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“Tough love” has been posited as a prevalent parenting style among black families; although most of the literature has focused on differences in parenting across black and white youth, examinations of parenting within an exclusively black sample are rare. The current study used an exclusively black sample to examine a blend of parenting practices aligning with a “tough love” conceptualization of parenting: child disclosure (CD), parental nurturance (PN), and harsh discipline (HD). Given prior evidence that it might be an adaptation to compromised environments, it was hypothesized that, if viable, “tough love” would present via positive associations between violence exposure (VE) and each parenting practice. These practices, in turn, would be associated with lower levels of internalizing (IB) and externalizing behavior (EB) problems. This model was tested separately for girls and boys and for IB (i.e., depressive symptoms and anxiety) and EB (i.e., disruptive behavior disorder (DBD) symptoms and overt aggression). Full models including direct associations were tested alongside fully-mediated models. VE was positively associated with each outcome for girls and boys in the direct effects models. In mediation testing among girls, direct paths between VE and each outcome remained the strongest. For IB and EB, VE was negatively associated with PN though PN was not associated with any outcomes.
Higher levels of VE were associated with higher levels of HD which were then associated with more negative IB and EB outcomes. For boys, fully-mediated models excluding direct paths between VE and the outcomes were selected. VE was negatively associated with CD and PN (IB only); neither mediator was associated with any outcome. Higher levels of VE were associated with higher levels of HD which were then associated negatively with all four outcomes. Findings indicated a pattern which more closely represented authoritarian parenting than “tough love” and which was, correspondingly, associated with more negative outcomes.
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INTRODUCTION

Youth Exposure to Violence: Prevalence, Costs, and Susceptibility

Youths’ exposure to violence has been identified as a damaging and pervasive problem facing society today (Stein, Jaycox, Kataoka, Rhodes, & Vestal, 2003). This is especially true in urban areas, where some estimates indicate that close to 90% of children and youths have been exposed to violence in school (Flannery, Wester, & Singer, 2004) and almost 80% have been exposed to violence in the neighborhood (Weist, Acosta, & Youngstrom, 2001). Although estimates of exposure to violence in the home are often more difficult to estimate, rates of 17% to 25% have been reported (Hotton, 2003; O’Brien, John, Margolin, & Erel, 1994). In one of the few nationally representative studies on the subject of violence exposure, Finkelhor and colleagues (Finkelhor, Ormrod, Turner, & Hamby, 2005) found that at least 1 in 3 participants (age range, 2 – 17 years) had witnessed or been exposed to the victimization of another in the past year. It is unsurprising, then, that Schwab-Stone and colleagues (1995) found that nearly 75% of urban youths surveyed reported feeling a lack of safety in one or more common environmental contexts. To compound this, often violence is not simply witnessed. Nationally, over 70% of children and youths have been victimized themselves, and of those, each has been victimized an average of 3 times (Finkelhor, Ormrod, Turner, & Hamby, 2005). In the United States, an average of 15 youths are murdered per day and more than 750,000 sustain injuries requiring
treatment in the emergency room (CDC, 2006). The financial costs of violence are staggering, with yearly estimates exceeding $158 billion (Children’s Safety Network Economics & Data Analysis Resource Center, 2000).

The effects of violence exposure may be particularly salient for racial and ethnic minority youth. For example, homicide is the leading cause of death for black youth aged 10 – 24 years (CDC 2007). Among non-Hispanic black males, homicide rates for this age group (53.1:100,000) significantly eclipse that for Hispanic males (20.1:100,000) and non-Hispanic White males (3.3:100,000). From a sociological and macroeconomic standpoint, this is not surprising. Levels of violence and violent victimization are frequently higher in poor, urban centers (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997); many of these poor, urban centers are also predominantly ethnic minority, and specifically, contain greater proportions of black residents (Cooley-Quille, Turner, & Beidel, 1995; Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997).

Youth Exposure to Violence: Compromising Youth’s Safe Havens and Competent Development

Youths who report high levels of exposure to community-level violence report a number of related fears, including fear of injury, the unknown, and danger (Cooley-Quille, Boyd, Frantz, & Walsh, 2001). This fear does not appear to be limited to the community context. Youth who have witnessed violence in the community also report
greater fears in the home and school contexts as well (Martinez & Richters, 1993).

Research in the area of family violence using the family systems theory addresses the
issue of the family and home as a context for support and safety as well as a source of
violence (Margolin, Oliver, & Medina, 2001). In this case, the child’s place of safety
is also a place of conflict, and over time the presence of conflict may erode the child’s
sense of safety. This violence may also have an impact on family resources, and the
resulting strain may result in a weakening of the family system (Margolin, 2005). As
Finkelhor et al. (2005) note, children and youths are often victimized or exposed to
violence in multiple ways, in multiple contexts, and by multiple people. It seems
reasonable to assume that a similar process might occur in these other contexts as
well. If associated with corresponding erosions in a youth’s sense of safety at school
and in the neighborhood, these contexts may also lose their ability to provide a youth
with a safe haven. In this case, even those homes untouched by family violence may
find that family resources are insufficient to act as a buffer against negative youth
outcomes.

Exposure to violence may also act as a stressor which impedes normative
competent development. Competent development has been defined as a “…pattern of
effective adaptation in the environment” (Masten & Coatsworth, 1998); in general,
competent children and youths achieve reasonable success in regards to age-
appropriate developmental tasks and possess the ability to continue to do so in the
future. For most youths, these age-appropriate developmental tasks include the
successful transition from elementary to junior or middle high school, continued
academic achievement in the face of new school challenges, involvement in school or
community related extracurricular activities, and the development of a greater sense of self-identity. However, because of its potential to change the course of these normal developmental trajectories, it has been hypothesized that children and youths may be more susceptible to the effects of violence exposure (Boney-McCoy & Finkelhor, 1995). Challenges to competent development such as this can have a number of negative results, including interfering with the development of self-regulation, or youths’ ability to control their attention, emotions and behaviors (Masten & Coatsworth, 1998). In turn, a lack of the ability to self-regulate has been associated with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, antisocial behavior problems, negative emotionality, and aggressive and disruptive behavior problems. As Margolin and Gordis (2004) note, more attention needs to be paid to the process by which violence exposure affects normative development and especially to how it affects the interpersonal relationships upon which youths typically draw comfort and support (e.g., parent/youth relationships). Throughout the course of development and as relationships change, youth may be more or less vulnerable to violence exposure as a function of the resources at their disposal. It seems likely that exposure to violence may operate, at least in part, via this mechanism. For example, the link between violence exposure and adverse youth psychopathology, namely internalizing and externalizing behaviors, has been well documented (e.g., Flannery, Wester, & Singer, 2004; Margolin & Gordis, 2004; Salzinger, Feldman, Stockhammer, & Hood, 2002).
Ecological Considerations in Violence Exposure

Other theoretical models may also provide some insight into additional pathways through which violence exposure may affect competent development. In a shift from the individual focus of many early psychologists, more attention is now being paid to the effects of the environment in which a person lives on later psychological and health outcomes. Beginning primarily in psychology with Bronfenbrenner’s social ecological theory (1977), and foreshadowed previously in sociology via relevant theories such as Shaw and McKay’s (1942) social disorganization theory, Merton’s (1968) strain theory, and Cloward and Ohlin’s (1960) differential opportunity theory, researchers began to shift attention to individuals as part of a nested social structure. In these views, individuals did not operate in isolation from their surroundings; social forces interacted with individuals who then acted in response to them. While most of the sociological theory was developed to explain the roots and causes of delinquency, Bronfenbrenner took a more developmental approach with his work.

Bronfenbrenner espoused the view that human development was embedded within broader cultural contexts. Transactional models built from this framework posit individual and reciprocal influences on child development from environmental forces, caregiver characteristics and child characteristics (Sameroff & Chandler, 1975). As it is unlikely that violence exposure occurs in isolation, Cicchetti & Lynch (1993) built upon this framework to further propose an ecological transactional model of violence exposure by combining ideas from earlier work on ecological influences (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, Belsky) with the idea of potentiating (i.e., factors linked with
an increased possibility of negative outcomes) and compensatory (i.e., factors linked with a decreased possibility of negative outcomes) risk factors that can act on both the youth and the environment surrounding the youth. This type of approach seems particularly useful for the study of violence exposure; as an event that can occur in different contexts, both those proximal to the youth as well as in more distal realms, and as one that can occur numerous times, sometimes approaching something akin to a chronic state, this pervasive and often ubiquitous exposure to violence among youth may, as the cumulative risk hypothesis argues, drive the increased likelihood of negative outcomes (Morales & Guerra, 2006; Mrug, Loosier, & Windle, 2008). In Cicchetti & Lynch’s (1993) framework, parents may act as a compensatory and enduring factor to guard against negative youth outcomes. However, for this to happen, parents need to engage in parenting behaviors that support competent development in their children and avoid those behaviors which have been shown to exacerbate negative child and youth outcomes.

