INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

**FOSTERING EMOTIONAL AND SOCIAL WELL-BEING:
EXAMINING THE CORRELATES OF MATERNAL EMOTIONAL STYLES
IN EARLY CHILDHOOD**

**Daniel G. Lagacé-Séguin
Carleton University**

A thesis

presented to Carleton University

**in partial fulfillment of the
thesis requirements for the degree of**

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Psychology

Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, 2001

July 5th, 2001

© copyright, 2001 Daniel G. Lagacé-Séguin

RUNNING HEAD: MATERNAL EMOTIONAL STYLES

**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-67034-1

Canada

The undersigned recommend to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
Acceptance of the thesis:

"Fostering Emotional and Social Well-Being:
Examining the Correlates of Maternal Emotional Styles
in Early Childhood"

submitted by

Daniel G. Lagacé-Séguin

in Partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Chair

External Examiner

Thesis Supervisor

Carleton University
July, 2001

Abstract

Two studies were completed to examine the relations between parental emotional styles, other parenting constructs, child regulation, and social adjustment in early childhood. In Study 1, 140 mothers completed the newly developed Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire (PESQ). Of these 140 mothers, 65 completed the Parenting Practices Questionnaire to assess parental disciplinary styles, and the other 75 completed the Child Behaviour Vignettes which are designed to assess parenting beliefs and emotional responses to a variety of hypothetical situations.

Two factors emerged for the PESQ: Emotion dismissing and emotion coaching. Both subscales exhibited acceptable factor loadings, item scale correlations, internal consistency reliability, and short-term stability (at a 6-month interval). No significant relations between parental emotional styles and disciplinary strategies were found. Emotion dismissing parenting style was significantly and positively associated with maternal espousal of parent-centered goals, whereas emotion coaching parenting style was significantly and positively associated with relationship-centered goals. Emotion dismissing parenting style was positively associated with angry and embarrassed emotional responses to misbehaviour and feelings of responsibility for prosocial situations. An emotion coaching parenting style was positively associated with feelings of responsibility during misbehaviour and prosocial situations.

The goal of Study 2 was to apply the new version of the PESQ to models to test the mediated and moderated relations with child regulation characteristics in the prediction of social outcomes. 100 mothers and their children participated. Child regulation characteristics were measured. Emotion regulation and behavioural regulation

were assessed using the Child Behaviour Questionnaire, and negative affect was rated by mothers using an adapted version of the Affect Intensity Measure. Teachers rated children on prosocial, aggressive, and anxious behaviours using the Child Behaviour Scale.

Significant interactions were found between parental emotional styles and regulation in the prediction of child outcomes. Emotion coaching parenting style was associated with positive adjustment among dysregulated children and associated with negative outcomes among regulated children. Conversely, emotion dismissing parenting style was more strongly associated with poor adjustment among well regulated than dysregulated children. Results are discussed in terms of the importance of considering both child and parent characteristics in the prediction of adjustment.

Acknowledgements and Dedication

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge a number of individuals who have supported me during the last five years. I have been very fortunate to have the guidance of my doctoral advisor Rob Coplan. It seems like only yesterday that I met with Rob to discuss working under his supervision to pursue Ph.D. studies. Words cannot describe how beneficial Rob's mentorship has been over the last five years. I thank him for his interest, effort, and enthusiasm with respect to my research. I will strive to provide my students at Mount Saint Vincent University with the same "academic package" as Rob has provided for me.

I would also like to thank Tina Daniels and Jo Wood for their support. They were always willing to lend a hand and encouraging words. Thank you. A big thank you to Linda Rose-Krasnor for participating as my external examiner and Karen March for participating as my internal examiner. The time that they have taken to read and comment on my research is greatly appreciated. To the moms, children, and daycare teachers I would like to say thank you for your participation in this project (and past projects). Your time is appreciated.

In addition I would like to thank Judy, Etelle, Jacqui, Kim, and Lynn for their support and wisdom. The five of you make a wonderful team....I'm going to miss you. And, Judy...Matthieu will miss you like crazy and will never forget his Friday visits!

As well, I would like to acknowledge another very important support system....my fellow graduate students...my closest friends at Carleton. Special thanks to Kendra, Cherami, Ann, Kim, Kavita, and Andrea for their ability to listen and provide advice. Also, warm thanks to Caryn who, despite the distance between us, has the ability

to make me laugh even when I don't feel like laughing. Even though we only shared two years at Carleton the memories are lasting a lifetime.

Finally, I would like to say my biggest thanks to my family. Mom and Dad....what can I say...other than I'm finally done! You have provided me with the moral grounding that I now instill in my own son. This guidance has helped me chart my path in life and I thank you for the words of encouragement and the interest that you show in my research. Without your support I wouldn't be where I am today. Rhett...I miss you.

To my most important and valuable support, my wife Sylvie, words cannot express my affection, admiration, adoration, and my thanks for all that you have given me in the last decade. Your patience, love, encouragement, support, and belief in my abilities have kept me going strong. But thanks most of all for your greatest gift...our son Matthieu. Before Matthieu I thought I understood the true essence of Developmental Psychology....now watching Matthieu develop from day to day, I truly believe I do. Thank you Matthieu for helping me understand that studying Psychology is something that I have chosen to do as a profession. Being Daddy to you is truly who I am. To our pets, Sascha, Louie, and Newman....thanks for providing stress relief when I need it most. To Diva and Buster...I miss both of you more than I can express.

I would like to end the acknowledgment section by dedicating my Ph.D. thesis to my sister-in-law Christina King-Seguin who lost her eight-year battle with breast cancer on August 23rd, 2000. Chris left behind my brother Jim and their son Jonathon. Her parenting was far beyond that of others...she would always take the time to listen, understand, and teach Jonathon regardless of the events occurring in her life. An

important lesson is learned by her exampleeven when we don't think we have the time, or when other events in our lives may seem more important or distracting, it is important to listen to our children. Chris is the inspiration for my thesis and her memory will always live on in our hearts. Everyday I strive to be just as good a parent to Matthieu as Chris was to Jonathon. The decade that she had with Jonathon has instilled the morals and beliefs that will live on forever. Even though she may be gone, her genuine heart and moral grounding lives on in her son. I miss you deeply, Chris, and I'm always thinking of you.

Contents

Title Page	i
Acceptance Page	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements and Dedication	v
Table of Contents	viii
List of Figures	xii
List of Tables	xiii
 GENERAL INTRODUCTION	 1
 PARENTAL EMOTIONAL STYLES	 3
The Building Blocks of Meta-Emotion	3
The Influence of Haim Ginott	4
Emotional Communication	7
Emotional Intelligence	9
Correlates of Emotional Intelligence	12
Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Parental Emotional Styles	14
Types of Emotional Parenting Styles	15
A Model of Meta-Emotion	17
Findings Related to the Model	18
Caveats and Criticisms	22
Parenting Styles	22
Other Parenting Variables	23
Assessing Meta-Emotion	24
Negative Affect	24
Regulation	25
Other Issues	26
Overview of Present Research	27
 INTRODUCTION – STUDY 1	 28
Development and Validation of the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire	28
Interview Assessment of Parental Emotional Styles	29
Original Item Pool	31
Establishing Psychometric Properties of the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire	31
Factor Structure	31
Reliability	32
Validity	32

Parental Disciplinary Styles	32
Baumrind's Parenting Styles	32
Criticisms of Baumrind's Approach	34
Disciplinary Styles and Parental Emotional Styles	35
Parental Belief Systems and Emotional Responses	37
Parenting Goals	39
Parenting Goals and Parental Emotional Styles	40
Attributions	41
Attributions and Parental Emotional Styles	44
Parental Emotional Responses	46
Emotional Responses and Parental Emotional Styles	47
Summary	50
METHOD – STUDY 1	50
Participants	50
Procedures and Methods	50
Measures	52
Parental Emotional Styles	52
Parental Disciplinary Styles	53
Parental Belief Systems and Emotional Responses	53
RESULTS-STUDY 1	55
Factor and Item Analysis of the PESQ Items	56
Internal Consistency and Item Analysis	59
Factor Analysis: Males and Females	59
Stability of PESQ Ratings	63
Demographics	63
Sex Differences	63
Construct Validity	65
PESQ Relations with Parenting Style Typologies	65
PESQ Relations with Parenting Goals	65
PESQ Relations with Attributions	65
PESQ Relations with Emotional Responses	68
DISCUSSION-STUDY 1	68
Psychometric Validation of the PESQ	69
Parental Emotional Styles and Disciplinary Strategies	71
Parental Emotional Styles and Belief Systems	76
Parenting Goals	76
Parenting Attributions	78
Parenting Emotional Responses	80
Summary	83
INTRODUCTION – STUDY 2	85
Emotional Styles and Child Outcomes	85
Child Regulation and Child Outcomes	86

Emotionality	87
Emotionality and Adjustment	88
Emotional versus Behavioural Regulation	88
Emotion Regulation	89
Behavioural Regulation	91
Regulation and Adjustment	92
Child Regulation and Parenting	92
Direction of Relations	94
Summary	95
Parenting, Regulation, and Social Adjustment: Mediated and Moderated Relations	96
Goodness of Fit	97
Summary of Hypotheses	98
Assessing Adjustment in Preschool	101
METHOD – STUDY 2	102
Participants	102
Procedures and Methods	102
Measures	102
Maternal Measures	102
Parental Emotional Styles	102
Child-Centered Regulation Constructs	103
Negative Affect	103
Behavioural Regulation	104
Emotion Regulation	104
Teacher Measures	104
Aggression, Anxiety, and Prosocial Behaviour	104
RESULTS-STUDY 2	105
Preliminary Analyses	105
Data Screening	105
Correlations with Demographic Variables	107
Relations between Measures of Child Regulation	107
Parental Emotional Styles and Child Regulation	107
Parental Emotional Styles and Social Outcomes	107
Child Regulation and Child Outcomes	113
Mediated (Indirect) Relations	113
Moderated Regression Analyses	116
Overview	116
Emotion Coaching	117
Emotion Dismissing	119
DISCUSSION-STUDY 2	126
Parental Emotional Styles and Social Outcomes	126
Parental Emotional Styles and Regulation	131
Parenting, Regulation, and Adjustment	134

Emotion Coaching	135
Emotion Dismissing	139
Regulation and Social Outcomes	142
Caveats and Future Directions	145
Importance of Fathers	145
Direction of Effect and Future Longitudinal Research	146
Shared Method Variance	147
Gender Differences	147
Emotions, Outcomes, and Regulation	148
Other Parental Emotional Styles	149
Culture	150
Examining Relations Beyond Childhood	150
Conclusions	150
References	152
Appendix A: Original Item Pool	175
Appendix B: Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire (original version)	178
Appendix C: Description of Study 1	185
Appendix D: Consent form – Study 1	186
Appendix E: Demographics questionnaire – Study 1	187
Appendix F: Parenting Practices Questionnaire	188
Appendix G: Child Behaviour Vignettes	191
Appendix H: Revised Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire	202
Appendix I: Child Behavior Scale	203
Appendix J: Description of Study 2	206
Appendix K: Consent Form – Study 2	207
Appendix L: Demographics questionnaire – Study 2	208
Appendix M: Affect Intensity Measure	209
Appendix N: Child Behaviour Questionnaire	212
Appendix O: Hierarchical Regression Analyses	219

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Summary of findings from Gottman et al. (1996, 1997)	19
Figure 2: Schemata for Study 1	51
Figure 3: Study 2 Model: The mediating and moderating relations between parental emotional styles, temperamental constructs, and social adjustment outcomes	100
Figure 4: Simple effects testing of moderated relation between emotion coaching and behaviour regulation to predict prosocial behaviour	120
Figure 5: Simple effects testing of moderated relation between emotion coaching and emotion regulation to predict anxious behaviour	121
Figure 6: Simple effects testing of moderated relation between emotion dismissing and behaviour regulation to predict anxious behaviour	123
Figure 7: Simple effects testing of moderated relation between emotion dismissing and negative affect to predict anxious behaviour	125

LIST OF TABLES**Study 1**

Table 1: Means and standard deviations for the PESQ	57
Table 2: Factor loadings for the emotion coaching and emotion dismissing subscales	58
Table 3: Corrected item total correlations for the two subscales of the PESQ	60
Table 4: Factor loadings for the two factor solution to the PESQ (males only)	61
Table 5: Factor loadings for the two factor solution to the PESQ (females only)	62
Table 6: Correlations between parental emotional styles and demographic variables	64
Table 7: Correlations between parenting styles and parental emotional styles	66
Table 8: Correlations between parental emotional styles and parenting goals, attributions and emotional responses	67

Study 2

Table 9: Means and standard deviations for boys and girls on parenting, regulation, emotionality, and outcome variables	106
Table 10: Correlations between parental emotional styles and demographic variables	108
Table 11: Correlations between emotion regulation, behaviour regulation, and negative affect	109
Table 12: Correlations between parental emotional styles (separately) with emotion regulation, behaviour regulation, and negative affect	110

Table 13: Beta coefficients for emotion regulation, behaviour regulation, and negative affect (separately) in the relative importance to parental emotional styles	111
Table 14: Correlaitons between parental emotional styles and social outcomes	112
Table 15: Correlations between emotion regulation, behaviour regulation, and emotionality (separately) with social outcomes	114
Table 16: Beta coefficients for emotion regulation, behaviour regulation, and negative affect (separately) in the relative importance to social outcomes	115
Table 17: Predication of social outcomes from emotion coaching and regulation	118
Table 18: Predication of social outcomes from emotion dismissing and regulation and negative affect	122

**Fostering Emotional and Social Wellbeing:
Examining the Correlates of Maternal Emotional Styles in Early Childhood**

*“Children need to feel understood, because when they feel understood
they feel loved”*

-Haim Ginott (1965)

During the first few years of life, the parent-child relationship has a profound impact on many aspects of children's development (e.g., Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 1998). In particular, variations in parenting styles and beliefs have been associated with deleterious and beneficial childhood outcomes. However, only a limited number of researchers have examined the impact of the variations in parental emotional styles on social and emotional development in childhood. It is most intuitive to surmise that a child who is “emotionally-connected” with their parent, versus a child who is not, would benefit socially and personally. And, to harvest and nurture these benefits, parents need to be cognizant of the skills necessary to become an effective emotional coach.

“Emotion coaching” may be easier for some parents than others. There are many factors that are directly related to parenting that may contribute to the variations in parental emotional style. Differences in parental disciplinary style, such as authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parenting (e.g., Baumrind, 1967; 1971) may define variations in emotional teaching. As well, variations attributed to parental beliefs such as goals (i.e., relationship-centered, and parent-centered) (e.g., Hastings & Rubin, 1999) and attributions (i.e., internal and external attributions) (e.g., Dix, 1993; Grusec & Goodnow,

1994) may attenuate observable contrasts in parental emotional styles. As well, parental emotional responses (e.g., Grusec, Dix, & Mills, 1989) may also be associated with parental emotional styles.

Moreover, there may be contextual effects which promote and/or obstruct emotional coaching. Intrinsic child characteristics may also contribute to variations in parental emotional styles. For example, emotionality (Buss & Plomin, 1975; Coplan, Barber & Lagace-Seguin, 1999) has been reported to influence parenting (e.g., Denham, 1993; Denham, 1998; Denham & Grout, 1993). However, the associations between context, emotionality, disciplinary styles and beliefs remains largely unexplored in the existing literature. In addition, there has yet to be an empirical examination of these associations with parental emotional styles. This noticeable gap in the parenting literature may reflect the need for a psychometrically sound measure to assess parental emotional styles.

Therefore, the central goals of this doctoral dissertation were to (1) develop and validate a rating scale designed to measure emotion coaching and dismissing parenting emotional styles; and (2) to test a conceptual model linking the correlates and outcomes of these different styles. As such, two studies were conducted. In the first study, the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire (PESQ) is developed and validated, and relations between emotion coaching and emotion dismissing and a variety of disciplinary styles, parenting beliefs, and emotional responses were examined¹.

In the second study, a conceptual model linking parental emotional style with child social outcomes (i.e., aggression, anxiety, and prosocial behaviour) was tested. This

¹ For the purposes of this dissertation only mothers were examined. Therefore, this should be kept in mind when interpreting the results of the study.

model emphasized the factors which may influence parent's ability to teach their children about emotions. Specifically, direct links were explored between parental emotional styles and social outcomes. Moreover, the contribution of potential mediating and moderating relations was also examined. These included child regulation variables such as emotion regulation, behaviour regulation and negative affect.

The structure of the general introduction to this dissertation is as follows. First, the building blocks of emotion coaching philosophy are examined, followed by a review of emotional communication within families, and the importance and correlates of emotional intelligence. These reviews provide the grounding necessary to introduce and examine meta-emotion philosophy and parental emotional styles.

Parental Emotional Styles

The Building Blocks of Meta-Emotion Philosophy

Results from past research have indicated that the way that parents' parent will influence their child's psychological and social development (e.g., Baumrind, 1971; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Robinson, Mandelco, Frost Olsen, & Hart, 1995). Traditionally, researchers interested in the relations of variations in parenting have examined parenting styles (e.g., Baumrind, 1967; Chen, 1999; Coolahan, 1999; Karavasilis, Doyle, & Margolese, 1999; Stewart, Pickens, & Morris, 1999; Vellet, Assel, Landry, Swank, & Smith, 1999) and parenting beliefs (e.g., Dix, 1992; 1993; Durrant, Broberg, Rose-Krasnor, 1999; Hastings, 1995; Hastings & Coplan, 1999; Hastings & Grusec, 1998).

Gottman, Fainsilber, and Hooven (1996; 1997) have recently added to the conceptual underpinnings of the parenting literature with the theory of parental Meta-

Emotion. Meta-emotion refers to an “organized set of feelings and cognitions about one’s own emotions and the emotions of others” (Gottman et al., 1997, p.7). From this description, it is reasonable to speculate that meta-emotion philosophy may be an internal parenting characteristic (i.e., parenting belief), which may influence observable parenting behaviours in such constructs as parental discipline.

As such, Gottman and colleagues (1996) proposed that parents who internalize versus those who fail to internalize the “emotional” knowledge of themselves and their children exhibit at least two distinct parenting characteristics. These characteristics have been defined as an emotion-coaching and emotion-dismissing typology, respectively.

Before examining meta-emotion theory and each of the parental emotional styles, the history leading up to the philosophy is chronicled in the next section. The review begins with the early work of Haim Ginott (e.g., 1965, 1971). Then a brief description outlining the importance of emotional communication (e.g., Denham, 1989, 1993, 1994, 1998) and emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995; Mayer & Geher, 1996; Mayer & Salovey, 1993; Mayer & Salovey, 1995; Salovey & Mayer, 1989-90) to parental emotional styles is provided. Following this, the theory of Meta-Emotion is presented. For clarification, the following sections prior to describing meta-emotion philosophy are not exhaustive accounts of the parental emotional communication and emotional intelligence literature per se. Instead, they are meant as a brief account of selected work that precedes, supports, and are directly relevant to the theory of meta-emotion.

The influence of Haim Ginott. Although the term meta-emotion is recent to the literature, some of the basic tenets of the theory have been outlined by early parenting researchers. For example, Haim Ginott (1965, 1971, 1975) believed that a parent who is

willing to positively address a child's emotional climate, and not simply dismiss emotions, provides the child with emotional validation. From this dyadic interaction the child is provided with reassurance from the parent that all emotions are normal reactions to every-day events and occurrences, and that all emotions are "allowed" to be expressed. In global terms, the parent becomes engaged in, and cognizant of the child's emotional world.

Ginott (1965) reported that consistent parent-child emotional communication leads to successful social and emotional development. Accordingly, listening to the emotions behind the words is fundamental for parents and children to establish a strong emotional bond. Moreover, listening to the emotions behind the words provides the most favorable outcomes when parents are knowledgeable about the basic stages of a child's emotional development (e.g., factors contributing to childhood fear, anger, sadness, and anxiety at various ages). In turn, this basic knowledge provides parents with the empathy required to address various emotions. Ginott (1965) also stressed the importance of genuine parental reactions to child emotions. Because parents feel a variety of emotions that can change from moment-to-moment depending upon their child's behaviour, it is important that their reactions are genuine but also controlled. For a child to feel that his/her emotions are truly validated, parental reactions should be paired with true understanding of their child's emotions.

Underlying Ginott's conceptualization of successful emotional parenting were two basic elements: 1) neither the parent's, nor the child's self-respect should be compromised during emotional communication; and 2) the parent should provide statements of understanding before statements of advice (Ginott, 1965). Ginott reported

that a child who is in the “throw” of strong emotions cannot process advice, but rather desires to be understood. An understanding approach in an emotionally heated interaction or situation, may be more likely to lead to calm and desired outcomes. When parents choose to provide advice before statements of understanding, or further decide to remark about the inappropriateness of their child’s emotions, the outcome will likely be more unfavorable. In this situation the child’s emotions wouldn’t cease to exist or disappear, but rather the child would now possess feelings of mistrust about their emotions (i.e., “I don’t have a right to feel this way”) (Ginott, 1965).

It would seem from Ginott’s conceptualization of parent-child emotional communication that parents are required to be in constant control of their emotions and emotional responses. For Ginott, this statement has some truth. He suggested that parents should be cognizant of their emotions, but also feel liberated to direct a variety of emotions (including negative emotions) towards their child, permitting that the expression is used as a learning device and not as an attack or criticism of a child’s personality or character. Instead, children can learn from parental expression of negative emotions in place of feeling psychologically threatened or intimidated.

In his work, Ginott (1965, 1971, 1975) made the distinction between setting limits on behaviours versus emotions. When parents cease unacceptable behaviours and fail to address the urges or emotions that preceded the event, they forego an opportunity to address the heart of the situation, and the child is left with feelings of character criticism (Ginott, 1965). Instead, Ginott believed that through parent-child interaction reasonable limits can be established allowing children certain physical reactions, and denying others. However, children need to know that there are no limits set on their emotional responses

to situations, and to be encouraged that verbalizing emotions and feelings (i.e., labeling) will produce positive results. It is notable that the emphasis of Ginott's research was on the emotional communication between parent and child. In the next section, a brief selection of past and present literature is presented which directly supports the importance of family emotional communication.

