EXPOSURE TO ETHNIC-POLITICAL VIOLENCE AND FINANCIAL STRAIN AS PREDICTORS OF PARENTAL DISTRESS AND PARENTING BEHAVIORS

Lynnel C. Goodman

A Thesis
Submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

December 2016

Committee:
Eric F. Dubow, Advisor
Carolyn J. Tompsett
Dara R. Musher-Eizenman
ABSTRACT

Eric F. Dubow, Advisor

War is a worldwide problem that exposes families to extreme acts of violence, disrupts family economic and parenting conditions, and can result in poor family psychological outcomes. The contagion of violence model suggests that violence spreads like an infectious disease across levels of the social ecosystem (Boxer et al., 2013). The contagion of violence model also aligns with the family stress model (Conger et al., 1992) in which financial strain and, more recently, exposure to community violence (Westbrook & Harden, 2010), have been shown to increase psychological distress in parents, which in turn leads to poorer parenting behaviors. Exposure to political violence has not yet been tested in the family stress model, but because political violence has been related to increased parental distress and higher rates of child abuse (e.g., Catani, Schauer, & Neuner, 2008), research suggests that exposure to political violence should function as a stressor in the model. Research has also shown that there are differences in parenting across child gender (Dwairy et al., 2006) which may moderate the family stress model. Using a three wave longitudinal study of Palestinian mothers, the present study found that overall exposure to political violence had an indirect effect on mothers’ use of punishment and that this relation was mediated by mothers’ averaged wave 1 and 2 distress (aggression, depression, and intimate partner violence); however, the indirect effect through intimate partner violence was moderated by sex of the child. Family income did not have a significant effect on parenting behaviors; neither exposure to political violence nor family income had a significant effect on parental monitoring. Future parenting interventions may benefit from targeting parental distress
to decrease corporal punishment within the context of war and thus decrease the mental health
effects of violence on children and their families.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

In 2014, over 172 million people were affected by 40 political conflicts (Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters, 2013; Pettersson & Wallensteen, 2015). These political conflicts disrupt society at every level. As community and government resources are destroyed, residents of war-torn regions experience extreme acts of violence, poverty, and collapsed social systems (Baingana, Bannon, & Thomas, 2005), all of which put them at an increased risk for posttraumatic stress, anxiety, depression, and aggression (Dubow et al., 2009; Dubow, Boxer, et al., 2012; Garbarino & Kostelny, 1996; Qouta, Punamaki, & El Sarraj, 2008).

When people are exposed to political violence, they are at risk for becoming more aggressive (Institute of Medicine, 2013). To explain this phenomenon, researchers have compared the spread of violence to the spread of infectious diseases (Institute of Medicine, 2013; Slutkin, 2013). As people are exposed to violence, they become “infected,” and then “infect” those with whom they come into contact, thus spreading violence across society. This contagion of violence model uses Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological systems model to track the spread of violence across society (Boxer et al., 2013; Cummings, Merrilees, et al., 2010; Dubow et al., 2009; Dubow, Boxer, et al., 2012; Salzinger, Feldman, Stockhammer, & Hood, 2002).

Another model, the family stress model, provides insight into the processes through which external stressors affect family functioning (Conger et al., 1992; Conger & Elder, 1994). In the original family stress model, financial strain on the family increased parental psychological distress, which in turn decreased parenting quality (Barnett, 2008; Conger et al., 2002; Conger, McCarty, Yang, Lahey, & Kropp, 1984; McLoyd, 1990). More recently, the family stress model has been applied to the process through which exposure to community violence affects families (e.g., Morrison Gutman, McLoyd, & Tokoyawa, 2005; Simons,
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Johnson, Conger, & Lorenz, 1997; Westbrook & Harden, 2010). Even though war increases financial strain and psychological distress, researchers have not examined the processes through which war affects family functioning such as parenting practices.

Supportive parenting protects children from “contracting” violence in the context of war (Cummings, Merrilees, et al., 2010; Dubow et al., 2009; Dubow, Boxer, et al., 2012; Garbarino & Kostelny, 1996). When parents are exposed to political violence, they also face an increased risk of mental health problems; these distressed parents tend to be less supportive and use more frequent and harsh punishments (Garbarino, 2001; Gondoli & Silverberg, 1997; McLoyd, Jayaratne, Ceballo, & Borquez, 1994; Planos, Zayas, & Busch-Rossnagel, 1997). When parenting declines, children are left more vulnerable to the trauma of war. Thus, in order to reduce the contagion of violence, parenting is a valuable protective factor that should be bolstered; however, the process through which war affects parenting has not been examined. If we identify this process, we can better understand how to develop interventions in order to improve parenting in the context of ethnic-political violence in order to decrease the negative effects of violence on the mental health of children and their families.

Using data from the prospective Palestinian-Israeli Exposure to Violence (PEV) Study (see Boxer et al., 2013; Dubow et al., 2012), the current study seeks to expand the family stress model by evaluating exposure to ethnic-political violence as a stressor that affects maternal psychological distress which, in turn, affects mothers’ discipline practices. Specifically, ethnic-political violence was conceptualized as violence that is based in a historical conflict between ethnic groups and is sanctioned by political and social entities (Dubow et al., 2009). In this thesis, I will first discuss the contagion of violence across the social ecosystem. Next, I will discuss the family stress model integrating exposure to ethnic-political violence as a family
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stressor. Then, I will describe the detrimental effects war has on the family and parenting.
Finally, I will describe the present study in which I will use the data from the Palestinian families
in the PEV data set to examine how exposure to ethnic-political violence and financial stress
affect mothers’ discipline practices as mediated by maternal psychological distress.

**Contagion of Violence across the Ecosystem**

Research has supported the idea that violence begets violence (Widom, 1989). Recently,
researchers have examined the spread of violence using the infectious disease model (Institute of
Medicine, 2013; Slutkin, 2013). In this public health model, when an individual comes into
contact with an agent (i.e., the disease), the agent activates a biological process that causes the
now-infected individual (i.e., the host) to experience symptoms. As the host comes into contact
with more people, the agent spreads from one individual to another. Not every exposed
individual contracts the agent. Once someone is exposed to the agent, individual (e.g., biological)
and environmental (e.g., socioeconomic status) characteristics affect an individual’s
susceptibility to the agent. Similarly, these characteristics affect how symptoms manifest in the
host (Institute of Medicine, 2013).

Applying the infectious disease model to violence, the contagion of violence model
suggests that exposure to violence—either directly as a victim or indirectly as an observer—can
lead to violent behavior. Like the infectious disease model, environmental and individual factors
influence an individual’s susceptibility to “infection” and the manifestation of the agent once the
individual becomes “infected.” According to Gary Slutkin (2013), some environmental factors
that affect susceptibility to violence exposure include social violence norms and socioeconomic
status (lower socioeconomic status individuals are more susceptible); individual factors include
age (younger individuals are more susceptible) and neurological differences (e.g., the hormone
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Oxytocin encourages prosocial behaviors in some individuals and mistrust and aggression in others; Institute of Medicine, 2013; Slutkin, 2013). Congruent with the infectious disease model, violence does not manifest itself in exactly the same way as it spreads; as it moves across different levels of society, violence can manifest as different types: collective, interpersonal, and self-directed (Institute of Medicine, 2013). For example, an individual exposed to community violence may subsequently perpetrate intimate partner violence.

