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Abstract

This chapter reviews research on whether children whose parents used corporal punishment (CP) have an increased probability of antisocial behaviour and crime as a child and as an adult. CP is defined as “The use of physical force with the intention of causing a child to experience pain, but not injury, for the purpose of correction or control of the child’s behaviour.” CP is experienced by a large percent of children in most of the world. In the U.S., for example, over 90% of children age 2-5 experience CP. It declines after that, but it is still 40% at age 13 and 13% at age 17. There have been more than 70 studies of the relation of CP to aggression, antisocial behaviour delinquency as a child and as an adult. Over 90% of these studies have found the theoretically predicted criminogenic effects of CP. Most of the studies have controlled for variables that could be the underlying cause of the relationship between CP and antisocial behaviour and crime such as whether the parent also perpetrated more severe assaults on the child, were cold and withdrawn, were low in socioeconomic status, or failed to provide cognitive stimulation. Moreover, many of these studies have been longitudinal, and found that when parents use CP to correct misbehaviour, the long term effect is a subsequent increase in the probability of antisocial behaviour and crime. Although most of the studies have been done in the UK and the USA, there are enough studies in other nations to conclude that the criminogenic effects of CP applies cross-nationally. The article presents a theoretical model to identify the processes which result in the link between CP and crime. It concludes with data showing a world-wide decrease in CP and suggests implications for trends in crime. Although the effect size for the relation of CP to crime is small compared to other traumatic childhood experiences, reducing CP could make a large contribution to preventing crime because such a large percent of children in most nations experience CP.

Résumé

Ce chapitre présente une revue des recherches relatives à la question de savoir si les enfants sur lesquels les parents ont recours aux châtiments corporels (CP) présentent un risque accru de développer des comportements antisociaux ou
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Les CP sont définis comme « Le recours à la force physique avec l'intention d'induire chez l'enfant une expérience de douleur, mais point de blessure, dans le but de corriger ou de contrôler son comportement ». Les CP sont subis par un très large pourcentage d'enfants dans la plupart des pays. Par exemple, aux USA, 90% des enfants de l'âge de 2 à 5 ans, font l'expérience des CP. Cela décroît après cet âge, mais est toujours à hauteur de 40% chez les 13 ans et à hauteur de 13% chez les 17 ans. Il y a eu plus de 70 études sur la relation entre, d'une part, les CP et, d'autre part, la violence et la délinquance antisociale chez l'enfant et l'adulte. Plus de 90% de ces recherches ont confirmé l’effet criminologique des CP que l’on pouvait prédire sur un plan théorique. La plupart de ces études ont pris en compte des variables qui pouvaient constituer la cause sous-jacente d’une relation entre les CP et le comportement antisocial et la délinquance, comme le point de savoir si le parent commettait aussi des maltraitances plus graves sur l’enfant, s’il était froid et distant, d’un niveau socio-économique faible, ou ne parvenait pas à fournir à l’enfant une stimulation cognitive. De plus, un bon nombre de ces études ont été longitudinales et ont trouvé que lorsque les parents recouraient aux CP pour corriger les bêtises, l’effet à long terme était une augmentation subséquente des probabilités de comportements antisociaux et délinquants. Bien que presque toutes les études ont été faites en Grande-Bretagne et aux USA, il existe suffisamment d’études dans d’autres pays pour conclure que les effets criminogènes des CP sont applicables partout. Cet article présente un modèle théorique permettant de révéler par quels processus les CP et le crime peuvent être reliés. Il conclut par des données montrant qu’il existe une réduction des CP à travers le monde et en dégage des implications pour l’évolution de la criminalité. Bien que l’effet d’échelle de la relation entre les CP et le crime est modéré comparé à d'autres traumatismes pouvant survenir dans l’enfance, la réduction des CP pourrait constituer une contribution importante à la prévention du crime dès lors qu’un très large pourcentage d’enfants en fait l’expérience à travers le monde.
2.1.1. Introduction

It is widely recognized that physically abused children (those whose parents perpetrated severe assaults such as punching, choking, or burning the child) are more likely to engage in crime than other children (Rebellon & Van Gundy, 2005; Widom, 1992). This article is about whether children whose parents used corporal punishment (CP) also have an increased probability of antisocial behaviour as a child and criminal behaviour as an adult. For purposes of this article CP is defined as “The use of physical force with the intention of causing a child to experience pain, but not injury, for the purpose of correction or control of the child’s behaviour.” (Straus, 2001, p. 4). There are dozens of synonyms, such as physical punishment, spanking, smacking, beating, paddling (Straus, In press).