Parenting, Environmental Influences, and Differences by Race/Ethnicity

According to Rohner (2004), parents play a critical role in a child’s adjustment as, “children’s sense of security and other emotional and psychological states are dependent on the quality of relationship with their parent(s)” (pg. 831); the effectiveness of this parent/youth bond, in turn, may be dependent on things such as the nature and quality of the parenting relationship. As Darling and Steinberg note
(1993), research on parenting styles emerged from the convergence of three main avenues of focus, namely, “…the emotional relationship between the parent and child, the parents’ practices and behavior, and the parents’ belief system (pg. 488).” Parenting style is a characteristic of the parent; parenting practices, on the other hand, are actual parenting behaviors. They are generally employed to influence a youth’s socialization and to reinforce parents’ priorities. Parenting style and parenting practices interact, as parenting style may influence not only the choice of parenting practice used but also its underlying socialization goal and effectiveness.

The parent/youth relationship is a reciprocal one. As much as youth’s behavior toward their parents may change with exposure to violence, so too may parents’ behavior change toward youth with exposure to violence. The notion that environmental stressors influence parenting practices is not a new one. Most notably, the family stress model, developed through work with Midwestern white families affected by a farming crisis and subsequently replicated among black families (Conger, Wallace, Sun, Simons, McLoyd, & Brody, 2002), indicated that economic distress negatively impacted parenting practices. These changes in parenting, in turn, were associated with higher levels of problem behavior, including higher levels of internalizing and externalizing behaviors, among children (Ge, Conger, Lorenz, & Simons, 1994).

Some (Darling & Steinberg, 1993) contend that social context and/or the cultural meaning attributed to parenting styles may explain some of the ethnic differences sometimes seen in the relation of parenting style with child and youth outcomes. As black families are proportionally more likely to be exposed to a greater
level of environmental instability than white families (e.g., neighborhoods characterized by higher levels of criminality, economic pressure, and residential mobility) (McLoyd, 1990), black parents may react by purposefully altering their parenting style. A few lines of research appear to partially support this proposition, among them alternate models of environmentally influenced parenting more specific to parenting in black families. Luthar (1999) has posited that the use of higher levels of control by black parents is a response to negative influences in the community. Although associations between race/ethnicity and certain parenting practices may be scattered throughout the literature, it has been hypothesized that, over time, adaptations become more specific within racial groups. In particular, black parents may have adopted socialization strategies that align with the risky social and physical environments in which black children often live (Bulcroft, Carmody, & Bulcroft, 1996). Parents living in communities characterized by high levels of violence exposure, in fact, may be especially attuned to problem behavior in their youth which may indicate either an increased risk of physical harm or the potential for the youth to act as an agent of harm against others (Kelley, Power, & Wimbush, 1992). For example, in neighborhoods in which mothers perceive more threats and fewer social resources, the use of punitive parenting is less strongly associated with poor youth outcomes, especially for black boys. This seems to provide support for the supposition that, in response to these external threats, black parents may employ greater levels of control and use more harsh discipline in an effort to protect their children and youth from harm. This is in line with a parental orientation designed to
provide youth with the safety and security lacking in their proximal environments and to limit the potential for physical and psychological harm.

Although urban black parents of youth exposed to higher levels of risk may use high levels of control with their children (Luthar, 1999), it has been suggested that these high levels of control are not viewed negatively (Deater-Deckard & Dodge, 1997). In fact, this strategy has been considered an adaptive response to the environment as it is thought to provide a sense of order and safety for these youth. Early evidence that black mothers were more authoritarian, and thus their children more likely to exhibit some of the negative sequelae associated with that type of parenting, gave way to later conceptualizations that broadened more classic views of parenting groupings when Baumrind’s (1967; 1991) original groupings of authoritative (characterized by warm, firm control) and authoritarian (characterized by negative, harsh control) parenting were given closer scrutiny by Brooks-Gunn and Chase-Lansdale (1995). Observing interactions between a mixed sample of about 700 black and white mothers and their children revealed an additional grouping of interest comprised primarily of black mothers: “tough love”, characterized by high levels of warm, firm control and high levels of negative, harsh control.

The prevailing viewpoint in research on parenting styles is that authoritatively reared youth are better adjusted, both socially and psychologically, and more competent (e.g., Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). Authoritative parents expect their children to obey rules and commands, but they do so in the context of a warm and open relationship. They communicate about rules and expectations and take a more child-centered approach to parenting that often involves
mutual decision-making. They offer their children more autonomy, but they do so in a setting that offers the boundaries of rules. Authoritarian parenting, on the other hand, has often been derided. These parents also expect their children to conform to rules and commands, but they do not necessarily do so in the context of a warm and loving relationship. They are much more dictatorial, do not always explain the reasoning behind their disciplining, and often use harsh or corporal punishment to gain compliance. Youth reared via an authoritarian parenting style are generally seen as less socially competent, have lower positive self-perceptions of themselves (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991), and may be more prone to depression (Doyle, Brendgen, & Markiewicz, 2003).

Authoritarian parenting is not without its benefits, however, as these youth do report less misconduct and drug use and a more positive orientation toward school (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). It may be that these youth conform their behavior to their parents’ expectations more thoroughly, in part because of a parental emphasis on control and obedience. Parents using “tough love”, a parenting style which appears to be a mixture between authoritative and authoritarian parenting, may be hoping to capitalize on the positive aspects of each by combining the nurturance and openness traditionally associated with authoritative parenting with the firm control and harsh discipline traditionally associated with authoritarian parenting. These parents may hope to provide their youth with the skills needed to be socially and psychologically well-adjusted but may also place great emphasis on controlling those behaviors which place their youth at risk in an already risky
environment, namely delinquent or aggressive behaviors, substance use, and/or a low connection with school.

Information about the three parenting practices hypothesized to co-occur within a “tough love” parent/youth relationship – openness, parental nurturance, and harsh discipline – is provided in greater depth below.

**Child Disclosure**

Parental monitoring has an extensive and varied association with adverse youth outcomes in the literature, including associations with lower levels of both internalizing and externalizing behavior problems among youth (e.g., Barber, Olsen, & Shagle, 1994). In the past, monitoring had been primarily conceived of as an active role undertaken by parents, involving the seeking out of and tracking of a child’s behaviors (Dishion & McMahon, 1998). In an expansion of this, Stattin and Kerr (2000) argue that there are three potential contributors to the construct of parental monitoring: *child disclosure*, or spontaneous disclosure regarding activities to parents by youths; *parental solicitation*, or an active search for information on an youth’s activities on the part of parents; and, *parental control*, or limitations on an youth’s activities and associations by parents via the imposition of rules and regulations. While the majority of previous research has focused on definitions of monitoring that align most closely with the latter two components, Stattin and Kerr (2000) argue that these conceptualizations of monitoring focus on less important components while
overlooking the main source of association between monitoring measures and youth outcomes – child disclosure.

In an examination of 703 Swedish 14-year olds, Stattin and Kerr (2000) found that child disclosure was more predictive of a traditional measure of parental monitoring than were parental solicitation and parental control. While active efforts on the part of the parents (solicitation and control) do contribute a small amount to explained variance for the construct of monitoring, they account for only 3% of child reported monitoring (versus 44% for disclosure) and 5% of parent reported monitoring (versus 38% for disclosure). Subsequent analyses indicated that this association was not the by-product of emotionally close bonds between parents and youths, suggesting that child disclosure can be an effective indicator of decreased risk for adverse outcomes even for youths who do not report close bonds with parents. Despite the relative weakness of association between family closeness and negative youth outcomes, however, it seems likely that antecedent behaviors in the parent/youth relationship have created a relationship in which such disclosure is either encouraged, accepted, expected, and/or the norm. While this does not necessarily reflect a “close” relationship between parent and youth as defined by Stattin and Kerr (2000) (i.e., the amount of conflict in the parent/youth relationship and a youth’s acceptance and understanding of who their parent is as a person), it may be reflective of a pattern of parent/youth interactions in which parents have established a relationship in which their youth feel comfortable disclosing or beholden to disclose events that have happened in their life without prompting.
Parental nurturance

Though there is a relative paucity of research on parental nurturance as compared to some other parenting practices, there are a number of highly related concepts which speak to its hypothesized effect. The Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PARTheory) posits that there are universal displays of perceived parental acceptance-rejection that manifest via four classes of behavior on the part of parents: warmth-affection, hostility-aggression, indifference-neglect, and undifferentiated rejection (Rohner, 2004). Rohner (2004) conceptualizes parent-child relationships as falling along a continuum of parental acceptance-rejection. That is, parent-child relationships in which there are high levels of parental warmth are characterized by positive emotionality and the expression of positive feelings through behaviors and actions. A parent demonstrating high levels of acceptance will display, “…warmth, affection, care, comfort, concern, nurturance, support or simply love…” (emphasis added: pg. 831). According to Rohner, parental acceptance is, in large part, a manifestation of parental warmth, and this warmth is an expression of the affective quality of the parent-child relationship. Parental rejection, on the other hand, is a product of the absence or withdrawal of the feelings and behaviors described above and their replacement with behaviors and interactions that can be both physically and psychologically damaging. In line with this view, individuals who perceive their relationship with their parents as rejecting report negative psychological and behavioral sequelae, including aggression, hostility and emotional instability. They are also more likely to report anxiety, insecurity, depression, substance abuse, and
externalizing behavior problems such as conduct disorder and delinquency (Rohner, 2004).

