

EXPLORING GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE PRAISE AND PUNISHMENT OF
CHILDREN

A THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCES

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

BY

ALEXANDRA F. WOODSON, B.S.

DENTON, TEXAS

AUGUST 2019

Copyright © 2019 by Alexandra Woodson

DEDICATION

Avery Taylor and Ryan Carter
My greatest sources of joy.

&

Gabrielle Aguirre

“Your voice should never be silenced by love; it should be praised by it.”

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis was possible due to a wonderful network of supportive individuals who I would like to acknowledge. My thesis chair, Dr. Lisa Rosen, guided me with patience and edits that have made this project a wonderful learning experience. I would also like to thank my thesis committee members. Dr. Shannon Scott has given me countless opportunities to learn and grow; working with her during this project was no different. I appreciate her vision during this process. Dr. Gabrielle Smith extended her time, knowledge, and positivity to this project. I am thankful that her door was always open for questions and support. My parents, Joanne and Stevan Bobb, always believed I would achieve this goal. They gave me the opportunities and affirmations that allowed me to believe it too. I want to thank my husband, Adam, for selflessly joining me in the process of accomplishing a graduate degree in a year with two young children. I want to acknowledge my fellow Psychological Sciences colleagues and friends, Courtney Tindell and Otter Day. Their friendship and support have been vital to my success in this program.

ABSTRACT

ALEXANDRA FAYE WOODSON

EXPLORING GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE PRAISE AND PUNISHMENT OF CHILDREN

AUGUST 2019

Praise and punishment serve as a framework for children to learn about themselves and their environment (Etaugh & Bridges, 2018). Several studies indicate that praise and punishment can impact a child's motivation, academic success, and self-perception (Henderlong-Corpus & Lepper, 2007; Karniol & Aida, 1997). The purpose of this research was to examine factors that influence how adults praise and punish children with an emphasis on gender differences and adult language use (Martin & Halverson, 1983; Rudman & Phelan, 2010). Participants were given a vignette depicting a child (male or female) performing a prosocial behavior or misbehavior. The study found there to be no significant gender differences in how participants praise and punish children. However, results suggest that adult's gender attitudes may predict how participants praise female children.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Praise.....	2
Gender and Praise	4
Punishment	5
Gender and Punishment.....	8
Gender Attitudes.....	9
Language.....	10
Gender and Language.....	12
Current Study.....	14
II. METHODOLOGY.....	17
Participants	17
Measures	18
Demographic Survey	18
Praise Vignettes	18
Coding Praise Vignettes	19
Punishment Vignettes.....	20
Coding Misbehavior Vignettes.....	20
Punishment Endorsement (DDI-E).....	21
Attitudes toward Women Scale- Short Version (AWS).....	22
Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count software (LIWC).....	23

Procedure	24
Analytic Plan	26
III. RESULTS	29
Praise Condition Results	29
Punishment Condition Results	31
Exploratory LIWC Data	32
Emerging Themes	33
Prosocial Vignette Themes	34
Misbehavior Vignette Themes	34
IV. DISCUSSION	36
Gender Differences Between Person and Process Praise	36
Praise Endorsement and Gender Attitudes	37
Gender Differences in Punishment	38
Punishment Endorsement and Gender Attitudes	39
Gender Attitudes and LIWC Variables	39
Interpretation of Emerging Themes	40
Prosocial Behavior Themes	40
Misbehavior Themes	41
Implications	43
V. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS	45
Future Directions	46
VI. CONCLUSION	51
REFERENCES	52
APPENDICES	
A. Demographics Survey	65
B. Praise Vignette	66
C. Praise Endorsement Questions	69
D. Punishment Vignette	71
E. Dimensions of Discipline Inventory- Cognitive Appraisal (DDI-E)	74

F. Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS).....77

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Punishment Coding Scheme Categories	21
2. Logistic Regression Results for Predicting the Use of Person-Centered Praise Using Gender Attitude Scores	31
3. Correlations between Gender Attitude Scores and LIWC Variables in the Punishment Condition	33
4. Correlations between Gender Attitude Scores and LIWC Variables in the Praise Condition	33

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

How a child internalizes and interprets praise and punishment shapes their behavior patterns and influences their self-concept or how they see themselves (Henderlong-Corpus & Lepper, 2007). Praise is a tool used to reinforce positive behaviors and encourage their reoccurrence (Kazdin, 2013). Conversely, punishment discourages children from performing behaviors considered to be maladaptive (Kazdin, 2013). The manner in which praise and punishment are employed can have long-term implications for development (Henderlong Corpus & Ogle, 2006). For example, when the type of praise used is inconsistent, children may have lower levels of self-esteem and demonstrate less persistence (Zentall & Morris, 2010). Similarly, when harsher types of punishment are used (i.e., physical punishment in the form of spanking) children can show lower scholastic accomplishment and higher levels of aggression (Font & Cage, 2018).

This study sought to examine how adults praise and punish children with a focus on the role a child's gender plays in these interactions. The study asked participants to respond to vignettes, or short stories, of children exhibiting a prosocial behavior or misbehavior. This study builds on the previous literature by assessing the gender attitudes of participants who were given opportunities to praise and punish children. This study assessed for differences in use of specific language categories

within the delivery of praise and punishment (e.g., positive emotion, negative emotion, and psychological drives). Previously, studies have shown male children to be punished more harshly than female children for misbehaving (Thomas & Blakemore, 2013). When adults gender their interactions with children, they are limiting the ways in which children process and experience the world (Fagot & Leinbach, 1993). Likewise, reinforcement of particular behaviors results in gender-role conformity and adherence, which can have an impact on the thoughts and ideals of an individual for a lifetime (Evans & Diekman, 2009). A review of pertinent research that relates to this study follows with an overview of praise, punishment, gender attitudes, and language. Since the current study focuses on gender differences, each topic will have a specific focus on gender differences that are found in the research to date.

Praise

Adults often praise children when they perform an act perceived as worthy of reinforcing (Kazdin, 2013). Praise can be tailored situationally and be delivered in multiple formats. Person-centered praise, process-centered praise, social comparison praise, and tangible rewards are common forms of positive reinforcement used with children and thoroughly researched (Gunderson et al., 2013; Kamins & Dweck, 1999; Pomerantz & Kempner, 2013). Person-centered praise and process-centered praise will be the primary forms of praise reviewed and used for the purposes of this study. Research centered on the topic of praise is often focused on the impact praise has on a child's self-esteem and motivation (Brummelman et al., 2014). This study used two

categories to code free responses participants give to vignettes prompting for praise of either a male or female child for a prosocial behavior. Formats of praise can have a range of positive and negative effects for children (Kamins & Dweck, 1999).

Person-centered praise is directed toward a “fixed trait” a child may possess and suggests that a child’s ability is not malleable (Gunderson et al., 2018). Examples of person praises are the phrases “Good girl!” or “You’re so smart” (Gunderson et al., 2013). One concern with the use of person praise is the possibility of reinforcing a contingent self-worth in a child (Burhans & Dweck, 1995). Contingent self-worth occurs when the conceptualization of self and self-worth is interpreted by the successful completion of deed and social acceptance, which is problematic for multiple reasons (Burhans & Dweck, 1995). Academics, appearance, social acceptance, faith, and athletics are all examples of areas on which self-worth can be contingent (Burwell & Shirk, 2009). When worth hinges on the success of actions children, can be more likely to experience cognitive dissonance during times of failure (Bower & Casas, 2015; Henderlong Corpus & Lepper, 2007). When a child sees being successful at a task as a fixed aspect of their self-concept, failure becomes a hit to their identity (Kamins & Dweck, 1999). This may lead a child to resist taking opportunities to learn new tasks, persevere through tough problems, and perceive themselves as having less self-worth (Bower & Casas, 2015; Burhans & Dweck, 1995; Kamins & Dweck, 1999). Lack of learning opportunities, perseverance, and self-worth can have a negative effect on a child’s academic success (Zentall & Morris, 2010).

Process-centered praise focuses on the effort given by the child in attempting a task or the enjoyment the child finds in completing the task (Gunderson et al., 2018; Pomerantz & Kempner, 2013). An example of process praise is “you tried your best!” or “you really liked drawing!” (Pomerantz & Kempner, 2013). Process praise is often cited in research as the optimal form of praise (Gunderson et al, 2013; Kamins & Dweck, 1999; Pomerantz & Kempner, 2013). Unlike person praise, process praise implies malleability of the child’s ability (Kamins & Dweck, 1999).

The current study aimed to add to research by examining relationships between the chosen format of praise used and the child’s gender depicted in the praise vignette. The current study expanded on previous research by taking into consideration how adult gender attitudes affect their style of praise and their language use when having praise interactions with children.

Gender and Praise

Studies with a focus on gender differences in the use of praise are limited (Henderlong Corpus & Lepper, 2007; Henderlong Corpus et al., 2006). A longitudinal study on predicting academic achievement from childhood praise found process praise to be used more frequently with male children than female children (Gunderson et al., 2018). This could be due what the child is being praised for (Henderlong Corpus & Lepper, 2007). For example, one study assessing how teachers praise children saw boys being praised specifically for intellectual tasks, while girls were praised more broadly for their good behavior (Henderlong Corpus & Lepper, 2007). Since gender stereotypes may

influence what a child is praised for, gender attitudes may play a role in the decision to use person and process praises. Therefore, the current study expanded on past praise research by investigating if the participant's or the child's gender has any relationship to the type of praise used in response to vignettes, as well as, assess if the participant's gender attitudes show differences in the approach to praise as well.

Punishment

Punishment is a method of behavior modification (Sege & Siegel, 2018). Similar to praise, there are several forms of punishment adults can use with children. Grounding, time outs, verbal punishment, and physical punishment are all examples. The manner in which a parent punishes their child can come from their own experiences of being punished and the reason they are punishing their child to begin with (Barkin, Scheindlin, Ip, Richardson, & Finch, 2007). For example, aggression and disobedience are often not punished in the same manner (Hallers-Haalboom et al., 2016). Punishment is distinct from abuse, as punishment is used without intent to physically or emotionally hurt or damage a child (Berzenski & Yates, 2013).