There have been many studies of the relation of CP to antisocial behaviour and crime. Based on a review by Haapasalo and Pokela (1999) and their own research, Farrington and Welsh (2006) concluded that “It is clear that harsh or punitive discipline (involving physical punishment) predicts a child’s delinquency.” This conclusion is even more clear from the results of a meta-analysis by Gershoff (2002). Gershoff investigated 88 studies, 49 of which tested the relation of corporal punishment (CP from here on) to antisocial and criminal behaviour. This included:

- Twenty seven studies of the relationship of CP to aggression by children. All 27 found that CP was associated with an increased probability of aggression;
- Thirteen studies of the relation of CP to delinquent and antisocial behaviour. Twelve of the 13 found that CP predicted an increased probability of delinquency and antisocial behaviour.
- Four studies of the relation of CP to aggression as an adult. All four found that CP predicted an increased probability of aggression;
- Five studies of the relation of CP to criminal and antisocial behaviour as an adult. Four of the five found that CP was associated with an increased probability of crime and antisocial behaviour.

It is important to consider the percent of children who experience CP because the prevalence and trends in CP can help understand the prevalence and trends in crime. Therefore the first part of the article describes the percent of children who experienced CP. The second part describes some of the specific studies which tested the criminogenic theory of CP. Although the results of the Gershoff meta-analysis are impressive because they reveal a degree of consistency between studies that is much higher than usual, the evidence is weaker than it seems because most of the studies are cross-sectional, almost all are U.S. studies, and some lacked needed controls. Therefore, this article provides examples of studies which used longitudinal designs, or were conducted in different national contexts, or which controlled for important confounding variables such as whether there was also physical abuse. The third part identifies some of the processes linking CP and crime. Finally trends in use of CP and the implications for trends in crime will be identified.
2.1.2. Prevalence of corporal punishment

The processes that can link CP and crime begin in infancy because, in many societies, parents start using CP with children before their first birthday. At least a third of parents in the U.S. and U.K. use CP with infants (Korsch, Christian, Gozzi, & Carlson, 1965; Newson & Newson, 1963; Straus & Stewart, 1999; Windham, et al., 2004). A typical example is slapping the hand of a child who pushes food from a high-chair tray to the floor after being told not to. This can be considered a child’s first lesson that violence that is morally correct, socially approved and legal in all but a few nations. It is important because, in addition to teaching what the child is being punished for, it also implicitly teaches that hitting to correct misbehaviour is morally correct. It will be argued that learning this behavioural script has a life-long effect, and that is part of the reason most violence from simple assaults to homicides is carried out to correct the perceived misbehaviour of the person attacked. Moreover, as the anthropologist Ashley Montague argued long ago, “Spanking the baby may be the psychological seed of war” (Montague, 1941).

In the US, over 90% of parents use CP, at least occasionally, with children age 2-4 (Straus & Stewart, 1999). Moreover, for toddlers, CP happens an average of two to three times a week (Giles-Sims, Straus, & Sugarman, 1995; Holden, Coleman, & Schmidt, 1995; Stattin, Janson, Klackenberg-Larsson, Magnusson, & McCord, 1995). The percentage of parents who use CP decreases after age five. However, a 1995 U.S. national survey found that at age 13, 40% still used CP, and at age 17, 13% still used CP (Straus & Stewart, 1999). The most recent U.S. national survey of children found 44% of children age 8 to 10 and 15% of children age 16-18 had experienced CP in the previous 12 months (Martin, 2006). Moreover, among parents who continue CP into the teen-age years, it is not a rare outburst. Within the sub-group of parents who use CP with teen age children, it occurs an average of four to five times a year (Straus, 2001; Straus, 2010).