Harsh discipline

In comparison to parental monitoring and parental nurturance, harsh discipline has been studied most extensively with black youth. Harsh discipline, in conjunction with other parental disciplining mechanisms that are overly punitive or inconsistent, has been proposed as one of the major mechanisms behind child and youth externalizing behavior problems (Baumrind, 1993). Use of high levels of harsh discipline have also been associated with youth reports of higher levels of psychological distress and depression (Turner & Finkelhor, 1996; Straus, 1994; Straus & Kaufman-Kantor, 1994) among samples of white as well as black youth (McLoyd, Jayaratne, Ceballo, & Borquez, 1994). This link, especially to depression, is long-lasting, persisting up to two years later (Eamon, 2002).

Parental use of mild to moderate discipline practices (e.g., discipline practices that do not cause physical injury, which may include spanking or slapping) is a contentious issue. One camp of researchers (e.g., American Academy of Pediatrics, 1998) seem to advocate for widespread ban of these types of parenting practices on the basis that they are linked with a variety of negative outcomes among children and youth. Others argue against any such ban, positing that these parenting practices are effective and desirable (Baumrind, 1996a; 1996b; Baumrind, Larzelere, & Cowan,
The issue becomes further complicated by the intersection of ethnicity and parenting practices.

Black mothers are more likely to use physical discipline than are white mothers (Lansford et al., 2004; Regalado, Sareen, Inkelas, Wissow, & Halfon, 2004) but physical discipline does not appear to be linked with as many negative consequences for black children as it is for white children (Deater-Deckard, Dodge, Bates, & Pettit, 1996; McLoyd, & Smith, 2002). Though most of this work has been done with young children, evidence suggests a certain amount of homogeneity in parenting across time, particularly for constructs such as monitoring and noninvolvement (Holden & Miller, 1999) and physical discipline (Lansford, Deater-Deckard, Dodge, Bates, & Pettit, 2004). Deater-Deckard et al (1996) believe this difference in outcomes is not attributable to SES but instead to ethnicity. In fact, ratings of externalizing behaviors for black children who, prior to age 5, experience non-harsh discipline as compared to those who experienced harsh, but not abusive, parenting are negligible. Lansford et al (2004) found that harsh discipline in early childhood and in early adolescence was related to higher levels of externalizing behavior problems in late adolescence for white youth but not for black youth.

Deater-Deckard & Dodge proposed that harsh discipline practices may be more prevalent and permissible in black families, in part to, “…prevent economic and social failure for a child who is growing up in a nonforgiving White society” (pg. 170) (Deater-Deckard & Dodge, 1997), and they did find that norms for the use of harsh discipline may be different in some black communities as compared to white communities. When presented with vignettes about disobedient children whose
parents responded with either reasoning or a spanking, black mothers rated the spanking parent more positively and the action taken as an example of good parenting as compared to white mothers who rated the spanking parent more negatively and as an example of an abusive parent (Deater-Deckard & Dodge, 1997). These findings provoked a great deal of attention and some backlash (note: see Psychological Inquiry, 8(3), 1997) from other parenting researchers. Despite this controversy, much remains to be done in the study of the association between harsh discipline and problem behavior outcomes for black youth.

Gender Differences

Some research indicates that boys are exposed to higher levels of violence than are girls (Cooley-Quille, Boyd, Frantz, & Walsh, 2001). As many as 86% of inner-city boys reported high levels of violence exposure in the past year, with more than half reporting a minimum of three instances of violence exposure in the past year (Sheidow et al, 2001). In a seeming confirmation of this, in a literature review of studies dealing with child and youth exposure to community violence, Stein and colleagues (Stein, Jaycox, Kataoka, Rhodes, & Vestal, 2003) reported that boys were exposed to more violence than girls in 13 of 19 studies dealing with gender differences. Only two of the included studies indicated that girls were exposed to more violence, while four found no gender differences in violence exposure. On the whole, boys were more likely to be victimized by violence (with the notable
exception of rape) and to witness more violence, though the differences in exposure rates were smaller for witnessing violence. Despite lower rates of violence exposure, however, girls often reported feeling more unsafe than males.

Some research has indicated that the strength of the association between violence exposure and internalizing and externalizing behaviors is equivalent for boys and girls (Buckner, Beardslee, & Bassuk, 2004; Schwab-Stone, Chen, Greenberger, Silver, Lichtman, & Voyce, 1999). However, in a study of urban African-American youth ages 9 – 11, Schiff & McKay (2003) found that the girls in their study had higher rates of violence exposure than did the boys, that girls also reported higher rates of aggression and delinquent behavior, and that mother reports of family cohesion were lower for mothers of girls than of boys. Although externalizing behavior problems are more common for boys, in general, the link between violence exposure and externalizing behavior problems does not appear to be moderated by gender. This may be because boys often display higher rates of externalizing behaviors at a younger age, though boys and girls follow similar developmental trajectories thereafter (Prinzie, Onghena, & Hellinckx, 2005).

Similarly, in their study of school children in grades 3-12, Flannery et al. (2004) found that reports of trauma (i.e., anxiety, depression, posttraumatic stress, dissociation, anger and sexual concerns) were higher among female students than among male students. Other information also indicates that girls reporting high levels of violence exposure report more internalizing behavior problems, including anxiety and depressive symptoms, than girls reporting low levels of violence exposure (Cooley-Quille, Boyd, Frantz, & Walsh, 2001). As such, the relationship between
violence exposure and internalizing behaviors may be stronger for girls than for boys (Buckner, Beardslee, & Bassuk, 2004).

**Summary**

Compromised environments have consistently demonstrated negative effects on youth’s internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors. Violence exposure, in particular, has been shown to have a detrimental effect on a broad array of outcomes and across multiple contexts. Though these effects on youth outcomes are direct effects, violence exposure and associated structural correlates have been shown to have effects on parenting as well, often by interfering with parents’ ability to engage in effective and positive parenting practices. Both parenting and parenting in compromised environments have been hypothesized and shown to vary by race/ethnicity and to have differential effects on boys and girls. Higher levels of more positive parenting practices, those that promote greater relationship quality between youth and parents, are generally thought to act as buffers against negative youth outcomes or to promote more positive youth outcomes. However, what constitutes “good parenting” is not necessarily the same for all cultural groups, nor is it the same for parents living in resource rich versus resource poor environments.

One line of research suggests that black parents, particularly black parents in resource poor or compromised environments, may, for a variety of reasons, engage in parenting practices that, when evaluated by different standards, be considered
harmful. Previous research has indicated that black mothers, in particular, are more likely than white mothers to adopt a “tough love” approach characterized by both high levels of warmth and high levels of discipline. Differences by ethnicity related to parenting styles that align, at least in part, with this conceptualization have shown that black youth are not as negatively affected by some parenting practices, such as the use of harsh discipline, as are white youth. Moving past the issue of between group differences in both parenting and youths’ responses to parenting, however, is the question of within group variability. Black parents do not act as a single, uniform whole employing a singular style of parenting, nor do black youth all consistently respond in the same manner. Whether or not these practices are pervasive and truly adaptive as hypothesized is up for debate and information regarding the variability of parenting practices within the black community is relatively sparse. The current examination sought to further inform both issues by looking at the following within a sample of predominantly urban, black, primarily low SES youth:

1) Is violence exposure associated with higher levels of internalizing and externalizing problem behavior outcomes?

2) Does parenting partially or fully mediate any association between violence exposure and negative youth outcomes? That is, is violence exposure associated with child disclosure, parental nurturance, and harsh discipline as would be expected in a “tough love” relationship and are these parenting practices, in turn, associated with lower levels of problem behaviors?