The spread of violence across levels of the social ecosystem aligns with Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological systems model in which individuals are nested within hierarchical ecosystems (see Figure 1). Violence in the proximal microsystem (e.g., family, peers) and exosystem (e.g., neighborhood, workplace) as well as the distal macrosystem (e.g., national politics, culture) can affect the individual directly or indirectly. Exposure to violence from any system directly affects an individual when he/she is victimized or directly witnesses the violence and suffers psychological and physical effects; exposure indirectly affects an individual when it affects the proximal systems. For example, when violence exposure affects family and community members, it disrupts relationships, and these subsequent changes may lead to further physical and psychological effects. Thus, violence at the political level can spread to the individual both directly and indirectly through the community and the family, as well as within and between these levels.

The spread of violence across the social ecosystem has been empirically supported. In a literature review, Salzinger and colleagues (2002) found that across twelve studies, youth’s exposure to community violence was related to their violent behavior. Research has also supported that violence can spread indirectly when community violence affects families which then affect individuals. A cross-sectional study of 346 low-income, single mothers from across
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the United States revealed that, when compared to mothers who were not exposed to community violence, mothers who had been exposed to community violence were two times as likely to engage in physically and psychologically aggressive behaviors toward their child (Zhang & Anderson, 2010). These results illustrate how violence can spread from the macrosystem to the individual both directly and through the microsystem.

Research has also examined the spread of violence from the political level—the macrosystem—across the other levels of the social ecosystem. In Northern Ireland, Cummings and colleagues (2010) surveyed 700 mother-child dyads (child age $M=12.34$ years; mother age $M=38.21$ years). To assess historical political violence in the participants’ communities, researchers collected archival counts of politically-motivated deaths in the participants’ neighborhoods. Both mothers and children reported their own exposure to sectarian community violence (i.e., community violence that occurred between Catholics and Protestants due to political strife) and exposure to nonsectarian community violence (i.e., community violence not fueled by the political context), the child’s psychological adjustment, and the mother’s parental monitoring (i.e., knowledge about child’s whereabouts and activities outside the home). Mothers reported on marital conflict. The results suggest that a community’s historical exposure to violence was positively related to current rates of exposure to sectarian community violence. Exposure to sectarian violence was associated with both greater marital conflict and greater externalizing problems in children, illustrating the relation between violence and aggression across the social ecosystem.

Boxer and colleagues (2013) found similar processes in Israel and Palestine that suggest ethnic-political violence spreads across the social ecosystem. Three cohorts of children (ages 8, 11, and 14 at wave 1) participated in three waves of interviews. Six hundred Palestinian children
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and 901 Israeli children reported their exposure to ethnic-political violence (i.e., loss or injury of a friend or family member, experiencing security checks/threats, and witnessing violence inflicted by the opposing ethnic group) and microsystem violence (i.e., family, school, and community violence) as well as their own aggressive behavior. Exposure to ethnic-political violence at wave 1 predicted increases in exposure to microsystem violence at wave 2, which in turn predicted increases in child aggression at wave 3 (for the 8-year-old cohort). For all cohorts, exposure to ethnic-political violence predicted subsequent child aggression. These findings suggest that violence at higher levels of the social ecosystem can spread to lower levels of the ecosystem in a directional pattern across time.

Researchers have identified psychological mechanisms through which exposure to violence might lead children to behave aggressively. Violence may be transmitted through observational learning. When individuals observe violent behavior, they learn social cognitions and develop social scripts and schemas that support violence (Huesmann & Kirwil, 2007). Another mechanism may be emotional and cognitive desensitization. When individuals are repeatedly exposed to violence, directly or indirectly, they experience less negative affect, less arousal to further violence exposure and develop more beliefs that violence is common and inevitable. As they come to believe that violence is normative, they may develop more positive moral beliefs about violence and become more likely to behave aggressively (Huesmann & Kirwil, 2007).

The Family Stress Model: Integration of Exposure to Ethnic-Political Violence

The Family Stress Model can be used to help identify the processes through which stressful events occurring outside of the family (i.e., at higher levels of the social ecosystem) affect family functioning. Conger and colleagues (1992) developed the family stress model by
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examining families affected by the Midwest agricultural crisis of the 1980’s. Their research revealed that financial problems--such as a low family income, unstable work, a high debt-to-asset ratio, and income loss--place economic pressure on the family, as parents report that the family cannot meet its material needs, falls behind in paying debt, and has to cut back its everyday expenses to live within the family’s means. This financial pressure then affects the parents’ emotional well-being, causing them to become depressed, demoralized, and pessimistic (Barnett, 2008) and increases marital conflict (Conger et al., 1992; McLoyd, 1990). The strain-induced distress can result in poor parenting behaviors, including increased negative parenting, parental hostility toward the child, and harsh punishment, as well as decreased positive parenting and parental warmth toward the child (Barnett, 2008; Conger et al., 1992, 2002; McLoyd, 1990; Morrison Gutman et al., 2005; Pinderhughes, Dodge, Bates, Pettit, & Zelli, 2000).

The family stress model has been expanded to include exposure to community violence as a stressor on family functioning. Community violence exposure, as a component of the constructs of neighborhood stress (Kotchick, Dorsey, & Heller, 2005; Morrison Gutman et al., 2005) and negative life events (Simons et al., 1997), has been shown to function as a stressor in the family stress model by increasing parental psychological distress which then increased poor parenting behaviors. Westbrook and Harden (2010) found modest but significant results using exposure to community violence as a stressor in the family stress model. This longitudinal study consisted of a nationwide, ethnically diverse (33% African American, 30% Latino, and 37% White) sample of 1,417 American mothers of 3-4 year old children enrolled in Head Start programs. The mothers reported on their family’s poverty status and exposure to community violence as well as on their own depression and parenting style. The results revealed that mothers exposed to community violence were more likely to be depressed. Across time, maternal
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depression was negatively associated with lower maternal warmth (e.g., affective warmth,
sensitivity) and fewer control behaviors (e.g., limit setting, supervision). Similarly, Beeber et al.
(2014) interviewed 251 mothers of children ages 1 month to 5 years old ($M = 25.3$ months)
enrolled in Head Start programs across the United States. The majority of the mothers were
African American (62%); their ages ranged from 15 to 44 ($M = 25.9$ years). In this cross-
sectional study, mothers reported on factors across Bronfenbrenner's (1979) social ecosystem:
economic hardship and educational attainment (macrosystem), exposure to neighborhood
violence (exosystem), family conflict (microsystem), maternal depressive symptoms (ontogenic),
and maternal parenting behaviors. The parenting behaviors measured were positive involvement
(e.g., playing, interacting, warm touch), negative control (e.g., spanking, restraining, scolding,
derogating), and developmental stimulation (i.e., teaching, talking). The results revealed that a
lower family income-to-needs ratio was related to higher levels of maternal depression. The
relation between exposure to violence and maternal depression was more complex. For
participants who did not report exposure to violence, high levels of chronic stress were related to
higher rates of depression, but this relation was not found in participants who had been exposed
to violence. Overall, these conflicting findings suggest that exposure to community violence may
function as a family stressor in the family stress model, but further research is needed to examine
this relation. Additionally, because depleted financial resources, psychological distress, and
exposure to violence are often effects of ethnic-political conflict, the processes through which
families are affected by ethnic-political conflict should also be congruent with the family stress
model.
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**Parenting under Conditions of War**