Emotional communication. It seems clear that Ginott conceived of emotional communication between family members as important to the optimal development of emotions. In support of this tenet, past researchers have found that early emotional transactions between parent and child are fundamental in the later organization of affect (e.g., Emde, 1980; Stern, 1985; Tompkins, 1962). More recently, researchers have examined the impact of variations of emotional communication on the development of children (e.g., Cassidy, Parke, Butkovsky, & Braungart, 1992; Denham, 1993; 1994; 1998; Denham & Grout, 1993; Denham, Renwick-DeBardi, & Hewes, 1994). For example, Denham et al. (1994) explored naturally occurring dyadic communication between mothers and their children. The results of this study supported the hypothesis that mothers who were skilled at regulating their own emotions had children who were well-regulated in their peer emotional communication. In contrast, long-term negative emotional communication may be counter-productive to the child's emotional development. For instance, Denham et al. (1994) also reported that children whose mothers exhibit long-lasting negative emotions (such as anger and sadness) were less likely than other children to respond prosocially to their mother's or peer's emotions.

In another study the roles of maternal and paternal emotional expression within the family were examined in association with children's familial social relations (Cassidy

et al., 1992). It was discovered that parental positive emotional expressiveness was related to children's positive emotional expression towards parents. Additionally, children's understanding of emotions were related to positive peer relations. This could be linked to Ginott's (1965) early research that suggested children be "allowed" to express emotions without parentally imposed limits. One can speculate that within the Cassidy et al. (1992) study, emotional expressiveness provided children with feelings of validation and thus better "equipped" resources to understand their emotional reactions and in turn, this supported enriched peer relations.

Bretherton, Fritz, Zahn-Waxler, and Ridgeway (1986) have also supported this position. In their study, parental verbalizations about emotions assisted young children in learning about expressing and understanding emotions. Similarly, Dunn, Brown, Slomkowski, Tesla and Youngblade (1991) as well as Dunn, Brown, and Beardsall (1991) underscored the importance of talking about emotions within the family. In both instances, maternal verbalization about emotional events predicted children's later emotional understanding.

The importance of families communicating emotionally is evident from this brief account of the literature. However, the importance of emotional communication can be linked with another literature base, which has direct relevance to the philosophy proposed by Gottman et al. (1996, 1997). In the upcoming section which elucidates meta-emotion philosophy, it will be made apparent that one of the hypothesized desired outcomes of parents who display "emotion-coaching" is to raise emotionally intelligent children. In the next section, the construct of emotional intelligence is briefly examined.

Emotional intelligence. Historically, emotions have been conceptualized as disorganized responses resulting from the lack of affective adjustment (Schaefer, Gilmer, & Schoen, 1940), and complete loss of cerebral control containing no trace of conscious purpose (Young, 1936). More recently, emotions have been theorized as helping us to organize, sustain, direct and focus cognitive activities (e.g., Easterbrook, 1959; Leeper 1948). Following from this, emotions can be understood as organized responses, crossing many psychological subsystems such as motivational, physiological, and cognitive systems. In addition, emotions usually arise in response to an event (Sternberg, 1998) that will have a positive or negative meaning for an individual. The theory of emotional intelligence (e.g., Goleman, 1995) supports this contention, but adds that emotions are adaptive and can potentially lead to enriching life experiences.

Mayer and Salovey (1993) described emotional intelligence as the intersection between two fundamental components of personality: the cognitive and emotional systems. Traditionally, intelligence has been conceptualized as cognitive performance. However, recent conceptions of intelligence have included human emotional functioning, including regulatory abilities (Mayer & Salovey, 1995). Despite the scattering of empirical evidence that is currently available to support the concept of emotional intelligence, there is a generally agreed upon multi-level definition of the construct. Emotional intelligence refers to the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotion knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth (e.g., Goleman, 1995; Harrington-Lueker, 1997; Martinez-Pons, 1997/98; Mayer & Geher, 1996; Mayer &

Salovey, 1993; Mayer & Salovey, 1995; Novick, 1998; Salovey & Mayer, 1989-90; Sternberg, 1998).

Salovey and Mayer (1989/90) have been credited for establishing the conceptualization of emotional intelligence (Sternberg, 1998) and its impact on human development. By drawing on an exhaustive review of the intelligence literature, they argued that emotional intelligence is a subset of social intelligence involving: (1) emotional self- and other-monitoring; (2) the ability to discriminate among variations of emotions; and (3) the knowledge to use this emotional information to guide thinking and behaviour. Clearly, one's own and other's emotions frequently occur in social situations. However, it has also been suggested that emotional intelligence is guided by personal intelligence (Gardner, 1983) conceptualized as inter- and intra-personal knowledge (Salovey & Mayer, 1989-90). Emotionally intelligent individuals will use the recognition of one's own and others' emotional states to solve problems and regulate behaviour.

Salovey and Mayer (1989-90) have linked three literatures that have become the foundation for research in emotional intelligence. They argued that individual differences exist for (1) the appraisal and expression of emotion; (2) the regulation of emotion; and (3) the utilization of emotions. Salovey and Mayer (1989-90) suggested that the accurate appraisal of emotions in one's self depends largely on the ability to learn about emotions, which in turn has been linked to the ability to speak clearly about them or the ability to label the plethora of human emotional reactions. According to the authors, accurate appraisal then leads to expedited emotional perception, and appropriate emotional self-expression. However, emotional intelligence is also linked to the ability to appraise emotions in others. Results from past (Ginott, 1965; 1971; 1975) and recent

research (e.g., Gottman et al., 1996; 1997; Goleman, 1995) have supported Salovey and Mayer's (1989/90) claim that these abilities are a subset of emotional intelligence. Particularly, empathic skills (i.e., ability to comprehend and re-experience another individual's emotions) have been shown to be characteristic of emotionally intelligent behaviour.

In the last ten years, emotion regulation has become one of the most vigorously studied areas of social and developmental psychology (e.g., Eisenberg & Fabes, 1995; Eisenberg, Fabes Shepard, Guthrie, Murphy, & Reiser, 1999; Eisenberg, Shepard, Fabes, Murphy, & Guthrie, 1998; Fabes, Eisenberg, Karbon, Troyer, & Switzer, 1994; Rubin, Coplan, Fox, & Calkins, 1995). However, sometime before this research, others (e.g., Salovey & Mayer, 1989-90) reported on the relations between the abilities to regulate emotion in the self and others, and emotionally intelligent behaviour. It has been suggested that regulatory abilities are a function of emotional intelligence because they lead to adaptive and reinforcing mood-states. Successful self-regulation may consist of the ability to maintain or prolong pleasant moods, or attenuate unpleasant emotions that arise from negative experiences. Emotion regulation in others includes the ability to alter the affective reaction in others (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1995). Although most individuals self- and other-regulate, emotionally intelligent individuals have been found to be more efficient at the process (Goleman, 1995). Positive regulation has been found to be associated with the enhancement of self- and others' emotions, and motivating the self and others to achieve desired goals (Gottman, et al., 1996).

Finally, Salovey and Mayer (1989-90) also provided compelling evidence that individuals differ in their ability to harness and utilize their emotions in order to solve

problems. It has been known for some time that our cognitive abilities such as memory (Isen, 1987), ability to complete complex tasks (Showers, 1988), and adaptive problem solving (Salovey & Mayer, 1989-90) are related to emotional intelligence. That is, emotionally intelligent people are able to solve problems quickly, effectively, and more successfully than individuals who are less emotionally intelligent. In sum, an individual with emotional intelligence is emotionally healthy. An awareness of own and other's feelings, and the ability to label and communicate them effectively, contributes to regulation, which in turn contributes to well-being.

Correlates of emotional intelligence. Since the appearance of Salovey and Mayer's (1989/90) article, there have been some empirical studies to examine the relations between emotional intelligence and child development (e.g., Davies, Stankov, & Roberts, 1998; Goleman, 1995; Harrington-Lueker, 1997; Martinez-Pons, 1998/99; Mayer & Beltz, 1998; Mayer & Geher, 1996; Mayer & Salovey, 1993; Mayer & Salovey, 1995; Novick, 1998). Some researchers have sought to examine emotional intelligence within a "family systems" model to determine the influence of parents and siblings on the development of emotionally intelligent behaviour (e.g., Goleman, 1995; Martinez-Pons, 1998/99; Morand, 1999). Martinez-Pons (1998-99) recently studied a group of adolescents to examine the extent to which parents influence self-perceived emotional intelligence. Positive relations between adolescence emotional intelligence and parental modeling, encouragement, and facilitation were discovered.

Further, Morand (1999) reported compelling evidence that family size influences emotionally intelligent behaviour, finding positive relations between emotional intelligence and family size. These results are a challenge to past researchers who have

found negative relations between family size and (traditionally measured) intelligence (e.g., Blake, 1989; Sputa & Paulson, 1995). These findings were based upon adolescent's speed and ability to identify a variety of common facial expressions, which has been commonly cited as a dimension of emotional intelligence (i.e., empathic abilities) (Goleman, 1998). Morand (1999) speculated that because larger families provide children with the opportunity to experience a range of emotions, they become skilled at reading the emotions of others.

In the opposite direction, there are some well documented consequences of emotional "illiteracy". According to Goleman (1995; 1998) children who possess low levels of emotional intelligence are at risk for aggressive or delinquent behaviours. These behaviours may be a larger manifestation of acting-out such as lying, cheating, arguing, destroying property, truancy, disobeying at home and school, and having uncontrollable tempers. He also described attention and cognitive problems as possible barometers for emotional illiteracy. Accordingly, an inability to pay attention, heightened and prolonged affective reactions, nervousness, and poor academic performance may be associated with a low emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995). Goleman (1995) also offered evidence that anxious and withdrawn behaviours may be consequences of emotional illiteracy. Feeling unloved, lonely, and wanting to be involved with others but lacking the social skills to initiate interactions have been hypothesized as outcomes related to low emotional intelligence.

As yet there is a relatively small literature base to explain the role of parenting in the development of emotions in children. With this said, Denham (1993) has provided the term "socializer" to represent any person who may come into contact with a child and

therefore potentially aid in the child learning about emotions. Socializers may include parents (primary socializers), relatives, peers, and teachers. Presumably, one of the mechanisms through which socializers help children learn about emotions is coaching. A coaching socializer, according to Denham (1993), will talk to children about emotions and this in turn fosters the ability of the child to talk about emotions as well.

Gottman and colleagues (1996, 1997) were among the first researchers to develop a parenting philosophy to emphasize the importance of parental emotional styles in children's social and emotional development. The following section is devoted to examining Meta-Emotion philosophy, parenting emotional styles, and the developing child.

Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Parental Emotional Styles

Gottman and colleagues (1996, 1997) were amongst the first researchers to study the influence of parental emotional styles and child outcomes. They conceptualized different observable parental emotional styles as being influenced by parental meta-emotion, which refers to an organized set of feelings and thoughts about one's own emotions and one's children's emotions (Gottman, et al., 1997). For instance, variations in meta-emotion could reflect how one parents may be "put off" by her youngsters' display of sadness, but another parent may be quite accepting and perceive the situation as an important time to discuss the child's emotions. So, not only does meta-emotion philosophy refer to emotions about emotions (as the concept meta-emotion suggests), but it also encompasses feelings and thoughts about emotions (Gottman et al., 1997).

Theoretically, parental meta-emotion is embedded within a web of observable parenting behaviours. Specifically, parent's meta-emotion philosophy is not independent

of parenting (Fainsilber, Gottman, & Hooven, 1996; Gottman, 1998; Gottman et al., 1996; 1997; Hooven, Gottman, & Fainsilber, 1995). Therefore, parental behaviours are influenced to some extent by beliefs and knowledge about one's own and other's emotions.

Types of emotional parenting styles. Several types of emotional parenting styles have been described. For the current research, two types were of primary interest². Parents who are aware of the emotions in their lives, who can talk about these emotions in a differentiated manner, who are aware of these emotions in their children, and who assist their children with their emotions (particularly negative emotions) are said to possess an emotion coaching parenting style (Fainsilber, et al., 1996; Gottman & Declaire, 1997; Gottman et al., 1996; 1997; Hooven, et al., 1995). Emotion coaches value a child's negative emotions as an opportunity for intimacy and can tolerate spending time with a sad, angry, or fearful child without becoming impatient with the emotion. Further, emotion coaching parents perceive the world of negative emotions as an important arena for parenting, are sensitive to the child's emotional states, respect the child's emotions, and use emotional situations constructively. For instance, an emotion coach would use emotional moments to listen to the child, empathize with soothing words and affection, help the child label the emotion that he/she is feeling, offer guidance on regulating the emotions, set limits and teach acceptable expression of emotions and problem solving skills (Fainsilber, et al., 1996; Gottman & Declaire, 1997; Gottman et al., 1996, 1997; Hooven, et al., 1995).

²Disapproving and laissez-faire parenting have also been described by Gottman. However, these styles are beyond the scope of this dissertation.

According to the extant literature (e.g., Gottman et al., 1997), this form of parenting is associated with children learning to trust their feelings, regulating their own emotions, and solving problems. Additionally, the children of emotional coaches have high self-esteem, are academically enhanced, and have strong peer relations (Gottman & Declaire, 1997). Although a majority of the outcomes associated with emotion coaching are related to a child's positive adjustment, Gottman et al. (1996,1997) have reported some unexpected findings. They have found in some studies that being in tune with a child's emotions may not always be productive. Direct links have been noted between meta-emotion philosophy and ratings of peer aggression. However, in all, it can be argued that emotion coaching parents are more skilled to maneuver in the world of emotions, are more comfortable within the world of emotions, and are better able to regulate their own and their children's emotions than parents who are not emotion coaches. By engaging in these behaviours, parents are preparing their children for the variety of emotions that they will encounter in future relationships.

Antithetically, parents who possess an emotion dismissing parenting style feel that emotions (particularly negative emotions) are potentially harmful to the child. Characteristically, these parents lack awareness of emotions within themselves and their children, fear being emotionally out-of-control, are unaware of techniques to address negative emotions, and believe negative emotions to be a reflection of poor parenting skills (Gottman et al., 1997). Further, instead of addressing displays of negative emotions, they ignore or dismiss the emotions (Fainsilber et al., 1996), attempt to rid the child of the negative emotions immediately (i.e., have to remedy the situation) (Hooven et al., 1995), and strive to reassure the child that the negative feelings always pass quickly

without lasting effects (Gottman & Declaire, 1997). Researchers have also reported that the dismissing style of parenting has been linked to distraction techniques to “shut down” a child’s negative affect, instances of ridiculing negative emotions, and the inability to teach effective problem solving skills to their child (Gottman et al., 1997). According to the available literature, the effects of a dismissing parental emotional style are potentially devastating to the emotional and social development of children. A child who is raised in a dismissing environment will be conditioned to believe that their negative feelings are inappropriate and not valid under any circumstances (Gottman & Declaire, 1997). In turn, the child may feel that there is something inherently “wrong” with feeling sad, angry, or fear, and may have trouble regulating their own emotions.

A Model of Meta-Emotion³

Gottman and colleagues (e.g., 1996, 1997) have sought to explain the relations between parents’ emotional styles and their child’s social and emotional development. Gottman hypothesized that meta-emotion (parent’s feelings about their own and their children’s emotions) would influence emotional communication between parent and child as well as impact on a variety of developmental outcomes for children. Further, he speculated that the way that parents talk to children about their emotions during children’s emotional episodes would be strongly related to their subsequent cognitive, social, and emotional development. They also postulated that variations in parenting styles influence variations in parental emotional styles and that a child’s regulation abilities relate to parental emotional styles.

³ The following information represents the findings from two of the primary published reports of the same study. Although the emphasis of the studies were to examine a model to relate meta-emotion to child outcomes, additional outcome variables were emphasized in the latter study. Therefore, to prevent repetition in reporting the findings, a synthesis of the two reports is presented. Other reports present similar findings.

Within the context of a longitudinal investigation of 56 preschool-aged children (at the beginning of the study), Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) proposed and evaluated a conceptual model linking meta-emotion with child outcomes directly, and through (1) derogatory (i.e., harsh and critical parenting) and scaffolding parenting (i.e., positive structuring, responsive, enthusiastic, engaged, and affectionate parenting); and (2) regulatory physiology (i.e., vagal tone) and emotion regulation abilities.

At Time 1 (age 5 years), Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) measured parental meta-emotion, parenting styles, and child regulatory physiology. At Time 2 (age 8 years), child emotion regulation abilities and child outcomes were assessed. The five outcomes that were examined included two measures of peer relations (teacher ratings of aggression for the 1996 and 1997 study, and observational ratings of negative-type play behaviours for the 1997 study), behaviour problems (an aggregation of maternal reports of affectivity and teacher reports of behavioural problems for the 1997 study), academic achievement, and physical health.

Findings Related to the Model

Figure 1 summarizes a series of ten path analyses from two published reports of meta-emotion philosophy (Gottman et al., 1996; 1997). The ten path analyses included five path analyses (one for each outcome variable) for each parenting style (scaffolding and derogatory). As can be seen in the diagram, Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) reported that meta-emotion styles were related to parenting skills. Specifically, they found associations between aspects of meta-emotion and the inhibition of derogatory parenting and the facilitation of scaffolding parenting. Also, for all models including the derogatory parenting style, aspects of meta-emotion were directly and significantly

Figure 1. Summary of findings from Gottman et al. (1996, 1997)

related to regulatory physiology. A similar pattern was noted for the scaffolding-praising parenting style for all outcome variables.

Direct links were noted between derogatory parenting and child academic achievement, peer relations (teacher rated and observational data), behaviour problems, and illness. Direct links were also found between scaffolding-praising parenting and academic achievement, negative affectivity, and illness. Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) reported that child physical health was related to derogatory parenting through regulatory physiology, and a child's ability to suppress vagal tone at age 5 predicted emotion down regulation at age 8.

Some conflicting results were reported in examining the direction of effects between emotion coaching and child regulatory physiology. First, when the path model arrows were reversed from emotion coaching to physiology, the models remained significant. This may suggest that vagal tone influences parental emotional style, however, causal links can also be speculated. Therefore, Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) suggest that they cannot rule out bidirectional relations. With this said, an exploration of the correlations between emotion coaching and the maternal ratings of child negative affect (a single scale used in the two studies to represent temperament) provided nonsignificant results. Future research would need to be completed to fully understand why these complimentary effects are occurring.

Finally, Gottman et al., (1996, 1997) reported direct links between meta-emotion and child outcomes for three models of negative parenting (behaviour problems, teacher ratings of peer relations, and child-illness) and for three models of positive parenting

(child-illness, behaviour problems, and observed peer interactions). Positive relations were found between components of meta-emotion and teacher-rated peer relations (aggression) and behaviour problems within the negative parenting models. However, within the same type of parenting, negative relations were noted between meta-emotion and illness, suggesting that more coaching leads to less illness. Within the positive parenting, negative relations were found for the illness and observed peer relations, but a positive relation was found for meta-emotion and behaviour problems. The unexpected positive relations between meta-emotion components and indicators of child maladjustment were surprising to Gottman et al. (1996, 1997). But they suggest that at times elements of meta-emotion “may not be a good thing for children”. It may be possible for parents to be too much “in-tune” with their child’s emotional states and being aware may foster its expression.

In sum, the findings from Gottman et al.’s (1996, 1997) studies have emphasized the importance of meta-emotion. Relations were found between meta-emotion and parenting behaviour and child regulatory physiology. Also, it was found that parenting, meta emotion and the child’s regulatory physiology and behaviour are related to child outcomes. Gottman et al. (1996) suggested three pathways from meta-emotion to child outcomes: one from the meta-emotion variables through child physiology and emotion regulation; one from the meta-emotion variables through parenting, and finally a direct path from meta-emotion to outcomes. Overall, their findings suggested that meta-emotion philosophy impacts on the other variables in the model which then impact on a variety of child outcome variables. However, a number of caveats need to be addressed.

Caveats and Criticisms

Gottman and colleagues (1996, 1997) have made important and novel contributions to the parenting and developmental psychology literature. With the development of the meta-emotion interview (Gottman et al., 1996, 1997) and the conceptualization of a model linking meta-emotion with social development, academic, and health outcomes, they have explored an area that has been under-represented in the existing literature. However, the conceptualization and measurement of meta-emotion and the influence of individual characteristics of the child on meta-emotion philosophy have been contentious issues for some researchers (see Cowan, 1996; Eisenberg, 1996).

Parenting styles. While there is agreement that many of the items included in the meta-emotion interview represent philosophies about parenting, it has been suggested that the interview itself may be tapping into descriptions of actual parenting behaviour and not meta-emotions. For example, Cowan (1996) argued that although Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) have suggested that they are measuring feelings and thoughts about emotion, the meta-emotion interview may be a representation of positive parenting and not truly beliefs or a philosophy pertaining to emotions. Eisenberg (1996) supported this claim and added that components of the meta-emotion interview represent situation specific parenting behaviours such as derogation and warmth-scaffolding.

However, in reply to Eisenberg (1996) and Cowan (1996), Fainsilber et al. (1996) defended the validity of the meta-emotion interview. They countered by reporting that their qualitative and quantitative analyses supported that although coaching did include a description of “positive” parenting behaviour, it went beyond to reflect an attitudinal approach to the world of children’s emotions. Fainsilber et al. (1996) contended that

observable coaching behaviours are manifestations of deeper parenting beliefs about the world of emotions. Using qualitative examples, the authors provided evidence that underlying coaching behaviour is a strong emphasis towards understanding the emotions of their children (i.e., existing attitudes towards emotions). Further moderate relations between the parenting and coaching variables provide evidence to support emotion coaching as more than an index of good parenting. Fainisilber et al. (1996) argued that strong relations would have been found if emotion coaching were simply an index of good parenting. And, if the coaching and parenting variables were an index of the same construct, the authors reported that they should predict the same child outcomes. Results supported different relations between coaching, parenting and outcomes (Fainsilber et al., 1996).