3) Do the relationships between violence exposure, parenting, and internalizing and externalizing behavior problems differ by gender?
If it is the case that, in accordance with the “tough love” parenting style, a parent/youth relationship in which harsh discipline coincides with a warm and nurturing relationship characterized, in part, by other positive parenting behaviors such as high levels of child disclosure exists, and that this parenting style is employed in an effort to counteract the effects of a compromised environment or to prepare a child to face an unjust world, then it should be the case that youth exposed to high levels of violence should have a relationship with their parent distinguished by higher levels of child disclosure, parental nurturance, and harsh discipline. If this parenting style, in turn, is either helpful – or at the very least not harmful – to the youth, then higher levels of these parenting variables should be associated with more positive outcomes for internalizing and externalizing risk behaviors.
METHOD

Participants

Data were drawn from the second wave of interviews with students (*Mean age* = 12.89, *SD* = 0.87) attending schools in a metropolitan area of the Southeast who participated in a larger 2 wave study of youth violence. These analyses use data from the black youth only (*N* = 465). The sample was relatively evenly divided by gender, with girls comprising 50.5% (*n* = 235; for boys, *n* = 230). Income was positively skewed (*range* = less than $5,000 to greater than $90,000 yearly), as nearly 14% (*n* = 62) of the sample reported household incomes of less than $5000 a year. The median income ranged between $20,000 and $25,000 yearly. Using the total number of people reported to live in the household and assuming that only one of those was a child, according to 2005 poverty level income thresholds, nearly 60% (*n* = 276) of the families in the current study reported incomes approximately at or below the poverty threshold (U.S. Census Bureau). As the number of children per household decreases the poverty threshold and as the median number of children per household for this sample was 3, this can be assumed to be a conservative estimate. Over 60% of youth (*n* = 280) indicated that they had not lived in the same household as both of their parents in the past 12 months (*n* = 155 (66%) for girls; *n* = 125 (54%) for boys). Youths were accompanied by an adult caregiver who was also interviewed separately, 85% (*n* = 396) of whom were biological mothers. Both the youths and their caregivers were compensated for their time. The study was approved by the
associated university’s Institutional Review Board (see Appendix A for IRB approval).

Procedure

A sampling frame was constructed using local school characteristics as a guide. From this pool, a random sample of schools was drawn. However, changes in local school board personnel restricted access to a subset of schools chosen during initial rounds of school selection. These schools were systematically replaced with other schools matched on key student characteristics. Letters were sent to parents of students in the final sample of selected schools explaining the purpose of the study and active consent was used to gain permission for youths’ participation. Both parental consent and youth assent was necessary for a youth’s participation in the study. Initial screening information was gathered in classrooms by trained interviewers. After this, all waves of data collection occurred at the study site. For those individuals who were unable to schedule an interview at the study site, home interviews or interviews at a neutral location in the community were conducted. All interviews were conducted face-to-face, though the use of computer assisted participant interviewing (CAPI) was used to gather information on sensitive topics.
Measures

All of the measures used in the current examination were derived from child reports.

Violence Exposure

Eighteen questions dealt with violence exposure. Stem questions for witnessing violence queried exposure to three violent events in the past 12 months: 1) heard someone say that they were going to hurt someone else really badly; 2) seen someone else get hit, kicked, punched or beaten up; and, 3) seen someone else threatened or hurt with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club? Parallel questions for victimization further asked whether or not these events had occurred to the respondent. If a youth indicated that he/she had witnessed or been victimized by any of these events, follow-up questions ascertained whether or not the exposure had occurred: 1) at home; 2) in school; or, 3) in the neighborhood. As such, it was possible for a youth to endorse witnessing a violent event or being victimized in more than one context for each exposure type. Items were summed so that higher levels of endorsement reflect higher rates of violence exposure in total. This measure provides a holistic representation of youth violence exposure by combining direct and indirect victimization across all salient contexts. Although it is possible to examine the individual effects of the type
and context of violence, the individual contributions of violence exposure by context have been examined elsewhere (e.g., Mrug, Loosier, & Windle, 2008). The current study focused, instead, on the totality of violence to which a youth could be exposed.

**Parenting**

*Child disclosure.* Child disclosure was measured via a 5-item scale adapted from Stattin & Kerr (2000). Participants were asked, “Even when your parents don’t ask you, do you tell them about: 1) your friends?; 2) school, such as how each subject is going and your relationship with teachers?; 3) important things that happened to you during your day?; 4) physical fights or other bad things that happened to others during your day?; and, 5) physical fights or other bad things that happened to you during your day?” Responses were given on a three-point scale (1=Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often). Items were summed so that higher scores on this item reflect higher levels of child disclosure (α=0.64 for girls and α=0.58 for boys).

*Parental nurturance.* Parental nurturance was measured via a 5-item scale (Barnes & Windle, 1987; Barnes, Farrell, & Windle, 1987). Participants were asked ‘How often:
1) do your parents give you praise or encouragement?; 2) do you rely on your parents for advice and guidance?; 3) do your parents give you a hug or kiss?; 4) do you and your parents do things together that you both enjoy?; and 5) do you discuss personal problems with your parents?’ Responses were given on a three-point scale (1 = Almost always, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Almost never). Items were reverse coded and summed so that higher scores on this item reflect higher levels of parental nurturance (α = 0.64 for girls and α = 0.66 for boys).

Harsh discipline. Harsh discipline was measured via a 5-item scale (Ge, Conger, Lorenz, & Simons, 1994). Participants were asked the frequency with which their caregiver did the following when disciplining: 1) loses his/her temper and yells at you?; 2) spanks you?; 3) hits you with a belt, paddle, or something else?; 4) tells you to get out or locks you out of the house; or, 5) slaps you?” Responses were given on a 5-point scale ranging from Never to Always. Items were summed so that higher scores on this item reflect higher levels of harsh discipline. (α = 0.62 for girls and α = 0.55 for boys) These internal consistency estimates are similar to those found in the original work done by Ge et al (1994), though those estimates were reports from fathers and mothers as opposed to youth reports (α = 0.62 for mothers and α = 0.58 for fathers). Relatively poor reliability for this measure is not uncommon as parents may rely primarily on one or two preferred types of punishment, thus decreasing inter-item
correlations. Mean scores of 8.32 ($SD = 2.53$) for boys and 8.12 ($SD = 2.58$) for girls for this item indicate low to moderate use and frequency of harsh disciplining practices for this sample.

**Internalizing Behaviors**

*Depressive symptoms.* Youths’ depressive symptoms were measured using the 6-item depression subscale of the Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children Predictive Scales (DPS) (Lucas, Zhang, Fisher, Shaffer, Regier, Narrow, *et al.*, 2001) which captures depressed mood, loss of interest/boredom and hopelessness in the past 12 months. Participants were asked if the following had occurred during the past 12 months: 1) Has there been a time when nothing was fun for you and you weren’t interested in anything?; 2) Has there been a time when you had less energy than you usually do?; 3) Has there been a time when you felt you couldn’t do anything well or that you weren’t as good-looking or as smart as other people?; 4) Has there been a time when you thought seriously about killing yourself?; 5) Has there been a time when doing even little things made you feel really tired?; and, 6) Has there been a time when you couldn’t think as clearly or as fast as usual?

The DPS was derived from the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children (DISC), a clinical interviewing protocol designed to provide child and youth diagnoses of mental health problems. The DPS
was formed by identifying gate and contingency questions from the larger NIMH-DISC which resulted in identical or near identical diagnosis rates as did administration of the full interview. Prospective validation among a sample of youth admitted to a community mental health agency (ages 9-17, of which 36.9% were black) indicated diagnoses based on self-reported answers on the DPS aligned with diagnoses assigned after the full interview in all but three cases. In these cases, misdiagnosis was the result of changes in endorsement of the gate items (e.g., from yes to no). For the major depressive disorder (MDD) subscale, prospective validation of the DPS evidenced sensitivity of 1.00 and specificity of 0.88. As they were gating items, response options for this scale were dichotomous ($0=\text{No}, 1=\text{Yes}$). Items were summed so that higher scores represent higher levels of depressive symptoms ($\alpha=0.68$ for girls and $\alpha=0.67$ for boys).

**Anxiety.** Anxiety was measured using the Revised Children’s Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS). The RCMAS has demonstrated evidence of construct validity (Reynolds & Richmond, 1985), internal consistency, construct and discriminant validity, and test-retest reliability (Perrin & Last, 1992), and correlates significantly with other established measures of anxiety (Reynolds & Richmond, 1978). In use with another sample of inner-city youths with high rates of violence exposure, the RCMAS subscales evidenced adequate reliability (range: 0.67 – 0.78) (White, Bruce, Farrell,
& Kliewer, 1998). The RCMAS is comprised of three subscales measuring physiological symptoms (e.g., It is hard for you to get to sleep at night.; You wiggle in your seat a lot.), worry/anxiety (e.g., You get nervous when things do not go the right way for you; Your feelings get hurt easily.), and concentration (e.g., You feel that others do not like the way you do things.; Other children are happier than you are.) and one subscale measuring social desirability. Only the 28 anxiety specific questions were used for this analysis. Response options for this scale were dichotomous (0=False, 1=True). Items were summed so that higher scores indicate higher levels of anxiety ($\alpha=0.89$ for girls and $\alpha=0.87$ for boys).