Although exposure to war and violence can negatively affect children’s physical and mental health, supportive parenting may buffer children from these negative effects and protect them from becoming infected by violence. Social support provided by the parent may attenuate or prevent the child from appraising an event as stressful, thus preventing a stress reaction in the child (Cohen & Wills, 1985). When parents are supportive and use non-violent discipline practices, children exposed to political violence have better psychological adjustment and fewer PTSD symptoms (Dubow, Huesmann, et al., 2012; Punamaki, Qouta, & Sarraj, 1997; Thabet, Ibraheem, Shivram, Winter, & Vostanis, 2009). Similarly, children exposed to political violence have fewer internalizing and externalizing problems when they live in a healthy functioning family—a family with no parental mental illness, family aggression, or family violence (Garbarino & Kostelny, 1996). Thus, when faced with trauma, children who receive support from their parents are more resilient.

While positive parenting can buffer children from the negative effects of war, parents too are entrenched in a war-torn environment. Like their children, parents who are exposed to war also experience decreased physical and mental health, including an increased risk of psychological distress, depression, and post-traumatic stress (Baingana et al., 2005; Başoğlu et al., 2005; Catani, Schauer, & Neuner, 2008; Scholte et al., 2004). Distress taxes a parent’s emotional resources (Planos et al., 1997) and lowers his/her sense of parenting efficacy and self-esteem (Gondoli & Silverberg, 1997). This distress impairs parents’ ability to interpret their child’s signals, decreases emotional responsiveness, and increases use of punitive discipline (Garbarino, 2001; Gondoli & Silverberg, 1997; McLoyd et al., 1994; Planos et al., 1997).
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Some studies of populations exposed to war report higher rates of child maltreatment. In a sample of children exposed to war in Afghanistan and Sri Lanka, over half of the children reported having been “beaten” by their parents; 10% of the Afghani children and 18% of the Sri Lankan sample reported that they have suffered an injury from maltreatment in the home (Catani et al., 2008). These rates are drastically higher than the 1% estimated prevalence rate of child maltreatment in the United States (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Children’s Bureau, 2012). Similarly, in another study that compared children of Holocaust survivors to children whose parents were not Holocaust survivors, offspring of traumatized Holocaust survivors reported higher levels of psychological abuse and neglect (Yehuda, Halligan, & Grossman, 2001). A study of Palestinian parents and their 10-12-year-old children found a relation between fathers’ self-reported war exposure and their children’s reports of psychological maltreatment; this relation was not statistically significant for mothers (Palosaari, Punamäki, Qouta, & Diab, 2013). Overall, these results suggest that a relation exists between war exposure and abusive parenting.

Studies have also examined the relation between families’ exposure to political violence, parental psychological functioning, and violence within the family. Haj-Yahia and Abdo-Kaloti (2003) surveyed 14- to 20-year-old Palestinian adolescents ($n = 1,185$; age $M = 15.58$). In this cross-sectional study, adolescents reported their exposure to family violence (father-to-mother, mother-to-father, parents-to-siblings, and parents and siblings-to-participant), their family’s exposure to political stressors, and their parents’ psychological adjustment. Exposure to political conflict was associated with more aggression and violence between family members. Perceived parental psychological adjustment was also related to the participants’ exposure to family violence. This study suggests that there is a relation between political violence and family
Macrosystem Predictors of Parenting Behaviors functioning. However, a longitudinal, prospective study is needed to determine the processes through which political violence affects family functioning and child rearing. Additionally, as only harsh and abusive parenting practices have been examined, research is needed to examine the effects of war exposure on positive parenting practices.

Research suggests that, in western samples, these parenting behaviors may differ by child gender (McKee et al., 2007). These differences are also found in Arab countries. In a cross-sectional study of 2,893 adolescents from eight Arab countries, males reported experiencing higher rates of authoritarian parenting while females reported experiencing higher rates of authoritative parenting (Dwairy et al., 2006). Similarly, in a cross-sectional study of Arab mothers in Israel (n = 2,447), mothers of male kindergarten students reported using more corporal punishment than mothers of female kindergarteners (Khoury-Kassabri, Attar-Schwartz, & Zur, 2014). In contrast, a study of 243 Jewish and Arab mothers in Israel did not find significant differences in reports of discipline used on male children compared to discipline used on female children (Khoury-Kassabri & Straus, 2011). These studies suggest that there are differences in parenting across sex, indicating that future research should explore whether sex of the child may moderate the effects of political violence on parenting behaviors.

The Present Study

War is a worldwide problem that affects families as they are exposed to extreme acts of violence and disrupted economic conditions (Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters, 2013; Themnér & Wallensteen, 2013). This exposure is related to numerous poor psychological outcomes and increased aggressive behaviors (Baingana et al., 2005; Baṣoğlu et al., 2005; Catani et al., 2008; Dubow, Boxer, et al., 2012; Dubow et al., 2009; Garbarino & Kostelný, 1996; Qouta et al., 2008; Scholte et al., 2004).
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Using the public health infectious disease model, the contagion of violence model suggests that violence spreads like an infectious disease through direct (i.e., victimization or witnessing violence) and indirect contact (i.e., a community or family member exposed to violence becomes “infected” and thus behaves differently toward the individual; Institute of Medicine, 2013; Slutkin, 2013). After exposure, environmental and individual factors affect whether the individual becomes “infected” and what “symptoms” he/she experiences. In this manner, violence can spread across types of violence and across social ecosystems (Institute of Medicine, 2013). Using Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological systems model of hierarchically-nested ecosystems, the contagion of violence model suggests that violence spreads from the distal levels of the ecosystem (the macrosystem) to more proximal levels (the exosystem and the microsystem), which then directly affect the individual.