With this said, questions remain about the relations between parental emotional styles, parenting beliefs about emotions, and parental disciplinary styles. Although Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) examined the relations between emotion coaching and variations of traditional parenting styles (scaffolding-praising, and derogation), it would be beneficial to examine these relations using other more traditional typologies of parental disciplinary styles. For example, much research has been conceived using Diana Baumrind's (1967) conceptualizations of parenting styles. However, there has yet to be evidence provided to examine the links between these traditional characterizations of parenting styles and parental emotional styles. As such in the present study these relations were explored.

Other parenting variables. Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) argued that beliefs about emotions underlie parental emotional styles. However, relatively little is known about

the relations between emotional styles and constructs related to parental beliefs such as goals, attributions and emotional responses. Also, researchers need to examine parental emotional styles as they relate to parenting goals, attributions, and emotional responses across different contexts and emotional climates. Because little is known about these parenting constructs in relation to parental emotional styles, an objective of the present study is to elucidate these relations.

In the present study, alternate conceptualizations of parenting were employed than in Gottman et al. (1996, 1997). A multi-dimensional perspective was taken through the assessment of parental disciplinary styles (as described by Baumrind, 1967) and parenting beliefs (goals, attributions, and emotional responses, see Coplan and Hastings, 1999). As aforementioned, the literature is not clear on the relations between parenting disciplinary styles, parenting beliefs, and parental emotional styles. Therefore, exploring these relations will add to the present knowledge about the interrelation among different parenting constructs.

Assessing meta-emotion. Currently, there exists only one method to assess parental emotional styles and meta-emotion philosophy. Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) have provided evidence for their theory by using the lengthy meta-emotion interview. It may be possible to assess these parenting constructs using methodology that is less time consuming, less expensive, and more likely to be used in the sampling of a large number of parents simultaneously. In the present study, a self-report parental scale was developed to assess emotion coaching and emotion dismissing parenting styles.

Negative affect. It can be recalled that Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) failed to find significant correlations between maternal reports of child temperament and parental

emotional styles. Eisenberg (1996) questioned these findings in light of other studies (e.g., Eisenberg & Fabes, 1994; Eisenberg, Fabes & Murphy, 1997, Fabes et al., 1994) which have found links between temperament based emotionality and maternal reactions to children's negative emotions. Variations are likely an artifact of the tool used to measure temperament. Eisenberg (1996) explained that within her studies, measures of affect are typically measured as indices of intensity, compared to indices of frequency inherent in the measures used by Gottman et al. (1996, 1997). Therefore following postulations by Eisenberg (1996), the present study included measures of intensity rather than frequency of negative affect and their influence on parental emotional styles.

Regulation. Eisenberg (1996) also described the importance of considering the impact of a multifaceted nature of regulation on parental emotional styles. A primary goal of Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) was to describe the associations between meta-emotion and child outcomes mediated by indices of emotion regulation (i.e., basal vagal tone and vagal tone suppression). These indices were likely indicative of attentional control (Eisenberg, 1996). As an outcome variable, they also examined the frequency with which parents needed to down-regulate their children's emotions, which could be considered an indication of the ability of the child to self-soothe. However, in addition to emotion regulation, it would be instructive to examine the associations between parental emotional styles and behavioural regulation (i.e., ability to change emotionally driven behaviours; self-regulation). In doing so, this may aid in addressing concerns that different types of parental coaching likely foster different types of regulation (Eisenberg, 1996). For instance, parental teaching about strategies to self-soothe may foster emotional regulation, whereas parental efforts to teach the child about the appropriate

emotional expression may enhance behavioural regulation. Indeed, these hypotheses could be considered for a future qualitative study. However, it is of foremost importance to examine the relations of different types of regulation on the global emotion coaching and dismissing parenting typologies (and bidirectional effects) before examining the effects within varying parental coaching dimensions on different types of regulation. In the present study, both emotion regulation and behavioural regulation were examined.

Other Issues. Other theoretical and methodological issues are worth noting. For instance, because of the methodological constraints inherent in the interviewing process, Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) had a very small sample to test their model (N=53) which was not ethnically diverse. Future research might be able to improve on the number of participants and ethnic diversity in an attempt to add support to the present literature on meta-emotion and to generalize to other populations. The compromised size of the sample also raises questions about reliability of the analyses used to support the Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) model. However, the model raises interesting questions about parenting and should be tested by using a variety of modifications.

Finally, it has been known for sometime that parents influence children from a very young age (e.g., Denham, 1998). The present meta-emotion literature reports on the influences of parental emotional style and child regulation and outcomes at ages 5 and 8. In the present study, the relations between meta-emotion and childhood adjustment at an earlier age were explored.

Overview of the Present Research

The purpose of this dissertation was to explore the links between meta-emotion, regulation, parenting, and child outcomes. In order to accomplish these goals, two studies were undertaken.

The major goal of Study 1 was to develop a rating scale designed to assess parents' emotional style, and to assess its psychometric properties. Assessing parental emotional styles has proven to be a complex task. To date, the meta-emotion interview is the only available instrument for assessing parental emotional styles. Given the time-consuming nature of the interview methodology (Gottman et al, 1996, 1997) a psychometrically sound self-report measure of meta-emotion that parent's could complete quickly would represent a significant contribution to the extant literature.

As such, a rating scale assessment was developed based on items derived from a previous scale which has never been assessed for its' psychometric properties (personal communication, Gottman, October, 1999). This new measure titled the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire (PESQ), was adapted to assess the extent to which emotion coaching versus dismissing behaviours and beliefs are used by parents with their children. Convergent validity (Anastasi, 1988) of the emotion coaching and emotion dismissing dimensions were assessed by examining their relations with parental disciplinary styles, beliefs, and emotional responses. This process provided an examination of the relations between meta-emotion philosophies and conceptualizations of parenting behaviours and beliefs. As the research literature stands, meta-emotion has only been examined in relation to a narrow conceptualization of parenting (praising-scaffolding, and derogation).

The major goal of Study 2 was to examine relations between parental emotional styles and children's adjustment in preschool. Drawing on the model generated by Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) the relations between parental emotional style and child outcomes were examined. Moreover, expanding on the Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) conceptualization of regulation and temperament, multi-dimensional maternal reports of child emotional and behavioural regulation and negative affect were examined as potential mediators and moderators of the relations between parental emotional styles and adjustment.

Study 1: Development and Validation of the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire

The purpose of Study 1 was to develop and assess the psychometric properties of a self-report measure of emotion coaching and emotion dismissing parenting philosophy. This measure was titled the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire (PESQ). Relations with measures of traditional disciplinary styles (see Baumrind, 1967), parenting beliefs systems (see Coplan & Hastings, 1999), and emotional responses (Coplan et al., under review) were explored to provide preliminary assessments of construct validity. By exploring these additional parenting constructs, a better understanding of the relations between parental emotional styles and a broader conceptualization of parenting will be elucidated than has been provided in the past (see Gottman et al., 1996, 1997).

This introduction is organized as follows. First, a discussion of the traditional method of assessing parental emotional styles is provided. Then, the original item pool is discussed, followed by the statistical techniques which will be used to establish the psychometric properties of the newly developed scale. Finally, conceptual links and exploratory hypotheses will be provided for the relations between parental emotional

styles and parental disciplinary styles, parental beliefs, and emotional responses (separately).

Interview assessment of parental emotional styles. Parental emotional style has been assessed by conducting a time-consuming four-part interview. The interview is a semi-structured process where the interviewer is able to probe for as long as necessary to make responses as clear as possible. During the introduction to the interview, the participant is explained the interview process and provided an example of an emotional setting (a surprise birthday party). Following the introduction, the interviewee is probed about his/her sadness. Questions include: (1) "What would the interviewee look like when feeling sad?"; (2) "Would anyone be able to tell that the interviewee is feeling sad?"; (3) "What would be going on inside?"; (4) "What would the interviewee be feeling about feeling sad?"; (5) "What would the interviewee be thinking?"; and (6) "Does the way that the interviewee feels about sadness have a history?". Following this, the interviewee is then asked questions pertaining to his/her child's sadness. This part of the interview includes questions similar to: (1) "How do you react to your child's sadness?"; (2) "Can you tell that he/she is sad?"; (3) "Can you see subtle signs?"; (4) "What does your child do when sad?"; (5) "How do you respond?"; (6) "What do you think about sadness?"; (7) "What are your reactions, thoughts, feelings?"; (8) "What may your goals be in this situation?"; (9) "Does this relate to anything in your past?"; (10) "What does your child's sadness bring out in you?"; and (11) "What are you trying to teach about sadness?", and (12) "Can you provide a recent example?".

During part two of the interview, identical questions are provided to the interviewee, however at this point the questions deal with the interviewee's anger and the

anger experienced by his/her child. In part three of the interview, the interviewee has to look at a variety of different emotions written on some cards and pick out the one that he/she would like to experience the most. They are asked if there are things that they do help themselves maximize the emotion that they chose. They then choose the emotion that they would least like to feel, and asked how they ensure that this feeling is kept at a minimum. Following this, they are to look at the list of emotions again and choose the emotion that they have the most trouble soothing and how they try to get over the emotion.

During the last part of the interview, the interviewee is probed about his/her child's emotion regulation abilities and problems. They are asked which emotion (from the list) their child has the most trouble getting over and how they attempt to get over this emotion. And, finally, they are asked about their philosophies about emotions. Specifically, they are encouraged to explain what they think emotions are all about and what they are used for.

Overall, three dimensions of parent's meta-emotion are examined within the interview. Awareness of one's own emotions refers to the ability to talk about the emotion, accepting that they experience this emotion, ability to distinguish the emotions from others, ability to talk at length about the emotion, and interest in the emotion (Gottman et al., 1996). Awareness of the child's emotions included noticing when the child experienced the emotion, being descriptive of the emotion, having insight into the child's experience about this emotion, being interested in the child's emotional experience, and being able to talk about the child's emotional experience at length. Coaching the child's emotion involved helping the child label the emotional experience,

being accepting of the child's emotion, teaching the child how to deal with and sooth intense emotions, and comforting the child during their emotional experience. These characteristics are used to assign parents a parental emotional style.

Original item pool. Within the extant literature, a psychometrically sound parental scale is currently not available to assess parental emotional styles (John Gottman, personal communication, October, 1999). However, Gottman and Declaire (1997) have published a rating scale version of the Meta-Emotion Interview, although this scale has never been examined for its psychometric properties (John Gottman, personal communication, 1999). As such, the items corresponding with the constructs emotion coaching and emotion dismissing formed the original item pool and were examined in the present study. This original item pool (21 emotion coaching and 24 emotion dismissing items) is displayed in Appendix A.

Establishing the Psychometric Properties of the PESQ

Factor structure. The emotion-coaching factor was expected to contain those items concerning meta-emotion philosophy and parental emotion-coaching philosophy. The emotion dismissing factor was expected to house those items which relate to a parent's uncertainty of their own and their child's emotions, and unawareness of how to deal with emotional situations. However, because this is the first time that such a scale has been developed the exact factor structure is not certain and an exploratory analysis was performed.

Reliability. Internal consistency reliability and short term stability (at six months) was investigated in this dissertation. Internal consistency was explored by examining Cronbach' alpha and item scale correlations using the scale reliability analysis in SPSS.

Validity. Several forms of validity were examined for the PESQ. Face validity was assessed for this dissertation. Face validity refers not to an actual test statistic, but rather whether the test superficially appears to measure what it is supposed to measure (Anastasi, 1988). Face validity then refers to whether the test "looks" valid. Because the items which comprise the PESQ were developed and adapted from the meta-emotion work of Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) (the leading experts in the area of meta-emotion philosophy), the PESQ is considered face valid.

Construct validity for the PESQ was also examined. Construct validity is used to determine the degree to which a test measures a particular construct (Anastasi, 1988). So, if a scale possesses construct validity, then there are acceptable correlations between it and other similar constructs or theoretically and conceptually relevant dimensions. Components of construct validity were explored by examining relations with parenting styles, beliefs and emotional responses. Although predominately exploratory in nature due to the lack of literature, a subsequent section will address many conceptually derived relations between parental emotional styles and (1) parenting styles, (2) parenting beliefs, and (3) emotional responses.

Parental Disciplinary Styles

Baumrind's parenting styles. Diana Baumrind has provide the parenting literature with some of the most often cited parenting constructs. They include the authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive disciplinary styles. The authoritarian parenting style

involves power assertion without warmth, nurturance, or two-way communication. In this respect, a parent who engages in this style is low in warmth, but high in control. Authoritarian parents attempt to control and evaluate the behaviours and attitudes of their children with an absolute set of standards. Above all, these parents value obedience, respect for authority, and preservation of order (Collins & Kuczaj, 1991).

Children of authoritarian parents report low self-esteem, spontaneity and varied levels of social withdrawal (Coopersmith, 1967) and have been considered by others to be fearful, apprehensive, moody, unhappy, easily annoyed, passively hostile, vulnerable to stress, and unfriendly (Baumrind, 1987). Adolescents of authoritarian parenting continue to be less well adjusted than those who are actively engaged by parents in an authoritative style (Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994).

Authoritative parents also set firm controls on the behaviour of their children and make strong demands for maturity, but are willing to listen to their child's point of view and even to adjust their behaviour accordingly. Parents who engage in authoritative parenting exercise control in combination with warmth, nurturance, democracy, and open parent-child communication. Solicitation of children's opinions and feelings as well as explanations and reasons for punishment are common practices for the authoritative parent.

An authoritative parenting style is generally considered advantageous to many aspects of child development (e.g., Baumrind, 1978). Results from past research have shown that children of such parents tend to cope with stress successfully, to be independent, self-reliant, self-assertive, friendly with peers, and cooperative with parents

(Baumrind, 1971), as well as intellectually and socially successful with a strong motivation to achieve (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Researchers have suggested a variety of reasons why authoritative parenting style support children's competence (e.g., Kuczynski et al., 1987). Control that appears fair and reasonable to the child, not arbitrary, is far more likely to be complied with and internalized. Additionally, parents who are secure in the standards they hold for their children provide models of caring and concern as well as confident, assertive behaviour. Finally, authoritative parents make demands that fit with children's ability to take responsibility for their own behaviour. As a result, the authoritative parents provide their children with feelings of competence, and high self-esteem and mature, independent behaviour are fostered (e.g., Kuczynski et al., 1987).

Permissive parents make few demands and engage in very little discipline (Baumrind, 1971). In general, permissive parents are warm and allow considerable self-regulation of their child's activities, making few maturity demands and do not insist that their children follow parentally defined standards (Baumrind, 1978). Permissive parents tend to have children who are rebellious, low in self-reliance and self-control, impulsive, aggressive, domineering, and low in achievement (Baumrind, 1971).

Criticisms of Baumrind's approach. Baumrind's typologies have been extensively studied and criticized since their conception. For example, Berk (1997) recently reported the likelihood that Baumrind's typologies represent culture specific examples of disciplinary techniques, because Baumrind's studies (e.g., 1967, 1971, 1978, 1987) have involved predominately Caucasian, middle class samples. Also, Baumrind's work has been questioned because of the difficulty associated with assigning a parent to a single

style (Sternberg, 1998). Many parents use different approaches at different times, under different circumstances, and with different children (Grusec & Goodnow, 1994).

However, despite the concerns raised by the researchers in the preceding review, the "classic" parenting styles typologies remain a focus of much research and will be employed herein. But, the limitations described in this section must be taken into consideration when interpreting the results.

Disciplinary styles and parental emotional styles. As aforementioned previously in this review, there has been a paucity of research to examine the relations between parental emotional styles and disciplinary techniques. Within the available literature, there is some controversy about whether strong relations would be found between parental emotional styles and traditional assessments of disciplinary styles. For example, Eisenberg (1996) suggested that emotional styles (as measured by Gottman) may actually be indications of positive and negative parenting and represent specific parenting behaviours rather than philosophies related to parenting. Similarly, Gottman et al. (1996) support that parental emotional styles differ from traditional assessments of parenting styles. For example, they suggest that to be an emotion coaching parent is different than to espouse authoritative parenting. Although characteristics of the two parenting constructs share similarities, the emotion coach has more "tools" at her disposal to deal with her child within an affective situation.

However, Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) have provided a scattering of support for relations between parental emotional styles and aspects of disciplinary parenting behaviours. They found negative relations between derogatory parenting (which has elements of an authoritarian discipline) and an emotion coaching parenting style.

Further, positive relations have been reported between scaffolding parenting (a variable which involves aspects of warmth) and emotion coaching. To add to this, the warmth variable that is a subcomponent of scaffolding parenting is one which is similar to Baumrind's conceptualization of warmth (Gottman et al., 1996), and the derogatory parenting variable has similar elements to the authoritarian disciplinary style (e.g., criticism) (Gottman, et al., 1996). In essence, from the sparse research that has been done to examine the relations, it is not fully understood if parental emotional styles are in fact separate from, or similar to traditional disciplinary techniques.

Evidently, the confusion within the literature demands future research to examine the relations between parental emotional styles and parenting disciplinary styles. Therefore, the present study elucidated these relations. It is clear that there is little research to suggest the existence of relations between parental emotional styles and disciplinary strategies. Because there is little research to draw upon, the succeeding hypotheses are primarily exploratory in nature.

Conceptually, it's intuitive to propose that parents who are emotionally dismissive with their children may also exhibit an authoritarian parenting style. Support for this hypothesis can be drawn from research that has shown the authoritarian parent's reliance on power assertion, lack of nurturance and lack of two-way communication with their children. One of the fundamental attributes of a dismissing parent is the lack of emotional communication. In this respect, perhaps a parent who is authoritarian is not providing the environment conducive to emotional coaching, and therefore is displaying an emotion dismissing style with their child. Therefore a positive relation was expected

between authoritarian parenting and a dismissive style, and a negative relation was expected between this same parenting style and an emotion coaching philosophy.

Further, hypotheses regarding the authoritative parenting style can be made in relation to parenting emotional style. Past research has shown that authoritative parenting includes open child-parent communication, warmth, and democracy. It seems from this description that an authoritative parent may possess some of the traits of an emotion coaching parenting style. From this, it was theorized that a positive relation would be found between authoritative parenting style and an emotion coaching philosophy and a negative relation would be discovered between this same parenting style and an emotion dismissing philosophy.

Finally, the extant literature has not examined the relations between permissive parenting and parental emotional style. Overall, permissive parenting is a reflection of warm parenting paired with little control. In this respect, it is also clear that the permissive parent does not take the time to talk with their child about parentally imposed rules, and this may relate to conversing about emotional issues within the home as well. Because of the lack of a clear, obvious conceptual relation between a parental emotional style and permissive parenting. No specific hypotheses were forwarded about this relation.

Parental belief systems and emotional responses

Researchers exploring parental belief systems have sought to understand how parents think about child-rearing, the nature and functioning of these beliefs, and how these beliefs are formed (e.g., Hastings & Coplan, 1999; Sigel, McGillicuddy-DeLisi, & Goodnow, 1992). Hastings and Coplan (1999) suggested three mechanisms through

which parental belief systems may influence parenting. To begin with, thought can be assumed to precede action during parents' deliberate attempts to influence children. Second, even when parents are reacting without conscious planning, beliefs may influence parents' interpretations of events and their subsequent actions. Finally, parental beliefs may impact how parents structure the home environment (perhaps even emotionally) and influence the broader realms of social experiences to which parents expose their children.

The study of parental beliefs is complicated by several mitigating factors. To begin with, parental beliefs are prone to contextual effects, including variations in children's behaviour which seem to elicit different beliefs (e.g., Dix, 1992; Mills & Rubin, 1990). Parental beliefs about social behaviours also may vary as a function of the gender of the child (e.g., Gretarsson & Gelfand, 1988). As well, the various components of the parental belief system, such as parenting goals, and attributions may be more or less subject to influence from situational factors.

In all, parental beliefs are expected to be variable and dependent upon the nature of specific child-rearing situations (Grusec & Goodnow, 1994) and have been shown to vary depending on the context of parent-child interaction (Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Holden, 1983; 1985) and the nature of children's behaviors (Dix, Ruble, Grusec, & Nixon, 1986; Hastings & Coplan, 1999; Mills & Rubin, 1990). However, the majority of research on variations of parental beliefs has examined the effects of different kinds of undesirable child behavior (e.g., misbehaviours) on beliefs; less attention has been given to the beliefs that parents have regarding prosocial child behaviors.

However, empirical studies are lacking in the examination of contextual influences of parenting beliefs in both positive and negative circumstances. In this investigation, emotion coaching and emotion dismissing parenting style were examined in relation to parenting goals, attributions, and emotional responses across two different contexts: situations depicting child misbehaviour, and situations marked by prosocial child behaviour. Because the components of parental belief systems precede action, influence interpretation of behaviours, and impact on the broader realms of a child's social experience, it is reasonable to suggest that they may also be related to parental emotional styles. In the following pages the constructs of parenting goals, attributions and emotional responses are examined and conceptual links are made with parental emotional styles.

Parenting goals. Parenting goals are the outcomes that parents hope to achieve during interactions with their children (Dix, 1992). Goals are experienced within specific child-rearing situations, and may vary across time and contexts (Hastings, 1995). Researchers have long theorized that the goals that parents bring to a parent-child interaction organize behaviour, psychological functioning, and an emotional climate (Dix, 1992; Goodnow & Collins, 1990; Pervin, 1989).

A parent who is concerned with achieving parent-centered goals is interested in meeting his or her own needs (Dix, 1992). Short-term effects such as establishing authority, obtaining compliance, respect, or obedience from a child during an interaction may be some of the concerns during a parent-centered interaction. In the long term, the parent is concerned with maintaining an obedient, respectful child, and in preventing misbehaviour from reoccurring (Hastings & Grusec, 1998).

A parent who maintains relationship-centered goals is concerned, in the short term, with avoiding or solving a conflict in a fair and balanced way, and reaching mutually acceptable outcomes. In the long term, these parents are concerned with building or maintaining love, trust, close family ties, and emotional equilibrium (Hastings & Grusec, 1998). Hastings and Coplan (1999) reported that mothers who espouse both relationship and parent-centered goals have children who are more socially competent than children of mothers who utilize strictly relationship centered goals. They offer the explanation that the children who were more socially competent were socialized to understand that there were limits set on their behaviour, but simultaneously, that their needs could also be met by their mothers.

