerves, worry, and black women: A community study in the American south. *Health Care for Women International*. 1989; 10:295–314. DOI: 10.1080/07399338909515854 [PubMed: 2768096]
- Combs-Orme T, Cain DS. Predictors of mothers' use of spanking with their infants. *Child Abuse & Neglect*. 2008; 32:649–657. DOI: 10.1016/j.chiabu.2007.08.006 [PubMed: 18571232]
- Cowan, CD., Hauser, RM., Kominski, RA., Levin, HM., Lucas, SR., Morgan, SL., Spencer, MB., Chapman, C. Improving the measurement of socioeconomic status for the National Assessment of Educational Progress: A theoretical foundation. 2012. https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/researchcenter/Socioeconomic_Factors.pdf
- Deater-Deckard K, Wang Z, Chen N, Bell MA. Maternal executive function, harsh parenting, and child conduct problems. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. 2012; 53:1084–1091. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2012.02582.x [PubMed: 22764829]
- Dix T. The affective organization of parenting: Adaptive and maladaptive processes. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1991; 110:3–25. DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.110.1.3 [PubMed: 1891517]
- Dix T, Lochman JE. Social cognition and negative reactions to children: A comparison of mothers of aggressive and nonaggressive boys. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*. 1990; 9:418–438. DOI: 10.1521/jsocp.1990.9.4.418
- Duncan LG, Coatsworth JD, Greenberg MT. A model of mindful parenting: Implications for parent-child relationships and prevention research. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*. 2009; 12:255–270. DOI: 10.1007/s10567-009-0046-3 [PubMed: 19412664]
- Evans SZ. Predictors of discipline severity among at-risk toddlers. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 2015; 50:88–95. DOI: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.01.011
- Halgue Eve PM, Byrne MK, Gagliardi CR. What is good parenting? The perspectives of different professionals. *Family Court Review*. 2014; 52:114–127. DOI: 10.1111/fcre.12074
- Furman, W., Gibson, RS. Identifying the links between parents and their children's sibling relationships. In: Schulman, S., editor. *Close relationships in social-emotional development*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex; 1995. p. 95–108.
- Gershoff E, Grogan-Kaylor A. Spanking and child outcomes: Old controversies and new meta-analyses. *Journal of Family Psychology*. 2016; 30:453–469. DOI: 10.1037/fam0000191 [PubMed: 27055181]
- Goodnow JJ. Parents' ideas, actions, and feelings: Models and methods from developmental and social psychology. *Child Development*. 1988; 59:286–320.
- Grogan-Kaylor A, Otis MD. The predictors of parental use of corporal punishment. *Family Relations*. 2007; 56:80–91. DOI: 10.1111/J.1741-3729.2007.00441.X
- Grolnick, WS. *The psychology of parental control: How well-meant parenting backfires*. New York: Psychology Press; 2012.
- Guzzo KB, Lee H. Couple relationship status and patterns in early parenting practices. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2008; 70:44–61. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00460.x
- Halgunseith LC, Ispa JM, Rudy D. Parental control in Latino families: An integrated review of the literature. *Child Development*. 2006; 77:1282–1297. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00934 [PubMed: 16999798]
- Harrist AW, Waugh RM. Dyadic synchrony: Its structure and function in children's development. *Developmental Review*. 2002; 22:555–592. DOI: 10.1016/S0273-2297(02)00500-2