Research on discipline using loss of privileges and time outs are not as abundant as research on verbal and physical punishment (Hallers-Haalboom et al., 2016). Time-out is a form of discipline where the parent limits a child's accessibility to enjoyable reinforces (Donaldson & Vollmer, 2012). Time outs are often seen as a more acceptable form of punishment among parents and child daycare facilities (Donaldson & Vollmer, 2012; Morawska & Sanders, 2010). Time outs give children the opportunity to calm

down in a safe space without distraction of parental emotion (Morawska & Sanders, 2010). Several studies have found time outs to be an optimal strategy to reduce children's misbehavior (Fabiano et al., 2004; Kaminski, Valle, Filene, & Boyle, 2008; Morawska & Sanders, 2010).

Verbal punishment is a category of discipline employed by adults to acknowledge children's misbehaviors and enforce rule adherence (Hallers-Haalboom et al., 2016; Wang & Kenny, 2014). Verbal punishment can range in severity (Wang & Kenny, 2014). Examples of verbal discipline are yelling, giving commands, and cursing (Hallers-Haalboom et al., 2016; Wang & Kenny, 2014). As with physical punishment, verbal punishment has an abusive pole on the continuum (Berzenski & Yates, 2013). Using humiliation or attacking a child's self-concept, or character during discipline are examples of emotionally abusive verbal punishment (Berzenski & Yates, 2013). Harsher forms of verbal punishments (e.g. yelling, cursing, and abuse) are associated with children having long-term adjustment issues (Berzenski & Yates, 2013). Experience with higher exposure to harsh verbal punishment can lead to poor emotional connection with parents that can generalize to other relationships later in life (Berzenski & Yates, 2013; Wang & Kenny, 2014). Studies have also shown poor self-esteem to be of concern with children who are punished with harsher verbal punishment (Berzenski & Yates, 2013).

The most severe type of punishment is physical discipline. Many experts have condemned the use of physical punishment with children (Kazdin, 2013; Smith, Ray, Stefurak, & Zachar, 2007). The argument hinges on defining where punishment stops

being a form of discipline and becomes a form of abuse (Taillieu, Afifi, Mota, Keyes, & Sareen, 2014). Spanking, slapping, and other physical gestures often having unintended negative consequences, such as an increase in aggressive behaviors and school conduct issues, adding to the argument against their use (Kazdin, 2013). Definition and legality of the use of physical punishment differs country to country (Taillieu et al, 2014). The use of physical punishment can lead to children learning to use aggression as a means to deal with conflict, as well as, an increased tendency for suicidal thoughts in later adolescence (Kazdin, 2013; McKinney, Milone, & Renk, 2011). Research indicates that southern states in the US, in particular, hold onto the use of corporal punishment in schools (McKinney & Brown, 2017). The Department of Education collects data on the use of discipline in public schools through their civil rights data collection (U.S. Department of Education, 2019). In the 2011-2012 school year, schools reported 166,807 cases of disciplinary actions taken using corporal punishment (U.S. Department of Education, 2019). Roughly one-fifth of the 166,807 corporal punishment cases were identified as occurring in the state of Texas that same year (U.S. Department of Education, 2019). Southern states have been indicated as potentially problematic for punishment of children for several reasons (McKinney & Brown, 2017). Southern states tend to have higher levels of poverty and lower levels of parental education (McKinney & Brown, 2017). These statuses can be indicative of parenting styles that may be more likely to endorse the use of harsher discipline strategies (McKinney & Brown, 2017).

Gender and Punishment

Punishment research tends to focus on the male population; this is due to research consistently showing that parents tend to punish male children more harshly than female children (Kazdin, 2013). This harsher reaction to behaviors may be coming from the stereotype that boys are more physically aggressive and need to be tapered down (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). This preconceived notion that males are aggressive can also lead people to perceive their actions as more aggressive than females regardless of behavior (Stewart-Williams, 2002). Interestingly, aggression from girls is often seen less as an inherent personality trait, and more as a reactive coincidence to a set of circumstances (Stewart-Williams, 2002). This study aims to not only replicate other studies by examining if boys will be punished more harshly, but also providing an extension to previous literature on punishment by assessing if language is used differently when you punish either boys or girls during times of punishment.

Previous studies also suggest that the gender of both the parent and the child factor into disciplinary situations (Hallers-Haalboom et al., 2016; Kerr, Lopez, Olson, & Sameroff, 2004). Parents tend to utilize discipline strategies differently (Kerr et al, 2004). Mothers tend to use verbal punishment over fathers (Hallers-Haalboom et al., 2016). Father's involvement in discipline is debated, with research suggesting that fathers are not as involved in daily aspects of child punishment therefore there is less research on their involvement in the punishment of children (Hallers-Haalboom et al., 2016; Wang & Kenny, 2014).

Gender Attitudes

Adults' gender attitudes may influence how they praise and punish girls and boys (Tenenbaum & Leaper, 2002). Although the focus of the current study is adult' gender attitudes, it is important to note that these attitudes begin to form in early childhood. Children self-identify with a specific gender at an early age. Even before children can understand the concept of gender, they have already begun forming gender expectations (Fagot & Leinbach, 1993; Heyman, 2001). Two-year-old children have shown the ability to use gendered language by using the terms 'he' and 'she' correctly (Leaper, 2015). As early as three years of age is when children begin to categorize and understand who they are through gender labels (Leaper, 2015). This identification encourages children to associate with peers and parents of the same gender and lead to imitating behaviors and interests (Karniol & Aida, 1997).

Gender schema theory assumes that the binary labeling of gender is so pervasive in American culture it is unescapable, and therefore highly impactful on self-conceptualization (Starr & Zurbriggen, 2017). Colors, toys, clothes, behaviors, and personality traits all become sex-typed (Fagot & Leinbach, 1989). These associations, or gender schemas, vary and serve the individual by acting as a reference of how each gender should be present (Martin & Halverson, 1983). Children and adults use these schemas to guide their understanding of themselves and the world around them. Out of these schemas, stereotypes are often created. Stereotyping is the generalization of an individual based on one characteristic (Mills, Culbertson, Huffman, & Connell, 2012). Although true at times, stereotypes, such as girls being kind and boys

being aggressive, can lead to misperceptions and misjudgments about the group they are directed toward. An example of how gender-role beliefs can have long lasting effects is the finding that stereotypes can inhibit women from being able to see themselves as successful in non-typical female positions (Rudman & Phelan, 2010).

Assisted by social pressures, parents and prominent caregivers are often a primary source of this learning and direct the stereotypes that influence children's early experiences (Mills et al., 2012). For example, for a child to identify with the same sex parent and model their likeness, the tendency for parents to display sex-typed qualities may reinforce these gender stereotypes (Leaper, 2015). In fact, one study saw a statistically significant relationship between the gender attitudes of children and the gender attitudes of their parents (Tenenbaum & Leaper, 2002). It is not well understood if or how the gender attitudes of adults play into the gendered praise or punishment of children. However, as previously discussed, gender attitudes can have an effect on how adults perceive and categorize children and their actions. Therefore, the current study will use gender attitude measures to predict how participant's respond to the praise and punishment vignettes.

Language

The effects of praise and punishment on a child's cognition are well-researched (Kamins & Dweck, 1999; Pomerantz & Kempner, 2013). However, research on the cognitive processes behind the individual giving the praise and punishment is not well understood. Past research has utilized computerized text analysis software to give insight

to cognitive reasoning behind language (Tausczik & Pennebaker, 2010). The Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) software is widely used in psychological research to investigate the cognitive processes that underlie language use (Pennebaker, Booth, Boyd, & Francis, 2015).

Previous studies have used interview techniques to examine gender and language use with children (Cimpian, Arce, Markman, & Dweck, 2007; Gelman et al., 2004; Pomerantz & Kempner, 2013). These studies looked at differences in topics discussed and time spent talking with a child (Gelman et al., 2004). Specific LIWC categories have not been previously investigated in the literature on praise and punishment; therefore, this study will utilize previous research to guide research questions about gender attitudes and language categories. For example, negative words are highly associated with negative events (Tausczik & Pennebaker, 2010). As previously discussed, punishment is used in response to negative behaviors shown by children, therefore this study expects to see higher uses of words categorized under negative affect with by the LIWC software with boys being punished (Kazdin, 2013).

Punishment can often be an occasion for parents to gain control of their children's actions; therefore, this study will utilize the drive category in LIWC to assess if responses are driven by the psychological need to control male children more so than female children (Haller-Haalboom et al., 2016). LIWC has been previously utilized to examine the emotions of the language of parents with children who have chronic illnesses (Hexem, Miller, Carroll, Faerber, & Feudtner, 2013). Hexem et al., used transcripts from parent interviews to examine if the psychological processes behind

language use would predict self-reported scores on an affect questionnaire (2013). Researchers found an inverse correlation between the positive emotion LIWC variable and the score of the affect measure, informing practitioners that a person's self-presentation and actual emotional state may not always match (Hexem et al., 2013). The current study is operating a similar idea, examining if individuals self-report their ideas on gender in a similar way that they are employed when they are talking to children.

Gender and Language

Sandra Bem's (1981) gender schema theory suggests that gendering the world around us is inevitable and inescapable. This can be partially due to gendered language (Meyer & Gelman, 2016). According to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, language has the ability to influence how individuals understand the world around them (Hussein, 2012). These ideas serve as a basis to further investigate relationships between gender attitudes and language use. As previously discussed, individuals rely on gender stereotypes to make quick inferences about those around them (Fagot, Leinbach, & O'Boyle, 1992). When stereotypes are communicated to children, according to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, they can affect how a child organizes the understanding of themselves in terms of gender and gender-roles (Bigler & Leaper, 2015).

Communication of personal attitudes about gender and the expectations about a child's gender is facilitated, partly, through a parent's use of language. Often, parents pass on their attitudes about gender through their speech without even realizing it (Gelman, Taylor, & Nguyen, 2004). Furthermore, research shows that parenting style is partially

dependent to the gender of the child and the parent (Axinn, Young-DeMarco, & Caponi Ro, 2010; McKinney, Milone, & Renk, 2011). For example, one study on perception of past childhood punishment showed that adult children often perceived the male parent to be harsher than the female parent (Stewart-Williams, 2002). While both parents may hold higher expectations for their daughters, fathers tend to discipline sons harsher than their daughters (Hallers-Haalboom et al., 2016).