Parental goals and parental emotional styles. Researchers have begun to examine the associations between parenting goals and parenting behaviours such as parenting styles and responsive parenting (e.g., Coplan et al., under review; Dix, 1992; Hastings, 1995). However, the relations between parenting goals and emotional styles have been unexplored. Further, little is known about these relations as a function of context. It can be surmised that a parent who is parent-centered and interested in meeting his/her own needs may not be interested in meeting the emotional needs of his/her child. Because short-term concerns of parents who use parent-centered goals is to obtain obedience and compliance, it is reasonable to expect that these parents would display emotion dismissing characteristics. For instance, during a highly emotional period, the parent focussed on his/her own goals will not take the time to allow their child to experience the emotion and will expect the child to comply with their demands to cease the emotion immediately. Therefore, within a situation where misbehaviour is pervasive, it was

hypothesized that a mother who is rated higher on emotion dismissing will espouse more parent-centered goals. However, whether these mothers would maintain parent-centered goals in prosocial situations is not conceptually clear. There is only recently been a scattering of literature to address prosocial situations and how they relate to parenting goals (e.g., Hastings and Coplan, 1999). And, there is nothing known of the relations between parental emotional styles and goals within prosocial situations. Therefore, this hypothesis is predominately exploratory.

A parent who is relationship-centered is interested in understanding the child's point of view. It can be recalled that an attribute of an emotion-coaching parent is the desire to understand how and why their child is experiencing a particular emotion. In the face of highly emotionally arousing situations, an emotion coach would embrace the situation as a time to discuss the emotions with their children and to teach techniques to handle affective responses. From this, it is reasonable to suggest that a relationship-centered parent may be linked to an emotion-coaching style of parenting, and therefore a positive relation may be found in both misbehaviour and prosocial situations. These hypotheses can be further strengthened by research which has shown that in the long term, these parents are concerned with the emotional equilibrium of their children (Hastings & Grusec, 1998). And, it is quite clear from the extant research on meta-emotion philosophy, that a concern of an emotion coaching parent is the emotional harmony of their children.

Attributions. Another aspect of the parental belief system is parental attributions. Parental attributions are causal factors that parents focus on to explain why certain child behaviours occur (Dix, 1993; Hastings & Coplan, 1999; Mills & Rubin, 1990; Scott-

Little & Holloway, 1994). They have been associated with parenting goals (Lagace-Seguin, 1999b; Moulton, 1998) in as much as they influence (and are influenced by) parental emotions and the degree of control a parent will display during times of discipline (Hastings, 1995). Early attribution researchers (e.g., Jones & Davis, 1965) have characterized attributions as cognitive processes in which people engage to understand others' behaviours. And from the seminal work of Dix (1992; 1993) and colleagues (Dix & Grusec, 1985; Dix, Ruble, & Zambarano, 1990) it is known that the attributions parents make of their children (e.g., lazy, uncaring, aggressive) influence socialization. In fact, Dix (1993) has reported that children internalize values and views that are consistent with the attributions made by their parents. For example, inferring that a child is poor in mathematics or is aggressive towards peers, may contribute to the development of inferior academic performance or low social competence with classmates.

We now understand that attributions can be characterized along a number of related dimensions. Parents may attribute a child's behaviour: (1) to dispositional factors that originate from within the child versus external, situational forces; (2) to manifestations of stable characteristics versus age-related factors that are subject to change; (3) to typical behaviour patterns versus exceptional, isolated or unusual acts; and (4) to intentional acts versus unintentional or accidental behavior (Dix, 1993).

Theoretical consideration and empirical examination of these attributional dimensions have suggested that they may share a common underlying factor structure (Dix, et al., 1990; Hastings & Rubin, 1999; Miller, 1995), reflecting the degree to which parents make internal versus external attributions or loci of control. Internal attributions

reflect the constellation of perceptions that a child's misbehaviours are dispositional, intentional, stable, and typical. These have been linked with parental anger, intervention, power assertion, and punitive responses to deal with their children's misbehaviours. It is reasonable to suggest that this type of parental response occurs because parents view the "internal" transgressions as being controllable. Alternatively, external attributions include the perceptions of children's misbehaviours as provoked, accidental, transitory, and unique, resulting from a new situation, for example. These beliefs may be less threatening to parents because they do not suggest serious problems or conflicts. As such, parents may feel more confident in their ability to alter the child's behaviors (Hastings & Coplan, 1999).

There has been some sporadic research to examine the influence of various contextual factors on parental attributions. Similar to parental goals, attributions have been found to vary depending on the context of parent-child interaction (Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Holden, 1983; 1985). It has been suggested that parents are likely to have positive attribution biases, or to be "developmental optimists" (Goodnow, Knight, & Cashmore, 1986), with respect to their explanations for their own children's behavior. Indeed, a few studies have shown that more internal attributions are made regarding children's positive behaviors (e.g., being helpful) than negative behaviors (e.g., fighting with peers), while the converse is true for parents' external attributions (Dix et al., 1986; Gretarsson & Gelfand, 1988). However, little is truly known about the relations between attributions and parental emotional styles across different contexts. In this investigation, emotion coaching and emotion dismissing parenting is examined as they relate to attributional processes across misbehaviour and prosocial situations.

Parental attributions and parental emotional styles. Although there is a small empirical literature base examining the links between attributional processes and disciplinary styles and parenting goals, surprisingly researchers have not yet addressed the associations between parental attributions and parental emotional style. As mentioned previously, how parents attribute responsibility for their child's behaviour often reflects their beliefs about child development, child rearing and discipline (Dix, 1993, Coplan et al., under review). It is reasonable to speculate that attributions may also be linked to their beliefs about parental emotional style. However, because of the lack of literature to suggest firm hypotheses relating parental emotional styles and attributions, the following hypotheses are based on conceptual relations and are therefore exploratory in nature.

As aforementioned, internal attributions about a child's misbehaviour reflect a constellation that these behaviours are dispositional, intentional, stable, and typical. And, it was also surmised that the outcomes of this type of attribution for some kinds of misbehaviours are parental power assertion and punitive responses (Dix, et al., 1989). From this, it may be that internal attributions will be related to emotion dismissing parenting styles within situations marked by misbehaviour. If parents are using punitive techniques in response to what they attribute to an internal characteristic, it follows that they will also not possess the traits of an emotion coach (it can be recalled that an emotion coach will not be punitive nor exert power during affective episodes). This may be particularly evident during situations marked by misbehaviour, which has traditionally been viewed as a destructive situation that requires quick remedy (i.e. parental involvement) which is reflective of dismissing characteristics.

It is less clear what the relation between dismissing parenting styles and attributions would be within prosocial situations. To speculate, it may be that the dismissing parent would act as a “developmental optimist” in this situation. Since their child would not be experiencing an emotional reaction that would require quick remedy, these parents may also relate their child’s prosocial behaviours to internal characteristics.

In the same vein, mothers who are rated higher on emotion coaching may attribute their children’s prosocial behaviours to internal characteristics. Dix et al. (1986) have suggested that more internal attributions are made regarding children’s prosocial-type behaviours than misbehaviours. In addition these same parents may view their children’s behaviours as being directly related to the internalization of parental meta-emotion philosophy. That is, the goal of emotion coaches is to teach children about emotions, teach children to empathize with others, and to help children understand the value of listening to others during situations which are (or are not) emotionally laden. That children are engaging in prosocial behaviour may be an indication to these mothers that characteristics of an emotion coaching style are being internalized and used overtly in social situations with peers.

Antithetically, external attributions are usually perceived as provoked, accidental, transitory, or unique by parents. Hastings and Coplan (1999) reported that in such a scenario, parents feel more confident in their abilities to alter their child behaviour. To add to this, it may also be that external attributions are positively associated with emotion coaching parenting style within situations marked by misbehaviour. The confidence that stems from these attributions may also lead to patience and willingness on the behalf of the parents to discuss the emotions with their children. Perhaps even more than

confidence to alter their child's behaviours, external attributions will provoke a parental desire to understand why their child is experiencing a particular emotion (reflected by a positive or negative situation) and to discuss the emotional experience with their child.

Parental Emotional Responses

Increasingly, there has been recognition of the importance of the affective components of parenting by researchers (e.g., Denham, 1998; Denham, et al., 1994; Lagace-Seguin, 1999b). It is known that emotional responses depend upon the appraisal of precipitating events (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Parenting behaviour is also likely to be influenced by emotional reactions to a child's immediate conduct. For instance, a child displaying aggressive behaviour versus prosocial behaviour will evoke different parental emotional responses (Grusec, et al., 1989). Goodnow, Cashmore, Cotton, and Knight (1984) argued that differences in emotional responses are associated with parental expectations. For example, if children are expected to have well-developed control over aggressive behaviours and to be able to participate in social interaction with peers by early childhood, then displays of contrary behaviours might be expected to elicit such negative emotions as disappointment, anger, or guilt in parents. Children's socially competent behaviours would be expected to result in parental satisfaction, happiness, or pride. In addition, there is recent evidence to suggest that parents do not simply react with positive emotions in response to child behaviors they encourage, and with negative emotions towards child behaviors they do not. Rubin (1990) has reported differences in parental emotional responses to behaviors indicative of social withdrawal and aggression, neither of which is actively encouraged by parents.

There has been limited literature to examine variations of emotional responses due to context. More recently, Coplan et al. (under review) reported that mothers reported that they would be most angry and embarrassed if their child displayed aggressive behaviors followed by misbehavior, shy, and prosocial acts. Further, mothers reported that they would feel most responsible for the prosocial behaviors, followed by shyness, aggression, and misbehaviors. This study represents one of the first to examine parental emotional responses within prosocial scenarios. Past studies to examine parental belief systems and emotional responses typically rely upon transgressions to assess parental constructs.

Emotional responses and parental emotional styles. The associations between parental emotional responses to child behaviours and parental emotional styles have yet to be examined. From the available research, it is reasonable to speculate that parents' emotions stemming from child behaviours may be related to parental emotional style in both prosocial and misbehaviour situations. As discussed previously, it is understood that different displays of child behaviour will lead to different emotional responses, and that parental expectations are linked to emotional experiences. In this dissertation, the links between parental emotional styles and emotional responses to child behaviours exhibited within two different situations were explored. Embarrassed, angry, and feelings of responsibility were examined as they relate to parenting emotional styles across misbehaviour and prosocial situations.

Although hypotheses were predominately exploratory, some relations were expected. It can be recalled that an emotion dismissing parenting philosophy is marked by characteristics such as disengagement from children's emotions, and feelings of

uncomfort, anxiety, and being overwhelmed when children display instances of an aroused affective state. From this, it may be that instances of emotional expression enrage these parents because they feel out of control, and in trying to cease the misbehaviour become angry or embarrassed. This idea is derived from past research that suggests that negative emotional responses are linked to power-assertive techniques in noncompliant or aggressive situations (Coplan, et al., under review).

However, Gottman et al. (1997) also reported that these parents may “duck for cover” when their children become emotional and look for the quickest method to sooth the child. It can be speculated from this that the parent who espouses a dismissing philosophy may not display instances of emotion within misbehaviour situations. Perhaps their lack of understanding and their fear of emotional states would lead to an inward expression and prevent them from feeling angry or embarrassed in such situations. It is obvious that the characteristics of an emotion dismissing parenting style share a dualistic meaning with respect to emotional expression

Furthermore, it may also be that the dismissing parent would not feel responsible for their children’s misbehaviours because they often characterize emotional states of their children as being trivial and “petty” in relation to adult concerns (Gottman et al., 1996). As well, knowledge is truly limited with respect to emotion dismissing style within prosocial situations. However, it may be assumed that since prosocial situations will not cause extreme emotional upset, that these parents will not respond with instances of anger or embarrassment towards their children. And, since parents are “developmental optimists”, it may stand to reason that they are also optimistic about their own parenting

as well. Therefore it may be that the parent who espouses a dismissing style also espouses feelings of responsibility when children are engaged in prosocial situations.

It can be recalled that emotion coaching parents are more "in-tune" and understanding of their own emotions. They are characteristically unafraid to show their emotions around their children: if upset they will cry around their children, and if angry they may lose their tempers. But the defining feature is that these parents use the emotional expressions as an outlet for talking to their children and teaching about the constructive expression of emotions. Therefore, given these features, it may be that emotion coaching parenting style will be related to a variety of emotional expressions across the two different contexts. It is plausible that during times of misbehaviour, the mother rated as high on emotion coaching may also respond with feelings of anger and embarrassed.

However, another argument could be made that because mothers fitting into this category are also "expert" emotion regulators, these negative-type behaviours would be undercontrol and therefore not central to emotional responses. Rather, these mothers may talk with children about their feelings instead of expressing them behaviourally. As well, during situations marked by misbehaviour relations may be found between feelings of responsibility and emotion coaching parenting style. The feelings of responsibility may provide the parent with the impetus to talk with their child about their behaviours. This idea fits nicely with one of the main characteristics of an emotion coaching philosophy: dyadic communication in the face of affective states. Finally, it doesn't seem conceptually sound that an emotion coaching parenting style would be positively associated with feelings of anger or embarrassment within prosocial situations. However,

it may be the case that these same parents would feel responsible for their children's prosocial behaviours. If this is found, it may signal that parents higher on emotion coaching are giving themselves credit for instilling the "emotional values" in their children that have provided them with the base to be socially competent.

Summary

To summarize, the goals of Study 1 were to: (1) examine the factor structure of the PESQ (Appendix B); and (2) explore the construct validity of the PESQ by examining associations with parental disciplinary style, parenting beliefs (goals and attributions), and emotional responses. Figure 2 represents the schemata depicting the objectives of Study 1.

Method

Participants

The participants included 140 mothers and their children (73 males, 67 females, $M_{age} = 56.0$ months, $SD_{age} = 7.34$ months) from nine participating local daycare centers in the Ottawa/Carleton region, and from Baby Bottoms (a local cotton diaper service). Mother ranged in age from 26 years to 38 years ($M_{age} = 32$ years, $SD_{age} = 6$ years), were predominately Caucasian, and had university or college education. Thirty-five percent (140/400) of the questionnaires that were delivered to participants were returned.

Procedure and Measures

A description of this study (see Appendix C) and a consent letter (see Appendix D) was delivered to participating daycares and Baby Bottoms in mid March, 2000. With the help of each daycare director and the manager of the cotton diaper service, these materials were distributed to the parents upon leaving their children at the daycare center,

Figure 2. Study 1 schemata

or in the case of the diaper service, upon receiving their order of diapers. The parents were requested to return the consent forms to their daycare, or with their diaper order within one week. Once consent forms were returned, two differently constructed measures packages were delivered to the daycares and to Baby Bottoms to be distributed to the participating mothers. All 140 mothers participating in the study received a demographics questionnaire (see Appendix E) and the PESQ. However, approximately half of the mothers received the Child Behaviour Vignettes (CBV, based on Hastings & Grusec, 1998) measure and the other half received the Parenting Practices Questionnaire (PPQ, Robinson et al., 1995). This was done in order to reduce the number of items (and time) for parents to complete questionnaires. By using this methodology for the data collection, it increased the likelihood of a modest response rate, and therefore an acceptable number of participants needed to perform a Principle Components Analysis.

Measures

Parental emotional styles. Parental emotional styles were assessed using the newly adapted 45-item Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire (PESQ) (see Appendix B) which contains subscales pertaining to emotion coaching and emotion dismissing parental emotional styles of the parents. The items were derived and adapted from Gottman and Declaire (1997) and through personal communication (John Gottman, October, 1999). According to Gottman, these items reflect coaching and dismissing parenting as well as levels of emotional awareness. Items were randomized for order and responses were solicited on a 5-point likert scale anchored by 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Parental disciplinary styles. In addition, the 62-item Parenting Practice Questionnaire (PPQ, Robinson et al., 1995; see also Hart, et al., 1997; Hart, et al., 1998) (see Appendix F) used to assess authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive disciplinary parenting styles (among other parenting dimensions) was included. The PPQ has been found to have a reliable factor structure for the items that represent each subscale (authoritative, $\alpha=.91$; authoritarian, $\alpha=.86$; and permissive, $\alpha=.75$, Robinson et al., 1995). In the current study, the alpha coefficients were authoritative, $\alpha=.88$; authoritarian, $\alpha=.83$; and permissive, $\alpha=.74$.

Parental belief systems and emotional responses. The final scale was the 70-item Child Behaviour Vignettes (CBV), based on Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Hastings & Rubin, 1999) (see Appendix G). The CBV was designed to assess parental beliefs, such as goals, causal attributions, and emotional responses across five situational contexts. Of interest in this study were the vignettes relating to prosocial, aggressive, and the two noncompliant scenarios. The shyness scenario was not included in this dissertation but will be examined in future analyses. Taking from past research which has collapsed across scenarios (Hastings & Coplan, 1999), of interest in this study was to collapse across the aggressive and two noncompliant situations to create a new variable termed “misbehaviour” and to assess the prosocial situation independently. Each mother was asked to read the vignettes and imagine that it is her child behaving in a prosocial, aggressive, or disobedient manner described.

After each vignette, mothers rated how important (from 1 “not at all” to 5 “very”) each of five possible parenting goals would be for them in that situation. These included two parent-centered goals (‘wanting the child to behave properly, immediately’; ‘wanting

the child to know that the mother expects proper behavior') and three relationship-centered goals, ('wanting the child to be happy'; 'wanting the child and mother to feel good'; 'wanting the child to trust the mother and know that she loves the child').

Following past research (Hastings & Coplan, 1999), child centered goals were not included in this dissertation. Past researchers (e.g., Hastings & Coplan, 1999) have reported respectable psychometrics for parenting goals. The alphas for this study were as follows: relationship centered in misbehaviour and prosocial scenarios: $\alpha=.73$ and $\alpha=.79$, respectively; parent centered in misbehaviour and prosocial scenarios: $\alpha=.81$ and $\alpha=.76$

Mothers' attributions for the behaviours described in the scenarios were also assessed on 5-point scales. Mothers rated the extent to which the behavior depicted in each vignette was stable ("a stage that will pass" to "will keep acting this way"), intentional ("did not mean to do this" to "did this on purpose"), typical ("never acts this way" to "just like how my child behaves"), and caused by dispositional factors ("due to the situation" to "due to my child's personality"). Results from a principle components factor analysis have revealed that the different attributions loaded on the same factor in each of the scenarios (Eigenvalues ranged from 1.96 to 2.05, all item loadings were greater than .60) (Coplan et al., under review), as has been found in prior investigations (Hastings & Rubin, 1999). As such, for each scenario, a summary variable was created where high scores represented external attributions (stage, unintentional, atypical, and due to situational factors) and low scores reflected internal attributions (stable, intentional, typical, and due to dispositional factors) to determine the extent to which two

orthogonal dimensions can be created for this study. The alphas for the attributions were as follows for the misbehaviour and prosocial scenarios: $\alpha=.73$ and $\alpha=.75$, respectively

Finally, mother's also provided ratings of emotional responses to the hypothetical vignettes. For each scenario, mothers rated from 1 "not at all" to 5 "very strong" how strongly she would feel "angry", "happy", "responsible", "worried" and "embarrassed" in response to the behaviors described in each vignette. Of interest in this study were the responses relating to feelings of embarrassment, anger, and responsibility. The alpha coefficients for the misbehaviour scenarios with respect to angry, embarrassed, and responsible emotional responses were : $\alpha=.80$, $\alpha=.74$, and , $\alpha=.79$, respectively. The emotional responses relating to the prosocial situations were single items.

As well, a detailed instruction sheet, a demographics page (see Appendix E), and a large envelope for the completed questionnaires was added to this package. Mothers completed this package at home, and a brief summary of the results was provided to each participating daycare upon the completion of this dissertation. Additionally, the names of each participating mother who returned completed measures packages were placed in a jar and a random draw was made for a \$250.00 gift certificate from the Rideau Center Mall.

Results

The original 45-items of the PESQ is displayed in Appendix B. Raw item score distributions were explored by calculating the value of the skew statistic divided by the standard error of the skew. Twenty-three items were dropped initially because of skewed distributions (negatively and positively skewed) and because of a lack of variability⁴.

⁴ Items that were removed had little variability and a restricted range. Those items with an asterisk were deleted from further analyses (see Appendix B).

Factor and item analysis of the PESQ items

The remaining 22 items were subjected to exploratory factor analysis using principle components analysis extraction with varimax rotation. An additional 8 items were dropped because of low factor loadings ($<.30$) or because they cross loaded on more than one factor. The remaining items were then again subjected to a Principal Components Analysis with varimax rotation. A check to determine if Principle Components Analyses is appropriate with the current data set supported this analysis. The KMO index used to compare the magnitudes of observed to partial correlations (i.e., sampling adequacy) was acceptable ($KMO=.78$) and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($Bartlett's=424.78$, $p<.001$) indicating that the variables within the population are correlated and Principle Components Analysis was warranted. Results indicated a two factor solution (i.e., two factors had Eigenvalues greater than 1.0). Together these two factors accounted for 67.4% of the variance. Means and standard deviations for each item can be seen in Table 1. Overall, the means and standard deviations for each subscale were emotion dismissing ($M=3.11$, $SD=.98$) and emotion coaching ($M=3.79$, $SD=.91$). Factor loadings for each subscale are displayed in Table 2. The two factors that emerged were labeled: (1) emotion dismissing and (2) emotion coaching.

The first factor, emotion dismissing had an Eigenvalue of 5.2 and accounted for 37.3% percent of variance in the data. The factor consisted of seven items referring to an emotion dismissing philosophy about parental emotional styles. These items all loaded highly on this factor, with factor loadings ranging between .83 and .88.