- Hawk CK, Holden GW. Meta-parenting: An initial investigation into a new parental social cognition construct. *Parenting: Science & Practice*. 2006; 6:321–342. DOI: 10.1207/s15327922par0604_3
- Hoffman, LW. Methodological issues in studies of SES, parenting, and child development. In: Bornstein, MH., Bradley, RH., editors. *Socioeconomic status, parenting, and child development*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2003. p. 125–143.
- Holden GW. Childrearing and developmental trajectories: Positive pathways, off-ramps, and dynamic processes. *Child Development Perspectives*. 2010; 4:197–204. DOI: 10.1111/j.1750-8606.2010.00148.x
- Holden GW, Coleman S, Schmidt KL. Why 3-year-old children get spanked: Parent and child determinants in a sample of college-educated mothers. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*. 1995; 41:431–452.
- Holden, GW., Hawk, C. Meta-parenting in the journey of child rearing: A cognitive mechanism for change. In: Kuczynski, L., editor. *Handbook of the dynamics in parent-child relations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage; 2003. p. 189–210.
- Holden GW, Williamson PA, Holland GW. Eavesdropping on the family: A pilot investigation of corporal punishment in the home. *Journal of Family Psychology*. 2014; 28:401–406. DOI: 10.1037/a0036370 [PubMed: 24730379]
- Holland GWO, Holden GW. Changing orientations to corporal punishment: A randomized, control trial of the efficacy of a motivational approach to psycho-education. *Psychology of Violence*. 2016; 6:233–242. DOI: 10.1037/a0039606
- Huang KY, Caughy MOB, Lee LC, Miller T, Genevro J. Stability of maternal discipline practices and the quality of mother–child interaction during toddlerhood. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*. 2009; 30:431–441. DOI: 10.1016/j.appdev.2008.12.024 [PubMed: 23450036]
- Hughes D, Rodriguez J, Smith EP, Johnson DJ, Stevenson HC, Spicer P. Parents' ethnic-racial socialization practices: A review of research and directions for future study. *Developmental Psychology*. 2006; 42:747–770. [PubMed: 16953684]
- Hughes C, Aldercotte A, Foley S. Maternal mind-mindedness provides a buffer for pre-adolescents at risk for disruptive behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*. 2016; 44:1–11. [PubMed: 26687502]
- Irwin LM, Skowronski JJ, Crouch JL, Milner JS, Zengel B. Reactions to children's transgressions in at-risk caregivers: Does mitigating information, type of transgression, or caregiver directive matter? *Child Abuse & Neglect*. 2014; 38:917–927. DOI: 10.1016/j.chiabu.2013.08.017 [PubMed: 24075063]
- Lansford JE. The special problem of cultural differences in effects of corporal punishment. *Law & Contemporary Problems*. 2010; 73:89–106.
- Lansford JE, Chang L, Dodge KA, Malone PS, Oburu P, Palmerus K, ... Quinn N. Physical discipline and children's adjustment: Cultural normativeness as a moderator. *Child Development*. 2005; 76:1234–1246. DOI: 10.1111/J.1467-8624.2005.00847.X [PubMed: 16274437]
- Lansford JE, Deater-Deckard K. Childrearing discipline and violence in developing countries. *Child Development*. 2012; 83:62–75. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01676.x [PubMed: 22277007]
- Lansford JE, Wager LB, Bates JE, Dodge KA, Pettit GS. Parental reasoning, denying privileges, yelling, and spanking: Ethnic differences and associations with child externalizing behavior. *Parenting*. 2012; 12:42–56. DOI: 10.1080/15295192.2011.613727 [PubMed: 23750114]
- Lee SJ, Altschul I, Shair SR, Taylor CA. Hispanic fathers and risk for maltreatment in father-involved families of young children. *Journal of the Society for Social Work & Research*. 2011; 2:125–142. DOI: 10.5243/jsswr.2011.7 [PubMed: 22624074]
- Lesane-Brown CL. A review of race socialization within Black families. *Developmental Review*. 2006; 26:400–426. DOI: 10.1016/j.dr.2006.02.001
- MacKenzie MJ, Nicklas E, Waldfogel J, Brooks-Gunn J. Spanking and child development across the first decade of life. *Pediatrics*. 2013; 132:e1118–e1125. DOI: 10.1542/peds.2013-1227 [PubMed: 24144718]
- Mah J, Johnston C. Parental social cognitions: Considerations in the acceptability of and engagement in behavioral parent training. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*. 2008; 11:218–236. DOI: 10.1007/s10567-008-0038-8 [PubMed: 18836832]