Research supports that men and women use language differently according to the gender of the child they are talking to (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003). Examples of this are parents tending to use the informal form of words (i.e., horsey) with female children more so than with male children (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003). It is also seen that there is a higher use of “prohibitives” (no!) with male children regardless of frequency of misbehavior (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003). One study saw that caregivers of 13-month-olds in a day care setting responded more to female children when they were babbling, and more to male children when they were crying or whining (Fagot, Hagan, Leinbach, & Kronsberg, 1985). There is research that shows parents communicate gender values to children in different ways (Endendijk et al., 2014). Endendijk et al., offered parents an opportunity to read a book with their children (2014). Male parents with only sons tended to promote gender-neutral characters with male pronouns, and mothers used more positive language towards pictures depicting children abiding by gender-roles (Endendijk et al., 2014). Both parents made more stereotypical inferences than counter-stereotypical (Endendijk et al., 2014). There is little research that

understands how parents use categories of language with children of different genders, this study expands on the research by using LIWC to categorize language so researchers can compare and contrast the responses in both gender conditions (Endendijk et al., 2014).

Current Study

The purpose of this study is to better understand the current state of gender differences in the praise and punishment of children while also using language analysis to investigate the reasoning behind the praise and punishment of children. Praise and punishment received from parents can serve as a method for reinforcing attitudes and behaviors in children (Etaugh & Bridges, 2018). Although studies have been done on the subject of praise, there is a gap in existing research this current study aims to fill by investigating how adults praise and punish children with the focus on a child's gender. Recent research shows that parents continue to model gender-role expectations, even though self-reported gender attitudes held by parents have become more progressive over time (Mesman & Groeneveld, 2018). This study replicates previous studies by investigating gender differences in the praise and punishment of children, but also aims to extend the literature by using linguistic analysis to examine relationships between gender attitudes and the use of language during these interactions. The current study aimed to answer questions about gender differences in how children are praised and punished as well as examine if there are relationships between gender attitudes and language when individuals praise and punish children. It is hypothesized that:

H1: Participants will use more person praise with female vignettes than male vignettes, and this will be influenced by the participant's gender attitudes. As girls are stereotypically praised more for their traits (e.g., being kind and helpful) than their ability, this study assumes this trend will be seen through person praise in response to female praise vignettes as well (Henderlong Corpus & Lepper, 2007). One study previously found this to be the case in their post-hoc analyses, and the current study seeks to expand on this previous finding (Gunderson et al., 2018). There is limited research on gender attitudes playing a role in gendered praise responses. Based on previous research that describes how individuals use gender schemas to make short cut assumptions, this study assumes attitudes will play a role in how praise is given (Tenenbaum & Lepper, 2002).

- a. Participants will endorse person praise in the female praise condition more than the male praise condition.
- b. Participants will use more person praise with female praise vignettes than male praise vignettes, as indicated by the praise coding system.
- c. Responses to female vignettes will show higher use of pronouns due to the use of person praise, as indicated by the LIWC software variable pronoun.
- d. Participants who report more conservative gender attitudes will respond to female praise vignettes with higher frequencies of person praise (as indicated by the coding scheme) than those who show more egalitarian views.

H2: Males will receive harsher punishment than females. Often parents use punishment as a means to control their children's behaviors (Hastings, Utendale, & Sullivan, 2007). Punishment research has often been focused on male children (Kazdin, 2013). One explanation of this phenomenon may be due to the perception of males being more aggressive than females (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Gender studies have been conducted, but gender attitudes and their role in adults punishing children are not well understood (Hallers-Haalboom et al., 2016).

- a. Participants will use more forms of punishment, as indicated by the vignette coding system, in the male punishment condition more than the female punishment condition.
- b. There will be a higher use of words associated with the LIWC negative affect category with male punishment vignettes than female punishment vignettes.
- c. Participants will use more words associated with power in response to male punishment vignettes as indicated by the LIWC power variable.
- d. Participants who report more conservative gender attitudes will respond to male punishment vignettes with higher endorsement of punishment (as indicated by the punishment coding system) than those who show more egalitarian views.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants were recruited through convenience sampling, by using Texas Woman's University's SONA-system. Participants who are in need of SONA research participation credit earned credit towards any class research requirements for participating in this study. The study was open to anyone who is eighteen or older, had internet access, and consented to participate. Participants were able to skip any questions they did not feel comfortable answering and were given the option to withdraw from the study at any point in time.

The study recruited 424 participants between the two conditions (praise and punishment vignettes). The punishment condition included 225 of the participants. The sample is primarily female ($N = 209$). Self-reported ethnicity is as follows: 32% of this sample self-reported as Hispanic/Latino ($N = 72$), 27.6% Caucasian/White ($N = 62$), 21.8% African American/ Black ($N = 49$), 15.6% Asian American ($N = 35$), .9% Native American ($N = 2$), .4% Middle Eastern ($N = 1$), and .4% as Nordic ($N = 1$). The age range for the punishment sample was 18-48 years ($M = 19.8$ years, $SD = 3.2$ years). The praise condition consisted of 199 participants. Participants age ranged from 18-50 ($M = 19.74$, $SD = 3.50$). The sample was primarily female ($N_{female} = 187$, $N_{Male} = 11$). The praise condition participants self-reported as 35.7% Hispanic/ Latino ($N = 71$), 30.2%

Caucasian/White ($N = 60$), 17.6% African American/ Black ($N = 35$), 12.1% Asian American ($N = 24$), 2% Native American ($N = 2$), 1% African ($N = 1$), 1.5% Biracial ($N = 3$).

Measures

Demographic Survey

The participants were asked to complete a short demographic survey (see Appendix A) to investigate qualities of the sample, as well as collect information pertinent to the research questions. Participants reported their age, gender, ethnicity, and level of education. In addition, participants were asked if they are currently a parent or have a future interest in becoming a parent.

Praise Vignettes

Praise vignettes were adapted from a publication exploring how parents reinforce good behavior (Bower & Casas, 2015). Similar to the aim of the current study, Bower and Casas (2015) used vignettes to qualitatively assess how adults react to children performing prosocial behaviors. The current study utilized the helping vignette from the Bower & Casas study, which depicts one child helping another that had been hurt (see Appendix A). Participants responded to the vignettes as if they were the parent reacting to their child in the specific scenario given. Since the current study will be investigating if the child's gender in the vignette plays a role in how adults praise children, the vignette was modified to explicitly state the gender of the child portrayed in the short story. Half of participants received the helping vignette showing their child as a female, and the other half received the vignette with a male child shown as the helper. Follow up

questions (see Appendix A) were asked on a seven-point Likert scale to further quantify participant's perception of praise (1 = *Not at all likely*, 7 = *Very likely*). The questions are divided up between person and process praise examples. Each type of praise was summed, higher scores equating to an endorsement of that type of praise. Examples include "How likely are you to use the phrase good girl/boy?" and "You have really made an effort!" (Jonsson & Beach, 2012).

Coding Praise Vignettes

Coding for praise vignettes will be adapted from the authors of the vignettes (Bower & Casas, 2015). In the original article by Bower and Casas, responses to praise vignettes were categorized as social reinforcement, character attributions, or parental approval (2015). The author defined social reinforcement as "praising the action and reinforcing the event" (Bower, 2015, p. 123). The current study will modify this category as process praise, as this definition matches previous literature (Gunderson et al., 2018; Pomerantz & Kempner, 2013). The original author defined character attributions as "praising the characteristics of the child" (Bower, 2015). Again, this study will modify this category to be coded as person praise (Gunderson et al., 2013; Kamins & Dweck, 1999; Pomerantz & Kempner, 2013). Cohen's Kappa was monitored throughout the coding process. Cohen's Kappa for process praise coding was .69, and .61 for person praise. Both within the acceptable range for reliability (Hallgren, 2012).

Punishment Vignettes

Punishment vignettes were adapted from a study investigating how college students perceived parent-child disciplinary interactions (Smith, Ray, Stefurak, & Zachar, 2007). The original vignettes described a story of a child committing a misbehavior and a parent reacting to their behavior. Since the purpose of this study was to investigate gender differences in punishment and measure how participants would react to a child's misbehavior, a vignette was adapted to include the child's gender (See Appendix A), and parental responses were omitted. With random assignment into one of four conditions, 25% of participants received a female child vignette and another 25% received the male child vignette for the punishment conditions.

Coding Punishment Vignettes

Misbehavior vignettes were coded first with LIWC for linguistic analysis, and secondly using a coding scheme to analyze the type of punishment used by the participant. The coding scheme for the punishment vignettes was adapted from the Dimensions of Discipline Inventory (DDI; Straus & Fauchier, 2007). Authors of the DDI operationally define corrective discipline as "behavior by parents in response to, and intended to correct, perceived misbehavior by a child" (Straus & Fauchier, 2007, p. 5).

Authors use the term corrective discipline as a means to be inclusive of positive reinforcement tactics used by parents in disciplinary situations (Straus & Fauchier, 2007). The DDI lays out nine domains of corrective discipline that the authors will use to guide

coding of free responses to misbehavior vignettes. Table 1 describes the categories and actions involved with each form of punishment researchers will be coding for.

Table 1

Punishment Coding Scheme Categories

Punishment	Actions
Corporal Punishment	Spanking, hitting a child with an object, or washing a child’s mouth out with soap
Deprivation of Privileges	Grounding, taking away privileges or allowances, or restriction of activities
Diversion	Timeout, demonstration of correct behavior, or redirection
Explain/Teach	Explanation of why a particular behavior is seen as inappropriate and discussion of better options for children to use in future
Ignore	Ignoring the behavior(s) displayed or the absence of consequences for the behavior displayed
Penalty Tasks/ Restorative Behavior	Extra chores or directing the child to apologize for their misdoing
Psychological Aggression	Yelling, scolding, humiliating, or calling the child names
Reward	Praising a child quitting their misbehavior
Monitoring	Checking on child to ensure there is no misbehavior

Note. Adapted from “Manual for the Dimensions of Discipline Inventory (DDI),” by M. A. Straus and A. Fauchier, 2012.

Punishment Endorsement (DDI-E)

To gain a better understanding of how participants endorsed punishment this study used the Dimensions of Discipline Inventory- Cognitive Appraisal questionnaire (DDI-E; Straus & Fauchier, 2007). The scale uses questions to assess the same nine categories that are described above in the punishment coding scheme: corporal punishment, deprivation of privileges, diversion, explain and teach, ignore, penalty tasks and restorative behavior,

psychological aggression, reward, and monitoring. This scale consists of twenty-six questions that asked the participants their opinion of doing each punishment behavior with children who are about ten-years-old. Example questions are: “Explain what the rules are to children that age to try to prevent misbehavior.”, “Take away allowance, toys, or other privileges because of misbehavior.”, and “Put children that age in “time out” (or send them to their room).”. Questions were answered on a 4-point Likert scale (1=*NEVER OK*, 2=*RARELY OK*, 3=*USUALLY OK*, or 4=*Always or almost always OK*). When used in the current study the punishment condition reported Cronbach’s alpha as .82, and .83 in the praise condition.