The second factor, labeled emotion coaching, had an Eigenvalue of 4.2 and accounted for 30.1% percent of the variance. The seven items loading on this factor

Table 1

PESQ Item Means and Standard Deviations (n=140)

<u>item</u> (abbreviated)	<u>mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
1. When child sad-time to solve problem	3.86	.86
2. Child's anger is worth exploring	4.14	.75
3. When child is sad-I have to fix world	2.47	1.12
4. When child sad-time to get close	4.07	.90
5. Child's sadness is something to get over	3.23	1.02
6. I prefer my child to be happy	3.73	.89
7. I help my child get over sadness quickly	3.48	.91
8. When child is angry-time to get close	3.07	1.12
9. When child is angry-I take time to share in experience	3.47	1.02
10. I try to change child's angry moods into cheerful ones	3.48	.93
11. Childhood is a happy-go-lucky time	2.58	1.04
12. When child is angry-my goal is to get him/her to stop	2.81	.98
13. When child is angry-I want to know what he/she is thinking	4.07	.83
14. When child is angry-time problem solve	3.88	.89

Table 2

Factor Loadings and Alpha Coefficients for the Two Factor Solution to the PESQ
(n=140)

<u>Factor and Item (abbreviated)</u>	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>
Sadness is something that one has to get over, to ride out, not to dwell on	.83	
I prefer my child to be happy rather than overly emotional	.86	
I help my child get over sadness quickly so he/she can move onto other things	.87	
I try to change my child's angry mood into cheerful ones	.85	
Childhood is a happy-go-lucky time, not a time for feeling sad or angry	.84	
When my child is angry my goal is to get him/her to stop	.88	
When my child is sad I am expected to fix the world and make it perfect	.87	
	$\alpha=.92$	
When my child is angry, it's an opportunity for getting close		.85
When my child is angry, I take some time to experience this feeling with him/her		.83
When my child is sad it's time to solve a problem		.81
When my child is angry I want to know what he/she is thinking		.84
Anger is an emotion worth exploring		.86
When my child is angry it's time to solve a problem		.82
When my child is sad it's time to get close		.87
		$\alpha=.90$

referred to an emotion coaching parenting philosophy. All items loaded relatively highly on the factor with item loadings ranging from .81 to .87. The correlation between the two factors was $r=.01$, n.s.

Stevens (1996) recommends testing each factor loading for significance to increase the likelihood that researchers retain statistically appropriate factors. Accordingly, Stevens suggests that for each factor loading to be significant with a sample size of $n=140$, loadings with a value of .43 in absolute value would be declared statistically significant. In the case of both subscales, all loadings are significant.

Internal consistency and item analysis. In order to examine the internal consistency of the newly created two factors, Cronbach's Alpha was computed for each of the two subscales. Nunnally (1978) provides a widely accepted rule of thumb that Alpha should be at least .70 for a scale to demonstrate internal consistency. Alpha values for the total subscales were: emotion dismissing .92 and emotion coaching .90.

In addition, item scale correlations (Table 3) were computed for each of the 14 items. Spector (1992) recommends a minimum item scale correlation of .40 in order to retain items for a specific scale. All items in the two subscales for the entire sample demonstrated acceptable item-scale correlations. The item scale correlations for emotion dismissing ranged between $r=.79$ and $r=.88$ and for emotion coaching between $r=.78$ and $r=.86$.

Factor analysis: Males and females. In order to examine potential sex differences in the factor structure of the PESQ, the data were factor analyzed again using principle components extraction and varimax rotation, separately for males and females. Results for a two factor solution are presented in Table 4 and Table 5. Although this procedure

Table 3

Corrected item-total correlations for the two subscales of the PESQ (n=140)

Factor and Item (abbreviated)	item-total correlation
I. Emotion Dismissing:	
Sadness is something that one has to get over, to ride out, not to dwell on	.79
I prefer my child to be happy rather than overly emotional	.81
I help my child get over sadness quickly so he/she can move onto other things	.88
I try to change my child's angry mood into cheerful ones	.83
Childhood is a happy-go-lucky time, not a time for feeling sad or angry	.82
When my child is angry my goal is to get him/her to stop	.86
When my child is sad I am expected to fix the world and make it perfect	.84
II. Emotion Coaching:	
When my child is angry, it's an opportunity for getting close	.86
When my child is angry, I take some time to experience this feeling with him/her	.81
When my child is sad it's time to solve a problem	.78
When my child is angry I want to know what he/she is thinking	.80
Anger is an emotion worth exploring	.83
When my child is angry it's time to solve a problem	.85
When my child is sad it's time to get close	.84

Table 4

Factor Loadings for the Two Factor Solution to the PESQ: Males only (n=73)

<u>Factor and Item (abbreviated)</u>	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>
Sadness is something that one has to get over, to ride out, not to dwell on	.82	
I prefer my child to be happy rather than overly emotional	.80	
I help my child get over sadness quickly so he/she can move onto other things	.86	
I try to change my child's angry mood into cheerful ones	.81	
Childhood is a happy-go-lucky time, not a time for feeling sad or angry	.78	
When my child is angry my goal is to get him/her to stop	.83	
When my child is sad I am expected to fix the world and make it perfect	.84	$\alpha=.88$
When my child is angry, it's an opportunity for getting close		.82
When my child is angry, I take some time to experience this feeling with him/her		.81
When my child is sad it's time to solve a problem		.83
When my child is angry I want to know what he/she is thinking		.84
Anger is an emotion worth exploring		.86
When my child is angry it's time to solve a problem		.78
When my child is sad it's time to get close		.81
		$\alpha=.89$

Table 5
Factor Loadings for the Two Factor Solution to the PESQ: Females only (n=67)

<u>Factor and Item (abbreviated)</u>	I	II
Sadness is something that one has to get over, to ride out, not to dwell on	.80	
I prefer my child to be happy rather than overly emotional	.83	
I help my child get over sadness quickly so he/she can move onto other things	.81	
I try to change my child's angry mood into cheerful ones	.89	
Childhood is a happy-go-lucky time, not a time for feeling sad or angry	.84	
When my child is angry my goal is to get him/her to stop	.78	
When my child is sad I am expected to fix the world and make it perfect	.79	$\alpha=.86$
When my child is angry, it's an opportunity for getting close		.80
When my child is angry, I take some time to experience this feeling with him/her		.78
When my child is sad it's time to solve a problem		.82
When my child is angry I want to know what he/she is thinking		.83
Anger is an emotion worth exploring		.84
When my child is angry it's time to solve a problem		.81
When my child is sad it's time to get close		.85
		$\alpha=.88$

resulted in a reduced sample size, the goal of these analyses was to search for large discrepancies in the factor structure as a function of gender. Overall, the factor structure and item loadings for gender (separately) were comparable to the full sample.

Stability of the PESQ ratings. The short term stability or 6-month test-retest reliability of each of the two PESQ subscales was assessed by correlating parents ratings (from the initial data collection) with the same parent's rating six months later (an additional data collection) (n=64). Overall, the PESQ subscales demonstrated moderate stability over a six month period. The emotion dismissing and emotion coaching subscales had correlations of $r=.58$ ($p<.01$) and $r=.53$ ($p<.01$), respectively. The revised version of the PESQ can be seen in Appendix H.

Demographic variables

The next set of analyses concerned the relations between the PESQ subscales and the demographic variables of child's age, mother's age, and mother's education. As can be seen in Table 6 there were no significant correlations between demographic variables and the subscales of emotion dismissing and emotion coaching.

Sex differences. In order to further examine possible sex differences in the PESQ subscales, a series of independent groups t -tests was computed between the males and females for each of the two sub scales. Results indicated no significant group differences between males and females in terms of emotion dismissing ($t(137)=-1.64$, n.s.) ($M_{\text{males}}=3.01$, $SD=.97$; $M_{\text{female}}=3.19$, $SD=.99$), and emotion coaching ($t(137)=-1.00$, n.s.) ($M_{\text{males}}=3.75$, $SD=.92$; $M_{\text{female}}=3.85$, $SD=.90$) parental emotional philosophy.

Table 6

Correlation between Parental Emotional Styles and Demographic Variables (n=140)

Parental Emotional Style	<u>Demographic Variables</u>		
	Child's age	Maternal education	Maternal age
Emotion Coaching	-.15	-.13	.11
Emotion Dismissing	.09	-.10	-.07

Construct validity

The final set of analyses concerned the relations between the PESQ subscales and other theoretically relevant and established parental ratings of conceptually linked parenting constructs. Specifically, correlations were computed between PESQ ratings and (1) maternal ratings of parenting styles (authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parenting) ($n=65$); and (2) maternal ratings of parenting goals, attributions, and emotional responses ($n=75$).

PESQ relations with parental style typologies. Results from correlations between emotional styles and parenting disciplinary styles are displayed in Table 7. No significant correlations were found.

PESQ relations with parental goals. Correlations between parental goals and the subscales of the PESQ are displayed in Table 8. Emotion coaching parenting was significantly and positively related with relationship-centered goals in response to child misbehaviour ($r=.39$, $p<.01$) and prosocial behaviour ($r=.43$, $p<.01$). In contrast, emotion dismissing parenting was significantly and positively related to parent-centered goals for the misbehaviour ($r=.64$, $p<.001$) and prosocial behaviour ($r=.39$, $p<.01$) scenarios.

PESQ relations with parental attributions. Correlations between parental attributions and the subscales of the PESQ can be seen in Table 8. No significant correlations were found.

Table 7

Correlations between Parenting Styles and Parental Emotional Styles (n=65)

Parenting Styles	<u>Parental Emotional Styles</u>	
	Emotion Coaching	Emotion Dismissing
Authoritarian	-.07	.10
Authoritative	.13	-.04
Permissive	-.08	.09

Table 8

Correlations Between PESQ and Parenting Goals, Attributions, and Emotional Responses(n=75)

Parental Beliefs	Parental Emotional Styles	
	Emotion Coaching	Emotion Dismissing
Goals		
Parent centered		
Misbehaviour	.15	.64***
Prosocial	.12	.39**
Relationship centered		
Misbehaviour	.39**	.15
Prosocial	.43**	.20
Attributions		
Misbehaviour	.03	.12
Prosocial	-.17	.11
Emotional Responses		
Angry		
Misbehaviour	.03	.40**
Prosocial	-.11	.02
Embarrassed		
Misbehaviour	.03	.33*
Prosocial	-.17	-.08
Responsible		
Misbehaviour	.28*	.12
Prosocial	.34**	.51**

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

PESQ relations with emotional responses. Correlations computed between the two PESQ subscales and three emotional responses (angry, embarrassed, responsible) for prosocial and misbehaviour scenarios are displayed in Table 8. Emotion dismissing parenting was significantly and positively related with angry ($r=.40$, $p<.01$), and embarrassed ($r=.33$, $p<.05$) emotional responses in vignettes depicted by misbehaviour scenarios, and with responsibility in the response to child prosocial behaviours ($r=.51$, $p<.01$). Emotion coaching parenting was related to feelings of responsibility during the misbehaviour ($r=.28$, $p<.05$) and prosocial situations ($r=.34$, $p<.01$).

Discussion

The major goal of this study was to establish the psychometric properties of the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire (PESQ). Specifically, the factor structure, internal consistency, short-term stability, and the construct validity of the scale were examined. Results have provided some preliminary evidence to support the PESQ as a reliable and valid alternative to the Meta Emotion Interview (Gottman et al., 1996) in the assessment of emotion coaching and emotion dismissing emotional styles. The PESQ was demonstrated to contain two factors: (1) emotion dismissing; and (2) emotion coaching. In the following sections, the findings and implications of these two subscales are reviewed and discussed. The psychometric validation of the PESQ is addressed first. Following, implications of the findings related to the relations between parental emotional styles and disciplinary strategies and belief systems are discussed. Finally, this discussion concludes with thoughts on the “next-steps” for the PESQ.

Psychometric Validation of the PESQ

The PESQ was demonstrated to consist of two factors. The first factor was labeled emotion dismissing. This factor is reminiscent of items pertaining to a variety of underlying dismissing characteristics as previously outlined by Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) and Gottman and Declaire (1997). Some of these parental characteristics include: (1) treating children's feelings as unimportant or trivial; (2) disengaging from children's emotions or ignoring emotions outright; (3) preferring that their child's negative emotions would disappear quickly; (4) characteristically using distraction techniques to sooth a child's negative emotions; (5) believing that children's feelings are irrational and therefore aren't worthy of attention; (6) focussing on how to get over the emotion rather than learning about the meaning of the emotion for the child; (7) viewing a child's emotions as a time to "repair" the event that caused the emotion and also to "repair" the emotion so that positive emotions could override the negative; and (8) lack of problem solving abilities which may be manifested in the belief that the passage of time will "cure" the emotional "ailment".

The second factor that emerged was labeled emotion coaching. This factor also consisted of a variety of underlying parental coaching characteristics outlined by Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) such as: (1) valuing children's negative emotions as a time for intimacy; (2) tolerating spending time with a sad or angry child; (3) perceiving the world of emotions as an important arena for parenting; (4) knowledge of methods to help with a child's emotion regulation abilities; (5) respecting a child's emotional states; (6) not feeling like they have to fix the emotional climate; (7) helping children label emotional states; and (8) a parent's ability to empathize about emotional states.

Results from this study provide researchers with a tool to measure parents' emotional styles. It was found that there was reasonable reliability and validity for both subscales of the PESQ. All items within both subscales exhibited moderate to high factor loadings, and the internal consistency measures revealed very cohesive subscales.

Furthermore, the PESQ represents a novel contribution to the literature. Until now, there have only been a limited number of researchers who have examined the emotional dimensions of parenting, particularly negative (i.e., an emotion dismissing style), in comparison to other parenting constructs (e.g., Denham, 1998; Goodnow et al., 1994; Eisenberg, 1996; Gottman and colleagues, 1996, 1997). Further, with exception of a few of the aforementioned researchers, (e.g., Gottman, et al., 1996, 1997) knowledge is truly limited about the characteristics and intentions of an emotion dismissing or emotion coaching parent.

The final version of the PESQ represents a substantially reduced number of items than the original 45-item scale. This reduction in items is not surprising given that one of the objectives of this first study was to create a short, concise scale to measure parental emotional styles. In addition, the original items were adapted from a pre-existing scale (Gottman and Declaire, 1997) that had yet been examined for its psychometric properties (personal communication with John Gottman, October, 1999). To speculate, one of the reasons that a number of items were found to be psychometrically unstable could be that they were inappropriately constructed for assessing the two dimensions. It may be that the semantics of the "poor" items did not capture the essence of an emotion dismissing and emotion coaching parenting philosophy.

In addition, it could be speculated that is very difficult to make the transition from an interview to a questionnaire methodology. The subscales of the original PESQ were designed to represent a majority of the responses from the Meta Emotion Interview (Gottman et al., 1996, 1997) (personal communication with John Gottman, October, 1999). The methodology of the interview includes probing parents for answers. Because this option is restricted in the questionnaire format, the shortened version of the PESQ may represent the fewest number of items possible to capture the essence of each parenting domain, without the privilege of probing for answers. In all, a defining difference between the original and revised versions of the PESQ may be a function how the participants are able to respond. With an interview, a more elaborate set of responses are available to the researcher, than with a questionnaire format. Therefore, the remaining items in the PESQ may represent those which are primarily conceptually and psychometrically associated with emotion coaching and emotion dismissing parental emotional styles.

Parental Emotional Styles and Disciplinary Strategies

The correlations between parental emotional styles and traditional disciplinary styles were explored to examine the construct validity of the PESQ. The hypotheses in this regard were exploratory in nature due to the controversy and uncertainty within the literature about actual relations. Specifically, it was surmised that an emotion dismissing style would be positively related to an authoritarian disciplinary style. Support for this hypothesis was derived from past research (e.g., Baumrind, 1967, 1971) which emphasized an authoritarian style being characteristic of reliance on power assertion, lack of nurturance, and little two-way (dyadic) communication. Additionally, it was thought

that because the authoritarian parents hold steadfast in their beliefs about preservation of order, that there would be direct relations between this disciplinary typology and the characteristics of an emotion dismissing parenting style. This line of thought is based on the literature which suggests that an emotion dismissing style is based on attempt to “preserve” emotional order by diminishing the negative affect immediately after it has occurred.

Perhaps surprisingly, results from this study did not support this hypothesis. Eisenberg (1996) suggested that emotional styles (as measured by Gottman) are actually indications of positive and negative parenting and represent specific parenting behaviours rather than philosophies related to parenting. Gottman et al. (1997) have suggested that the emotional aspects of parenting not only represent parenting behaviours but are also manifested in parenting philosophies and provide qualitative examples and statistical analyses as evidence to suggest that emotional styles are a combination of behaviours and philosophies.

Because results from this study do not support that a dismissing parenting style is associated with an authoritarian disciplinary style, support for Eisenberg (1996) was not provided in this investigation (as much as parenting behaviour can be defined by a disciplinary strategy). However, this finding may add support to Gottman’s suggestion that emotionally dismissing parents are not necessarily “bad” parents. The present results did not suggest that dismissing parents utilized harsh disciplinary techniques (as defined by authoritarian parenting style). It is possible that dismissing parents may be characteristically unsure of how to respond to their child’s emotional states, as Gottman (1997) has suggested. This explanation is grounded by past findings that emotion

dismissing individuals lack a repertoire of tools to help teach their children techniques to regulate emotions and therefore interact with their child in the way they see best suited to the situation—ridding the emotional state and regaining a smooth emotional climate as soon after the emotion begins.

It was also theorized that an emotion coaching style would be positively related to an authoritative disciplinary style. Again, support for this hypothesis was derived from past research (e.g., Baumrind, 1967, 1971) which has found authoritative parenting to be characteristic of warmth, nurturance, democratic parenting, and two-way (dyadic) communication. Also, because past research has found that solicitation of children's opinions and feelings, as well as explanations and reasons for discipline are fundamental aspects of an authoritative style, it was thought there would be direct relations between this disciplinary typology and the characteristics of an emotion coaching parenting style. The basis for this argument comes from the available literature which has reported that an emotion coaching style is based on empathy, open communication, and an overall general consideration that negative emotions serve useful purposes in our lives and must be used as a venue for teaching about emotion regulation, emotional problem solving, and appropriate outlets for emotional expression. All of these characteristics are reminiscent of an authoritative style

The results from this study did not indicate that emotion coaching was positively related to authoritative style. Although this finding is a challenge to explain given the similar characteristics between the two parenting constructs, some light has been shed on the basic relations between a fair and balanced disciplinary style and an emotional style which is representative of fundamentally empathic parenting.

Although Gottman and colleagues (1996, 1997) did not statistically test if emotion coaching was related to authoritative style (thus one of the reasons it was included in this study), they argued that an emotion coaching style was more than just “good” parenting as outlined by Diana Baumrind. One interpretation of the lack of findings in this study may be that elements of an emotion coaching parenting style are different from those aspects of authoritative parenting. That is, Gottman and colleagues (1996, 1997) agree that authoritative parenting is linked with desirable outcomes in childhood such as positive social and academic development. However, they argue that emotion coaching parenting may bring something different to the parent-child interaction. Gottman suggests that the authoritative parent may not always exhibit the ability to maneuver within the world of emotions, whereas an emotion coach is very knowledgeable about emotions and able to aid their children in emotional understanding. With this said, one can see how this statement could be argued by some researchers such as Baumrind (e.g., 1967, 1971) who has indirectly and directly suggested that authoritative parenting is representative of good emotional quality to parent-child relationships. Further research should be done to examine this relation (or lack of relation) further.

Finally, results show that there are no significant relations between either type of parental emotional style and permissive parenting. Specific hypotheses were not generated in this regard because of the lack of conceptual links between the two variables. Overall, permissive indulgent parenting is a reflection of warm parenting paired with little control. In this respect, it is also clear that the permissive parent does not take the time to talk with their child about parentally imposed rules, and this may relate to conversing about emotional issues within the home as well. One possible reason

that there were no relations found in this regard may be that parental emotional styles are “tapping into” different aspects of parenting than the permissive typology. Permissive parents do not insist on children following pre-set parentally defined standards. It can be speculated that both the emotion coaching and the emotion dismissing parenting styles reflect sets of “emotional” standards that must be followed. The emotion coaching parent provides a climate that expects and encourages standards involved with teaching and learning about the socialization of emotions. On the other hand, emotion dismissing parents have standards that are set in a climate of emotional disregard and lack of awareness.

In sum, although these findings do not support the present hypotheses, some expected directions of associations were found. Albeit non-significant, emotion dismissing parenting style was positively related to an authoritarian disciplinary style and negatively associated with authoritative disciplinary style. Similarly, emotion coaching was negatively associated with authoritarian and positively associated with authoritative disciplinary styles (again, non-significantly).

Additionally, it may be that parental emotional styles are associated with certain aspects of disciplinary styles that were not assessed in this dissertation. For example, emotion dismissing parenting may be related to non-reasoning or directiveness strategies and emotion coaching may be associated with warmth and involvement. Future researchers may want to consider examining the individual elements of the disciplinary styles to determine if there are relations present. It is clear that although the hypotheses relating to parental emotional styles and disciplinary typologies were not supported, it does open the area to further study.

Parental Emotional Styles and Belief Systems

Parenting goals. The construct validity of the PESQ was also explored by examining relations with parental belief systems. Findings demonstrated conceptually and theoretically expected relations between parenting goals and an emotion dismissing style. It was hypothesized that a dismissing style would be associated with parent-centered goals within situations marked by misbehaviour. This hypothesis was supported. Specifically, parent-centered goals (i.e., outcomes that reflect the parent's needs coming before the child's needs) were found to be positively related to emotion dismissing style in situations marked by both misbehaviour and prosocial interactions. Parents who utilize parent-centered goals are characteristically interested in establishing authority, obtaining compliance, respect, and obedience from their child (Hastings and Grusec, 1998). These elements of the parent-centered goals are displayed in the hope of maintaining an obedient, respectful child, who will be unlikely to misbehave in the future. Because central to parent-centered goals is the desire to meet own rather than the child's needs, it is possible to suggest that this parenting belief may not be conducive to meeting a child's emotional needs. In fact, this speculation has been supported with the current findings across two different contexts.