The contagion of violence model also aligns with the family stress model in which financial strain and, more recently, exposure to community violence have been shown to increase psychological distress in parents, which in turn leads to poorer parenting behaviors (Conger et al., 1992). Exposure to ethnic-political violence has not yet been tested in the family stress model, but because political violence has been related to increased parental distress (Baingana et al., 2005; Başoğlu et al., 2005; Catani et al., 2008; Scholte et al., 2004) and higher rates of child abuse (Catani et al., 2008; Palosaari et al., 2013; Yehuda et al., 2001), research suggests that exposure to political violence should function as a stressor in the family stress model in the same way as financial strain and exposure to community violence. If we determine the processes through which war affects parenting, we can better understand how to target interventions to improve parenting in the context of war and thus decrease the mental health effects of violence on children and their families.
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In this study, I used data from the prospective Palestinian-Israeli Exposure to Violence (PEV) Study (see Boxer et al., 2013; Dubow et al., 2012) and combined the family stress model and the contagion of violence model to examine the effects of both ethnic-political violence and socioeconomic strain on families. Palestinian and Israeli families were sampled, but I only analyzed data from the Palestinian mothers because exposure to ethnic-political violence was much higher among Palestinian families, the Palestinian sample was a representative sample, and the Palestinian attrition rate across three waves of data collection was extremely low. Mothers were assessed annually over three consecutive years, and measures included ethnic-political violence and socioeconomic strain, emotional distress, and parenting behaviors, enabling a prospective analysis of the effects of ethnic-political violence exposure at Wave 1 on maternal distress at Wave 2, and in turn, on parenting behaviors at Wave 3, controlling for prior levels of maternal distress and parenting behaviors.

Hypothesis

Mothers’ distress will mediate the relation between macro-system level stressors (financial strain, exposure to ethnic-political violence) and parenting behaviors. Child sex will moderate the relation between predictor and parental monitoring as well as the relation between mediator variables and parental monitoring. Family income and exposure to ethnic-political violence will predict higher levels of distress (i.e., depression, aggression, intimate partner violence). The mothers’ distress will then predict lower rates of parental monitoring and higher rates of punishment. Sex of the child will moderate both the relation between macro-system level stressors (financial strain and exposure to ethnic-political violence) and parenting behaviors (punishment and monitoring) as well as the relation between distress and parenting behaviors.
Macroystem Predictors of Parenting Behaviors

CHAPTER II. METHODS

Participants

Background of the Palestinian-Israeli Exposure to Violence (PEV) Study (Boxer et al., 2013; Dubow, Huesmann, et al., 2012). Between 2008 and 2010, three cohorts (ages 8, 11, and 14) of Palestinian and Israeli children (N = 1,501 at wave 1) were recruited. These youth and their mothers were interviewed once a year for three years. The focus of the current analyses is on Palestinian parents because, compared to the Israeli sample, the Palestinian sample was exposed to higher levels of ethnic-political violence, and the Palestinian sample is a nationally representative sample (see Boxer et al., 2013; Dubow et al., 2012). The three-year attrition rate for the Palestinian sample was only 5% (whereas it was 14% among Israeli Arabs and 37% among Israeli Jews). Because the focus of this study is on the effects of external factors on parenting behavior, I focused on data collected from the mothers.

Demographic characteristics of the participants. At wave one, 599 mothers (64% from the West Bank, 36% from Gaza; mean age = 37.22, SD = 6.57) of children ages 8, 11, and 14 (n = 200 for each age group; 301 girls, and 298 boys) were included in the study. All of the mothers were married and, on average, reported having 4.89 (SD = 1.86) children in their home. One-third of them reported having at least a high school diploma. Based on the 2007 census (Dubow, Huesmann, et al., 2012; Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics, 2008), these demographics are representative of the general population of Palestine. At wave two, 590 of the original parent-child dyads (98%) were interviewed; and at wave three, 572 dyads (95%) were interviewed again.
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Procedure

Staff from the Palestinian Center for Policy Survey Research conducted the sampling and interviews. To obtain a sample representative of the general population, residential areas in the West Bank and Gaza Strip were sampled proportionally using census maps provided by the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics. Of the families initially approached, 10% declined to participate. Participants were told that the researchers were studying the effects of ethnic-political conflict on children and their families, and assessments of one child and parent from each home would take about an hour to complete. At wave 1, the family was compensated at the region’s equivalent rate of $25. Interviewers of the same ethnicity interviewed the participants in Arabic, their native language. Interviews were conducted in the family’s home. Interviewers read the surveys to the respondents privately and individually and recorded the responses. The Institutional Review Board of the University of Michigan (Behavioral Sciences) and the ethics board of the Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research approved all procedures. The Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB) at Bowling Green State University approved the use of these data.

Measures

To ensure accuracy of translation, teams of native speakers translated all measures from English to Arabic and back to English. Focus groups then reviewed the measures and reported that they were comprehensible and applicable to their culture. All measures were administered at each of the three waves.

Demographic and background variables. The mothers reported basic demographic characteristics: on a 10-point scale (1 = illiterate, 2 = elementary, 3 = preparatory, 4 = some high
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school, 5 = high school graduate, 6 = some college of tech school, 7 = bachelor’s degree or RN
degree, 8 = some graduate school, 9 = master’s degree, 10 = doctorate or law degree).

**Exposure to ethnic-political conflict and violence.** The Exposure to Political Conflict
and Violence Scale consists of 24 items adapted from the Political Life Events Scale (Slone,
Lobel, & Gilat 1999). This measure was designed for Middle Eastern individuals. The mothers
indicated how often they experienced each event in the past year. Participants responded on a 4-
point scale (0 = never, 1 = once, 2 = a few times, 3 = many times) across five domains: loss of
or injury to a friend or family member (5 items; e.g., “Has a friend or acquaintance of yours
been injured as a result of political or military violence?”); non-violent events (6 items; e.g.,
“How often have you spent a prolonged period of time in a security shelter or under curfew?”);
self or significant others participated in political demonstrations (3 items; e.g., “How often have
you known someone who was involved in a violent political demonstration?”); witnessed actual
violence perpetrated by Israelis (4 items; e.g., “How often have you seen right in front of you
Palestinians being held hostage, tortured, or abused by Israelis?”); and witnessed media
portrayals of violence (6 items; e.g., “How often have you seen video clips or photographs of
injured or martyred Palestinians on stretchers or the ground because of an Israeli attack?”).
Scores reflect the average of responses to all 24 items (α = .76 at Wave 1).

**Financial strain.** Following the recommendations of the regional experts,
socioeconomic status was measured in one item asking the participants to rate their household
income in relation to the provided average Palestinian household income. Participants responded
along a 4-point scale (1 = below average, 2 = average, 3 = above average, 4 = way above
average).

**Mothers’ distress.** Three measures of distress are included in the PEV data set.
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**Depression.** Participants responded to 5 items (e.g., “feeling blue”) from the depression scale of the Symptom Checklist-90 (Derogatis, 1994). Respondents indicated on a 4-point scale (0 = not at all, 1 = a little bit, 2 = moderately, 3 = quite a bit, 4 = extremely) how much each problem has distressed or bothered them during the past seven days. The responses to each item were averaged to produce a scaled score (α = .76 at Wave 1, .78 at Wave 2).