Rates of CP that can be compared cross-nationally are available for the 17,404 students in the 32 nations surveyed for International Dating Violence Study (Douglas & Straus, 2006; Rebollon, Straus, & Medeiros, 2008; Straus, 2008; Straus & Ramirez, 2007). In each of the nations, the students were asked whether they had been “spanked or hit a lot before age 12.” In most of the 32 nations, over half of the students recalled being spanked or a hit a lot. This is a lower-bound estimate because it refers to being hit “a lot,” and because many people do not remember much of what happened when they were two to five years old, which are the peak ages for CP. The rates ranged from less than a fifth of the students in the low CP nations such as Sweden and the Netherlands to almost three-quarters of the students in the nations where CP was most prevalent (Taiwan and Tanzania).
2.1.3. Corporal punishment and juvenile antisocial behaviour

These studies cited above indicate that CP is frequent and continues for many years and occurs world-wide. It will be argued that these experiences set in motion a number of criminogenic processes, for example, weakening the bond between child and parent (Afifi, Brownridge, Cox, & Sareen, 2006; Straus & Hill, In Press), which is a key element in the social control theory of crime. Social learning is probably another linking mechanism because CP provides a behavioural model of violence. If CP is a risk factor for crime, even if the effect size for CP is low, the effect on the crime rate can be high because, as the studies just reviewed indicate, almost all children experience CP.

Although misbehaviour does evoke CP, eight longitudinal studies that controlled for the level of misbehaviour at the start of the study found that when parents use CP, it is associated with a subsequent increased probability of antisocial and aggressive behaviour Berlin (2009), Brezina (1998), Gunnoe & Mariner (1997), McLoyd (2002), Millar (2009), Mulvaney (2007), Straus (1997); These longitudinal studies also controlled for many possible confounding factors, such as socioeconomic status and parental warmth and support.

2.1.4. Corporal punishment and criminal offences

Since the meta analysis by Gershoff (2002) which found that CP was related to delinquency and crime, there have been a number of other studies. Examples include a study of a Swiss sample of 19,631 students aged 11 to 16 (Kuntsche & Wicki, 2004) which found that the more CP, the more assaults perpetrated. A study of 1071 Spanish university students (Gámez Guadix & Straus, In press) found that, even after controlling for whether there was also psychological aggression by the parents, SES, and positive parenting, the more CP experienced as a child, the more antisocial behaviour and criminal acts as a young adult.

Assaults on marital and dating partners. Research on the relationship of CP to assaulting a marital or dating partner has consistently found that CP is associated with an increased probability of assault. Straus (1996) and Kessler (2001) using two different U.S. national samples found that the more CP, the higher the probability of assaulting a partner, and that the relation of CP to assaulting a partner applied to assaults by women as well as men, as did a study of university students in 32 nations (Douglas & Straus, 2006; Straus, Douglas, & Medeiros, In Press). Other studies which found that CP is associated with an increased probability of partner violence include Cast (2006), Foshee (1999; Foshee, Ennett, Bauman, & Suchindran), and Lavio (2002). Longitudinal studies that found similar results include Simons et al., (1998)1998) and Ehrensaft (2003).

Other adult antisocial behaviour and crime. Afifi, Brownridge, Cox, & Sareen (2006) studied a nationally representative sample of 5,877 U.S. adults found that, as adults, the percent of people with conduct disorder/antisocial behaviour was 32% higher for participants who had experienced CP. Four other
studies compared the extent of criminal behaviour as an adult by those whose parents depended on CP with those whose parents did not, were the studies in Finland by Pulkkinen (1983), in Great Britain by Farrington (1978), and in the United States by McCord (1991) and Straus, Colby, & Medeiros (In Press). All found that children whose parents used CP had a greater probability for subsequently committing serious crimes. Two of these studies will be briefly described to illustrate the methods and what was found. The studies which controlled for parental warm and support found that it reduced the percent of children convicted of a serious crime, but did not cancel the effect of CP.