Patterns in the data suggested that regardless of situations marked by misbehaviour or prosocial behaviour, mothers who were rated higher on an emotion dismissing philosophy tended to espouse goals related to meeting her needs and not her child's needs. For example, it may be that during a highly emotional episode (i.e., misbehaviour), a parent focussed on his/her goals only may not take the time to allow the child to experience the emotion and will try to fix the situation immediately to alleviate

some of the stress. This stress may be due to the theory that the parent does not have the tools to deal with the highly emotional state. Also, the finding with respect to the prosocial scenario offers insight into the parenting beliefs of a mother rated higher on emotion dismissing. It can be speculated that these mothers may not have the emotional knowledge to deal with characteristics of a prosocial situation. And presumably, some of these characteristics would involve a positive emotional climate. One way to interpret these findings is to suggest that mothers rated higher on emotion dismissing focus on their goals only, even within situations when her child is experiencing a positive emotional encounter. In this respect, it may be that mothers rated higher on emotion dismissing cannot successfully deal with positive emotions, and therefore try to control the situation by focussing on their own goals, while neglecting to share in the positive situation with their child. In all, it seems that a dismissing parenting style is represented by ridding the characteristics of misbehaviour and prosocial situations, regardless of whether the characteristics are generally represented by positive or negative emotions.

It was hypothesized that emotion coaching style would be positively related to relationship centered goals across the two situations. This hypothesis was supported. Findings suggest that relationship-centered goals (i.e., outcomes that reflect a balanced concern over child and parent needs) were found to be positively related to an emotion coaching style in situations marked by misbehaviour and prosocial interactions. Parents who utilize relationship-centered goals are characteristically interested in problem solving in fair and balanced ways and reaching mutually acceptable outcomes (Hastings and Grusec, 1998). Further, a desired outcome of parents who possess relationship-centered goals is to maintain emotional harmony of their child in the long-term. Because

central to relationship-centered goals is the desire to address and meet both the parents and children's needs, it is sound to suggest that this parenting belief is well suited to meeting a child's emotional needs.

The aforementioned explanation has been supported with the current findings across both the prosocial and misbehaviour scenarios. Regardless of positive or negative situations, a mother rated as higher emotion coaching espoused a greater desire in maintaining the dyadic nature of her relationship with her child. And, an emotion coaching parenting style was not found to be related to parent-centered goals in either of the two hypothetical situations. Taken together, implications of these findings suggest that even in the face of misbehaviour, mothers rated as higher on emotion coaching are concerned about her relationship with her child, and her child's well being. This is reminiscent of the characteristics of an emotion coaching mother outlined by Gottman (1996, 1997). Further, the issues surrounding context add to current knowledge.

Parental attributions. Parental attributions are causal factors that parents focus on to explain why certain behaviours occur (e.g., Dix, 1993; Hastings & Coplan, 1999) and in past research (e.g., Hastings & Rubin, 1999) it has been found that parental attributions can be described along internal vs. external loci of control. It was predicted that internal attributions for misbehaviour situations episodes would be positively related to emotion dismissing parenting styles. This line of reasoning came from past studies that have found that internal attributions for misbehaviours have been linked to punitive techniques which most closely resemble an emotion dismissing style. The relations between emotion dismissing parenting and attributions within prosocial situations were primarily exploratory in nature. However, given that there would be no specific affect to dismiss, it

was thought that perhaps mothers high on emotion dismissing would be developmental optimists and attribute prosocial behaviours to internal child characteristics.

In all, there were no significant associations (although the direction of effects would suggest that parents high on emotion dismissing would attribute misbehaviour and prosocial behaviour to external circumstances). It may be that because the emotion dismissing style is not as characteristically punitive as other parenting constructs such as an authoritarian approach to discipline, that these dismissing parents are not overly predisposed to blaming their child for misbehaviours, for example. This finding may add to the literature by suggesting that emotion dismissing parents do not view their children's negative emotions as representing dispositional, or even stable characteristics. In fact, that these parents try to rid the emotions immediately may provide insight into their beliefs that negative emotions are changeable, although further research would have to be done to explore this further.

It was also hypothesized in this study that external attributions would be positively related to emotion coaching parenting styles within situations marked by misbehaviour. Although this hypothesis was not supported, the relation was in the proper direction. Past studies have found that external attributions have been linked to parental feelings of confidence in altering child behaviour. The confidence that stems from these attributions may be speculated to be the "window" that is needed to promote dyadic conversation between parent and child, or perhaps even lead to a willingness to discuss emotions with their children during times of misbehaviour. In addition, these parents may be more apt to want to understand why their child is experiencing a particular

emotion and to discuss emotional experiences with their child. Perhaps with a larger sample this hypothesis would have been supported.

In addition, it was thought that, internal attributions would be associated with emotion coaching parenting style in prosocial scenarios. Again, this hypothesis was not supported, but the relation was in the expected direction. It was suggested earlier that mothers who are rated higher on emotion coaching may attribute their children's prosocial behaviours to internal characteristics. This line of thought came from Dix et al. (1986) who have suggested that more internal attributions are made regarding children's prosocial-type behaviours than misbehaviours. And, it was further hypothesized that these same parents may view their children's prosocial behaviours as being directly related to the internalization of parental meta-emotion philosophy. Again, it can be speculated that with a larger sample this relation may become significant.

Parental emotional responses. Finally, correlations between emotional responses to prosocial and misbehaviour situations and emotion dismissing parenting style were examined to add to the construct validity of the scale. It can be recalled that the majority of these hypothesized relations were based on conceptual links and were, for the most part, exploratory in nature.

It was not clear whether negative emotional responses would be associated with emotion dismissing parenting style in situations marked by misbehaviour. For one, it was hypothesized that negative emotions such as anger and embarrassment may be positively associated to an emotion dismissing parenting style. These hypotheses, although partly exploratory in nature, were derived from past research that suggests that negative emotional responses are linked to power-assertive techniques in noncompliant or

aggressive situations (Coplan, et al., under review). Also, conceptually, an emotion dismissing parenting style has been characterized as having elements of negative emotions such as feelings of fear, uncomfort, and anxiety over a child's emotional state. The results of this study support these hypotheses. It was determined that an emotion dismissing parenting style was positively associated with angry and embarrassed emotional responses during episodes marked by child misbehaviour. It can be recalled that this same parenting style was associated with parent-centered goals during times of misbehaviour. These findings may reflect that a mother who espouses a dismissing style has outcomes in mind related to her own needs (i.e., extinguishing the emotional climate) during situations marked by misbehaviour. Further, she will become angry and embarrassed if the affect related to the misbehaviour situation is not tempered.

Interestingly, emotion dismissing style was also linked with feelings of responsibility during prosocial episodes, but not in episodes of misbehaviour. In essence, this finding suggests that dismissing parents take responsibility for their children's positive behaviour, but will not take responsibility when the behaviour is negative. This may reflect the emotion dismissing parent's attempts to rid negative emotions quickly and immediately so that responsibility does not fall upon the parent. After all, previous findings in this study have shown that moms rated higher on emotion dismissing do not tend to place internal blame on their children for negative-type behaviour. Since the parent would be the next likely individual to blame for child misbehaviour (especially in this age group) it is in the best interest of the parent to quickly rid the emotion.

Correlations between emotional responses to prosocial and misbehaviour situations and emotion coaching parenting style were also examined. In this part of the

study, clear hypotheses were not suggested with respect to negative-type emotions in misbehaviour scenarios. There was some ambivalence as to the decision whether emotion coaches would feel more emotions across different scenarios, or show more constraint and feel relatively less emotional (and presumably less overtly emotional) in an attempt to teach their children about emotion regulation. The results of this study have provided some very interesting findings.

First, there were no significant relations noted between emotion coaching and angry or embarrassed emotions within situations marked by misbehaviour or prosocial interactions. This finding may suggest that emotion coaches have the ability to regulate and control their own feelings of emotions during situations of child misbehaviour and this may be reflected in regulation of overt behaviours as well. This is in contrast to the mother who displays the emotion dismissing style and who feels these negative emotions and therefore may lack the ability to regulate her emotions.

Interestingly, emotion coaching style was linked with feelings of responsibility during prosocial and misbehaviour episodes. In all, this finding suggests that these parents will take responsibility for their children's "good" and "bad" behaviour. This finding may mirror the emotion coaching parent's desire to talk with their children about emotional responses in a variety of situations. Feelings of responsibility in each situation may promote dyadic communication in an attempt to teach the child about context appropriate behaviours and emotions. This idea is further strengthened by the positive relations between emotion coaching and relationship-centered goals across the two distinct situations. Because mothers who are rated higher on coaching are also concerned about outcomes related to both herself and her child within "good" and "bad" situations,

it stands to reason that she would feel responsible for their children's behaviour in each situation as well. After all, if there is concern over fair and balanced outcomes during times of misbehaviour for example, these parents may feel responsible to discuss behavioural transgressions with their children in the hopes of teaching about appropriate expression of behaviour. Presumably, this fits nicely with one of the characteristics of an emotion coaching style: to set limits on the behavioural expression of emotion.

Summary

To summarize, the major goal of this study was to establish the psychometric properties of the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire (PESQ). Specifically, factor structure and internal consistency, short-term stability, and construct validity were examined. Overall, preliminary data was provided to support the PESQ as a reliable and valid alternative measure for the assessment of parental emotional styles. Moreover, the results from this study provided insight into the nature of emotion coaching and emotion dismissing in relation to well established constructs of parenting such as disciplinary styles, parenting beliefs (goals, attributions), and emotional responses.

It is necessary to mention that the PESQ may only be addressing a small aspect of Gottman's Meta-Emotion Interview. Therefore, the next step for the PESQ is to validate it against Gottman's Meta-Emotion Interview. Although preliminary results show promising psychometric properties for the scale vis a vis factor structure, item scale analysis, relations with parental belief systems and emotional responses, as well as moderate short-term stability of the scale, the ultimate test of the measure would be to examine its construct validity in reference to the Interview. Recently, contact was made with one of the major authors of the Interview and communication has begun to

undertake this task. It is hoped that preliminary results to further the psychometric stability of the PESQ will be available shortly.

Although caveats will be examined in a later section of this dissertation, it needs to be clarified that there may be some empirical implications of examining only one prosocial scenario versus an aggregate of three “misbehaviour” scenarios. The possibility arises that the stronger relations noted within misbehaviour scenarios may be due to the broader conceptualization of misbehaviours versus prosocial behaviours. Future research needs to examine different aspects of prosocial behaviours to clarify these relations.

The next study in this dissertation focused on applying this newly developed scale to models examining the linear and nonlinear relations between a parent’s emotional style, child regulation, and social outcomes.

Study 2

Parental Emotional Styles, Child Regulation, and Adjustment to Preschool

A psychometrically sound self-report measure of emotional styles was established in the first study. Further, the relations between emotional styles, disciplinary typologies, parenting beliefs, and emotional responses were explored. Given this, the goal of the second study was to test a model exploring the pathways between emotional styles, child regulation, and adjustment in a preschool setting. In the review that follows, hypothesized mediating (indirect relations) and moderating (interaction between parenting emotional styles and temperamental characteristics) relations are explored. Although there is a paucity of research to support these relations with social adjustment, many theorized links are introduced and tested in the proposed theoretical model.

Emotional Styles and Child Outcomes

As described in Study 1, variations in parenting constructs such as parenting styles and parenting beliefs have been defined both as risk factors for children developing problem behaviors and as beneficial aspects to a child's social adjustment (see for example, Dix, 1985, 1992, 1993; Patterson, 1986; Paterson & Sanson, 1999; Stice & Gonzales, 1998). However, to date, very little is known about the relations between parental emotional styles and social adjustment. Fundamentally, Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) are the only researchers who have published findings regarding the associations between emotion coaching and dismissing and childhood adjustment. To reiterate from the introduction to Study 1, Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) have discovered that an emotion coaching style influences (both directly and indirectly) child outcomes such as peer

relations, physical illness, and academic success. Although these findings have provided an impetus for future research, they are very tentative because of the methodological issues outlined earlier in this paper. Also as described earlier in this dissertation, other researchers have found that emotional communication between parents and children fosters positive adjustment. Positive peer relations (Cassidy et al., 1992) and a solid base for understanding own and other emotions (Bretherton et al., 1986; Dunn et al., 1991) have been linked to a strong dyadic emotional bond between parents and children.

However, there are other factors that may mediate or moderate the relations between parenting and child outcomes. Some of these factors include variables related to child characteristics. In this next study, the role of variables related to child regulation in the relations between parenting and child outcomes is explored. More specifically, negative affect, emotion regulation, and behavioural regulation are examined to determine their relations with parental emotional styles and aggressive, anxious, and prosocial behaviours in early childhood. The structure of this introduction is to first introduce traditional conceptualizations of child regulation. From there, the variables which are of interest to this study, namely negative affect, emotion regulation, and behaviour regulation are described and elucidated.

Child Regulation and Child Outcomes

Some researchers have conceptualized issues of child regulation from a temperamental perspective. Bates (1989) and others (e.g, Campos, Barrett, Lamb, Goldsmith, & Sternberg, 1983) have suggested that temperament is a stable consistent organismic "behavioral disposition" that is discernable over time and persistent across contexts. Moreover, these temperamental dispositions have powerful effects on the

reactions of other people to the individual, and allow others to anticipate the actions of the individual under varying circumstances (Prior, 1992).

Rothbart (1988) has defined temperament as individual differences in reactivity and regulation. Reactivity is an individual difference variable which refers to the intensity of emotional experience (Rubin et al., 1995). Antithetically, regulation is a reflection of the child's ability to control or modulate reactivity and may include changes in attention and efforts to self-soothe (Rubin et al., 1995). According to Rothbart (1988), both reactivity and regulation function together to produce patterns of behaviour that are essential to a child's developing personality. For the purposes of this study, Rothbart's conceptualization of regulation was used. Specifically, emotionality (also termed negative affect in this study), emotion regulation, and behaviour regulation were examined as aspects of child regulation.

Emotionality. Emotionality is a common theme in various views of temperamental dispositions or regulation (Thompson, 1999). For the most part, negative emotionality (i.e., negative affectivity) represents a proneness to negative emotional experiences including dysphoria, anxiety, irritation, preoccupation, anger, and fear. Individuals high in negative affectivity tend to be distressed, upset, nervous, and tense even in the absence of negative external stressors (Watson & Clark, 1984). Emotionality is often assessed as a measure of temperament (see Bates, 1989; Goldsmith & Campos, 1982), and is often the combination of different child characteristics. For example, Buss and Plomin (1984) combine frequency and intensity of emotionality to form a single construct of affect, and Thomas and Chess (1977) typically define reactivity as intensity of emotional responding.

More recently, along similar conceptual lines, Larsen and Diener (1987) have studied affect intensity as a measure of temperamental disposition. Instead of examining frequency of emotionality (e.g., Izard, 1982), Larsen and Diener examined affect intensity, that is, the intensity of emotions when they are experienced rather than how frequently they are experienced. They have reported that affect intensity correlates positively with negative affectivity and distress in emotion inducing contexts (Larsen & Diener, 1987).

Emotionality and adjustment. A number of empirical investigations have found temperament and emotionality to be associated with various dimensions of developmental adjustment such as academic achievement (e.g., Coplan, et al., 1999; Martin, 1989; Moller, 1983; Pullis & Cadwell, 1982), internalizing and externalizing problems (e.g., Caspi, Henry, McGee, Moffitt, & Silva, 1995; Caspi & Silva, 1995), and positive social skills (Bates, Bayles, Bennett, Ridge, & Brown, 1991). Further, other researchers have found emotionality to be related to negative behaviours and behavioural problems in childhood (e.g., Bates, 1990; Kyrios & Prior, 1990) like anti-social behaviour (Krueger et al., 1994), and aggression (Rothbart, Ahadi, & Hershey, 1994).

Emotional versus behavioural regulation. Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) proposed and supported the hypothesis that physiological regulation in children is associated with parental emotional styles. This finding has furthered the understanding of physiological regulation and its function in guiding children towards an optimal state for the reception and delivery of sensory information (Stern, 1985). Eisenberg (1996) has suggested that it is important to conceive of regulation from multiple perspectives. Therefore, this study expands on Gottman's findings by examining parental emotional styles in relation to

emotion and behavioural regulation. In the following section these constructs are explored. A review of the past literature has established each as a correlate of social adjustment in preschool.

Emotion regulation. Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) reported a dimension of emotion regulation (i.e., vagal tone) to be a correlate of both parental emotional style and social adjustment. Mirrored by the intense study of emotion regulation during the past decade, there exists several different definitions and approaches to studying this construct. Because of the many conceptualizations, for the purposes of this dissertation, emotion regulation was defined as the process of initiating, maintaining, modulating or changing the occurrence, intensity, or duration of internal feeling states usually in order to accomplish a goal (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1992). Within current models, this type of regulation often includes regulation of attention such as attention shifting and focussing on task related channels (e.g., Derryberry & Rothbart, 1988).

Research on regulation has blossomed in the past few years (e.g., Guthrie & Reiser, 1999; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1992; 1994; 1995; Rubin, et al., 1995; Zeman, Penza, Shipman, & Young, 1997). For example, Eisenberg and various colleagues (e.g., 1995; 1996; 1997; 1998; 1999) have consistently examined emotion regulation as involving the control of impinging stimuli and internal states. Originally this view of emotion regulation was borrowed from past (and current) models of temperament which frequently involve attention processes such as attention shifting and attention focussing.

Temperament researchers (e.g., Derryberry & Rothbart, 1988; Rothbart, et al. 1994) have found that the ability to control attention is associated with relatively low levels of negative emotion in adults and infants. That is, individuals who can regulate

their emotional arousal through the allocation of attention react more positively to stressful events (Derryberry & Rothbart, 1988). Further, Rothbart, et al. (1994) have found positive relations between good emotion regulation (i.e., attention control) and several social adjustment constructs relevant to social competence (e.g., empathy).

Kellam (1994) found that problems in concentration played a central role in the development of shy and aggressive behaviour and poor academic skills in first grade children. And, in a study to explore the relations between emotionality, emotion regulation, and preschooler's adaptation, Rubin et al. (1995) reported an interaction between the inability to regulate emotions and sociability in the prediction of social maladaptation (e.g., internalizing and externalizing problems).

In Eisenberg and Colleagues' recent research on emotion regulation (e.g., see Eisenberg and others 1995; 1996; 1997; 1998; 1999), attentional control (operationally defined as the aggregates of attention shifting, and focussing) has been traditionally examined with the Derryberry and Rothbart (1988) temperament scales and the Child Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ), Rothbart et al., 1994). Clearly then, one method to measure emotion regulation is through the exploration of specific temperamental traits (also see Rubin et al., 1995 for support of this position). Each scale provides separate scores for attentional shifting and focussing, and can be combined to form a total attentional control scale score.

As mentioned previously, a purpose of this study is to examine regulation from multiple perspectives. Because Eisenberg and colleagues' approach to assessing emotion regulation has been found to be reliable in a number of studies, their approach will be adopted for this study. However, because the attentional perspective to emotion

regulation can be assessed reliably with the use of only one scale, and also to reduce the burden on mothers, only the CBQ (Rothbart, 1996) was administered.

Behavioural regulation. Recently, Eisenberg (1996) has suggested that it would be productive to examine regulation from more than one perspective. That is, researchers have traditionally conceived of regulation as strictly “emotion regulation”, neglecting to consider other facets such as behavioural regulation. In other words, regulation may also be conceptualized as the regulation of emotionally driven behaviour (once emotion has occurred). Traditionally, this subtype of regulation has been examined in research on constructs such as behavioural inhibition and self-regulation that involve the ability to modulate the behavioural expression of impulses and/or feelings (Eisenberg, 1996). From this, one way to conceive of behavioural regulation is the ability to modulate or change the duration of behavioural concomitants of emotion (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1992). Behavioural regulation is involved with the communication of emotion and the inhibition or activation of behaviour. Thus, the research supports that the critical difference between emotion and behavioural regulation is the locus of regulation: internal psychological and physiological reactions or overt behaviours.

With this said, one way to conceptualize behavioural regulation is to consider as the inhibition and activation of behaviour. As such, Eisenberg and various colleagues (e.g., 1995; 1996; 1997; 1998; 1999) have traditionally examined inhibitory control as the barometer to measure behavioural self-regulation. Inhibitory control, as previously explained, has been found to modulate the behavioural expression of impulses and feelings. Further, Kochanska, Murray, and Coy (1997) have described inhibitory behaviour as impacting on children's abilities to plan and pursue desired goals. Eisenberg

and others (e.g., 1995; 1996; 1997; 1999; 1998) have consistently used subscales from the Child Behaviour Questionnaire (Rothbart et al., 1994) as measures to assess behavioural regulation. Particularly, the most commonly employed subscales assess impulsivity (e.g., “usually rushes into an activity without thinking about it”), and inhibitory control (e.g., “can wait to enter into new activity if asked to”). Because 1) an objective of this study was to examine regulation from a multidimensional perspective; 2) because behavioural regulation has not been examined in relation to parental emotional styles in the literature extant; and 3) because the CBQ has been used successfully in the past, Eisenberg and colleagues approach to measuring behavioural regulation was employed.

Regulation and adjustment. It has already been alluded to that emotional and behavioural regulation appear to impact on a number of child social and developmental domains. For example, Eisenberg et al. (1995) reported that socially appropriate behaviour (including low levels of aggressive and disruptive behaviour) was positively related to high levels of behavioural regulation. Additionally, Eisenberg and Fabes (1995) found that regulatory capabilities are associated with general social skills and sociometric status. Further, Eisenberg et al. (1998) reported that children’s shyness was negatively related to the ability to regulate emotions and behaviours. Moreover, longitudinal studies with children have reported that behavioural undercontrol is related to externalizing problems (Caspi, et al. 1995). Clearly, the ability to regulate emotions and behaviours has a profound impact on the social development of children.

Child regulation and parenting. As suggested in a previous section, emotion regulation can be influenced by external sources such as parenting. Gottman et al.(1996,

1997) argued that parental coaching philosophies about the expression of emotion affects parents' inhibition of negative affect toward the child and facilitate positive parenting, as well as directly affect children's regulatory physiology and the ability to regulate their own emotions (positive relations). In their view, parents' supportive emotion coaching provides the opportunity for children to develop the ability to inhibit negative affect, to self-soothe, and to focus attention. These skills are expected to enhance socially skilled behaviours. Antithetically, children whose parents dismiss negative emotions and do not talk about them with children in a supportive way are expected to be relatively low in the ability to manage both their emotions and their attention in social situations. Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) suggested that this is especially true if the parent mocks or belittles the child. In general, Gottman and colleagues found that parents who were relatively aware and supportive of these expressions of emotion (rather than the reverse) had children who were well regulated and therefore could manage their emotional arousal in social contexts, and this included being less aggressive with peers in social contexts.

