November 13, 2013

Dear AAP Board of Directors:

Suppose a medical organization announced a series of press releases opposing all use of radiation treatment based on two types of studies published in a prominent medical journal. The first type of study reached its conclusion based only upon inappropriate levels of radiation dosages. The second type of study used typical dosages, but stridently disparaged radiation on the basis of one more significant association than would be expected by chance.

While it is hard to imagine such studies being considered sufficient evidence to discontinue radiation, these are exactly the kinds of studies that Pediatrics not only publishes about disciplinary spanking, but features to the media. Two retrospective studies by Afifi et al.\(^1,2\) were said to provide evidence against all disciplinary spanking, when the survey measure only used the terms “push, grab, shove, slap, or hit,”\(^1,2\) not “spank.” Now an article by MacKenzie et al.\(^3\) claims to have evidence against all spanking when only 2 of 16 tests were significant (after all controls were included), and the mean effect of spanking at the age of 3 was in the opposite direction (albeit not significantly so). Overall, the mean effect size was equivalent to an odds ratio of 1.06 (where OR = 1.00 indicates no association at all), which could easily be due to other confounding variables.

Why is Pediatrics highlighting these kinds of studies to the media, when this kind of evidence would not be acceptable for publication if used to evaluate a medical treatment? Even a journalist reporting on the first study noted the disconnect between the press release and the actual study findings.\(^4\) Two possible explanations come to mind. The first possible explanation is that the conclusions advanced in these weak studies have already been established by higher quality research. But this is not the case in the three studies recently published in Pediatrics. To the contrary, all three studies relied heavily on a meta-analysis by Gershoff\(^5\) based solely on correlational evidence. Correlational data provide a poor basis for inference about the efficacy of treatment. When using correlations, all corrective actions (whether disciplinary or medical) appear to be harmful for chronic problems because people without the problem typically do not receive the treatment. For instance, there is a positive correlation between cancer and radiation treatment within any given year, because those of us who didn't have cancer that year didn't receive any radiation.\(^6\) Cross-sectional correlations would even make a perfect cancer treatment look harmful, because cancer symptoms during treatment would count as evidence against it. Longitudinal studies would make it appear ineffective because the correlations would average \(r = .00\), if radiation patients became indistinguishable from the general population on cancer-related outcomes. Thus even a perfect corrective action would be regarded as harmful or ineffective by the unadjusted correlational evidence used in Gershoff’s\(^5\) meta-analysis.

Fortunately, two recent meta-analyses of disciplinary spanking have moved beyond the kinds of correlations that are biased against corrective disciplinary actions. Based on studies similar to MacKenzie et al.,\(^3\) the first meta-analysis found tiny adverse effects of spanking of children under the age of 7 on externalizing behavior problems (partial \(r = .06\), equivalent to OR = 1.24), which could easily be accounted for unmeasured confounds.\(^7\) The second meta-analysis found
that physical punishment led to more adverse outcomes than alternative disciplinary tactics only when it was used severely or as the main disciplinary method. Customary spanking led to similar outcomes as all alternative tactics across all studies except one, which favored spanking. Conditional spanking (nonabusive usage when 2- to 6-year-olds respond defiantly to milder tactics) was associated with significantly less noncompliance or aggression than 10 of 13 alternative tactics to which it had been compared. Analyses of conditional spanking included the only four randomized trials of spanking, all of which supported conditional spanking as one of the two most effective enforcements for time out for children demonstrating clinical levels of noncompliance.

Only two studies have replicated the strongest causal evidence against customary spanking while also testing alternative disciplinary methods that parents could use instead. They both found similar tiny adverse effects for all other types of disciplinary corrections as well as for two professional treatments for behavior problems. Psychotherapy and Ritalin both appeared to be just as harmful as spanking in this kind of statistically controlled prospective study. Additional analyses in those studies indicated that all these apparently adverse effects were due to residual selection bias, which is reduced but not eliminated by statistical controls.

The other likely explanation for why the Pediatrics editorial office might feature such weak evidence is because they are biased against considering the possibility that disciplinary spanking might be an acceptable disciplinary option under some limited conditions. If so, this bias must be minimized in order for Pediatrics to maintain its scientific credibility. Previously, the American Academy of Pediatrics championed scientific objectivity on this issue by co-sponsoring a scientific consensus conference on corporal punishment, which found no convincing evidence of harm when parents used disciplinary spanking appropriately.

Please consider the evidence we have cited and consult with your editorial staff so that a more informed and objective treatment can be applied to any future study of disciplinary spanking published in Pediatrics.

Robert E. Larzelere, PhD  
Professor, Dept. of Human Development and Family Science  
Oklahoma State University

Den A. Trumbull, MD, FCP  
Pediatric Healthcare  
Montgomery, AL

Joseph Zanga, MD, FAAP, FCP  
Chief of Pediatrics, Columbus Regional Health and Professor of Pediatrics  
Mercer University School of Medicine.

Marjorie Lindner Gunnoe, PhD  
Professor, Dept. of Psychology  
Calvin College
References