- Merrifield KA, Gamble WC, Yu JJ. Using social cognitive theory to understand meta-parenting in parents of young children. *Family Science*. 2015; 6:362–369. DOI: 10.1080/19424620.2015.1076495
- Mulvaney MK, Mebert CJ. Parental corporal punishment predicts behavior problems in early childhood. *Journal of Family Psychology*. 2007; 21:389–397. DOI: 10.1037/0893-3200.21.3.389 [PubMed: 17874924]
- Nelson JA, Leerkes EM, O'Brien M, Calkins SD, Marcovitch S. African-American and European-American mothers' beliefs about negative emotions and emotion socialization practices. *Parenting*. 2012; 12:22–41. DOI: 10.1080/15295192.2012.638871 [PubMed: 22639552]
- Nelson L, Padilla-Walker L, Christensen K, Evans C, Carroll J. Parenting in emerging adulthood: An examination of parenting clusters and correlates. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. 2011; 40:730–743. DOI: 10.1007/s10964-010-9584-8 [PubMed: 20809102]
- Nicholson J, Howard K, Borkowski J. Mental models for parenting: Correlates of metaparenting among fathers of young children. *Fathering*. 2008; 6:39–61. DOI: 10.3149/fth.0601.39
- Nolen-Hoeksema S, Wisco BE, Lyubomirsky S. Rethinking rumination. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. 2008; 3:400–424. DOI: 10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00088.x [PubMed: 26158958]
- Park JL, Johnston C, Colalillo S, Williamson D. Parents' attributions for negative and positive child behavior in relation to parenting and child problems. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*. 2016; 45:1–13. DOI: 10.1080/15374416.2016.1144191
- Pinderhughes EE, Dodge K, Bates JE, Pettit GS, Zelli A. Discipline responses: Influences of parents' socioeconomic status, ethnicity, beliefs about parenting, stress, and cognitive-emotional processes. *Journal of Family Psychology*. 2000; 14:380–400. [PubMed: 11025931]
- Pfiffner LJ, McBurnett K. Family correlates of comorbid anxiety disorders in children with attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*. 2006; 34:725–735. DOI: 10.1007/s10802-006-9060-9 [PubMed: 17039405]
- Polaha J, Larzelere RE, Shapiro SK, Pettit GS. Physical discipline and child behavior problems: A study of ethnic group differences. *Parenting: Science and Practice*. 2004; 4:339–360. DOI: 10.1207/s15327922par0404_6
- Regalado M, Sareen H, Inkelas M, Wissow LS, Halfon N. Parents' discipline of young children: Results from the National Survey of Early Childhood Health. *Pediatrics*. 2004; 113:1952–1958. DOI: 10.1542/peds.113.6.S1.1952 [PubMed: 15173466]
- Rodriguez CM, Smith TL, Silvia PJ. Multimethod prediction of physical parent–child aggression risk in expectant mothers and fathers with Social Information Processing theory. *Child Abuse & Neglect*. 2016; 51:106–119. [PubMed: 26631420]
- Runyan DK, Shankar V, Hassan F, Hunter WM, Jain D, Paula CS, ... Bordin IA. International variations in harsh child discipline. *Pediatrics*. 2010; 126:e701–e711. DOI: 10.1542/peds.2008-2374 [PubMed: 20679301]
- Rutherford HJV, Goldberg B, Luyten P, Bridgett DJ, Mayes LC. Parental reflective functioning is associated with tolerance of infant distress but not general distress: Evidence for a specific relationship using a simulated baby paradigm. *Infant Behavior and Development*. 2013; 36:635–641. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2013.06.008>. [PubMed: 23906942]
- Straus MA, Stewart JH. Corporal punishment by American parents: National data on prevalence, chronicity, severity, and duration in relation to child and family characteristics. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*. 1999; 2:55–70. DOI: 10.1023/A:1021891529770 [PubMed: 11225932]
- Taylor CA, Hamvas L, Paris R. Perceived instrumentality and normativeness of corporal punishment use among Black mothers. *Family Relations*. 2011; 60:60–72. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2010.00633.x [PubMed: 22707816]
- Taylor CA, Manganello JA, Lee SJ, Rice JC. Mothers' spanking of 3-year-old children and subsequent risk of children's aggressive behavior. *Pediatrics*. 2010; 125:e1057–e1065. DOI: 10.1542/peds.2009-2678 [PubMed: 20385647]
- UNICEF. Hidden in plain sight: A statistical analysis of violence against children. New York: UNICEF; 2014.