**Aggression.** Participants reported the frequency with which they have been physically aggressive in the past year on a 4-point scale (0 = never, 1 = once, 2 = a few times, 3 = 5 or more times). They responded to the five items from the Severe Physical Aggression Scale (Huesmann, Eron, Lefkowitz, & Walder, 1984) including, “How often have you slapped or kicked someone?” and “How often have you threatened or actually cut another person with a knife?” Responses were averaged to produce a scaled score (α = .67 at Wave 1, .57 at Wave 2).

**Intimate partner violence.** The participants responded to six items from the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1979). The response scale was modified into a 10-point scale (ranging from 0 times to 9 or more times). Sample items included “How many times over the last 12 months have you or your spouse threatened to hit or throw something at the other?” and “How many times in the last 12 months have you or your spouse kicked, bit, or hit with a fist?” Because these items are endorsed at a very low level, Straus et al. (1998) suggest deriving a frequency score by dichotomizing each item into never versus ever in past year and then taking a sum of these dichotomized scores.

**Parenting variables.** Positive and negative parenting variables are available in the PEV data set.

**Parental Monitoring.** To assess parental monitoring, mothers responded to the 5 items from the Parent Monitoring index (Capaldi & Patterson, 1989) on a 4-point scale (0 = Never, 1 =
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Sometimes, 2 = Most of the time, 3 = Always). Sample items included “How often do you know where your child is when he/she is out of the house?” and “How often does your child talk with you about his/her daily plans?” Responses to all items are averaged to create a scale score (αs ranged from .67 to .74 across waves).

Punishment. Participants responded to 5 items from the Physical Assault index of the Conflict Tactic Scales, Parent-Child version (Straus et al., 1998). The response scale was modified into a 4-point scale (1= never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often). Sample items included “How often in the past year have you or your spouse spanked this child?” and “How often in the past year have you or your spouse punched or kicked this child?” Because physical punishments are endorsed at a very low level, Straus et al. (1998) suggest deriving a frequency score by dichotomizing each item into never versus ever in past year and then taking a sum of these dichotomized scores.
Overview of Analyses

**Preliminary analyses.** I computed descriptive statistics (frequencies, means, and standard deviations) to describe the demographic characteristics of the sample (child sex, child age, mothers’ age, average parent level of education), as well as skewness tests to determine whether any variables required transformations. Next, I examined the demographic differences in the major study variables (exposure to ethnic-political violence, financial strain, maternal distress, parenting). Specifically, I computed correlations to examine whether continuous demographic variables (child age, mothers’ age, parent education) were related to the major study variables. Demographic variables that were significantly related to the major study variables were statistically controlled in the moderated mediation analyses described below.

**Major analyses.** To demonstrate support for a moderated mediational model, I expected that socioeconomic status and exposure to ethnic-political violence at wave 1 would be associated with mothers’ distress (depression, aggression, and intimate partner violence) at wave 2 which would then predict parenting behaviors (punishment and monitoring) at wave 3. I also explored whether sex of the child would moderate the relation of predictor and mediator variables with parenting variables.

I used the PROCESS Macro for SPSS (Hayes, 2012) to determine whether the hypothesized predictor variables operated through the mediator variables to indirectly affect parenting variables. For each parenting outcome variable, the models were set up as follows (see Figure 3): 1) exposure to ethnic-political violence and financial strain at wave 1, along with covariates (significant in the preliminary analyses: child age, mothers’ age, parent level of education) and control variables (wave 1 parenting variables); and 2) the hypothesized
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mediators, including mothers’ depression, aggression, and exposure to intimate partner violence at wave 2. The PROCESS Macro calculates unstandardized beta weights for all paths in the model, as well as bootstrapped upper- and lower-bound confidence intervals to determine the significance of the indirect effects of the predictors on the outcome through each proposed mediator variable; if the confidence interval does not include zero, the indirect effect is significant.

Results of the Preliminary Analyses

Missing and skewed data. Intimate partner violence was the only skewed variable. In order to reduce the skew, the variable was log transformed.

The data were examined for missing values, and 60 missing cases (out of 599) were identified. A logistic regression was computed to determine if any of the demographic/exposure variables predicted missingness: age (β = .04, p > .05), education level (β = .03, p > .05), family income (β = -.01, p > .05), and exposure to violence (β = -.02, p > .05) at wave 1 did not significantly predict missingness. The PROCESS Macro uses listwise deletion.

Descriptive statistics. The final sample consisted of 539 Palestinian mothers, 100% of whom were married. These mothers had an average of 4.91 children in the home (SD = 1.86). Descriptive analyses were calculated (see Table 1) and bivariate correlations among all of the continuous demographic variables and the major study variables were computed (see Table 2).

Bivariate correlations between continuous demographic variables (mothers’ age, education level, and child age) and study variables of interest were examined to determine which variables to statistically control for in the major analyses. Mothers’ age, child age, and education were all significantly correlated with major study variables of interest (see Table 1) and were therefore entered as covariates in the major analyses. Older maternal age was associated with
Macrosystem Predictors of Parenting Behaviors

lower levels of maternal aggression, intimate partner violence, and use of punishment. Higher levels of parental education were associated with higher levels of family income and lower levels of depression and intimate partner violence. Older child age was associated with lower levels of family income, parental monitoring, punishment, and mothers’ depression. Additionally, the results showed moderate stability of the mediator variables between wave 1 and wave 2 ($r$ ranged from .40 to .53).

**Results of the Major Analyses**

Using the PROCESS Macro for SPSS (Hayes, 2012), a series of moderated mediation analyses were computed to test the hypothesis that family income and exposure to ethnic-political violence would predict mothers’ distress (i.e., depression, aggression, intimate partner violence), which would then predict parenting behaviors (lower rates of parental monitoring and higher rates of punishment). Sex of the child was included as a moderator of the relation between predictor and mediator variables and between the mediators and parenting behaviors (punishment and monitoring; see Figure 3). Both the wave 3 dependent variables (parenting behaviors) and three Wave 2 mediators (mothers’ distress) were regressed on the wave 1 predictor variables (family income, exposure to ethnic-political violence), mediator variables, outcome variables, and correlated demographic variables (child age, mothers’ age, parent level of education).

In figures depicting the models, for ease of presentation, only paths between the major study variables as well as wave 1 mediator variables were depicted. The accompanying table presents unstandardized direct, indirect, and total effects.
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Model 1. Mothers’ wave 2 mothers’ distress as a mediator of the relation between wave 1 exposure to ethnic-political violence and wave 3 parental monitoring. Figure 4 shows that after controlling for mothers’ distress at wave 1 (intimate partner violence, depression, and aggression), exposure to ethnic-political violence at wave 1 did not significantly predict the mediators at wave 2. Mediators were moderately stable over time, as shown in Table 2. Table 3 shows that exposure to ethnic-political violence at wave 1 neither had a significant direct nor indirect effect on wave 3 parental monitoring. Moderated mediation was not significant through any of the mediators.