Attitudes toward Women Scale- Short Version (AWS)

The original Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS) was developed in 1970 to assess individual’s mindset about women in society (Spence & Helmreich, 1972). The current study utilized the shorted AWS questionnaire (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973). Consisting of 25 items, the AWS is intended to measure the degree to which a participant’s attitudes on women are egalitarian in nature (Spence et al., 1973). Sample items include: “Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than of a man.” and “A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage” (see Appendix A; Spence et al., 1973). The AWS is answered on a 4-point Likert scale (0 = *agree strongly*, 1 = *agree mildly*, 2 = *disagree mildly*, 3 = *disagree strongly*). The higher the participant scores on the AWS the more egalitarian their views of women are (Spence et al., 1973). The shortened measure correlates strongly to the original ($r_{\text{males}} = .968$,

$r_{\text{female}} = .969$), with authors reporting Cronbach's alpha as .91 (Yoder, Rice, Adams, Priest, & Prince, 1982). For this study, Cronbach's alpha was calculated as .87 in the punishment condition and .90 in the praise condition. Although this scale is older, to date, it is one of the most widely used in literature to measure attitudes toward women. Recent literature that used the AWS includes research on hiring discrimination against the transgender community and assessment of gender-role attitudes in Latina immigrants (Van Borm & Baert, 2017; Villalba, Ramirez-Ortiz, Devieux, Attonito, & Rojas, 2018).

Linguistic inquiry and word count software (LIWC)

The LIWC software was used to assess the cognitive, emotional, and grammatical factors of writing samples. LIWC has been utilized in a wide range of psychological research (e.g., to evaluate language use in narcissists, shifts in media before and after natural disasters, and deception) (Correa, Scherman, & Arriagada, 2016; Hawkins, Boyd, & Barrett, 2017; Masip, Bethencourt, Lucas, Segundo, & Herrero, 2012). LIWC is designed to read a piece of writing one word at a time and notes how that word is scaled in the LIWC dictionary. LIWC will then analyze a piece of writing in an output file from the following categories: four language variables (analytical thinking, clout, authenticity and emotional tone), three types of general data on the writing (the number of words per sentence and percent of words that were in the LIWC dictionary and able to be analyzed), 21 types of linguistic descriptions (e.g., pronouns, articles), 41 word classifications of psychological constructs (affect, cognition, motivations, biological mechanisms), six personal concern categories (e.g.,

work, home, leisure), five informal language types (fillers, swearwords), and 12 categories of punctuation (Pennebaker, Booth, Boyd, & Francis, 2015). Of interest to the current study are the LIWC variables she/he, power, and negative affect. Tausczik and Pennebaker (2010) discuss LIWC's she/he variable as allowing investigators insight to the concentration of third person pronouns in a piece of text. Therefore, the she/he variable will serve as an indicator of participants using person-centered praise with the child in the vignette. The power variable was used to determine if participant's motive to gain control is more prevalent with a specific gender condition (Pennebaker, Booth, Boyd, & Francis, 2015). Examples are the power words are: obey, forbid, and comply (Pennebaker, 2010).

Procedure

The study was administered online using PsychData, a secure data collection platform that enables confidentiality and anonymity of participants. Participants were recruited through Texas Woman's University's SONA system. Participants took the survey at a time and place that was convenient for them, as long as they had internet access. Participants read through and indicated informed consent before participating in questionnaires.

After participants consented to participating in the study, they were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: female misbehavior, male misbehavior, female positive behavior, or male positive behavior. Once participants were randomly assigned into the conditions, participants were directed to the demographics survey. No identifying

information was collected, and participants were given the contact information of the principle investigator in order to obtain results at the conclusion of the study.

After filling the short demographic survey, participants were presented with the vignette designated for their condition. Participants were asked to read the vignette carefully, and then respond with exactly what they would do or say in response to the short story as if they were the parent of the child depicted. If participants were in the positive behavior condition eight questions about praise endorsement followed the vignette. If the participant was assigned to the misbehavior conditions, the punishment endorsement scale from the DDI followed the free response question. After follow-up questions were completed, participants responded the AWS gender attitudes measure. At the completion of the survey, participants were thanked for their contribution to the study.

In addition to LIWC coding the free responses, vignettes were also coded by three undergraduate research assistants for specific types of praise and punishment. The progress of three undergraduates was monitored through training and coding procedures, and twenty-five percent of the vignettes were double coded. Cohen's kappa was assessed to determine inter-rater agreement between the individuals coding the free responses to praise and punishment vignettes to check for a maintenance of coding consistency. Discrepancies were discussed, and reliability was assessed throughout. Analyses were run using the coding methods to look at relationships between types of praise and punishment used and the responses to demographic questions and gender attitude measures.

Analytic Plan

The data were uploaded to SPSS and cleaned. Assumptions were checked before performing analyses. Hypotheses are listed under the broad research assumption along with the method of analysis that was used to test each hypothesis.

H1: Participants will use more person praise with female vignettes than male vignettes, and this will be influenced by the participant's gender attitudes.

- a. An independent samples *t*-test was used to compare the mean use of person-centered praise endorsement between the two gender conditions of praise vignettes.

The independent variable is the gender of the child depicted in the praise vignette, and the dependent variable is the Likert scale score of person-centered praise endorsement.

- b. A chi-square was conducted to assess for differences in the type of praise used and the gender conditions.

The two categorical variables considered were the gender of the child depicted in the vignette and the type of praise given as indicated by the praise coding scheme.

- c. An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare the third person pronoun variable, she/he, which LIWC creates between the two gender conditions.

The independent variable is the gender of the child in the vignette and the dependent variable is the LIWC pronoun variable.

- d. In order to assess whether participants who report more conservative gender attitudes responded to female praise vignettes with higher frequencies of person praise (as indicated by the coding scheme) than those who show more egalitarian views, a logistic regression was conducted on the female praise vignette.

The independent variable is the gender attitude score, indicated by the AWS. The dependent variable is the coded dichotomous variable person-centered praise (1= *person-centered praise was used*, 0= *person-centered praise was not used*).

H2: Males will receive harsher punishment than females.

- a. An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare average punishment endorsement between the male and female punishment conditions.

The independent variable is the gender of the child, and the dependent variable was the summation of types of punishment used as indicated by the punishment coding scheme.

- b. An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare the negative affect variable, which LIWC creates between the two gender conditions.

The independent variable is the gender of the child, and the dependent variable is the negative affect variable.

- c. An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare the power variable, which LIWC creates between the two gender conditions.

The independent variable is gender of the child and the dependent variable is power variable.

- d. A regression was run to test if participants' gender attitudes predicted higher endorsement of punishment in the male punishment condition.

The independent variable is gender attitudes scores on the AWS, and the dependent variable is the mean score on the punishment endorsement scale.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Results are reported in three separate sections for clarity. First, the results from hypotheses relating to the praise condition will be reported, followed by results from the punishment condition hypotheses. Researchers then report themes that emerged from the prosocial vignette and then the misbehavior vignette free responses.

Praise Condition Results

To compare how the participants endorsed person praise between the two conditions and an independent sample *t*-test was used to compare endorsement of person-centered praise. The assumption of homoscedascity was violated and degrees of freedom were adjusted. Results indicated that participants used more person-centered praise in response to the female vignette ($M = 4.70, SE = .17$) than process centered praise ($M = 4.41, SE = .19$). However, the difference was not significant $t(216.44) = .133, p > .8$.

To test if participants in the male and female conditions differed in using person praise to vignettes a chi-square test of independence was performed. The relationship between the dichotomous person-centered praise coding variable and the gender condition was not statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 198) = .066, p > .7$.

The third person pronoun LIWC variable she/he was used as another way to measure the use of person-centered praise. To test if participants in the female vignette

praise condition used more third person pronouns than participants in the male vignette condition, an independent sample t -test was run. Although not significant ($t(197) = .534$, $p > .5$), participants used more third person pronouns as indicated by the she/he LIWC variable in the female condition ($M = 7.18$, $SE = .47$) than in the male condition ($M = 6.84$, $SE = .45$).

A logistic regression was used to determine if gender attitude scores predicted the use of person-centered praise in the female praise condition. The predictor variable in this study was the gender attitudes score, with higher scores indicating more egalitarian gender attitudes. The dependent praise variable was a dichotomous variable (1 = *person-centered praise was used by participant*, 0 = *person-centered praise not used by participant*). Results of the logistic analysis indicate that the model provides a statistically significant prediction of person-praise, over the constant-only model, $\chi^2(1, N = 95) = 4.8$, $p < .05$. The Nagelkerke pseudo R^2 indicated that the model accounted for 7.6% of the total variance. Prediction success for the cases used in the development of the model was relatively high, with an overall prediction success rate of 78%. Table 2 presents the regression coefficients (B), the Wald statistics, significance level, odds ratio [Exp(B)], and the 95% confidence intervals (CI) for odds ratios for the predictor. The Wald test reports that gender attitudes are a statistically significant predictor of person praise use.

Thus, we can conclude that gender attitudes are a reliable means of predicting a participant's use of person-centered praise with a child.

Table 2

Logistic Regression Results for Predicting the Use of Person-Centered Praise Using Gender Attitude Scores

<i>Step</i>	<i>Variable Entered</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Exp(B)</i>	95.0% CI for Exp(B)	
						<i>Lower</i>	<i>Upper</i>
1	Gender Attitude Scores	-1.48	4.64	0.03	0.23	.06	.875

Punishment Condition Results

To determine if participants used more punishment with one gender over the other an independent sample *t*-test was run. Due to violating the assumption of homoscedascity the degrees of freedom were adjusted. Results showed that participants used more punishment in response to vignettes in the female condition ($M = 1.86, SE = .07$) than the male condition ($M = 1.84, SE = .79$). However, the difference was not significant $t(216.435) = .133, p > .8$.

To test the hypothesis that the LIWC negative emotion variable would be higher in response to the male vignette than the female vignette, an independent sample *t*-test was run. Results showed that participants used more words associated with negative emotion in response to vignettes in the male condition ($M = 2.24, SE = .23$) than the female condition ($M = 1.90, SE = .19$). However, the difference was not significant $t(223) = -1.263, p > .2$.