Figure 1. The more corporal punishment experienced by students in the International Dating Violence Study, the higher the criminal history scale score

The relation of CP to crime by young adults was investigated using data from the International Dating Violence Study. This study included an index measuring eight criminal acts (four violent crimes and four property crimes). The left side of Figure 1 gives the individual-level results for the 17,404 students in the study. It shows that the more CP experienced the higher the average score on the criminal behaviour scale. Moreover, although there was much less crime among the children of highly supportive parents, the relation of CP to crime followed the same pattern for children of most highly supportive as for the least supportive parents, and for children in the top and bottom fifths of nations in economic development. The right panel of Figure 1 gives the results using the 32 nations as the cases. It shows the higher the rate of CP in a nation, the higher the student crime rate.
2.1.5. What explains the links between corporal punishment and crime?

Figure 2. Processes Explaining The Link Between Corporal Punishment & Crime*

The most widely mentioned process explaining the link between CP and crime is social learning. Children learn that it is legitimate to hit to correct misbehaviour. Unfortunately, adults also misbehave. The can insult, not pay back a debt, flirt with ones’ partner, cheat, etc. When those events occur, the more parents used CP to correct misbehaviour, the greater the probability of using the same method to stop the insults, the flirting, the cheating, etc. as was shown by (Straus & Yodanis, 1996). However, other processes are shown in Figure 2.

The three middle boxes of Figure 2 identify the relation of CP to many characteristics in childhood and adulthood that have also been found to be related to antisocial behaviour and crime. Thus, one can infer that they are variables which provide explanations for the link between CP and crime. Examples of studies which tested whether the variables in the three centre boxes do explain part of the relationship between CP and crime include a study of 1,003 children age 2-14 in two U.S. cities which found that, as hypothesized, CP was associated with a decrease in the child-to-parent bond and that this in turn was associated with an increased probability of delinquency (Straus, et al., In Press, chapters 2-3). Another example is a path analysis of a nationally representative sample of over three thousand US parents, which found CP was associated with an increased probability of approval of violence, violence between the parents, and depression. These three variables in turn, explained a significant part of the covariance of CP and physical abuse. (Straus & Yodanis, 1996)
2.1.6. Trends in corporal punishment and implications for crime

Because CP is associated with an increased probability of antisocial behaviour and crime, trends in CP have implications for trends in crime. There are clear indications that CP is decreasing. Twenty four nations prohibited CP by parents, starting with Sweden in 1979, followed by other Scandinavian nations a few years later, Germany in 2000, and 18 other nations since then. Large reductions in CP can be accomplished by such changes in national policy, as illustrated by the experience of Sweden and Germany. In the 1950’s 97% of Swedish parents spanked and a third did it “at least daily.” By 2006 it had decreased to 10% (Modig, 2009). In Germany, surveys of nationally representative samples of children age 12 to 18 found large decreases from 1992 to 2002, especially in the most severe forms of CP (Bussman, 2004). The shift away from CP is likely to continue, and probably accelerate. This not only because the European Union and the United Nation requested all member nations to prohibit CP. It is because of the fundamental changes in the nature of society that underlies both this request and the changes that have occurred so far. These changes are described in Straus (In press).

2.1.7. Criticisms of the research

Causal sequence. Most of the studies are cross-sectional, and therefore can indicate that CP is a response to the antisocial behaviour of the child rather than that CP causes antisocial behaviour. Two types of research provide evidence of a CP to crime causal effect. First, are the previously cited longitudinal studies which controlled for the Time-1 level of misbehaviours that presumable led to use of CP and found that CP was associated with a subsequent increase in antisocial and criminal behaviour. Second are parent-training intervention. Crozier and Katz (1979), Patterson (1982), and Webster-Stratton et al. (1990; 1988) evaluated programs which included steps to get parents to stop spanking. In all three, the behaviour of the children improved after spanking ended. A study over 500 families used randomized controls to evaluate a parenting intervention to reduce child problem behaviours (Beauchaine, Webster-Stratton, & Reid, 2005) found significant decreases one year later in CP and a significant relationship between reduction in CP and children’s externalizing behaviour problems.