Externalizing Behaviors

Disruptive behavior disorder symptoms. Disruptive behavior disorder (DBD) symptoms were measured via a combination of the 7-item oppositional defiant disorder (ODD) (e.g., Have you gotten even with people by doing things like hurting them, messing up their things, or telling lies about them?; Have you blamed someone else for your mistakes or for things you did that you shouldn’t have done?) and 8-item conduct disorder (CD) (e.g., Have you lied to get money or something else you wanted? Have you stolen from anyone else when they weren’t around or weren’t looking?) subscales of the DPS (Lucas, Zhang, Fisher, Shaffer, Regier, Narrow, et al., 2001). Each of the scales referenced occurrences in the past 12 months. Prospective
validation of the ODD subscale evidenced sensitivity of 0.87 and specificity of 0.61. For the CD subscale, sensitivity was 0.81 and specificity was 0.81. As they were gating items, response options for this scale were dichotomous (0=No, 1=Yes). Items were summed so that higher scores represent higher levels of DBD symptoms (α=0.70 for girls and α=0.75 for boys).

**Overt aggression.** Overt aggression was measured using the 18-item overt aggression measure developed by Little and colleagues (2003a; 2003b) which was based on earlier research involving overt, reactive, and instrumental aggression (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Dodge & Coie, 1987). The scale was composed of three 6-item subscales. The pure overt aggression subscale measured unprovoked verbal and physical aggression on the part of the youth (e.g., I’m the kind of person who often fights with others.) The reactive overt aggression subscale measured the youth’s use of verbal and physical aggression in response to provocation (e.g., When I’m hurt by someone, I often fight back.) The instrumental overt aggression subscale measured the youth’s use of verbal and physical aggression as used to achieve a goal (e.g., I often start fights to get what I want.) Each item was rated on a four point scale ranging from “not at all true” to “completely true.” Items were summed so that higher scores on this scale indicate higher levels of overt aggression (α=0.89 for girls and α=0.87 for boys).
Data Analysis Plan

To determine if child disclosure, parental nurturance, or harsh discipline mediated the relationship between violence exposure and internalizing (i.e., depression and anxiety) and externalizing (i.e., DBD symptoms and overt aggression), models were estimated separately for boys and girls as well as for internalizing and externalizing behaviors using LISREL student version 8.54 (Scientific Software International, Inc.). The models were estimated by examining the structural models. For each, a full model including direct paths was estimated first. In the second model, the direct paths were eliminated, leaving a mediational only model (2 x 2 x 2 = 8 models total). Figure 1 illustrates the hypothesized models. Because a moderate correlation existed between parental nurturance and harsh discipline for girls (r = -0.42, \( p < 0.05 \)), these two variables were allowed to covary in each model for girls only. This correlation remained significant in the path model. This path is not represented in the hypothesized model. The path coefficient is not presented in the girls’ path models as this value is not available for the standardized solution.
Figure 1. Hypothesized Path Model Containing Direct and Indirect Paths to Both Internalizing and Externalizing Behaviors

Model fit criteria (i.e., $X^2$, $\Delta X^2$, RMSEA, TLI, CFI) were used to determine which model provided the best, and most parsimonious, fit to the data. See Table 1 for more information on these indices of model fit (Schumacker & Lomax 2004). In addition, the order condition was also assessed and satisfied. Satisfaction of the order condition indicates that the number of free parameters to be estimated in the model is less than or equal to the number of distinct values in the matrix. The current models were over-identified (i.e., there were multiple ways to estimate parameters from the observed data).
Table 1.

*Rationale for use of Fit Indices to Assess Model Fit*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indices</th>
<th>Rationale for use</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square ($\chi^2$)</td>
<td>Non-significance of $\chi^2$ indicates similarity in sample covariance matrix and reproduced model-implied covariance matrix.</td>
<td>$p = \text{ns}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Chi-square ($\Delta \chi^2$)</td>
<td>Significant change in $\chi^2$ between models indicates that one model fits the data significantly better than the other model. Is assessed by calculating whether the difference in $\chi^2$ for each model is smaller than the critical $\chi^2$ value derived using the difference in degrees of freedom between the models.</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>Measure of lack of fit between the population covariance matrix and the implied covariance matrix. This measure is corrected for degrees of freedom.</td>
<td>Less than or equal to 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)</td>
<td>Compares value of fitting function of model under study to the value of the fitting function of the null model.</td>
<td>Greater than or equal to 0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative fit index (CFI)</td>
<td>Compares a restricted model with a full model using a baseline null model.</td>
<td>Greater than or equal to 0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is important because models which are under-identified, or models in which there are more parameters to be estimated than there are distinct values in the matrix, will not allow for parameter estimation. Just-identified models, or models in which the number of parameters to be estimated and the number of distinct values in the matrix are equal, are saturated models and so will always return perfect model fit. In
later figures, dotted lines are used to represent the direct pathways from violence exposure to each outcome measure. These paths were not estimated in the mediational only models. Each set of models will be discussed separately below.

Structural equation modeling tests have an underlying assumption of multivariate normality of the data; violation of this assumption results in underestimation of the standard errors. As standard errors are used in the calculation of the significance of path loadings, failure to correct for violations of multivariate normality increase the risk of making a type I error. PRELIS was used to check for univariate and multivariate normality of the data. Skewness and kurtosis values showed significant variation from the normal distribution, indicating that the data did not meet the assumption of multivariate normality. To correct for this, raw data were converted into an asymptotic covariance matrix using the SIMPLIS interface of LISREL. The asymptotic covariance matrix weights the data in such a way that it adjusts the normal-theory weight matrix to correct for the bias in standard errors and fit statistics that occur with non-multivariate normal data (Lomax & Schumacker, 2004). Following this, path loadings were estimated using robust maximum likelihood estimators. Robust maximum likelihood estimators and standardized solutions are presented below. In addition, the corrected for non-normality $\chi^2$ is also reported.

Very few individuals ($n = 4$) were lost due to incomplete data. These individuals were deleted from the dataset for these analyses. At the time of data collection for the second wave, the majority of students had transitioned from the school from which they were recruited for screening into one of the area junior high
schools. Mobility between schools within the district was also high. These factors mitigated any initial clustering effects that may have resulted from the original sampling plan.
RESULTS

Violence exposure

Overall, 83% ($n = 389$) of the youth had been exposed to violence in school, 38% ($n = 177$) had been exposed to violence in the neighborhood, and 13.5% ($n = 63$) had been exposed to violence in the home. Eighty-nine percent ($n = 415$) of the youth had witnessed at least one type of violence in any context and 29% ($n = 135$) had experienced at least one type of victimization in any context. Less than 10% ($n = 44$) of the youth reported no incidence of either witnessing violence or being victimized.

See Table 2 for rates of violence exposure by gender. Total violence exposure did not differ by gender, $t(463) = 0.45, p = ns$.

Table 2.

*Frequencies for Violence Exposure by Context, Witnessing, and Victimization for Girls and Boys (N = 465)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th></th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>(85.5%)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>(81.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In neighborhood</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>(31.5%)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>(44.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(16.6%)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(10.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed at least once in</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>(89.4%)</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>(89.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimized at least once in</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>(24.7%)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(33.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No incidence in any context</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(9.4%)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(9.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was first necessary to demonstrate a direct link between violence exposure and internalizing and externalizing behaviors before any indirect associations through parenting practices could be examined. As seen in Figure 2, violence exposure was directly associated with internalizing and externalizing behaviors for both boys and girls.

**Figure 2. Direct Associations Between Violence Exposure and Internalizing and Externalizing Behaviors for Both Girls and Boys**
Correlations

As seen in Tables 3 and 4, several significant correlations between variables were present for both girls and boys. Notably, violence exposure was correlated with internalizing and externalizing behaviors for all. For girls, the three hypothesized mediating variables were also correlated. Of those, the strongest correlation was between parental nurturance and harsh discipline ($r = -0.42, p < 0.05$), indicating a moderate and negative correlation between these two variables. Conversely, parental nurturance was positively correlated with child disclosure ($r = 0.33, p < 0.05$), though child disclosure was negatively correlated with harsh discipline ($r = -0.27, p < 0.05$). For boys, parental nurturance and child disclosure were the most strongly correlated of the three hypothesized mediating variables ($r = 0.33, p < 0.05$), indicating a small positive correlation between these two variables. Although child disclosure was negative correlated with harsh discipline ($r = -0.18, p < 0.05$), harsh discipline was not correlated with parental nurturance ($r = 0.08, p = ns$). Not surprisingly, as seen in Tables 2 and 3, depressive symptoms and anxiety were strongly correlated for both girls and boys, as were DBD symptoms and overt aggression.
Table 3.

*Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Internalizing and Externalizing Behavior Measures for Girls*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Violence exposure</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Child disclosure</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parental nurturance</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Harsh discipline</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>-0.42*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. Depressive symptoms</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. Anxiety</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>0.70*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Disruptive behavior disorder symptoms</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>-0.29*</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Overt aggression</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>0.62*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25.85</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *p < 0.05*
Table 4. Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Internalizing and Externalizing Behavior Measures for Boy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Violence exposure</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Child disclosure</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parental nurturance</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Harsh discipline</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. Depressive symptoms</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. Anxiety</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>0.62*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Disruptive behavior disorder symptoms</td>
<td>0.43*</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Overt aggression</td>
<td>0.34*</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.61*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.54</td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < 0.05
Girls Internalizing

For girls’ internalizing behaviors, the full model, including both direct and indirect paths, provided the best fit to the data, $X^2(2) = 1.44, p = \text{ns}$, RMSEA = 0.00, TLI = 1.05, CFI = 1.00 ($\Delta X^2(2) = 13.59$, $p < 0.05$, for the full model as compared to the reduced model). The model explained 15% of the variance for depressive symptoms and 21% of the variance for anxiety among girls.

As seen in Figure 3, higher levels of violence exposure were directly associated with higher levels of both depressive symptoms, $b = 0.34$ ($\beta = 0.30$, $p < 0.05$), and anxiety, $b = 0.38$ ($\beta = 1.29$, $p < 0.05$). The strength of this association was slightly stronger for anxiety as compared to depressive symptoms. Although violence exposure was not associated with child disclosure, higher levels of violence exposure were associated with lower levels of parental nurturance, $b = -0.19$ ($\beta = -0.19$, $p < 0.05$). Parental nurturance, however, was not associated with either depressive symptoms or anxiety. Higher levels of violence exposure were associated with higher levels of harsh discipline, $b = 0.17$ ($\beta = 0.23$, $p < 0.05$). Higher levels of harsh discipline, in turn, were associated with higher levels of anxiety, $b = 0.16$ ($\beta = 0.41$, $p < 0.05$), but not with depressive symptoms. Overall, this indirect association explained 6.5% of the association between violence exposure and anxiety.
Figure 3. Relationships between Violence Exposure, Parenting Practices, and Internalizing Behaviors for Girls

Girls Externalizing

For girls’ externalizing behaviors, the full model, including both direct and indirect paths, provided the best fit to the data, $X^2(2) = 1.44, p = ns$, RMSEA = 0.00, TLI = 1.05, CFI = 1.00 ($\Delta X^2(2) = 9.28, p < 0.05$), for the full model as compared to the reduced model). The model explained 11% of the variance for DBD symptoms and 18% of the variance for overt aggression among girls.

As seen in Figure 4, higher levels of violence exposure were directly associated with higher levels of both DBD symptoms, $b = 0.28 (\beta = 1.03, p < 0.05)$, and overt aggression, $b = 0.38 (\beta = 0.44, p < 0.05)$, though the strength of the association
between violence exposure and overt aggression was 1.4 times as strong as that between violence exposure and DBD symptoms. Violence exposure was not associated with child disclosure; however, higher levels of violence exposure were associated with lower levels of parental nurturance. Parental nurturance was not, in turn, associated with either DBD symptoms or overt aggression. Higher levels of violence exposure were associated with higher levels of harsh discipline, $b = 0.17$ ($\beta = 0.23$, $p < 0.05$). Higher levels of harsh discipline were associated with higher levels of DBD symptoms, $b = 0.22$ ($\beta = 0.61$, $p < 0.05$) but not with overt aggression. Overall, this indirect association explained 11.3% of the association between violence exposure and DBD symptoms.
Boys Internalizing

For boys’ internalizing behaviors, both the full and the mediation model provided a good fit to the data, and there was no difference in model fit ($\Delta \chi^2(2) = 5.25, p = \text{ns}$). As such, as the more parsimonious model, the reduced model was selected, $X^2(5) = 11.44, p < 0.05$, RMSEA = 0.00, TLI = 1.03, CFI = 1.00. The model explained 6% of the variance in depressive symptoms and 10% of the variance in anxiety.
As seen in Figure 5, higher levels of violence exposure were associated with lower levels of child disclosure, $b = -0.11$ ($\beta = -0.12, p < 0.05$), lower levels of parental nurturance, $b = -0.19$ ($\beta = -0.19, p < 0.05$), and higher levels of harsh discipline, $b = 0.24$ ($\beta = 0.33, p < 0.05$). Of the three, however, only harsh discipline was associated with any outcome. Higher levels of harsh discipline were associated with higher levels of both depressive symptoms, $b = 0.20$ ($\beta = 0.13, p < 0.05$) and anxiety, $b = 0.28$ ($\beta = 0.68, p < 0.05$). The indirect path through harsh discipline to anxiety was 1.4 times as strong as the pathway to anxiety. Overall, this indirect association explained 12.0% of the association between violence exposure and depressive symptoms and 20.1% of the association between violence exposure and anxiety.
Boys Externalizing

For boys’ externalizing behaviors, both the full and the mediation model provided a good fit to the data, and there was no difference in model fit ($\Delta X^2(2) = 4.90, p = \text{ns}$). As such, as the more parsimonious model, the reduced model was selected, $X^2(5) = 11.40, p < 0.05$, RMSEA = 0.00, TLI = 1.03, CFI = 1.00. The model explained 7% of the variance in DBD symptoms and 12% of the variance in overt aggression.
As seen in Figure 6, higher levels of violence exposure were associated with lower levels of child disclosure, $b = -0.09$ ($\beta = -0.12$, $p < 0.05$), and higher levels of harsh discipline, $b = 0.23$ ($\beta = 0.37$, $p < 0.05$). Violence exposure was not, however, associated with parental nurturance. Of the other two mediating variables, only harsh discipline was associated with any outcome measure. Higher levels of harsh discipline were associated with higher levels of both DBD symptoms, $b = 0.16$ ($\beta = 0.46$, $p < 0.05$) and overt aggression, $b = 0.22$ ($\beta = 0.22$, $p < 0.05$). The indirect path through harsh discipline to overt aggression was 1.4 times as strong as the pathway to DBD symptoms. Overall, this indirect association explained 11.5% of the association between violence exposure and DBD symptoms and 12.0% of the association between violence exposure and overt aggression.
Figure 6. Relationships between Violence Exposure, Parenting Practices, and Externalizing Behaviors for Boys
DISCUSSION

Findings

The current study asked three main questions. First, I sought to determine if violence exposure was associated with higher levels of internalizing and externalizing problem behavior outcomes among a sample of predominantly urban, black, primarily low SES youth. When violence exposure, in isolation, predicted each outcome measure, this was the case. In the models containing only direct associations, higher levels of violence exposure were associated with higher levels of internalizing and externalizing behaviors for both girls and boys. When the parenting variables were added into the model, however, these direct associations remained significant for girls only. According to the univariate analyses, girls did not have significantly more total violence exposure than did boys. Within internalizing behaviors, girls’ reports of higher levels of violence exposure were more strongly associated with higher levels of overt aggression than they were with DBD symptoms; within internalizing behaviors, the strength of the association between higher levels of violence exposure and higher levels of depressive symptoms and anxiety were roughly equal.

Secondly, I sought to determine whether parenting partially or fully mediated the association between violence exposure and negative youth outcomes. Based on previous evidence regarding differences in parenting styles among black parents, it was hypothesized that negative outcomes in black youth exposed to higher levels of violence would be mediated by the use of specific parenting practices. In particular, it was hypothesized that higher levels of child disclosure, higher levels of parental nurturance, and higher levels of harsh discipline would act to buffer the negative
effects of violence exposure. This “tough love” approach to parenting has been theorized to be both a culturally acceptable approach to child-rearing and a response to the environment. In comparisons of samples of black children and youth to samples of white children and youth, this parenting style has been shown to be used more frequently and with greater success. However, when this type of parenting was examined in a within group design, patterns similar to those found with white youth appear to exist.