An independent sample *t*-test was run to determine if words associated with the LIWC power variable were used more with male vignettes than female vignettes. Results showed that participants used approximately equal words associated with power in response to vignettes. In the male condition the power variable had a mean use of 5.86 terms per response ($M=5.86, SE=.39$), and in the female condition the power variable had a mean use of 5.85 terms per response ($M=5.85, SE=.34$). However, the difference was not significant $t(223)=-.29, p > .9$.

A regression analysis was used to analyze if gender attitude scores would predict punishment use in the misbehavior condition. Gender attitude scores did not significantly predict punishment use ($\beta= 1.44, p >.3$).

Exploratory LIWC Data

The LIWC software analyzed and categorized the free responses into classifications such as: grammatical categories (pronouns), affective processes (negative and positive), and motive processes (drive, e.g., power words and affiliative words). These categories were used in correlation analyses to explore relationships between demographic variables, as well as, gender attitude scores. In the praise condition, there were no significant relationships between gender attitudes and LIWC variables (see Table 3). In the punishment condition, there were no significant relationships between gender attitudes and LIWC variables (see Table 4).

Table 3

Correlations Between Gender Attitude Scores and LIWC Variables in the Punishment Condition

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1.	2.	3.	4.
1. Attitude Toward Women Scale	2.39	.36	--			
2. Word Count	70.07	31.87	.13	--		
3. Negative Emotion	2.05	2.28	-.04	-.06	--	
4. Power	5.86	3.90	-.07	-.12	.27**	--

Note. ** $p < .01$.

Table 4

Correlations Between Gender Attitude Scores and LIWC Variables in the Praise Condition

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
1. Attitude Toward Women Scale	2.45	.36	--				
2. Word Count	61.57	25.5	.01	--			
3. She/he	7.00	4.57	-.01	-.16*	--		
4. Positive Emotion	8.60	3.78	.14	-.37**	.06	--	
5. Affiliation	2.57	2.34	.05	.06	-.06	-.01	--

Note. * $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Emerging Themes

Several themes emerged during the process of coding free responses vignettes that LIWC and the coding schemes did not take into account. The following are themes that emerged consistently throughout participants' free responses. Full analysis of themes is beyond the scope of the current study, but authors consider the themes worth mentioning for future review.

Prosocial Vignette Themes

The first emergent theme that will be discussed is cognitive approval. This study will define cognitive approval as the internal acknowledgement of the child's good behavior without externalizing these thoughts of approval. Examples include, "I would be a proud mother," "I'd be proud and happy that she helped another playmate," and "I would feel proud of my child for helping and caring about others."

Another theme that emerged while coding the praise responses was disapproval. This theme describes instances of participants describing disappointment or disapproval that the child in the vignette stopped to help the hurt child instead of following directions to get in the car. Examples include: "I would have been both proud and disappointed with my daughter...Even if she did the right thing I would still have gotten on to her because I want her to obey me..." and "I would be a little annoyed since we were in a hurry."

The emerging theme personal pride details participant responses that express pride in themselves for the child in the vignette demonstrating a helpful behavior. Examples of personal pride are "Also seeing things like that makes you feel like you're doing a good job as a parent" and "This would make me feel proud as a mother because I raised my kid to be a decent human being". Further discussion of these themes and their context will be discussed in the next chapter.

Misbehavior Vignette Themes

Contingent punishment emerged as a theme. Researchers are defining contingent punishment as punishment delivered with an added contingency clause, meaning the

punishment had flexibility in how it was delivered. Often this contingency was based on how the child received the participant's initial acknowledgement of the misbehavior. Examples of participants using contingent punishment are: "Her punishment would depend on her response," "If it happened again I would punish her more," and "Depending on his answer that may be the only thing done."

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The current study investigated gender differences in the praise and punishment of children. Specifically, exploring how gender attitudes may play a role in these important interactions. Researchers found a predictive relationship of gender attitudes and person praise toward female children. Although previous research done by Hallers-Haalboom et al. (2016), led us to hypothesizing gender attitudes would also predict harsher punishment toward males, interestingly, there was no predictive relationship between gender attitudes and use of punishment towards male vignettes.

Gender Differences Between Person and Process Praise

Earlier research suggests that adults generally use more process praise with male children than person praise but did not extend this finding to further understand differences in how adults praise based on gender (Henderlong Corpus & Lepper, 2007). The current study utilized three methods of measuring participant's use of person-centered praise. A self-report praise endorsement scale, the praise coding scheme, and the she/he LIWC variable. Person-centered praise reinforces the inner qualities of a child, while process praise reinforces the efforts or actions of a child (Bayat, 2011). Participants reported higher endorsement of person-centered praise and use of the she/he LIWC variable with female praise vignettes. Although these results were not statistically significant, findings suggest that gender could factor into how a child is praised.

The current study is the first to use LIWC to analyze adult responses to child behavior. LIWC allowed this study to have another measure of person praise that was not a self-report measure. Although the differences in the use of third person pronouns was not significant, participants still used more third person pronouns in the female condition than the male condition. This lends evidence that LIWC could possibly be used as a measure for previous qualitative studies examining how praise is used. As there is little previous discussion on specific gender differences in praise, LIWC could retroactively quantify these differences to better understand praise trends over time.

Praise Endorsement and Gender Attitudes

Gender attitudes did significantly predict use of person praise in response to female vignettes. This is an important addition to the literature previously investigating how adults praise children. There are many negative consequences that result from gendering praise, specifically for girls. Person-centered praise solidifies that a trait in a child is rigid, no amount of effort can change it, and a child's worth is dependent on it (Bayat, 2011). Person-centered praise has the potential to illicit contingent-self-esteem or contingent self-worth (Bayat, 2011). This contingent self-esteem is acknowledged as a first step towards a child's learned helplessness, which occurs when a child no longer believes effort contributes to successful outcomes (Burnhans & Dweck, 1995). This belief leads to a drop in motivation and a decrease in determination, leaving a child to have a hard time performing academically (Burnhans & Dweck, 1995). Although there is no antidote for gender biases, there are methods in which to reduce their effects (Staats,

2015). Continued investigation on how gender attitudes play a role in praise will create a body of knowledge that will guide education and awareness efforts. It is education and awareness of biases that allows individuals to avoid harming children with the negative consequences of gendering these important interactions (Staats, 2015).

Furthermore, praise delivered in a way that supports and solidifies gender stereotypes limits an individual's ability to gain full perspective of their context, abilities, and future (Bigler & Leaper, 2015). Female children are less likely to receive positive reinforcement about their abilities in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) courses (Ceci & Williams, 2011). Thus, the of receipt person-centered praise is a potential explanation as to why there is gender disproportionality in STEM fields (Ceci & Williams, 2011).

Gender Differences in Punishment

Our hypothesis that males would receive more punishment endorsement than females based on coding of free vignettes was not supported. Surprisingly, the average amount of punishment, as determined by the sum of punishment types used, was higher in response to female vignettes than male. This counters previous literature that males tend to receive more punishment than females from their mother (Hallers-Haalboom et al., 2016). One explanation for this finding is aggression from females is unexpected and considered less acceptable (Endendijk et al., 2014). It could be possible that girls showing physical aggression toward another child does not align with participants' typical female gender roles. Therefore, participants responded using more types of punishment to

reinforce social expectations as well as traditional gender-role expectations (Endndijk et al., 2014).

Punishment Endorsement and Gender Attitudes

There is no previous literature describing how gender attitudes specifically play a role in the use of punishment. Although there was no significant predictive relationship between gender attitude scores and use of punishment in response to male vignettes further investigation is warranted. Previous studies suggest that the gender of the child and the parent plays a role in punishment (Hallers-Haalboom et al., 2016). The sample used in the current study did not grasp a large male audience or a large number of parents; this affects the generalizability of findings. Since previous studies suggest these two factors play a role in how adults punish children, it is worth continuing this investigation with a sample that is more aligned with previous research.

Gender Attitudes and LIWC Variables

There is no previous literature investigating gender attitudes and LIWC variables. The current study did not find any correlational relationships between gender attitudes and the LIWC variables in either praise or punishment conditions. One explanation for this may be the unique setting the study pulled participants from. Participants are students from a predominantly female university, where many departments teach from a pro-feminist point of view. This may have skewed how participants self-reported their gender attitudes. It could be that gender attitudes do not influence specific variables directly. Gender attitudes could be acting as a moderator for praise and punishment interactions.

Although beyond the scope of the current study, future investigations should consider comparing praise and punishment data sets to quantify this claim.

Furthermore, researchers ran independent-sample *t*-tests to explore gender differences in LIWC variables that were not hypothesized. In the praise condition, there were no gender differences in LIWC variables. However, in the punishment condition one LIWC variable, word count, showed a significant difference between gender conditions. This is an interesting finding that counters previous literature that suggests mothers generally do not talk to their sons as much as they do their daughters (Gelman, Taylor, & Nguyen, 2004). One explanation for why this occurred could be that participants are using a stereotype that males are more aggressive, and therefore are using more words to communicate how they are going to punish male children and assure that the misbehavior will not happen again (Prentice & Carranza, 2002).

Interpretation of Emerging Themes

Prosocial Behavior Themes

In the positive behavior condition, researchers coded for praise and parental approval if the participant explicitly stated that they told the child the praise, or that the participant was proud. During the coding process, it became apparent that the participant did not always communicate their approval, pride, or praise to the child. There is no previous literature that explains why this would emerge in praise responses. Although beyond the scope of the current study, examining the context in which participants externalize or

internalize praise will allow follow through with understanding why the phenomenon occurred in this study.

Researchers also saw participants expressing a pride in their parenting technique, and how good it made them feel that they had successfully passed down values they consider to be important. Parents use praise with hopes that values they determine to be important will be passed down to their children (Bower & Casas, 2016). It is not surprising that participants in this study made similar comments referring to a pride in how their child was raised. The emergence of this theme maps onto social cognition theories (Crandall, Ghazarian, Deater-Deckard, Bell, & Riley, 2018). When a child performs in line with a parent's beliefs this can lead to an ego boost for the parent (Crandall et al., 2018). Unexpectedly, researchers found disapproval to emerge in the praise condition. This disappointment was expected with the misbehavior condition, but not with the praise condition. Individuals who disapproved generally did so due to the child disobeying instructions to leave the park, or due to the participant indicating they were in a rush or had somewhere else to be. This counters previous studies on praise that found participant reactions to prosocial behaviors to be positive (Bower & Casas, 2016). Researchers of the current study speculate that this may be due to the cognitive inflexibility of a participant (Brassell et al., 2016). Cognitive flexibility is the ability of an individual to understand the circumstances for what they are and to adjust their plan or tailor their reactions accordingly (Brassell et al., 2016). This flexibility has previously been tied to personal parenting style and parenting flexibility as well as specific outcomes for children (Brassell et al., 2016). The more flexibility the parent had

cognitively, the less behavior problems seen in children (Brassell et al., 2016).