- Vittrup B, Holden GW. Children's assessments of corporal punishment and other disciplinary practices: The role of age, race, SES, and exposure to spanking. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*. 2010; 31:211–220. DOI: 10.1016/j.appdev.2009.11.003
- Vittrup B, Holden GW, Buck J. Attitudes predict the use of physical punishment: A prospective study of the emergence of disciplinary practices. *Pediatrics*. 2006; 117:2055–2064. DOI: 10.1542/peds.2005-2204 [PubMed: 16740848]
- Weiss B, ADK, Bates JE, Pettit GS. Some consequences of early harsh discipline: Child aggression and a maladaptive social information processing style. *Child Development*. 1992; 63:1321–1335. DOI: 10.1111/1467-8624.ep9308195003 [PubMed: 1446555]
- White R, Zeiders KH, Gonzales NA, Tein JY, Roosa MW. Cultural values, US neighborhood danger, and Mexican-American parents' parenting. *Journal of Family Psychology*. 2013; 27:365–375. DOI: 10.1037/a0032888 [PubMed: 23750519]

FIGURE 1.
Predicted relations between study variables.

Table 1

Means and Correlations between the Variables

Variable	Mean (SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Corporal Punishment	4.26 (1.95)							
2. Non-Coercive Discipline	22.35 (6.24)	.24**						
3. Metaparenting Total	135.68 (19.07)	-.09	-.05					
4. Assessing	41.47 (7.17)	-.10	-.05	.91**				
5. Anticipating	32.98 (4.99)	-.10	-.05	.81**	.70**			
6. Reflecting	25.18 (6.29)	-.12	-.05	.80**	.69**	.46**		
7. Problem Solving	36.05 (5.01)	.06	-.01	.69**	.48**	.54**	.33**	
8. Relationship Quality	58.36 (8.35)	.18	.09	-.21*	-.20*	-.24*	-.05	-.20*

Note.

*
p < .05.**
p < .01.

N = 113 mothers. Theoretical ranges of variables: Metaparenting: 41–205. Assessing: 9–45. Anticipating: 12–60. Problem solving: 11–55. Reflecting: 9–45. Corporal Punishment: 3–21. Non-Coercive: 6–42. Relationship Quality: 15–75. Larger numbers = more frequent occurrence or better quality.

Table 2

Means (SD) and other Statistics for the Three Racial/Ethnic Groups

	African- American (AA)	European- American (EA)	Mexican- American (MA)	Significance Test = $F(2, 110)$	Cohen's d	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval	Significant Group Differences
Metaparenting Total	142.77 (21.02)	129.46 (15.07)	136.35 (19.45)	4.43, $p < .01$	0.73	13.31	[4.43, 22.20]	AA v. EA
Assessing	44.80 (7.37)	38.77 (6.12)	41.59 (7.06)	6.62, $p < .01$	0.89	6.03	[2.77, 9.29]	AA v. EA
Anticipating	35.00 (4.56)	31.33 (4.97)	33.07 (4.85)	4.92, $p < .01$	0.77	3.67	[1.42, 5.93]	AA v. EA
Problem Solving	36.27 (6.32)	36.64 (3.92)	35.38 (4.90)	.70, $p = .50$	0.66	3.98	[1.04, 6.92]	AA v. EA
Reflecting	26.70 (7.24)	22.72 (4.44)	26.32 (6.47)	4.91, $p < .01$	0.65	-3.60	[-5.97, -1.23]	MA v. EA
Corporal Punishment	3.97 (2.13)	4.87 (2.34)	3.91 (1.24)	3.07, $p < .05$	0.40	-.90	[-1.96, .16]	AA v. EA
Non-Coercive Discipline	19.97 (6.46)	22.36 (6.19)	23.95 (5.72)	3.83, $p < .05$	0.65	-3.98	[-6.84, -1.12]	AA v. MA
Relationship Quality	55.87 (9.60)	57.62 (9.12)	60.74 (5.97)	3.42, $p < .05$	0.61	4.87	[-8.73, -1.01]	AA v. MA

Note: African-American n = 30, European-American n = 39, Mexican-American n = 44. Theoretical ranges of the variables: Metaparenting: 41–205. Assessing 9–45. Anticipating: 12–60. Problem solving: 11–55. Reflecting: 9–45. Corporal Punishment: 3–21. Non-Coercive: 6–42. Relationship Quality: 15–75. Larger numbers = more frequent occurrence or better quality