Model 2. Mothers’ wave 2 distress as a mediator of the relation between wave 1 family income and wave 3 parental monitoring. Figure 5 shows that family income at wave 1 did not significantly predict the wave 2 mediators: intimate partner violence, depression, and aggression. Table 3 shows that wave 1 family income did not have a significant direct effect on wave 3 parental monitoring. There were neither significant indirect effects of wave 1 family income on wave 3 parental monitoring nor moderated mediation through any of the wave 2 mediators.

Model 3. Mothers’ wave 2 distress as a mediator of the relation between wave 1 exposure to ethnic-political violence and wave 3 punishment. Figure 6 shows that exposure to ethnic-political violence at wave 1 did not significantly predict the mothers’ intimate partner violence, depression, or aggression in wave 2. Exposure to ethnic-political violence at wave 1 neither had a significant direct effect nor a significant indirect effect on wave 3 punishment (see Table 3). Moderated mediation was not significant through any of the wave 2 mediators.

Model 4. Mothers’ wave 2 distress as a mediator of the relation between wave 1 family income and wave 3 punishment. Figure 7 shows that family income at wave 1 did not
Macrosystem Predictors of Parenting Behaviors predict any of the wave 2 mediators. Table 3 shows that family income at wave 1 did not have a direct effect or indirect effect on wave 3 parental monitoring. Moderated mediation was not significant through any of the wave 2 mediators.

**Supplementary Mediational Analyses**

In the first 4 models described above, it was noted that there were no effects of wave 2 proposed mediators once the wave 1 score on the mediators was controlled. In fact, the strongest wave 1 predictor of the wave 2 mediator was the score on the corresponding wave 1 mediator, rather than wave 1 exposure to ethnic-political violence or wave 1 family income. It is possible that the moderate stability of the mediators from wave 1 to wave 2 (rs ranged from 0.40 to 0.53) attenuated the likelihood of finding a significant relation between other wave 1 scores (e.g., exposure to ethnic-political violence) and wave 2 proposed mediators. A supplementary set of mediation analyses were computed that did not control for the wave 1 mediators. Instead, I averaged each mediator’s wave 1 and wave 2 scores, and used these average scores as the mediating variables and recomputed the same models.

To facilitate description of the results, direct effects as well as the significant indirect effects and paths were highlighted in the text. See Table 4 for unstandardized direct, indirect, and total effects. Additionally, in figures and tables depicting the models, for ease of presentation, only paths between major study variables were depicted.

**Model 5. Mothers’ averaged wave 1 and wave 2 distress as a mediator of the relation between wave 1 exposure to ethnic-political violence and wave 3 parental monitoring.**

Table 4 shows that wave 1 exposure to ethnic-political violence had a direct effect on wave 3 parental monitoring for male children but not for female children. Figure 8 shows that exposure to ethnic-political violence at wave 1 uniquely predicted higher levels of each of the average of
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wave 1 and 2 mediators: intimate partner violence, depression, and aggression. However, averaged wave 1 and 2 mothers’ distress did not predict wave 3 parental monitoring.

Model 6. Mothers’ averaged wave 1 and wave 2 distress as a mediator of the relation between wave 1 family income and wave 3 parental monitoring. Table 4 shows that wave 1 family income did not have a significant direct effect on wave 3 parental monitoring. Figure 9 shows that wave 1 family income uniquely predicted higher levels of averaged wave 1 and 2 mothers’ aggression. However, averaged wave 1 and 2 mothers’ distress did not predict wave 3 parental monitoring.

Model 7. Mothers’ averaged wave 1 and 2 distress as a mediator of the relation between wave 1 exposure to ethnic-political violence and wave 3 punishment. Table 4 shows that exposure to ethnic-political violence at wave 1 did not have a significant direct effect on punishment, regardless of child sex. The indirect effect of exposure to ethnic-political violence on punishment was significant through the averaged wave 1 and 2 intimate partner violence for male children but was not significant for female children. Conversely, the indirect effect through averaged wave 1 and 2 depression was significant for female children but not for male children. There were significant indirect effects through averaged wave 1 and 2 maternal aggression for both female and male children. Moderated mediation was only significant through averaged wave 1 and 2 intimate partner violence. Figure 10 shows that exposure to ethnic-political violence at wave 1 uniquely predicted higher levels of each of the averaged wave 1 and 2 mediators: intimate partner violence, depression, and aggression. In turn, mothers’ averaged wave 1 and wave 2 depression and aggression predicted higher levels of wave 3 punishment.

Model 8. Mothers’ averaged wave 1 and 2 distress as a mediator of the relation between wave 1 family income and wave 3 punishment. Table 4 shows that wave 1 family
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income did not have a direct effect on wave 3 punishment. The indirect effect of wave 1 family income on wave 3 punishment was only significant through the mediator of mothers’ averaged wave 1 and 2 aggression and was significant for both female and male children. Figure 11 shows that wave 1 family income level uniquely predicted higher levels of the mothers’ averaged wave 1 and 2 aggression. Additionally, mothers’ averaged wave 1 and wave 2 aggression and depression predicted higher levels of wave 3 punishment.
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CHAPTER IV. DISCUSSION

In the current study, I sought to combine the family stress model (e.g., Conger et al., 1992) and the contagion of violence model (e.g., Institute of Medicine, 2013; Slutkin, 2013) by examining the effects of both ethnic-political violence and socioeconomic strain on parenting in Palestinian families. The theory is that in conditions of war, economic resources are depleted and families are both victims and witnesses of violence. As families experience strain from an insufficient family income and exposure to ethnic-political violence, their psychological resources are depleted and their mental health is affected.

Research suggests that parental distress taxes a parent’s emotional resources (Planos et al., 1997) and lowers his/her sense of parenting efficacy and self-esteem (Gondoli & Silverberg, 1997). This distress impairs parents’ ability to interpret their child’s signals, decreases emotional responsiveness, and increases use of punitive discipline (Garbarino, 2001; Gondoli & Silverberg, 1997; McLoyd et al., 1994; Planos et al., 1997). Furthermore, these parents are more likely to learn social cognitions and develop social scripts and schemas that support violence (Huesmann & Kirwil, 2007). This change in beliefs about and emotional response to violence may cause parents to develop more positive moral beliefs about violence and become more likely to behave aggressively (Huesmann & Kirwil, 2007). Finally, research suggests that parenting behaviors may differ according to the sex of the child (e.g., Dwairy et al., 2006; Khoury-Kassabri & Straus, 2011), suggesting that child sex may affect the way that exposure to stress and parental distress impact parenting behaviors.