Some participants took the opportunity to “lecture” their children about the importance of kindness and helping others. Sometimes this was on top of praise others in lieu of it. This supports research done by the authors of the vignettes used in the current study. Bower and Casas (2016) labeled this induction. It is a means of not just praising the child for the action, but a method of walking the child through the reasoning why the parent believed this was a good deed and how to continue these helpful actions in the future.

Misbehavior Themes

There were several emergent themes seen with responses to misbehavior as well. A major theme that emerged was contingent punishment. Participants would give punishment contingent on how they perceived their child received or reacted to the punishment, or contingent on the perception of the child’s intentions for misbehaving and pushing the other child. For example, participants would explain that if they perceived their child was being cruel and mean the punishment was different from their child having a momentary lapse in judgment, being selfish. This theme may have ties to the previously mentioned cognitive flexibility as well (Brassell et al., 2016). A parent with the forethought to react to not only the misdeed but also how the child handles the mistake may be showing more cognitive flexibility, than a parent who is adamant about a specific punishment regardless of how the child reacts to the situation (Brassell et al., 2016). Another theme that needs more exploration is understanding how the participant instructed the child to apologize to the child they pushed down. Examples are: “make,” “tell,” and “force” versus using the term “ask.” Researchers in the current study saw the words make

tell and force as more commanding than ask, which seems more cooperative.

Although beyond the scope of the current paper, using the LIWC drive variable may help explore the differences in language found when a participant was offering the child options of restorative behaviors.

Implications

Data gathered in the praise condition of this study has implications for education of parent and teacher populations. Previous research has linked the use of person-centered praise to negative social emotional and academic consequences for children (Henderlong Corpus & Lepper, 2007). This study suggests that gender attitudes have a predictive relationship with this form of praise. Although biases are not something individuals can completely rid themselves of, awareness of biases held may help mitigate serious consequences that occur when biases go unchecked (Burgess, Beach, Saha, 2017). This study linking gender attitudes as a predictor of person-centered praise suggests that education of how to use praise in a manner that will be most effective is critical to helping children build the confidence that is necessary to achieve academically and socially (Bayat, 2011).

Data collected in the punishment condition of this study yielded interesting contradictions to previous literature. Previous studies focused on the tendency for male children to receive more punishment than female children, however the current study saw the opposite (Kazdin, 2013). This particular finding has implications for future research, in that discipline studies should pay special attention to the context in which female children are being disciplined in and how the individual reacting to the child perceives the misbehavior. Findings also have implications for educators and parents,

who should pay special attention to how they are reacting to the misbehavior of their disciplinary actions with female children.

CHAPTER V

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

This study had several limitations to the methodology used and generalizability of findings. First, the sample obtained for this study was primarily women (92%), limiting the generalizability of findings to women. Secondly, the sampling methods used to obtain this sample were limited to the SONA system at Texas Woman's University. Students not participating in a class that used the SONA system were automatically eliminated from participating in this study. The online survey method also brings its share of issues to the table as well. If the participant experienced internet issues or computer glitches, their participation may have been disrupted.

This study also failed to capture a decent sample of parents, who are a primary population of interest in the literature reviewed in the creation of this study. Parent populations have routine experiences with positive behaviors and misbehaviors of children (Kerr et al., 2004). Specifically, parents play an important role in helping children learn to regulate emotions and form positive relationships (Fraley, 2019; Kerr et al., 2004). Therefore, future research should devote time to understanding current praise and punishment practices of this population.

Lastly, the current study did not ask participants to rate how severe the misbehavior was in the punishment condition. This would have allowed the researchers to determine if

participants consistently agreed on the degree of the transgression performed by the child. This would have allowed researchers to better understand gender differences in the acceptability of the action performed.

Future Directions

There are several future directions to continue the exploration of this topic as well as strengthen the methodological approach of praise and punishment research. The first suggestion is to explore how the finding in this paper occurs in school environments. Surveying teachers would expand the understanding of how gender attitudes play into praise and punishment of children in a more generalizable and applicable manner. To strengthen the understanding of participant's relationship to children, researchers should include demographic questions further probing into participant's relationship with children. Asking questions about important children in the participants' lives would allow investigators to quantify the likelihood of these praise and punishment interactions occurring in their daily lives.

Secondly, a robust investigation of how parents, fathers in particular, praise and punish children is warranted. Research on this topic generally lacks male participation, as is true for the current study. Prior research notes that fathers are unavailable and less involved in praise and punishment of their children (Wang & Kenny, 2014). Interestingly, more and more fathers are opting to stay home with their children (Lee & Lee, 2018). It is also important to note that parenting does not always come in a stereotypical male-

female dyad (Gibson, 2017). Therefore, observing trends in the involvement of fathers in praise and punishment critical.

As previously mentioned, parenting plays an important role in socialization and formation of attitudes (Meyer & Gelman, 2016). It would be helpful to expand the current study by exploring how participants experienced punishment growing up and compare to their current attitudes on punishment, as well as, investigate how gender attitudes of parent participants affect use of praise and punishment.

The findings of this study implicate that education on the effects of gender attitudes in interactions with children is warranted. Future research should look to investigate and plan an intervention for parent and teaching populations. This intervention should consider using attribution theory along with gender schema theory to build this training (Espinoza, Areas da Luz Fontes, & Arms- Chavez, 2014; Starr & Zurbriggen, 2017). Previous research indicates that attribution of ability to children based on gender has implications for their motivation, classroom engagement, and classroom performance (Espinoza et al., 2014). This aligns with the literature outlined in this paper on the negative consequences of using person-centered praise, which is in other words an attribution to a child's character (Espinoza et al., 2014). This intervention should emphasize to participants the important role teachers and caregivers play in giving children opportunities for learning and play. It would be important for this education to dive into gender play roles and stereotypes to help acknowledge biases and learn how to avoid relying on them. A discussion on how to avoid punishing gender atypical play and

reinforcing only gender conforming play should be included. Thus, allowing children the chance to choose activities based on their interests, not on the attributions of adults around them (Weiner, 1972). This has important implications for better understanding the lack of female representation in STEM fields and male participation in helping fields (Ceci & Williams, 2011; Jackson, Wright, & Perrone-McGovern, 2010).

Another consideration for future research would be exploring generational differences in perceived acceptability and use of punishment with children. There is evidence that parenting styles can be transmitted from generation to generation (Lukek, 2015). Interestingly, although there has been a past reliance on corporal punishment there is a growing trend to avoid the use of this form of punishment in younger generations (Lukek, 2015). A meta-analysis of previous punishment research may show a generational trend that allows researchers to test differences in use of punishment between age groups.

Culture is another aspect that influences the transmission of parenting styles (Mah & Johnston, 2012). Although beyond the scope of the current study, future studies should consider an in-depth exploration of how culture and ethnicity play a role in both gender attitudes and punishment. Understanding these influences would be important to consider when developing the aforementioned educational intervention for parents and teachers.

Future research efforts should also look at the different types of punishment separately to analyze for gender differences in specific punishment use. An in-depth theme analysis should be conducted to better explore emerging themes found during the

coding of free responses. It should be investigated if these themes emerge more so with one of the gender conditions over the other.

Lastly, in the discussion of emergent themes researchers suggest that cognitive flexibility may be the source for both the emergence of disapproval in the praise vignettes and contingent punishment in the misbehavior vignette. Future investigations on adult cognitions during praise and punishment should assess the cognitive flexibility of participants. Since previous research has shown better child outcomes with parents who show more flexibility, this consideration could play an important role in future education and research understanding (Brassell et al., 2016).

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Praise and punishment powerful tools of reinforcement that adults use to shape behavior of children (Etaugh & Bridges, 2018). The findings of the current study suggest to researchers that gender biases do play a role in how to reinforce behavior in children. Furthermore, it can be concluded that praise and punishment are not randomly given to children. Adults carefully consider context when reacting to positive and negative behaviors.

Although this study failed to support hypotheses about participant use of LIWC variables, the study did extend the literature on child reinforcement by opening a vein of research using linguistic inquiry to attempt to understand reinforcement interactions better. Informed research on gendered praise and punishment will allow for better education of the parent and teacher populations. Findings from this study suggest that further consideration of gender attitudes role in interactions with children is warranted. Praise and punishment are important tools adults use to educate children on social expectations for their behavior (Etaugh & Bridges, 2018). It is possible that reinforcing gender roles is included in this process (Evans & Diekman, 2009). Previous research has been limited in providing a picture of how adult gender attitudes play a role in these important moments. The current study lays the foundation for further exploration of gender attitudes. With preliminary knowledge that gender attitudes play a part in praise and possibly punishment, it is critical to explore and educate parents and teachers to discontinue the use of gender biased praise and punishment.

REFERENCES

- Axinn, W. G., Young-DeMarco, L., & Caponi Ro, M. (2010). Gender double standards in parenting attitudes. *Social Science Research, 40*, 417-432.
doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.08.010
- Barkin, S., Scheindlin, B., Ip, E. H., Richardson, I., & Finch, S. (2007). Determinants of parental discipline practices: A national sample from primary care practices. *Clinical Pediatrics, 46*, 64-69. doi:10.1177/000992280629644
- Bayat, M. (2011). Clarifying issues regarding the use of praise with young children. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 31*, 121-128.
doi:10.1177/0271121410389339
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88*, 354-364. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.88.4.354
- Berzenski, S. R., & Yates, T. M. (2013). Preschoolers' emotion knowledge and the differential effects of harsh punishment. *Journal of Family Psychology, 27*, 463-472. doi:10.1037/a0032910
- Bigler, R. S., & Leaper, C. (2015). Gendered language: Psychological principles, evolving practices and inclusive policies. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 2*, 187-194. doi:10.1177/2372732215600452
- Bower, A. A., & Casas, J. F. (2016). What parents do when children are good: Parent reports of strategies for reinforcing early childhood prosocial behaviors. *Journal*

of Child and Family Studies, 25, 1310-1324. doi:10.1007/s10826-015-0293-5

Brassell, A. A., Rosenberg, E., Parent, J., Rough, J. N., Fondacaro, K., & Seehuus, M.