Eisenberg et al. (1997) have supported this position in a recent study of parents reported reactions to children's negative emotions. Children whose mothers minimized or were punitive of these emotions experienced low levels of socially appropriate behaviour, coping, and popularity. In another study (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1994) parental negative reactions were correlated with children's real-life reactions when anger or frustrated. Minimized and punitive reactions were associated with escape (coping) behaviours when faced with a stressful situation.

Other supportive empirical evidence for Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) comes from Carson and Parke (1996) who found that children whose fathers tended to respond to

displays of negative emotion with negative emotion were less socially skilled (i.e., shared less, avoided others more, and were more aggressive) than their preschool peers.

Moreover, results from research also suggests that in general, punitive, nonsupportive parenting (obtained from parental reports) is associated with negative outcomes and problem behaviour for children (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Based on the above findings of Gottman and colleagues, Eisenberg and Colleagues, and others, it was expected that parental emotional styles would be associated with children's regulation. However, little research has been conducted to examine the mediated and moderated influences of child regulation on the relations between parenting and child outcomes. These issues are addressed in an upcoming section.

Direction of relations. It is evident from this review that aspects of a child's regulation may influence development in another way. Until now, it has been suggested that the direction of influence between parent and child is from the parent to the child. Plomin, DeFries, and Loehlin (1977) and Scarr and McCartney (1983) report that a child's behavioural style may evoke certain reactions from others such as how a child with a temperamentally sunny disposition will elicit smiles and interest from peers and parents (Plomin et al., 1977). These positive social reactions are likely, in turn, to influence the child's development and the growth of personality attributes (such as sociability) much differently from the reactions evoked by a child with a difficult temperamental profile (Thompson, 1999).

Moreover, Cook, Kenny and Goldstein (1991) and Fish, Stifter and Belsky (1991) found that adolescent's and young children's expression of negative affect toward their parents seemed to elicit negative parental affect directed toward them. Further, Eisenberg

and Fabes (1994) found that mothers' perceptions of children's temperament were significantly related to mother's reports of their reactions to negative emotions. And, in another study mothers' perceptions of girls' negative emotionality were positively related to maternal reports of minimizing the child's negative emotion and were negatively correlated with reports of helping or encouraging their child to solve the problem that caused the negative emotion (Eisenberg et al., 1997). So, contrary to Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) preliminary findings, it would seem that there is at least partial evidence for aspects of children's regulation driving parenting responses. It has yet to be confirmed that regulation influences emotion coaching and emotion dismissing parenting styles as Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) conceptualized the typologies.

Summary. Various aspects of parenting (including parental emotional styles) are related to child outcomes. Also, research has provided examples of relations between aspects of a child's regulation and social adjustment. Moreover, it is also reasonable to suggest that there are associations between child regulation and various aspects of parenting, including relations with parental emotional styles (Gottman et al, 1996, 1997). However, the relations with parental emotional styles have only been examined in a few select studies. Therefore the literature would benefit from further exploration to determine if replication is possible. Furthermore, it is not fully understood if the child regulation variables mediate the relation between parental emotional styles and outcomes in childhood. And, moderated hypotheses between parental emotional styles and aspects of child regulation have received little attention. As such, each of these relations were examined in this study. The child outcome variables used in this study included aggressive, anxious, and prosocial behaviours in preschool.

Parenting, Regulation, and Social Adjustment: Mediating and Moderating Relations

There are various possible mechanisms that may explain the relation between parental emotional styles and the social adjustment of children. To begin with there may be a direct causal link between these variables. In this case, the parental style would directly effect aggression, anxiety, and/or prosocial behaviours. It is also conceivable that both of these constructs are associated with child regulation. For example, it may be that emotion coaching is positively related to emotion regulation which is positively related to prosocial behaviours. Finally, it may be that parental emotional styles interact with child regulation to predict adjustment. In this study, all three of these possibilities are considered.

A number of studies have examined the contribution of aspects of regulation (as defined in this dissertation), and parenting disciplinary techniques to social adjustment in childhood. However, there has been very little attempt to examine the separate contribution of parental emotional styles and dimensions of regulation to social adjustment in the same study. Further, the parenting literature lacks of investigation of possible interactions between parental emotional styles and various aspects of regulation to predict social adjustment.

In a few studies researchers have examined the interaction effects of aspects of regulation and other parenting variables (e.g., Campbell, 1997; Martin, 1981; Stice & Gonzales, 1998). For example, Campbell (1997) reported that negative maternal control combined with maternal rating of child behavioural problems were associated with high teacher ratings of externalizing problems. Further, Martin (1981) found that high mother responsiveness and low infant demandingness influenced later child compliance. More

recently, Stice and Gonzales (1998) found support for the hypothesis that adolescent temperament moderates the relations between parenting and social adjustment. They reported that maternal and paternal control evidenced stronger relations to anti-social behaviour at elevated levels of behavioural undercontrol. Similarly, it was reported in the same study that the combination of paternal support and behavioural undercontrol were associated with risky behaviour such as illicit drug use. Stice and Gonzales (1998) reported that the magnitude of the relations between parenting and problem behaviours were stronger for adolescents who evidenced the temperamental risk factor of elevated behavioural undercontrol. The Goodness of fit theory is one conceptual framework that can be applied to understand the aforementioned findings.

Goodness of fit. Thomas and Chess (1977) have argued that the goodness of fit between child temperament and the requirements and opportunities of the surrounding environment is a major contributor to child adjustment. Goodness of fit has been examined from a variety of perspectives including pupil-teacher interactions (Keogh, 1986), adjustment to preschool (Klein, 1982), and more recently parent-child interactions (Paterson & Sanson, 1999).

In terms of a parent-child paradigm, goodness of fit refers to the extent that parenting characteristics and child characteristics are well matched. If a child possesses the characteristics that help him/her cope adequately with the expectations of the environment then a “good fit” would be present. In this case, the outcome would be positive behavioural adjustment (Paterson & Sanson, 1999). Alternatively, if a child does not have the characteristics that are well suited to the environmental demands, deleterious outcomes may result.

In this vein, Thomas and Chess (1977) reported that a child who has a slow-to-warm-up temperament is more likely to experience developmental problems if their parents cannot accommodate their children's style (i.e., insisting on rapid adaptation). Intuitively, this characterization may be similar to the emotion dismissing parent hypothesized by Gottman et al. (1996, 1997). Antithetically, children with difficult temperament may avoid maladjustment if their parents adjust their behaviour and expectations to accommodate their children's temperament and behaviour. Speculation may lead one to suggest that an emotion coaching parent may be better “emotionally equipped” in this situation because of the heightened awareness of their own and their child's emotions.

Eisenberg et al. (1999) supported the importance of identifying environmental factors that influence change in children's expression of temperament. This echoes the Goodness of Fit theory which suggests that a good fit occurs when the child's characteristics (e.g., temperament) are adequate to cope with the expectations of the environment in which he/she is functioning, thereby providing positive adjustment (Thomas, Chess, & Birch, 1968).

In essence, there has been very limited attention to the goodness of fit theory with respect to parental emotional styles and child regulation variables. As such, in the present study the goodness of fit theory was used as a conceptual framework to speculate on the results of moderated analyses.

Summary of hypotheses

Based on the existing literature, it is hypothesized that high negative emotionality, lower regulatory ability (emotion and behavioural) and an emotional dismissing parenting

style would be associated concurrent child behaviour problems. It was also expected that lower negative emotionality, higher regulatory ability (i.e., emotion regulation, behavioural regulation), and an emotion coaching parenting style would be associated with positive social adjustment in preschool.

Indirect relations between parenting styles and adjustment were explored. For example, it was of interest to determine if emotional styles would predict social adjustment over and above the child-centered temperamental characteristics (i.e., emotionality, emotion regulation, and behavioural regulation). In the previous review it was shown that each of the temperamental characteristics is linked to a variety of child adjustment variables. However, research has yet to determine if an emotion coaching or emotion dismissing parental emotional style can predict social adjustment when the variance accounted for by regulation (as defined in this study) is removed. These analyses would allow for the exploration of indirect pathways (from parenting through child regulation, to adjustment) to be explored.

Finally, interactions or moderating associations between parental emotional styles and regulatory characteristics were explored in the prediction of outcomes. Because past researchers have spent little time examining such interaction effects, hypotheses in this area are primarily exploratory in nature. For example, it is possible that emotional dismissing parenting style may not be associated with negative outcomes among children with higher regulatory ability (high emotion regulation, high behavioural regulation, or low negative affect) In the same vein, coaching parents may be associated with positive outcomes with children rated with an opposite pattern of regulatory characteristics.

Figure 3 summarizes these relations.

Figure 3. Study 2 Model: The mediating and moderating relations between parental emotional styles, regulation constructs, and social adjustment outcomes

Assessing Adjustment in Preschool

From the existing literature it is clear that there are numerous ways to operationally define children's preschool adjustment (see for example, Carey Fox, & McDevitt, 1977; Coplan, Wichmann, Lagace-Seguin, Rachlis, & McVey, 1999; Coplan et al., 1999; Fox & Field, 1988; Jewsuwan, Luster, & Kostelnik, 1993; Skarpness & Carson, 1987; Slee, 1986, Zjademan & Minnes, 1991). However for the most part, researchers determine social adjustment in preschool in terms of the presence or lack of behaviour problems (see Achenbach, Howell, Quay, & Conners, 1991). And, behaviour problems can be examined from many different perspectives such as anxiety and aggression.

Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) have examined elements of externalizing (i.e., peer aggression) and internalizing (i.e., frequency of negative emotions) problems in their past research. However, another dimension that is worthy of attention when examining social adjustment is positive behaviour such as social competence (e.g., Tremblay, Vitaro, Gagnon, Piche, and Royer, 1992). Therefore, in addition to "problem" outcomes, social competence or prosocial behaviours (i.e., helping behaviours) (e.g., Coplan, Gavinski-Molina, Lagace-Seguin, & Wichmann, in press) were also examined as outcome variables in the present study by utilizing the Child Behaviour Scale (CBS) (Ladd & Profilet, 1996) (Appendix I).

Method

Participants

The participants included 100 mothers, their children (41 males, 59 females, $M_{age}=58.0$ months, $SD_{age}=6.03$ months), and teachers from seven local daycare centers in the Ottawa/Carleton region. Mothers ranged in age from 22 years to 31 years ($M_{age}=28$ years, $SD_{age}=2$ years), were predominately Caucasian, and had university or college education. Thirty-one percent (100/320) of the questionnaires delivered to participants were returned.

Procedure and Measures

A description of this study (see Appendix J) and consent letters (see Appendix K) were delivered to participating daycares in October, 2000. With the help of each daycare director, these materials were distributed to the parents upon leaving their children at the daycare center. The daycare directors informed the teachers about the study and asked for their participation in filling out the one teacher-rating scale. The parents were requested to return the consent forms to their daycare within one week. Once consent forms were returned, the measures packages, along with a demographics page (see Appendix L) were delivered to the daycares to be distributed to the participating mothers and teachers. Each package for the mothers contained three measures and the packages for the teachers included one measure.

Mother's Measures

Parental emotional styles. Parents completed the PESQ (see Study 1 and Appendix H), used to assess the emotion coaching and emotion dismissing styles of the parents. The factor loadings for the emotion dismissing subscale ranged from .62 to .81

and from .51 to .74 for the emotion coaching subscale. The alpha coefficients for the current sample were emotion dismissing $\alpha=.80$, and emotion coaching $\alpha=.78$. The removal of any one item did not increase the overall alpha coefficient.

Child Regulation Characteristics

Negative affect. Specific items from the Affect Intensity Measure (AIM) (Larsen and Diener, 1987) were used to assess the intensity of negative affect (see Appendix M). The AIM is a 40-item questionnaire that assesses the characteristic magnitude or intensity with which an individual experiences emotions. All items were written to assess the intensity dimension, unconfounded with the frequency with which specific emotions occur. Test-retest reliability for the total AIM at 1-, 2-, and 3-month intervals are .80, .81, and .81 respectively (Larsen, 1984). The validity of the AIM has been assessed relative to parental report and peer report of emotional response intensity. Larsen & Diener (1987) report that parental report of emotional intensity correlated .50 with the AIM. Peer reports correlated .41 with the AIM. And, affect intensity correlates positively with negative affectivity as well as autonomic arousal and reports of distress in emotion-inducing contexts but again, seems to reflect more than just frequency of negative emotionality (Larsen & Diener, 1987).

Although the AIM was originally designed as a self-report measure of affect intensity, it has been used successfully as a maternal report measure of children's general, positive, and negative emotionality (personal communication with Nancy Eisenberg, February, 2000) (e.g., see Eisenberg and various colleagues, 1994, 1995, 1998, 1999). Taking from this past research, only those items that refer to a child's negative affect

were examined in this study. Eisenberg has reported good internal consistency of the items pertaining to negative affect ($\alpha=.88$). The alpha for variables in the present study was $\alpha=.84$.

Behavioural regulation. Two subscales from the Child Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ, Rothbart, 1996) were used to assess dimensions of behavioural regulation (see Appendix N). The 13-item impulsivity (e.g., “usually rushes into an activity without thinking about it”) subscale (reversed), and the 13 item inhibitory control (e.g., “can wait before entering into a new activity if asked to”) subscale was used to assess behavioural regulation. Rothbart (1996) reported alpha coefficients for these subscales of $\alpha=.78$ and $\alpha=.74$, respectively. The alpha coefficient for the present study were similar: $\alpha=.76$ and $\alpha=.79$ for impulsivity and inhibitory control, respectively. Combined (and reversed where necessary) the alpha coefficient was $\alpha=.77$ for behavioural regulation.

Emotion regulation. Also from the CBQ (Rothbart, 1996), the 14-item attention focussing (e.g., “sometimes becomes absorbed in a picture book and looks at it for a long time”) subscale, and the 12 item attention shifting (e.g., “can easily shift from one activity to another”) subscale was used to assess emotional regulation. Rothbart (1996) reported alpha coefficients for these subscales of $\alpha=.74$ and $\alpha=.72$, respectively. The alphas for the current study were slightly higher: $\alpha=.75$ and $\alpha=.78$ for the attention focussing and attention shifting subscales, respectively. Combined, the alpha coefficient was $\alpha=.76$ for emotion regulation.

Child Adjustment

Aggression, anxiety, and prosocial behaviour To assess children’s adjustment to preschool, teachers completed the Child Behavior Scale (CBS, Ladd & Profilet, 1996)

(see Appendix H) was used. Its psychometric properties have been well established (Ladd & Profilet, 1996), and for the purpose of this study, the aggression, anxiety, and prosocial dimensions were examined. All alphas for the subscales have been shown to be quite stable across time and with different cohorts (aggression $\alpha=.89$ to $\alpha=.92$; anxiety $\alpha=.77$ to $\alpha=.79$; prosocial $\alpha=.91$ to $\alpha=.92$) (Ladd & Profilet, 1996). For the present study, the alpha coefficients were also acceptable (aggression $\alpha=.86$; anxiety $\alpha=.81$; prosocial $\alpha=.88$).

Results

The primary goal of this study was to describe predictive pathways to preschool adjustment from parental emotional styles and child temperamental characteristics. The results section is presented as follows. First, preliminary analyses are presented where assumptions are tested and relations with demographic variables are explored. The second section contains correlations between the parenting, temperament, and outcome variables. Finally, more sophisticated hierarchical regression analyses are performed to examine mediated and moderated relations.

Preliminary Analyses

Data screening. All data were examined for outliers, linearity and homogeneity of variance. Since no assumptions were violated, there was no need to transform the data.

A series of Manovas was performed to explore simple gender differences in all parenting, regulation and negative affect, and outcome variables. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 9. A significant gender difference was only found for prosocial behaviour ($F(4,94)=6.49, p<.05$). Prosocial ratings were higher for girls ($M=2.34, SD=.44$) than for boys ($M=2.08, SD=.33$).

Table 9

Means and Standard Deviation for Boys and Girls on Parenting,
Regulation/Emotionality/ and Outcome Variables

	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>
Parental Emotional Style		
Emotion Coaching _a	3.90 (.46)	3.81 (.76)
Emotion Dismissing _a	3.36 (.73)	3.18 (.55)
Regulation/Emotionality		
Emotion Regulation _b	4.33 (.89)	4.52 (.67)
Behaviour Regulation _b	4.51 (.41)	4.60 (.98)
Negative Affect _c	4.10 (.67)	4.01 (.53)
Outcomes		
Aggression _d	1.55 (.78)	1.46 (.55)
Anxiety _d	1.52 (.46)	1.44 (.44)
Prosocial Behaviour _d	2.08 (.33)	2.34 (.44)

_a 5-point scale

_b 7-point scale

_c 6-point scale

_d 3-point scale

Correlations with demographic variables. Correlations were computed between all demographic variables (e.g., child's age, mother's age, and mother's education) and emotion coaching and emotion dismissing styles (see Table 10). There were no significant correlations found.

Relations between measures of child regulation. Correlations between the emotion regulation, behaviour regulation, and negative affect variables are displayed in Table 11. Negative affect was significantly and negatively associated with emotion regulation ($r = -.29, p < .05$)⁵.

Parental emotional styles and child regulation. Results from correlations between parental emotional style and child regulation variables are displayed in Table 12. Emotion dismissing parenting style was significantly and negatively related to behaviour regulation ($r = -.20, p < .05$). Two separate regression analyses were run to predict emotion coaching and emotion dismissing from the three regulation variables (see Table 13). The three regulation variables did not account for a significant proportion of variance in emotion coaching ($F(3,96) = .23, n.s.$), or emotion dismissing styles ($F(3,96) = 2.24, p < .10$). However, behaviour regulation ($\beta = -.21, p < .05$) exhibited a significant unique contribution to the prediction of a dismissing parenting style.

Parental emotional styles and social outcomes. Results from correlations computed between parental emotional styles and teacher rated anxiety, aggression, and prosocial behaviour are displayed in Table 14. Results revealed no significant correlations.

⁵ Because the regulation variables are not strongly associated and given that they are conceptually distinct variables, they were not aggregated.

Table 10

Correlations between Parental Emotional Styles and Demographic Variables

Parental Emotional Style	<u>Demographic Variables</u>		
	Child's age	Maternal Education	Maternal Age
Emotion Coaching	-.11	-.03	.14
Emotion Dismissing	.02	-.02	-.19

Table 11

Correlations Between Emotion Regulation, Behaviour Regulation, and Negative Affect

	Emotion Regulation	Behaviour Regulation
Negative Affect	-.29*	-.11
Emotion Regulation		.15

*p<.05

Table 12

Correlations between Emotion Coaching and Emotion Dismissing (Separately) with
Emotion Regulation, Behaviour Regulation, and Negative Affect

	<u>Parental Emotional Style</u>	
	Emotion Coaching	Emotion Dismissing
Child Regulation		
Emotion Regulation	.04	.05
Behaviour Regulation	.07	-.20*
Negative Affect	-.05	.13

* $p < .05$

Table 13

Beta Coefficients for Child Regulation Variables in the Prediction of Parental Emotional Styles

Child Regulation	<u>Parental Emotional Style</u>	
	Emotion Coaching	Emotion Dismissing
Emotion regulation	.02	.12
Behaviour regulation	.13	-.21 *
Negative affect	-.03	.14

* $p < .05$

Table 14

Correlations between Emotion Coaching and Emotion Dismissing (separately) With
Social Outcomes

Child Outcome	<u>Parental Emotional Style</u>	
	Emotion Coaching	Emotion Dismissing
Anxiety	.07	-.06
Aggression	.03	.04
Prosocial Behaviour	.09	.03

Child regulation and child outcomes. Correlations between measures of regulation and child outcomes are displayed in Table 15. Results revealed that emotion regulation was significantly and negatively associated with anxiety ($r = -.20$, $p < .05$) and aggression ($r = -.20$, $p < .05$) and significantly and positively associated with prosocial behaviour ($r = .23$, $p < .05$). In addition, behaviour regulation was significantly and negatively associated with anxiety ($r = -.20$, $p < .05$). No significant relations were noted for emotionality.

A series of multiple regression analyses were then computed to examine the magnitude of the relations between child regulation and social outcomes. Table 16 displays the relative importance of the regulation variables in the association with social outcomes. The three regulation variables did not account for a significant proportion of variance in anxious behaviour ($F(3,96) = 2.43$, $p < .10$). In addition, the three regulation variables did not account for a significant proportion of variance in aggression ($F(3,96) = 2.42$, $p < .10$). And, the three regulation variables did not account for a significant proportion of variance in prosocial behaviour ($F(3,96) = 1.50$, n.s.).

Mediated/Indirect Relations

Conceptually, it was postulated that child regulation might mediate the relation between parental emotional styles and child outcomes. However, there were no outcome variables related to both parental emotion coaching and child regulation variables.

Table 15

Correlations between Emotion Regulation, Behaviour Regulation, and Emotionality and Social Outcomes

	Emotion Regulation	Behaviour Regulation	Emotionality
Anxiety	-.20*	-.20*	.08
Aggression	-.20*	-.15	.18
Prosocial Behaviour	.23*	.07	-.09

* $p < .05$

Table 16

Beta Coefficients for Emotion Regulation, Behaviour Regulation, and Negative Affect
Predicting Social Outcomes

	Emotion Regulation	Behaviour Regulation	Emotionality
Anxiety	-.17	-.17	.02
Aggression	-.15	-.12	.12
Prosocial Behaviour	.19	.04	-.04

Therefore, a hierarchical regression analysis was not justified to examine if parental emotional style could predict child outcomes beyond the contribution of child regulation.