I hypothesized that family income and exposure to ethnic-political violence would predict higher levels of mothers’ distress (i.e., depression, aggression, intimate partner violence). Mothers’ distress (depression, aggression, intimate partner violence) would then predict parenting behaviors (lower rates of parental monitoring and higher rates of punishment). I also
Macrosystem Predictors of Parenting Behaviors explored how the sex of the child would moderate both the relation between macro-system level stressors (financial strain and exposure to ethnic-political violence) and parenting behaviors (punishment and monitoring) as well as the relation between mothers’ distress (depression, aggression, and intimate partner violence) and parenting behaviors (punishment and monitoring). No specific predictions were made about the moderation effects.

**Macro-Level Predictors, Mothers’ Distress, Parenting Behaviors**

In the first model, I hypothesized that wave 1 exposure to ethnic-political violence and family income would predict the mothers’ wave 2 distress variables (depression, aggression, intimate partner violence) and subsequently predict wave 3 parenting (punishment and monitoring). A major strength of the present study is its three-wave longitudinal design which allowed me to run a highly restrictive model controlling for change over time of mothers’ wave 1 to wave 2 distress (aggression, depression, and intimate partner violence) as well as wave 1 to wave 3 parenting (punishment and monitoring). By controlling for moderately stable distress variables at wave 1, however, the results showed that wave 1 family income and exposure to ethnic-political violence did not significantly predict mothers’ distress at wave 2. Given the moderate stability over 1 year in distress measures, I examined a less restrictive model by averaging the relatively stable wave 1 and wave 2 parental distress variables as an index of cumulative distress.

**Wave 1 Macro-Level Predictors, Mothers’ Averaged Wave 1 & 2 Distress, Wave 3 Parenting**

**Exposure to ethnic-political violence.** When exposure to ethnic-political violence was included as a stressor in the family stress model, the results demonstrated that ethnic-political violence has stronger effects on mothers’ punishment behaviors than on parental monitoring.
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Specifically, I found that for male children, wave 1 exposure to political violence indirectly affected wave 3 punishment through averaged wave 1 and 2 intimate partner violence and aggression. For female children, wave 1 exposure to political violence indirectly affected punishment through mothers’ averaged wave 1 and 2 depression and aggression. Wave 1 exposure to ethnic political violence did not indirectly affect parental monitoring through any of the mothers’ distress variables. However, exposure to political violence at wave 1 did have a direct effect on parental monitoring for male children.

It is possible that the weaker findings of exposure to ethnic-political violence predicting parental monitoring compared to exposure to ethnic-political violence predicting punishment might be due to low variance in parental monitoring across the sample showing that, overall, most of the mothers reported that they were monitoring their children. Additionally, the results revealed stronger relations between mothers’ distress and punishment behaviors than between mothers’ distress and monitoring. The mothers’ distress may affect emotion regulation and parenting efficacy which causes them to respond to their child’s behavior with physical punishment, thus affecting their abilities to respond to their child’s behavior more than their monitoring behaviors.

The stronger results predicting maternal use of punishment compared to parental monitoring might also be due to specific type of monitoring measure used in this data set. The measure assessing parental monitoring focuses on the frequency that the child communicates his or her activities, whereabouts, etc., to his or her parents. It does not explicitly measure how often the mothers are actively soliciting this information from their children. If parental distress compromises parenting behaviors, it is possible that higher levels of distress might affect mothers’ resources to actively solicit information about the child’s activities and whereabouts.
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Overall, mothers’ distress mediated the relation between exposure to ethnic-political violence and punishment behaviors. However, any mediational effect of intimate partner violence was specific to child-gender. Intimate partner violence mediated the relation between exposure to ethnic-political violence and punishment for male children but not for female children, suggesting that intimate partner violence may affect male children more than female children. This finding is inconsistent with previous research which overall reveals no child sex differences in the effects of intimate partner violence on children (Grych, Jouriles, Swank, McDonald, & Norwood, 2000; Herrenkohl, Sousa, Tajima, Herrenkohl, & Moylan, 2008; Wolfe, Crooks, Lee, McIntyre-Smith, & Jaffe, 2003).

Financial strain. When financial strain was used as a predictor to test the Family Stress Model in this Palestinian sample, findings were largely insignificant. In contrast with previous research that has established a relation between financial strain and positive and negative parenting through parental distress in American samples (Barnett, 2008; Conger et al., 1992), the present results did not reveal a relation between family income and parental monitoring. Similarly, the relations between family income and punishment were largely insignificant. The one notable result revealed that mothers’ averaged aggression fully mediated the relation between family income and punishment. However, incongruent with previous research, higher family income was related to higher levels of mothers’ aggression which were then related to more frequent use of punishment. This result may well be spurious. However, if replicated, it is possible that the result could reflect findings in the extant literature that the loss of socioeconomic status is related to an increased risk subsequent psychological distress (e.g., Porter & Haslam, 2005). In the present study, perhaps participants with higher family income at
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wave 1 may have suffered financial loss by wave 2 which resulted in their higher wave 2 aggression.

Overall, these results suggest that in the present sample of Palestinian families living in a war zone, financial strain may not be as salient of a stressor on families as it is in western countries. Exposure to ethnic-political violence may overshadow financial strain and, as a result, may have a stronger impact on parental psychological well-being and parenting behaviors in the context of war.

Limitations and Implications

There are several limitations of the current study. The primary limitation is that a self-report survey was used to measure all constructs. Future research should utilize multi-method, multi-reporter designs to expand the current findings. A second limitation is that family income is used as a proxy variable for financial strain, the construct of interest. Measures examining financial strain or needs-to-debt-ratio of the family may allow more accurate measurement and may produce results consistent with previous literature. Third, the Conflict Tactic Scale—utilized to measure punishment behaviors—was modified in this study to assess behaviors of both parents in the home together rather than mothers’ and fathers’ behaviors separately. In addition, this data set consisted exclusively of mothers, not father. Future research should focus on recruiting a sample of fathers to broaden the picture of potential mediational effects of parent distress and parenting behavior among children in war zones.

Implications for Future Research and Practice

Despite these limitations, the current study expands previous literature by examining the family stress model in a three wave, longitudinal study utilizing a large, Middle Eastern sample.
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The prospective design of the study allowed me to examine whether exposure to ethnic-political violence affects mothers’ later distress which then affects use of punishment.