(2016). Parent's psychological flexibility: Associations with parenting and child psychosocial well-being. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*, 5, 111-120.

doi:10.1016/j.jcbs.2016.03.001

Brummelman, E., Thomaes, S., Overbeek, G., Orobio de Castro, B., van den Hout, M. A.,

& Bushman, B. J. (2014). Brief report on feeding those hungry for praise: Person praise backfires in children with low self-esteem. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143, 9-14. doi:10.1037/a0031917

doi:10.1037/a0031917

Burgess, D. J., Beach, M. C., & Saha, S. (2017). Mindfulness practice: A promising

approach to reducing the effects of clinician implicit bias on patients. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 2, 372-376. doi:10.1016/j.pec.2016.09.005

doi:10.1016/j.pec.2016.09.005

Burhans K. K., & Dweck, C. S. (1995). Helplessness in early childhood: The role

of contingent worth. *Child Development*, 66, 1719-1738.

Burwell, R. A., & Shirk, S. R. (2009). Contingent self-worth and gender differences

in adolescent depression: A commentary. *Sex Roles*, 61, 769-777.

doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9694-5

Ceci, S. J., & Williams, W. M. (2011). Understanding current causes of women's

underrepresentation in science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 108, 3157-3162. doi:10.1073/pnas.1014871108.

doi:10.1073/pnas.1014871108.

Cimpian, A., Arce, H. C., Markman, E. M., & Dweck, C. S. (2007). Subtle linguistic cues

affect children's motivation. *Psychological Science*, 18, 314-316.

Correa, T., Scherman, A., & Arriagada, A. (2016). Audiences and disasters: Analyses of

- media diaries before and after an earthquake and a massive fire. *Journal of Communication*, 66, 519-541. doi:10.1111/jcom.12245.
- Crandall, A., Ghazarian, S. R., Deater-Deckard, K., Bell, M. A., & Riley, A. W. (2018). The interface of maternal cognitions and executive function in parenting and child conduct problems. *Family Relations*, 67, 339-353. doi:10.1111/fare.12318
- Donaldson, J. M., & Vollmer, T. R. (2012). A procedure for thinning the schedule of time-out. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 45, 625-630.
- Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). *Language and Gender*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Endendijk, J. J., Groeneveld, M. G., van der Pol, L. D., van Berkel, S. R., Hallers-Haalboom, E. T., Mesman, J., & Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J. (2014). Boys don't play with dolls: Mothers' and fathers' gender talk during picture book reading. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 14, 141-161. doi:10.1080/15295192.2014.972753
- Espinoza, P., Areas da Luz Fontes, A. B., & Arms-Chavez, C. J. (2014). Attributional gender bias: Teachers' ability and effort explanations for students' math performance. *Social Psychology of Education*, 17, 105-126. doi:10.1007/s11218-013-9226-6
- Etaugh, C. A., & Bridges, J. S. (2018). *Women's lives: A psychological exploration* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Evans, C. D., & Diekmann, A. B. (2009). On motivated role selection: Gender beliefs, distant goals, and career interest. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 33, 235-249. doi:10.1111/f.1471-6402.2009.01493.x

- Fabiano, G. A., Pelham, W. E., Manos, M. J., Gnagy, E. M., Chronis, A. M., Onyango, A. N., et al. (2004). An evaluation of three time-out procedures for children with attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Behavior Therapy, 35*, 449-469.
- Fagot, B. I., Hagan, R. Leinbach, M. D., & Kronsberg, S. (1985). Differential reactions to assertive and communicative acts of toddler boys and girls. *Child Development, 56*, 1499-1505.
- Fagot, B. I., & Leinbach, M. D. (1989). The young child's gender schema: Environmental input, internal organization. *Child Development, 60*, 663-672.
- Fagot, B. I., & Leinbach, M. D. (1993). Gender-role development in young children: From discrimination to labeling. *Developmental Review, 13*, 205-224.
- Fagot, B. I., Leinbach, M. D., & O'Boyle, C. (1992). Gender labeling, gender stereotyping, and parenting behaviors. *Developmental Psychology, 28*, 225-230.
- Font, S. A., & Cage, J. (2018). Dimensions of physical punishment and their associations with children's cognitive performance and school adjustment. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 75*, 29-40. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2017.06.008
- Fraley, R. C. (2019). Attachment in adulthood: Recent developments, emerging debates, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 70*, 401-422.
doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-102813
- Gelman, S. A., Taylor, M. G., & Nguyen, S. P. (2004). Mother-child conversations about gender. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 69*.
Overton, W. F. (Ed.).
- Gibson, M. F. (2017). Predator, pet lesbian, or just the nanny? LGBTQ parents of

- children with disabilities describe categorization. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 65, 860-883. doi:10.1080/00918369.2017.1364565
- Gunderson, E. A., Gripshover, S. J., Romero, C., Dweck, C. S., Goldin-Meadow, S., & Levine, S. C. (2013). Parent praise to 1-3-year-olds predicts children's motivational frameworks 5 years later. *Child Development* 84, 1526-1541. doi: 10.1111/cdev.12064
- Gunderson, E. A., Sorhagen, N. S., Gripshover, S. J., Dweck, C. S., Goldin-Meadow, S., & Levine, S., C. (2018) Parent praise to toddlers predicts fourth grade academic achievement via children's incremental mindsets. *Developmental Psychology*, 54, 397-409. doi:10.1037/dev0000444
- Hallers-Haalboom, E. T., Groeneveld, M. G., van Berkel, S. R., Endendijk, J. J., van der Pol, L. D., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & Mesman, J. (2016). Wait until your mother gets home! Mother's and father's discipline strategies. *Social Development*, 25, 82-98. doi:10.1111/sode.12130
- Hallgren, K. A. (2012). Computing inter-rater reliability for observational data: An overview and tutorial. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, 8, 23-34.
- Hastings, P. D., Utendale, W. T., & Sullivan, C. (2007). The socialization of prosocial development. In J. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization* (pp. 638–664). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Hawkins, R. C., & Boyd, R. L. (2017). Such stuff as dreams are made on: Dream language, LIWC norms, and personality correlates. *Dreaming*, 27, 102-121. doi:10.1037/drm0000049

- Henderlong-Corpus, J., & Lepper, M. R. (2007). The effects of person versus performance praise on children's motivation: Gender and age as moderating factors. *Educational Psychology, 27*, 487-508. doi:10.1080/01443410601159852
- Henderlong Corpus, J., Ogle, C. M., & Love-Geiger, K. E. (2006). The effects of social-comparison versus mastery praise on children's intrinsic motivation. *Motiv Emot, 30*, 335-345. doi:10.1007/s11031-006-9039-4
- Heyman, G. D. (2001). Children's interpretation of ambiguous behavior: Evidence for a 'boys are bad' bias. *Social Development, 10*, 230-247.
- Hexem, K. R., Miller, V. A., Carroll, K. W., Faerber, J. A., & Feudtner, C. (2013). Putting on a happy face: Emotional expression in parents of children with serious illness. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management, 45*, 542-551. doi:10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2012.03.007
- Hussein, B. A. S. (2012). The sapir-whorf hypothesis today. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2*, 642-646.
- Jackson, Z. V., Wright, S. L., & Perrone-McGovern, K. M. (2010). Work-family interface for men in nontraditional careers. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 47*, 157-166. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1920.2010.tb00100.x
- Jonsson, A. C., & Beach, D. (2012). Predicting the use of praise among pre-service teachers: The influence of implicit theories of intelligence, social comparison, and stereotype acceptance. *Education Inquiry, 3*, 250-281. doi:10.3402/edui.v3i2.22033
- Kamins, M. L., & Dweck, C. S. (1999). Person versus process praise and criticism:

- Implications for contingent self-worth and coping. *Developmental Psychology*, 35, 835-847.
- Kaminski, J. W., Valle, L. A., Filene, J. H., & Boyle, C. L. (2008). A meta-analytic review of components associated with parent training program effectiveness. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 36, 567-589. doi:10.1007/s10802-007-9201-9.
- Karniol, R., & Aida, A. (1997). Judging toy breakers: Gender stereotypes have devious effects on children. *Sex Roles*, 36, 195-205.
- Kazdin, A. E. (2013). *Behavior Modification in Applied Settings*. Long Grove, IL.: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Kerr, D. C. R., Lopez, N.L., Olson, S. L., & Sameroff, A. J. (2004). Parental discipline and externalizing behavior problems in early childhood: The roles of moral regulation and child gender. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 32, 369-383.
- Leaper, C. (2015). Gender and social-cognitive development. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.) *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science* (7th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Lee, J. Y., & Lee, S. J. (2018). Caring is masculine: Stay-at-home fathers and masculine identity. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 19, 47-58.
doi:10.1037/men0000079
- Lukek, S. P. (2015). Intergenerational transfer of parenting styles: Correlations between experience of punitive discipline in childhood, opinion regarding discipline methods, and context of parenting. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 24, 299-318. doi: 10.1080/10926771.2015.1009600

- Mah, J. W. T., & Johnston, C. (2012). Cultural variations in mothers' acceptance of and intent to use behavioral child management techniques. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 21*, 486-497. doi:10.1007/s 0826-011-9502-z
- Martin, C. L., & Halverson, C. F. (1983). The effects of sex-typing schemas on young children's memory. *Child Development, 54*, 563-574. Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1130043>
- Masip, J., Bethencourt, M, Lucas, G., Segundo, M., & Herrero, C. (2012). Deception detection from written accounts. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 53*, 103-111.
- McKinney, C., & Brown, K. R. (2017). Parenting and emerging adult internalizing problems: Regional differences suggest southern parenting factor. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 26*, 3156-3166. doi:10/1007/s10826- 017-0749-x
- McKinney, C., Milone, M. C., & Renk, K. (2011). Parenting and late adolescent emotional adjustment: Mediating effects of discipline and gender. *Child Psychiatry Human Development, 42*, 463-481. doi:10.1007/s10578-011-0229-2
- Mesman, J., & Groeneveld, M. G. (2018). Gendered parenting in early childhood: Subtle but unmistakable if you know where to look. *Child Development Perspectives, 12*, 22-27. doi:10.1111/cdep.12250

- Meyer, M., & Gelman, S. A. (2016). Gender essentialism in children and parents: Implications for the development of gender stereotyping and gender-typed preferences. *Sex Roles, 75*, 409-421. doi:10.1007/s11199-016-0646-6
- Mills, M. J., Culbertson, S. S., Huffman, A. H., & Connell, A. R. (2012). Assessing gender biases: Development and initial validation of the gender role stereotypes scale. *Gender in Management: An International Journal, 27*, 520-541. doi:10.1108/17542411211279715
- Morawska, A., & Sanders, M. (2010). Parental use of time out revisited: A useful or harmful parenting strategy? *Journal of Child Family Studies, 20*, 1-8. doi:10.1007/s10826-010-9371-x
- Pennebaker, J. W., Booth, R. J., Boyd, R. L., & Francis, M. E. (2015). Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count: LIWC2015. Austin, TX: Pennebaker Conglomerates (www.LIWC.net).
- Pomerantz, E. M., & Kempner, S. G. (2013). Mother's daily person and process praise: Implications for children's theory of intelligence and motivation: brief report. *Developmental Psychology, 49*, 2040-2046. doi:10.1037/a0031840
- Prentice, D. A., & Carranza, E. (2002). What women and men should be, shouldn't be, are allowed to be, and don't have to be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*, 269-281.