For girls, the association between violence exposure and internalizing and externalizing outcomes was partially mediated by harsh discipline. Although higher levels of violence exposure were associated with both lower levels of parental nurturance and higher levels of harsh discipline, it was only these higher levels of harsh discipline which were, in turn, associated with any outcome measure. Girls’ reports of higher levels of parental harsh discipline were associated with higher levels of anxiety and DBD symptoms though not with depressive symptoms or overt aggression. It may be that girls did not perceive that harsh discipline was being used in a relationship characterized by high levels of parental nurturance, a parenting practice critical to the “tough love” approach and one which separates it from more traditional conceptualizations of authoritarian parenting (Baumrind, 1968; 1972). As evidenced by the moderate negative association between the two variables, girls who reported higher levels of harsh discipline also reported lower levels of parental nurturance. Whether this was objectively true, subjectively these girls’ reports seemed to point to a distancing in their relationship with their parent. It may be that they have more distant parents with whom they do not regularly engage in activities they both
enjoy or who are not approachable and accessible. It may also be true, however, that rather than seeing the provision of discipline as part of an acceptable parenting strategy targeted toward their best interests, the use of harsh discipline with girls results in an erosion of the parent/daughter bond. Instead, girls may be more likely to avoid a disciplining parent, thus removing themselves from what could be a source of potentially valuable support and protection. Not only is their environment a source of anxiety, characterized by higher levels of violence exposure and the fear of victimization or injury, but their relationship with their parent is also a source of anxiety. As such, their parent becomes not a safe haven against the stressors of their environment but a stressor in and of themselves, carrying with them the threat of physical or verbal punishment. It is not entirely clear why harsh discipline did not mediate the association between violence exposure and depressive symptoms. It may be that girls’ depressive symptoms are linked more strongly with another parenting variable, such as maternal depressive symptoms, not measured in the current study.

In regard to DBD symptoms, harsh discipline, and in particular the corporal punishment component of harsh discipline practices, has been linked with aggressive, criminal, and delinquent behaviors (for a review see Gershoff, 2002). Given these findings in previous research, the finding that higher levels of harsh discipline are associated with higher levels of DBD symptoms is not surprising though the lack of an association between harsh discipline and overt aggression is a little perplexing. It may be that this relationship is entirely subsumed under the strong link between higher levels of violence exposure and higher levels of overt aggression. Some theorists (e.g., Baumrind, 1993) have postulated that harsh discipline’s detrimental
effects are a result of modeling or other mechanisms (e.g., escape conditioning) as parents punishing children and youth for aggressive acts through the employment of aggressive parenting techniques seem to reinforce the use of force in attaining compliance. They may also model capitulation to aggression in order to avoid pain as a way of attaining a desired outcome, thus further reinforcing the use of aggression as an effective strategy. Specific to overt aggression, it may be that immersion in an environment characterized by high rates of violent victimization and/or the witnessing of violence on a regular basis acts as the modeling agent in this scenario, minimizing the role of negative parenting practices. In addition, the presence of the association between harsh discipline and DBD symptoms may be a by-product of age. As girls grow older, acts of overt aggression may develop into a more concrete pattern of serious delinquent and antisocial behavior, as evidenced by the DBD symptom items. Further, it is also possible, however, that this mediating relationship is confounded by other mechanisms. For example, it is likely that girls who exhibit higher rates of DBD symptoms, including things such as lying or stealing, may also elicit higher rates of discipline in response to these conduct problems. Given Kandel and Wu’s (1995) finding that the use of harsh discipline at baseline predicted control problems among children 6 years later more strongly than baseline measures of children’s control problems predicted use of harsh discipline 6 years later seems to suggest, however, that harsh discipline may have a negative effect on disruptive behaviors even in the presence of such bidirectional effects. It is also possible, however, that there is a gene/environment interaction link present. Antisocial parents may be more likely to
use harsh discipline and may also be more likely to pass along antisocial personality traits to their children. This may also serve to exacerbate this link.

Unlike with girls, the association between violence exposure and internalizing and externalizing behaviors was fully mediated by the parenting variables for boys (see Appendix B for the full models). Higher levels of violence exposure were associated with lower levels of parental nurturance (internalizing only), lower levels of child disclosure, and higher levels of harsh discipline. Higher levels of harsh discipline, in turn were associated with higher levels of all of the problem behavior outcomes. Within internalizing behaviors, this relationship was stronger for anxiety than for depressive symptoms, and within internalizing behaviors, this association was stronger for overt aggression than it was for DBD symptoms. There was no significant zero-order correlation between parental nurturance and harsh discipline for boys (and as such, a correlation between the two was not allowed in the path model), however, suggesting that while higher levels of harsh discipline were not associated with lower levels of parenting nurturance as was the case with girls, higher levels of harsh discipline were not associated with higher levels of parental nurturance either. Child disclosure displayed a small-to-moderate positive correlation with parental nurturance and was minimally negatively correlated with harsh discipline at the zero-order level, suggesting a more complete and holistic negative response in the parent/youth relationship in association with violence exposure among boys. This would seem contrary to the notion of both the prevalence and effectiveness of “tough love” as a protective strategy among black parents. It may also be that, as with girls, these boys did not perceive harsh discipline as occurring in the context of a nurturing
and open parent/youth relationship. Instead, in an expansion from the findings seen
with girls, higher levels of harsh discipline were associated with more negative
problem behaviors across all outcomes. The mediation pattern seen with boys seems
to point to a more traditional authoritarian approach to parenting, and, accordingly,
carries with it the negative sequelae attached to that parenting style. Unfortunately, as
with girls, the current examination does not address the question of whether this is a
purposeful parenting strategy selected to act as a protective mechanism or if it is the
result of distancing that has occurred between the youth and his or her parent in
response to the previous use of harsh discipline. Also, as discussed earlier in
reference to girls, the associations between higher levels of harsh discipline and
higher levels of externalizing behavior problems may be confounded by parental
responses to youth problem behavior via the use of harsh discipline instead of the
reverse or by gene/environment interactions.

Instead of each of the parenting practices co-occurring equally, it seems
clearly apparent that harsh discipline bore the lion’s share of the contribution to
negative outcomes in the current examination. For both boys and girls, the
detrimental associations between higher levels of harsh discipline and negative
outcomes appears to support the conclusion that this is not a parenting practice that is
an effective adaptation to the environment, nor is it one which co-occurs within a
close and nurturing relationship. Bender et al (2007) found that maternal harsh
discipline was associated with youth internalizing and externalizing behavior
problems, net effects of other parenting variables such as affection, quality of
attachment, and parental control. Maternal use of harsh discipline, specifically,
impeded youths’ ability to express warmth and engagement when interacting with their mothers. This may indicate that youths are less likely to work to maintain a positive and enriching relationship with their mothers when mothers use higher levels of harsh discipline, something which may be even more important in times of stress and/or conflict.

In line with this, we can see across all of the current models that youth who reported higher levels of violence exposure were more likely to report higher levels of harsh discipline, lower levels of parental nurturance, and, for boys, lower levels of child disclosure (note: there was no relationship between these variables for girls). As such, it may that parents of youth exposed to higher levels of violence do use more control and exhibit less warmth than those parents of youth with lower levels of violence exposure. Alternately, it may just be that these youth perceive their parents as parenting in this way. Regardless, this more traditionally authoritarian parenting style would be in line with other work which suggests that parents adopt this type of parenting style, generally thought of as negative, as a shield against environmental risks (e.g., Bulcroft, Carmody, & Bulcroft, 1996; Luthar, 1999). This attempt at safeguarding the youth may express itself primarily through increased levels of control via the use of harsh discipline. For example, for girls, parental nurturance and harsh discipline were negatively correlated, suggesting that they perceived harsh discipline as occurring within a relationship with less parental nurturance. This correlation was not present for boys, yet for both, it was not the lower levels of parental nurturance which were associated with negative outcomes but instead the higher levels of harsh discipline. There is no way to determine if the use of harsh
discipline by the parents of youth in this sample was a planned and purposeful strategy adopted to achieve specific developmental and socialization goals or if it was, instead, a by-product of impulsivity, immaturity, or some other related construct previously shown to be related to the use of harsh discipline (for a review see Gershoff, 2002). Regardless of parents’ intentions, however, youth did not appear to perceive harsh discipline as occurring within an open and nurturing relationship and, in fact, it could be that prior use of harsh discipline in earlier childhood had already worked to erode the strength of the youths’ attachment to their parents, further exacerbating this. This finding seems to be in line with Mandara and Murray’s (2002) assertion that the typology of black families characterized by high levels of family cohesion and the use of authoritative disciplinary styles (i.e., the Cohesive-Authoritative family type) display higher rates of family functioning and promote better youth outcomes.