Confounding with abuse. The relation of CP to antisocial behaviour and crime may occur because the CP group includes some parents who also physically abused the child. Although most studies of CP do not take this into account, a number of studies have found criminogenic effects after removing physically abused children from the sample or controlling statistically for physical abuse (Afifi, et al., 2006; Gámez Guadix & Straus, In press; MacMillan, et al., 1999; Straus, 2001, chapters 7 and 8; Straus & Yodanis, 1996 Vissing, 1991).

Cultural context. Societies differ in respect to the cultural or behavioural normativeness of CP. It has been argued that when CP is the norm, children will
understand that it is for their own good and will not suffer adverse effects (Larzelere, 1993; Polite, 1996). There have been at least 15 studies of this issue, 12 of which have found that the harmful side-effects of CP apply regardless of the normativeness of CP in different cultural contexts (Berlin, et al., 2009; Deater-Deckard, Bates, Dodge, & Pettit, 1996; Eamon & Mulder, 2005; Foshee, et al., 2005; Gershoff, et al., 2010; Gunnoe & Mariner, 1997; Lansford, et al., 2005; McLoyd, Kaplan, Hardaway, & Wood, 2007; McLoyd & Smith, 2002; Mulvaney & Mebert, 2007; Pardini, Fite, & Burke, 2008; Rohner, Kean, & Cournoyer, 1991; Straus, et al., 1997; Straus & Lauer, In Press).

2.1.8. Conclusions

The introduction to this article asked whether CP has the same relation to crime as physical abuse. The evidence summarized suggests that it does, but with the qualification that the “effect size” is less. For example, Afifi et al. (2006) found that CP was associated with a 30% average increase in externalizing behaviour problems, whereas physical abuse was associated with a 163% increase. Strassberg (1994) found that CP was associated with twice the number of acts of physical aggression observed in kindergarten, whereas physical abuse was associated with four times as many physically aggressive acts. Although the effect size is small compared to other traumatic childhood experiences, the link between CP and crime is robust. There is over 90% agreement between a large number of studies (Gershoff, 2002; Haapasalo & Pokela, 1999). Changes in juvenile crime in Sweden since the 1979 are also relevant. When Sweden banned CP in 1979, there was widespread concern that it would result in a nation with children “running wild.” The opposite has happened. Rates of juvenile crime, drug use, and suicide declined (Durrant, 2000, 2008). The decrease in youth crime probably has many causes, of which less CP might be one. But we can be certain that the reduction in CP in Sweden did not cause an increase in crime.

Ending CP could make a large contribution to reducing crime because almost all children in most nations experience CP. Therefore, the cumulative effect of ending CP can be very large, even though effect size is small, as shown by the following example:

- Epidemiological studies suggest that over 90% of the 70 million U.S. children experienced CP, although there is great variation in frequency and severity. This compares with perhaps one million who experience physical abuse.
- The previously described study by Afifi (2006) of a U.S. nationally representative sample found that CP was associated with 2.2% more cases of externalizing problems such as antisocial personality, whereas physical abuse was associated with 15.3% more cases.
- Based on these data, ending all CP could reduce antisocial behaviour problems by:
  0.022 times 70 million = 1,540,000 fewer cases.
- Ending all physical abuse could reduce antisocial behaviour by:
0.153 times 1 million = 153,000 fewer cases

- Thus ending CP could be associated with ten times greater decrease in antisocial behaviour than ending physical abuse.

Because child antisocial behaviour is a risk factor for crime, the example above suggests that reducing CP could reduce crime, provided parents continue to monitor and correct misbehaviour. That is what happened in Sweden. Four Swedish studies found that no-hitting did not mean no-discipline (Durrant & Janson, 2005). It has meant correcting misbehaviour by non-violent methods. It is important to recognize that in Sweden, the tremendous reduction in CP was accomplished by informing and helping parents, not by criminal penalties. That should be the approach of other national efforts to end CP. Laws to end harsh punishment by parents must exemplify the non-punitive methods of correcting misbehaviour that they require of parents.
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