- Rudman, L. A., & Phelan, J. E. (2010). The effect of priming gender roles on women's implicit gender beliefs and career aspirations. *Social Psychology, 41*, 192-202.
doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000027
- Sege, R. D., & Siegel, B. S. (2018). Effective discipline to raise healthy children. *Pediatrics, 142*, 1-10. doi:10.1542/peds.2018.3112
- Smith, B., Ray, G. E., Stefurak, T., & Zachar, P. A. (2007). College student evaluations of parent-child disciplinary situations. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*, 757-767.
doi:10/1007/s10896-007-9123-x
- Spence, J. T., & Helmrich, R. (1972). The attitudes toward women scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. *Journal Supplement Abstract Service Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 2*, 1-51.
- Spence, J. T., Helmrich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the attitudes toward women scale (AWS). *Bulletin on the Psychomic Society, 2*, 219-220.
- Staats, C. (2015). Understanding implicit bias: What educators should know. *American Educator, 39*, 29-43.
- Starr, C. R., & Zurbriggen, E. L. (2017). Sandra Bem's gender schema theory after 34 years: A review of its reach and impact. *Sex Roles, 76*, 566-578.
doi:10.1007/s11199-016-0591-4
- Stewart-Williams, S. (2002). Gender, the perception of aggression, and the overestimation of gender bias. *Sex Roles, 46*, 177-189.

- Straus, M.A., & Fauchier, A. (2007). *Dimensions of Discipline Inventory* [Measurement instrument].
- Taillieu, T. L., Afifi, T. O., Mota, N., Keyes, K. M., & Sareen, J. (2014). Age, sex, and racial differences in harsh physical punishment: Results from a nationally representative United States sample. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 38*, 1885-1894. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2014.10.020
- Tausczik, Y. R., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2010). The psychological meaning of words: LIWC and computerized text analysis methods. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 29*, 24-54. doi:10.1177/0261927X09351676
- Tenenbaum, H. R., & Leaper, C. (2002). Are parent's gender schemas related to their children's gender-related cognitions? A meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 38*, 615-630. doi:10.1037//0012-1649.38.4.615
- Thomas, R. N., & Blakemore, J. E. (2013). Adults' attitudes about gender nonconformity in childhood. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 42*, 399-412. doi:10.1007/s10508-012-0023-7
- U. S. Department of Education, Civil Rights Data Collection. (2019). 2011-2012 Discipline Estimations for National Total. Retrieved from https://ocrdata.ed.gov/StateNationalEstimations/Estimations_2011_12
- Van Borm, H., & Baert, S. (2017). What drives hiring discrimination against transgenders? *International Journal of Manpower, 39*, 581-599. doi:10.1108/IJM-09-2017-0233
- Villalba, K., Ramierz-Ortiz, D., Devieux, J. G., Attonito, J., & Rojas, P. (2018).

- Gender- role attitudes among immigrant Latinas: Empowering women. *World Medical and Health Policy*, 10, 401-414. doi:10.1002/wmh3.288
- Wang, M., & Kenny, S. (2014). Longitudinal links between fathers' and mothers' harsh verbal discipline and adolescents' conduct problems and depressive symptoms. *Child Development*, 85, 908-923. doi:10.1111/cdev.12143
- Weiner, B. (1972). Attribution theory, achievement motivation and the educational process. *Review of Educational Research*, 42, 203-215. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1170017>
- Yoder, J. D., Rice, R. W., Adams, J., Priest, R. F., & Prince, H. T. (1982). Reliability of the attitudes toward women scale (aws) and the personal attributes questionnaire (paq). *Sex Roles*, 8, 651- 657.
- Zentall, S. R., & Morris, B. J. (2010). "Good job, you're so smart": The effects of inconsistency of praise type on young children's motivation. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 107, 155-163. doi:10.1016/j.jecp.2010.04.01

APPENDIX A

Demographic Questionnaire

Demographics Survey

Age: _____

Ethnicity:

- ___ African-American/ Black
- ___ Hispanic/Latino
- ___ Asian-American
- ___ Caucasian/ White
- ___ Native American
- ___ Other

Gender:

- 1) Male
- 2) Female
- 3) Transgender
- 4) Other
- 5) Prefer not to respond

Please indicate level of Education:

- 1. No high school/some high school
- 2. High School Diploma/ GED
- 3. Some College
- 4. Associates Degree
- 5. Bachelor's Degree
- 6. Master's Degree
- 7. Doctorate Degree

Do you have children?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

If no, would you like to eventually have children?

- 1. Yes
- 2. Maybe
- 3. No
- 4. N/A

APPENDIX B

Praise Vignette (Bower & Casas, 2015)

Praise Vignette

Adapted from Bower & Casas (2015)

Please respond to the following vignette, as the child's parent, with exactly what you would do or say:

“One day you arrive at your child's school to pick him/her up. You see your child in the school-yard, where several other children are also playing. You call to your child to hurry. Your child stops playing and starts to run toward you. As your child is running, he/she sees another child who falls off some nearby play equipment. Your child turns and goes toward the hurt child, and says “Are you okay?” Then your child helps the other child to get up and stands with the other child.”

APPENDIX C

Praise Endorsement Questions (Jonsson & Beach, 2012).

Praise Endorsement Questions

Jonsson & Beach, 2012

Participants will be asked to respond to follow up questions adapted from Jonsson & Beach, 2012, and will be answered on a 7 pt. Likert scale.

1. How likely are you to use the following phrases to praise to the child in the above vignette?

a. You're really good at this!

Not at all likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very likely

b. You must be working hard!

Not at all likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very likely

c. You are so talented!

Not at all likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very likely

d. Good girl/boy!

Not at all likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very likely

e. You must be concentrating hard!

Not at all likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very likely

f. You have really made an effort!

Not at all likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very likely

g. You are so gifted!

Not at all likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very likely

h. It is great that you did not give up even if it was hard!

Not at all likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very likely

Person Praise Questions: 1, 3, 4, 7

Process Praise Questions: 2, 5, 6, 8

APPENDIX D

Punishment Vignette (Smith, Ray, Stefurak, & Zachar, 2007)

Punishment Vignette

Adapted from Smith, Ray, Stefurak, & Zachar (2007)

How would you respond your son/daughter in the following scenario?

“You are at the park watching your son/daughter play ball with a group of children. You then see your son/daughter push another child to the ground and take the ball from them. The child who was knocked to the ground gets up and is apparently unharmed.”

APPENDIX E

Punishment Endorsement Questions (DDI-E; Straus & Fauchier, 2007)

Dimensions of Discipline Inventory- Cognitive Appraisal (DDI-E)

Straus & Fauchier, 2007

Even if you do not have children, we would like to have your current opinion about doing each of the following with children who are about 10 years old. I think that it is: 1. Never OK, 2. Rarely OK, 3. Usually OK, or 4. Always or Almost always OK.

1. Explain what the rules are to children that age to try to prevent misbehavior.
2. Take away allowance, toys, or other privileges because of misbehavior.
3. Put children that age in “time out” (or send them to their room).
4. Shout or yell at children that age.
5. Grab or shake children that age to get their attention.
6. Give children that age something else they might like to do instead of what they are doing wrong.
7. Try to make children that age feel ashamed or guilty.
8. Deliberately not pay attention to misbehavior.
9. Spank, slap, smack, or swat children that age.
10. Use an object such as a paddle, hairbrush, belt, etc. on children that age.
11. Praise children that age for finally stopping bad behavior or for behaving well.
12. Hold back affection from children that age by acting cold or not giving hugs or kisses.
13. Send children that age to bed without a meal.
14. Let children that age know that you are watching or checking to see if they do

Something.

15. Give children that age money or other things for finally stopping bad behavior or for behaving well.

16. Show or demonstrate the right thing to do.

17. Let children that age misbehave so that they have to deal with the results.

18. Give children that age extra chores as a consequence.

19. Make children that age do something to make up for misbehavior; for example, pay for a broken window.

20. When children that age behave badly, tell them that they are lazy, sloppy, thoughtless, or some other name like that.

21. Withhold allowance, toys, or other privileges until children that age do what you want them to do.

22. Check on children that age to see if they are misbehaving.

23. Check on children that age so that you can tell them they are doing a good job.

24. Make children that age apologize or say they are sorry for misbehavior.

25. Wash the mouths of children that age out with soap, put hot sauce on their tongue, or something similar.

26. Ground children that age or restrict their activities outside the home because of misbehavior

APPENDIX F

Attitudes toward Women Scale (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973)

Attitudes toward Women Scale-Short Version (1973)

Janet T. Spence, Robert Helmreich, Joy Stapp

1. Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than of a man.
2. Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day.
3. Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce.
4. Telling dirty jokes should be a mostly a masculine prerogative.
5. Intoxication among women is worse than intoxication among men.
6. Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.
7. It is insulting to women to have the “obey” clause remain in the marriage service.
8. There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex.
9. A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.
10. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.
11. Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.
12. Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.

13. A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.
14. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.
15. It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.
16. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.
17. Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage, even their fiancés.
18. The husband should not be favored by laws over the wife in the disposal of family property or income.
19. Women should be concerned with their duties of childbearing and house tending, rather than with desires for professional and business careers.
20. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.
21. Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men.
22. On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contributing to economic production than are men.
23. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.

24. Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.

25. The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.