Limitations

There are some limitations to the findings outlined above. Path models, as opposed to latent variable models, rely on a single manifest variable to represent a construct. While this is not uncommon among other types of analyses (e.g., generalized linear models), one of the primary advantages of structural equation modeling (SEM) using latent constructs is the ability to use multiple measures order
to more fully represent the dimensions of that construct. With multiple manifest
variables representing a latent construct, SEM will provide estimates of measurement
error, or the proportion of the manifest variable which is measuring something other
than the hypothesized latent construct. This can be used as an indicator of the
reliability of the manifest variable. With a single manifest variable “representing” a
latent construct, error variance is set to 0.00. This assumes that there is no
measurement error in this variable, a theoretical assumption that does not reflect the
reality of social science research.

In this analysis, a number of the manifest variables used demonstrated reliability,
as measured by Cronbach’s alpha, of a barely acceptable level. An $\alpha$ of 0.80 or
greater is considered to be an indicator that a scale has good reliability while an $\alpha$ of
0.60 or greater is considered to be an indicator that a scale has acceptable, but
certainly not desirable, reliability. In this analysis, only the measure of anxiety
demonstrated an $\alpha$ of 0.80 or greater. Child disclosure, parental nurturance, harsh
discipline, and depressive symptoms all demonstrated $\alpha$’s much closer to the 0.60 cut-off.
This was, in some part, a function of scale size. All three parenting measures
were five-item measures. Depressive symptoms was a six-item measure with
dichotomous response options. Limited variability on some of the items contained
within these measures could have resulted in low inter-item correlation. This, in turn,
will result in lower values for Cronbach’s alpha. Future studies would be well served
to include multiple scales measuring similar dimensions of each construct, and to
include scales with demonstrated good reliability among black youth. A large number
of scales have not been validated using samples of black youth, however, which may complicate selection of appropriate measures.

Another concern in the interpretation of the data from the current set of analyses is its cross-sectional nature. As illustrated by Maxwell and Cole (2007), cross-sectional models of mediation may be extremely biased and not representative of the actual longitudinal processes underlying them. Also, because all of the data used came from the second wave of data collection, it is impossible to speak to causality or to measure the effects of previous experience on current findings. In fact, though the current model reflects ideas relating to the direction of associations, it is highly likely that these association are non-recursive, or bidirectional. Namely, parent/youth interaction does not occur in a static flow and in a static state from one participant to another. Instead, feedback loops exist between parent and youth so that parents’ behaviors affect youths and vice versa. Cooley-Quille et al (2001) found that youths with high levels of exposure to community violence were more likely than their low-exposure counterparts to report withdrawn behavior and somatic complaints. It may be these responses subsequently affect the parent/youth relationship. A youth who is more withdrawn may be less likely to disclose information to his/her parent or to engage with his/her parent in shared leisure time activities or hobbies. Conversely, a youth who often voices somatic complaints may elicit increased concern from parents attuned to respond to their youth’s needs. They may also draw the ire of parents who are already operating in high stress environments by increasing those levels of stress. Just as violence exposure may affect parenting practices which may, in turn, affect violence exposure, parenting practices may also affect behavioral outcomes which
may, then, affect parenting behaviors. Violence exposure may also affect behavioral outcomes that then affect violence exposure. An additional concern associated with cross-sectional models is that different configurations of variables within such models may fit the data just as well as the chosen configuration. For example, it may be that violence exposure mediates the association between parenting and behavior outcomes and not the other way around. Or, behavioral outcomes may mediate the association between violence exposure and parenting.

Another limitation is that the items chosen to reflect parenting practices in this examination by no means fully reflect the breadth and depth of all possible measures. Evolutionary takes on ecological perspectives of development stress not only the surrounding environment but also the rearing environment as a causative agent for youth behavior (Belsky, 1997; Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Parents bring to parenting their own ontological baggage (Darling & Steinberg, 1993), such as temperament, coping mechanisms, problem-solving skills, attitudes, and child-rearing priorities. Reinforcement for what seems to be, objectively, problem behavior can be a function of environment (Belsky, 1997). For children living within dangerous environments, acting out in externalizing ways may be a function of survival or protection. Those behaviors which psychologists classify as problematic (e.g., aggression, delinquency), may serve as a protective factor in threatening environments.

Although the measure of violence exposure used here was carefully constructed to represent both indirect and direct violence exposure in the contexts in which youth are most deeply embedded, this construction also makes it impossible to unpack the individual contributions of both type and context of violence exposure.
For further information regarding the effects on internalizing and externalizing behaviors specific to context using the same sample, please see Mrug, Loosier, & Windle (2008).

Another major limit to the current set of analyses is the lack of multigroup modeling. Had multigroup modeling been used to compare the results across gender, a statistical comparison of structure coefficients could have been made between the two models to verify whether or not the associations found for girls were the same as those found for boys, both in direction and in magnitude. Without this, any conclusions about the group differences or similarities is only speculative. All of the data used was also derived from a single reporter: the child. Information gathered from a single reporter tends to be more highly correlated with itself than is information on the same measure gathered from different sources. This may have exacerbated any associations found.

Future studies are needed to clarify and replicate the associations found here. The use of longitudinal data would help to further clarify the direction in which these differences in parenting occur and to attenuate any biases inherent in the use of cross-sectional data. Likewise, it may be useful to collect more data on parenting practices and to collect data from difference sources in order to minimize the effects of single-reporter bias. Although prior research seems to suggest that differences among black and white youth are the result of ethnicity more so than SES (Deater-Deckard, Dodge, Bates, & Pettit, 1996), future studies of within group processes may want to explore the role of SES among black families as a potential covariate of exposure to violence and parenting practices as well as a predictor of negative youth outcomes. It may be
that SES does not explain away the association found in the current study, however, even within samples of black youth. Luthar and Latendresse (2005) concluded that parenting among low and high income parents was not substantially different, and that children in each group perceive their parents as equally competent. For children on both ends of the economic spectrum, closeness to parents acted as a protective factor while parental criticism heightened vulnerability to negative outcomes. In particular, a youth’s reported closeness to his or her mother was most predictive of better adjustment. In contrast to this, however, is Vonnie McLoyd’s (1998) thoughtful treatise on child development in the face of socioeconomic disadvantage; few studies (Bluestone & Tamis-LeMonda, 1999; Kelley, Power, & Wimbush, 1992) have examined child and youth outcomes by looking at variation in parenting practices within black families, specifically as it relates to the use of harsh discipline.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Previous studies had indicated that black children and youth responded more positively to the use of discipline than did white children and youth. However, within a sample of black youth, this was not the case. Harsh discipline did not occur within a relationship characterized by high levels of nurturance and openness, as had been suggested previously, nor did its use promote more positive youth outcomes. Instead, the use of harsh discipline was associated with negative outcomes for both boys and girls. This association appeared to be stronger for boys as the links between violence exposure and internalizing and externalizing behaviors were fully mediated by parenting practices, and, specifically, by the use of harsh discipline. For girls, harsh
discipline only partially mediated this association, suggesting that parents may contribute to negative outcomes among girls exposed to higher levels of violence.

Violence prevention programs have been shown to be effective in decreasing some measures of youth risk, such as ratings of aggression (Mytton, DiGuiseppi, Gough, Taylor, & Logan, 2006). However, the majority of violence prevention programs are school-based. Those which focus on relationship or skills-building seem to offer the most promise. These types of interventions generally focus on the development of good relationships, improving communication skills, building empathy and a greater understanding of the consequences of behavior on both the individual and others, interpersonal skills, and positive methods of assertion. Though these skills are generally aimed at changing the way youths see and interact with peers, the results of the current study indicate that a broader perspective, and in particular one which deals with the family, is needed. In this case, it is not only the youth’s patterns of interaction with their parents which need to be addressed but also the parents’ interactions with their youths. As Lochman (2004) notes, parenting practices which are known to influence the development of youth psychopathology should logically be included in interventions designed to address them; it has long been noted that trying to change the youth without changing their environment is not as successful an approach as is multilevel intervention. Unfortunately, an individual’s parenting style is difficult to change, and perhaps even more so when backed by cultural norms which support the use of certain parenting practices such as harsh discipline. However, despite prevailing favorable attitudes toward the “tough love” approach to parenting within black families, interventions should strive to challenge
and change norms that this type of parenting is pervasive and protective. Instead of
protecting youth against the negative consequences of an environment inundated by
exposure to violence, parents who use harsh discipline, especially in concert with the
lack of a nurturing and caring relationship, are putting youth at further risk instead of
buffering its effects. Instead, programs designed to improve youth outcomes, whether
they be specific to violence prevention or, more broadly, aimed at the reduction of
youth psychopathology, should stress the importance of a warm, nurturing parenting
relationship which includes mutual decision-making and problem solving and which
employs alternative methods of discipline which are neither harsh nor abusive.
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