Currently, most trauma-focused treatments target the child as the agent of change (Miller & Rasmussen, 2010). However, because children exposed to political violence experience both political violence and domestic violence (Catani et al., 2008; Palosaari et al., 2013; Yehuda et al., 2001) and positive parenting has been related to positive child outcomes in the context of war (Dubow, Huesmann, et al., 2012; Punamaki, Qouta, & Sarraj, 1997; Thabet, Ibraheem, Shivram, Winter, & Vostanis, 2009), interventions to improve child distress among children exposed to political violence should utilize a more psychosocial focus that targets parenting and the family environment (Miller & Rasmussen, 2010). Additionally, results of this study suggest that these family interventions should focus on decreasing harsh punishment behaviors by targeting parental distress that may result from parents’ own trauma exposure experiences.
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Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Scale Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>24 – 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Age</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>8 – 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 Family income</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 Exposure to Political Violence</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 Punishment</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 Monitoring</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 Depression</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>0 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 Aggression</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0 – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2 Depression</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>0 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2 Aggression</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2 Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0 – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 3 Punishment</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 3 Monitoring</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Bivariate Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education Level</td>
<td>-11**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Child Age</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family Income</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Political Violence</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Wave 1 Depression</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Wave 1 Aggression</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Wave 1 Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Wave 1 Punishment</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Wave 1 Monitoring</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Wave 2 Depression</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Wave 2 Aggression</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Wave 2 Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Wave 3 Punishment</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Wave 3 Monitoring</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 3

Unstandardized Direct and Indirect Effects of Macro-Level Predictors (Exposure to Ethnic-Political Violence and Family Income) on Wave 3 Parenting (Punishment and Monitoring) through Wave 2 Parental Distress (Aggression, Depression, Intimate Partner Violence), Controlling for Wave 1 Child Age, Parent Age, Parent Level of Education, as Well as Wave 1 Parental Distress and Parenting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Mediator Variable</th>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Direct Effect (Mediator on Predictor)</th>
<th>Direct Effect (Criterion on Mediator)</th>
<th>Female Indirect or Direct Effect</th>
<th>Male Indirect or Direct Effect</th>
<th>Moderated Mediation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1 Exposure to Political Violence</td>
<td>W2 Depression</td>
<td>W3 Punishment</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Exposure to Political Violence</td>
<td>W2 Aggression</td>
<td>W3 Punishment</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Exposure to Political Violence</td>
<td>W2 Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>W3 Punishment</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Exposure to Political Violence</td>
<td>W2 Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>W3 Punishment</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Income</td>
<td>W2 Depression</td>
<td>W3 Punishment</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Income</td>
<td>W2 Aggression</td>
<td>W3 Punishment</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Income</td>
<td>W2 Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>W3 Punishment</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Income</td>
<td>W3 Punishment</td>
<td>W3 Punishment</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Exposure to Political Violence</td>
<td>W2 Depression</td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Exposure to Political Violence</td>
<td>W2 Aggression</td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Exposure to Political Violence</td>
<td>W2 Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Exposure to Political Violence</td>
<td>W2 Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Income</td>
<td>W2 Depression</td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Income</td>
<td>W2 Aggression</td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Income</td>
<td>W2 Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Income</td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001. † 95% C.I. does not include 0.
Table 4

Unstandardized Direct and Indirect Effects of Macro-Level Predictors (Family Income and Exposure to Ethnic-Political Violence) on Parenting (Punishment and Monitoring) through Averaged Wave 1 and Wave 2 Parental Distress (Depression, Aggression, Intimate Partner Violence) Controlling for Wave 1 Child Age, Parent Age, Parent Level of Education, as Well as Wave 1 Parenting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Mediator Variable</th>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Direct Effect (Mediator on Predictor)</th>
<th>Direct Effect (Criterion on Mediator)</th>
<th>Female Indirect or Direct Effect</th>
<th>Male Indirect or Direct Effect</th>
<th>Moderated Mediation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1 Exposure to Political Violence</td>
<td>Avg Depression</td>
<td>W3 Punishment</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.05†</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Exposure to Political Violence</td>
<td>Avg Aggression</td>
<td>W3 Punishment</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.04†</td>
<td>.03†</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Exposure to Political Violence</td>
<td>Avg Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>W3 Punishment</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05†</td>
<td>.06†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Income</td>
<td>Avg Depression</td>
<td>W3 Punishment</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Income</td>
<td>Avg Aggression</td>
<td>W3 Punishment</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.02†</td>
<td>.01†</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Income</td>
<td>Avg Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>W3 Punishment</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Income</td>
<td>Avg Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>W3 Punishment</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Exposure to Political Violence</td>
<td>Avg Depression</td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Exposure to Political Violence</td>
<td>Avg Aggression</td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Exposure to Political Violence</td>
<td>Avg Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Exposure to Political Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.22†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Income</td>
<td>Avg Depression</td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Income</td>
<td>Avg Aggression</td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Income</td>
<td>Avg Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>W3 Monitoring</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. ***p < .001. **p < .01. † 95% C.I. does not include 0.
Figure 1. Ecological systems model.

Financial Stress → Parental Emotional Distress → Parenting Behaviors

Figure 2. Family stress model.
Figure 3. Path analysis model of the relation between parental exposure to macrosystem-level stressors and parenting behaviors with parental distress (depression, aggression, and intimate partner violence) as mediators. Covariates at wave 1 include the following: child age, parent age, parent level of education, and wave 1 parenting variables.
Figure 4. Path analysis model of the relation between parental exposure to political violence and monitoring, with parental distress (depression, aggression, and intimate partner violence) as mediators. Covariates at wave 1 include the following: child age, parent age, parent level of education, and wave 1 mediators and parenting variables.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. 

$R^2 = .32^{***}$  
$R^2 = .21^{***}$  
$R^2 = .27^{***}$  
$R^2 = .30^{***}$
Figure 5. Path analysis model of the relation between family income and monitoring, with parental distress (depression, aggression, and intimate partner violence) as mediators. Covariates at wave 1 include the following: child age, parent age, parent level of education, and wave 1 mediators and parenting variables.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. 
Figure 6. Path analysis model of the relation between parental exposure to political violence and punishment, with parental distress (depression, aggression, and intimate partner violence) as mediators. Covariates at wave 1 include the following: child age, parent age, parent level of education, and wave 1 mediators and parenting variables.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. 
Figure 7. Path analysis model of the relation between family income and punishment, with parental distress (depression, aggression, and intimate partner violence) as mediators. Covariates at wave 1 include the following: child age, parent age, parent level of education, and wave 1 mediators and parenting variables.

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.
Figure 8. Path analysis model of the relation between parental exposure to political violence and monitoring, with parental distress (depression, aggression, and intimate partner violence) as mediators. Covariates at wave 1 include the following: child age, parent age, parent level of education, and wave 1 parenting variables.

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.
Figure 9. Path analysis model of the relation between family income and monitoring, with parental distress (depression, aggression, and intimate partner violence) as mediators. Covariates at wave 1 include the following: child age, parent age, parent level of education, and wave 1 parenting variables.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. 
Figure 10. Path analysis model of the relation between exposure to ethnic-political violence and punishment, with parental distress (depression, aggression, and intimate partner violence) as mediators. Covariates at wave 1 include the following: child age, parent age, parent level of education, and wave 1 parenting variables.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. 
Figure 11. Path analysis model of the relation between family income and punishment, with parental distress (depression, aggression, and intimate partner violence) as mediators. Covariates at wave 1 include the following: child age, parent age, parent level of education, and wave 1 parenting variables.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. 