Moderated Regression Analyses

Overview. To examine moderated (interactive) pathways in the prediction of child outcomes, interactions between predictor variables (i.e., parental emotional styles and child regulation) were explored using multiple regression analyses. Cohen's partialled products technique (Cohen, 1978, Cohen & Cohen, 1983) was employed where independent variables are first entered into the regression equation as a block, followed by the various interaction terms (as represented by their multiplicative products). At each step, the significance in R^2 change was assessed to determine if each main effect or interaction added to the predictiveness of the overall equation.

As such, standardized interaction terms were created by combining emotion coaching and emotion dismissing (separately and standardized) with each of the three temperamental dimensions (negative affect, emotion regulation, and behavioural regulation—all standardized). Once the interaction terms were created they were then re-standardized. And, these six interactions (i.e, three interactions representing emotion coaching x each of the regulation variables—negative affect, emotion regulation, behaviour regulation; and three interactions representing emotion dismissing x each of the regulation variables—negative affect, emotion regulation, behaviour regulation) were tested in the prediction of the three outcomes (anxiety, aggression, and prosocial behaviour). In all, eighteen interactions were tested.

In order to assess the moderating effects (i.e., each of these interaction terms), as mentioned, specific blocks of variables were entered into the hierarchical regression

analyses. The first block included the main effects for the parenting emotional style (coaching or dismissing) being tested and the regulation dimension being tested (i.e., negative emotionality, emotion regulation, or behavioural regulation). The second block included the interaction term (the combination of the regulation dimension and the parenting style).

Where significant interactions were detected (i.e., a significant in R^2 change), follow up analyses were conducted. Only those regressions that were found to be significant are presented in the following section. Complete results for all interaction terms are presented in Appendix O.

Emotion Coaching Results from regression analyses revealed significant interactions between emotion coaching and behaviour regulation to predict prosocial behaviour ($R^2_{\text{change}}=.11$, $F(1,96)=11.54$, $p<.01$), and emotion coaching and emotion regulation to predict anxiety ($R^2_{\text{change}}=.04$, $F(1,96)=4.40$, $p<.05$). Results are displayed in Table 17.

Interactions were explored by re-computing the regression analyses separately for groups of children scoring above or below the median in terms of the relevant child regulation variable. Similar procedures to examine interactions and simple effects have been outlined by many different researchers (e.g., Aiken & West, 1991; Calkins, Gill, Johnson, & Smith, 1999; Gottman et al., 1997; Rubin, Cheah, & Fox, 2001). The first interaction was between emotion coaching and behaviour regulation in the prediction of prosocial behaviour. Results from follow-up analyses indicated that emotion coaching was not associated with prosocial behaviour among children with higher

Table 17

Prediction of Social Outcomes from Emotion Coaching and Regulation and Emotionality

Dependent Variable: Prosocial Behaviour		
	Main effects (β)	Interaction term (ΔR^2)
Step 1		
Emotion Coaching	.08	
Behaviour Regulation	.06	
Step 2		
Emotion Coaching x Behaviour Regulation		.11**
<hr/>		
Dependent Variable: Anxious Behaviours		
	Main effects (β)	Interaction term (ΔR^2)
Step 1		
Emotion Coaching	.08	
Emotion Regulation	-.21*	
Step 2		
Emotion Coaching x Emotion Regulation		.04*
<hr/>		
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$		

behaviour regulation ($\beta = -.21$, $t = -1.50$, n.s) but significantly and positively associated with prosocial behaviour among children with lower behaviour regulation ($\beta = .37$, $t = 2.72$, $p < .05$) (see Figure 4).

The second interaction was between emotion coaching and emotion regulation in the prediction of anxiety. Results from follow-up analyses indicated that emotion coaching was positively associated with anxiety among children with higher emotion regulation ($\beta = .26$, $t = 1.81$, $p < .10$), but not associated with anxiety among children with lower emotion regulation ($\beta = -.08$, $t = -.54$, n.s.) (see Figure 5).

Emotion Dismissing Results from regression analyses revealed significant interactions between emotion dismissing and behaviour regulation to predict anxious behaviours ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .04$, $F(1,96) = 3.99$, $p < .05$) and emotion dismissing and negative affect to predict anxious behaviours ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .05$, $F(1,96) = 4.72$, $p < .05$). Results are displayed in Table 18.

Interactions were again explored by re-computing the regression analyses separately for groups of children scoring above or below the median in terms of the relevant child regulation variable. The first interaction was between emotion dismissing and behaviour regulation to predict anxious behaviour. Follow up analyses revealed that, emotion dismissing was significantly positively associated with anxious behaviour among children with higher behaviour regulation ($\beta = .36$, $t = 2.70$, $p < .05$), and not associated with prosocial behaviour among children with lower behaviour regulation ($\beta = .06$, $t = .43$, n.s.) (see Figure 6).

Figure 4

Simple Effects Testing of Moderated Relation Between Emotion Coaching and Behaviour Regulation to Predict Prosocial Behaviour

..... Behaviourally Regulated
_____ Behaviourally Dysregulated

* $p < .05$

Figure 5

Simple Effects Testing of Moderated Relation Between Emotion Coaching and Emotion Regulation to Predict Anxiety

+ $p < .10$

Table 18

Prediction of Social Outcomes from Emotion Dismissing Regulation, and Negative Affect

Dependent Variable: Anxious Behaviours		
	Main effects (β)	Interaction term (ΔR^2)
Step 1		
Emotion Dismissing	-.10	
Behaviour Regulation	-.22*	
Step 2		
Emotion Dismissing x Behaviour Regulation		.04*
<hr/>		
Dependent Variable: Anxious Behaviours		
	Main effects (β)	Interaction term (ΔR^2)
Step 1		
Emotion Dismissing	-.07	
Negative Affect	.09	
Step 2		
Emotion Dismissing x Negative Affect		.05*
<hr/>		

* $p < .05$

Figure 6

Simple Effects Testing of Moderated Relation Between Emotion Dismissing and Behaviour Regulation to Predict Anxious Behaviours

..... Behaviourally Regulated
_____ Behaviourally Dysregulated

* $p < .05$

The second interaction was between emotion dismissing and negative affect on the prediction of anxious behaviours. Follow up analyses indicated that emotion dismissing was not associated with anxious behaviours among children who have higher negative affect ($\beta=.04$, $t=.25$, n.s.), and positively associated with anxious behaviours among children with lower negative affect ($\beta=.29$, $t=1.89$, $p<.05$) (see Figure 7).

Figure 7

Simple Effects Testing of Moderated Relation Between Emotion Dismissing and
Negative Affect to Predict Anxious Behaviours

..... High Negative Affect
_____ Low Negative Affect

* $p < .05$

Discussion

The goal of this second study was to examine predictive pathways to preschool adjustment from parental emotional styles and child regulatory characteristics. Specifically, associations between parental emotional styles (i.e., emotion coaching and emotion dismissing), child regulation variables (i.e., emotion regulation, behaviour regulation, and negative affect); and teacher ratings of child outcomes (i.e., anxiety, aggression, and prosocial behaviour) were explored. Results indicated only a few direct linear relations between parental emotion style and child regulation, and between child regulation and outcomes. However, several “moderated” relations were found in the prediction of outcomes. For example, emotion coaching was negatively related to child anxiety among lower-regulated children, but positively related to anxiety among well higher-regulated children. As well, emotion dismissing was positively related to anxious behaviours among lower regulated children, but a stronger positive relation was found among well regulated children.

Parental Emotional Styles and Social Outcomes

Somewhat surprisingly, there were no direct relations found between parental emotional styles and child outcomes. Specifically, no significant correlations were noted between emotion coaching or emotion dismissing parenting styles and preschool children’s prosocial, anxious, or aggressive behaviours. These current results are not consistent with the previous findings of Gottman et al. (1996, 1997).

In a longitudinal investigation, Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) did report some direct links between meta-emotion philosophy and child outcomes such as teacher-rated and observed peer relations and child health. For example, a parent’s use of meta-emotion

parenting techniques in early childhood predicted higher teacher ratings of aggression, lower instances of negative-type play behaviours, and fewer health problems three years later. There are several possible explanations for the differences noted between Gottman's results and the present findings.

To being with, Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) noted predictive associations between aspects of parental emotional styles in early childhood and social outcomes three years later. In the present study, concurrent associations between parental emotional styles and social outcomes were explored. Therefore, direct relations between this variable may not become evident until the middle childhood years. In support of this speculation, Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) argued that parents who use emotion coaching techniques at an earlier age may be essentially teaching their children how to be "savvy" and to use emotional knowledge to their benefit at later times. That is, emotion coaching has been suggested to be directly responsible for teaching children about issues surrounding emotional self-knowledge, self-regulatory abilities, and attention to salient aspects of social situations. The same may be true of an emotion dismissing style (i.e., that direct "negative" influences may not be evident until later childhood). Although in the current study evidence is not found to support the influence of parental emotional style on childhood social adjustment, it may be that a similar study set within a longitudinal framework would provide results to support the findings of Gottman et al. (1996, 1997).

As well, a different set of outcome variables were examined in this study compared to those in the research of Gottman et al. (1996,1997). Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) examined the academic achievement, peer relations (teacher rated aggression and observational ratings of negative-type play) and health of children. In the current study

aggression, anxiety, and prosocial behaviours were explored. The lack of relations between aggression and coaching in the current study may be due to different outcomes, different measures, or different measurement techniques. Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) used both teacher-rated and observational reports to predict aggressive behaviours. In the current study, only teacher reports were used, and they were addressed using a different measure than that used by Gottman et al. (1996, 1997). It may be that each scale was assessing different aspects of aggression. Further, differences in the direct associations may be a product of observational versus teacher ratings of child peer relations. Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) reported a direct link between meta emotion and observations of peer relations. It is possible that the observations are a more accurate measure of aggression. However, it may also be that there is no significant direct relation between parental emotional styles and outcome variables (as measured in this study) in early childhood. Future research could assess similar variables using different scales and measurement techniques to answer this question.

Other important issues that likely contributed to differences include aspects related to the age difference between children in the current study versus those in Gottman's study. First, it's very likely that the social situations of preschool differ from those of grade three. Indeed, Gottman et al (1997) suggested that "the social skills related to peer social competence in middle childhood are not the same as the skills emotion coaches are building in their children" (p.178). Within a preschool setting, the ratio of teachers to students is typically higher, and there are less opportunities for the students to be off on their own for lengths of time (e.g., recess in middle school). Therefore, the preschool social environment can be viewed as under more control and direction than the

middle school environment. One may speculate that the preschool environment provides an opportunity for more cohesive and controlled interactions between students.

Therefore, it can be suggested that the lack of significant findings may be due differences in social climate of preschool versus middle school. The environment may not require young children to use the meta-emotion “tools” acquired directly by their parents.

Further, teachers may temper poor adjustment that may be associated with a dismissing parenting style.

Other age-related issues that may have influenced the differences in findings are directly related to context and emotional awareness. To speculate, it is possible that as children age their abilities to understand, “read”, and cope with the emotional states of others greatly improve. With these augmented abilities may come the necessity to use the emotional tools instilled by their parents. Some studies report that children’s understanding of emotions occur at an early age (e.g., Wellman, 1991) while other studies suggest children cannot distinguish among various emotional states (e.g., Kalish, 1997). However, there is an abundance of research to suggest that with age comes greater knowledge and understanding of emotions (e.g., Feinman, 1982; Thompson, 1999). Also, there has been evidence to suggest that young children will cope with negative emotions differently than children in middle childhood (Beaver, 1997; Terwogt & Stegge, 1995). A closer look at emotional intelligence may provide insight to support that over time, children’s experience with emotions become fine-tuned and meta-emotion abilities may become more central to their social adjustment.

Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) and Gottman and Declaire (1997) have suggested that the skills that are provided to children by their parents will define their levels of

emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence refers to the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotion knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth (e.g., Goleman, 1995; Martinez-Pons, 1997/98; Mayer & Salovey). Perhaps as children age and their cognitive ability increase, the emotional intelligence skills provided to them by their parents become directly relevant to their social functioning. This thought fits nicely with the previous argument that changes in social structure may call upon different social skills that may be fuelled by parental emotional styles.

In support of this idea, it can be recalled that some central characteristics of an emotion coached child includes an augmented ability to relate to people in tough social situations, to understand the emotions of others, and to use this emotional understanding for their own benefit (e.g., promoting better friendships, more positive peer relations). Children at age five are very egocentric in their understandings of many social issues (Piaget, 1952). Examples of egocentrism can be observed in daycares through children's rampant use of collective monologues, for example. At approximately age seven, egocentrism begins to diminish and children are better cognitively equipped to take on the perspective of others. It may be at this time that the direct influence of the emotion-coaching parent is evident because the child is able to view situations from the perspectives of others and this promotes characteristics of meta-emotion (i.e., awareness of own and others' emotional states).

Parental Emotional Styles and Regulation

There was only one significant direct relation found between parental emotional styles and child regulation. Specifically, there was a moderate negative relation between emotion dismissing parenting style and behaviour regulation. Thus, children were less behaviourally regulated when their parents used a more dismissing approach to relating to their emotional needs. However, there were no relations found between emotion dismissing parenting and emotion regulation or negative affect, or emotion coaching parenting and the three child regulation variables.

The present finding linking dismissing parenting styles and behavioural regulation extends current knowledge and is consistent with past research linking aspects of parenting to aspects of children's regulation. For example, Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) found a significant association between aspects of meta emotion and regulatory physiology suggesting that coaching a child's emotions has a soothing effect on the child. As well, other researchers such as Stice and Gonzales (1998), have reported direct relations between maternal control and a child's behavioural regulation (measured as behavioural undercontrol) and negative affect. And, Szewczyk, Neff, Dranger, Mangelsdorf, and Schoppe (2001) observed negative associations between competent parenting and positive engagement (separately) and negative affect in children. Further, hostile control was positively related to behavioural undercontrol. And, the same authors reported consistent findings one year later with maternal reports of children's regulation. In all, the negative association between dismissing parenting style and behaviour regulation supports and extends some recent literature to suggest that there is an association between parenting and child regulatory ability.

The characteristics of a dismissing parent lend well to speculation about the conceptual mechanisms driving this association with child behaviour regulation. Parents who espouse a dismissing approach have a philosophy that negative emotion is dangerous and harmful for children. Further, these parents have little self and other-emotional awareness and immediately try to shut down emotions as soon as they being. Because behaviour regulation is an indication of a child's ability to regulate behaviour that is driven by an emotional situation and is conceptualized as a child's ability to inhibit behaviour, it is plausible to suggest that a dismissing style may promote behavioural dysregulation. Presumably, a support system is not in place to teach and reinforce the techniques children need to learn to self-inhibit emotionally laden behaviours. It may follow then that the dismissing parent may not be a good behavioural self-regulator and therefore cannot provide advice and guidance for their children. This speculation is consistent with the idea that emotion dismissing parents fear being emotionally out of control and have little knowledge about what to do with children's emotions. One can speculate that both of these characteristics are associated with observable behaviours, perhaps fuelled by emotional states.

However, the direction of this relation cannot be determined. Because this study was correlational in nature, it is also plausible that behaviourally under-regulated children evoke dismissing parenting. It can be speculated that a child who is characteristically impulsive and less able to inhibit their behaviour may promote parental feelings such as being overwhelmed, fearful, unsure, and uncomfortable in emotionally charged situations. Further, these parents may regard their children's behaviours as indications of poor emotional adjustment and therefore blame themselves for their child's poorly

regulated behaviours. It may follow that these feelings lead to a sense of helplessness which ultimately lead to dismissing styles.

The lack of relations between emotion dismissing and emotion coaching and the other regulatory variables would seem to require some explanation. It was not clear why these relations were not found. To speculate, it may be that the direct influence of parental emotional styles on some aspects of regulatory abilities will only be evident later in childhood. Gottman did find immediate associations between meta emotion and regulation (defined as child physiology), but also indirect associations were found on a child's later ability to regulate their own emotions. It may be that aspects of physiological regulation are immediately present and that the form of measurement used in this study was not sensitive enough (or designed as such) to address these issues.

Presumably, the conceptualization of the regulation variables may have also had an impact on the direct relations. It can be recalled that the elements of regulation in this study were assessed and conceived of differently than in Gottman's research. First, Gottman only used one form of regulation (emotion regulation), whereas in this study three forms were explored (emotion regulation, behaviour regulation, and negative affect). In addition, Gottman used a physiological measure during the first testing session (children aged 5 years) as well as a maternal rating scale during the second testing session (children aged 8 years). In the present study, mothers completed two scales to assess the three different forms of regulation. Differences in findings may be due to testing techniques.

As well, it can be speculated that there may be some influence of the mothers reporting both their parenting styles and their children's regulatory abilities. Had there

been a different methodology such as teacher or observational reports of child regulation, associations might have been evident. This issue is discussed further in the section pertaining to caveats and future directions.

However, the fundamentals of temperament theory provide other speculative reasons for these nonsignificant findings. It is also possible that aspects of emotion coaching and emotion dismissing parenting are not directly related to regulation if what was being assessed were aspects of children's temperament. It can be recalled from a previous section that Rothbart (1988) has defined temperament as individual differences in reactivity and regulation. The former is an individual variable that refers to intensity of emotional experience and the latter is a reflection of the child's ability to control or modulate reactivity and may include changes in attention and efforts to self-soothe. According to Rothbart,(1988), both reactivity and regulation are essential aspects to a child's developing personality. It is plausible that a significant relation was only found for behaviour regulation because the other forms of regulation are more temperamentally based and therefore not directly associated with parental emotional styles. However, further research needs to clarify this speculation because: (1) bidirectional influences of similarly conceptualized aspects of temperament on various parenting characteristics have been found (e.g., Cook et al., 1991; Fish et al., 1991; Plomin et al., 1977); and (2) little is known about the relations between parental emotional styles and aspects of regulation.

Parenting, Regulation, and Adjustment.

Past research on the emotional aspects of parenting have provided researchers with a good beginning in understanding the relations between parental emotional styles,

child regulation, and outcomes (e.g., Gottman et al., 1996, 1997). However, little is known about the interactive associations between parental emotional styles and child regulatory characteristics in the prediction of child social adjustment within preschool. Gottman et al. (1997) explored some interactive associations between emotion coaching and measures of child temperament but found no significant relations in the predictions of child social outcomes. Thus results from the present study have provided some of the first evidence that emotion coaching and dismissing styles may be differentially related to child social adjustment for different types of children.

Emotion coaching. Significant interactions were found between emotion coaching parenting style and behaviour regulation in the prediction of prosocial behaviour; and emotion coaching parenting style and emotion regulation in the prediction of anxious behaviours. Thus, emotion coaching was related to different child outcomes depending upon the emotion and behavioural regulation of the child.

To begin with, the higher the behavioural dysregulation, the stronger was the relation between coaching and prosocial behaviour. An opposite pattern of results was indicated for the interaction between emotion coaching and emotion regulation in the prediction of anxiety. The higher the regulation, the stronger was the relation between coaching and anxiety.

These findings are somewhat provocative. Among children who were rated as behaviourally dysregulated, maternal coaching was positively associated with prosocial behaviour. Although causality cannot be inferred from these findings, it is possible to speculate about the relations between parental emotional styles and outcomes taking into consideration child regulation. The results are consistent with other studies which

suggest that parenting interacts with child variables in the prediction of social outcomes (e.g., Calkins et al., 1999; Campbell, 1997, Martin, 1981). Thus, implications of emotion coaching seem to differ depending upon child regulation. For a dysregulated child, emotion coaching seems to act as a protective factor. A child who is dysregulated and coached by a parent was less likely to be rated by teachers as anxious and more likely to be seen as prosocial. Presumably, a coaching style which is based on empathy, dyadic communication, and awareness of children's emotional states provides lower-regulated children with the tools necessary to be rated as socially adjusted in preschool. On the other side of the coin, less emotion coaching combined with more dysregulation was linked to more problems in preschool. To speculate, the less time a parent spends with their lower-regulated child discussing emotional issues may have an impact on maladjustment in preschool.

A very different story emerged for well regulated children. Somewhat surprisingly, the current results suggest, among other speculations, that children who are regulated may be subject to deleterious outcomes if parents use an emotion coaching parenting style. Among children who were rated as well regulated, maternal coaching was associated with higher ratings of anxiety. One way to interpret these findings is in light of recent research related to the construct of parental over-protectiveness, or over-solicitous parenting.

Over protective parenting may be characterized by displays of warmth, intrusiveness, and/or restrictiveness in situations that do not warrant it (Rubin, Nelson, Hastings, and Asendorpf, 1999; Thomasgard & Metz, 1993). Although this may seem counterintuitive (i.e., that too much "positive" parenting can lead to poor development),

there is some current research that has supported this claim. Rubin, Cheah, and Fox (2001) found that maternal over-solicitous behaviour positively predicted four year old children's socially reticent, wary, and shy behaviours. In addition, past research by Malatesta, Culver, Tesman, & Shepard (1989) has found that maternal over-facial expression (during situations that do not warrant the expression) is associated with poor mother-child attachment in early childhood. The authors speculate that this form of disengagement may signal a protective function for the infant in escaping a potentially anxious, and inescapable, situation.

Again, with respect to the current findings, speculations can be provided about the conceptual mechanisms driving the relations in early childhood. It may be that an oversolicitous parental emotional style (when unwarranted) causes children to become concerned about their own emotional well being and this is reflected in social outcomes. In essence, the children may be experiencing "emotional overload". This finding supports Gottman et al. (1997) who suggest that "being in-tune" with a child's negative emotions may foster its development. However, support for this statement has been found only for those children who are well-regulated. Children who are dysregulated may benefit from an emotion coaching parenting style. If a child is dysregulated, it would appear appropriate for the parent to espouse an emotion coaching philosophy towards her child. The parental emotional style may provide the emotional support and teaching for the child so that they are buffered from adjustment difficulties. In all, the parent would act as a protective factor for the child.

However, on the opposite side of the coin, it is duly noted that less coaching was associated with positive outcomes for higher-regulated children. While being cautious

not to infer causality, a possible implication of this finding would be for parents who utilize an emotion coaching style to reduce their coaching if their children are well regulated. But, parents who espouse this style should continue their coaching styles in situations with children who exhibit lower regulation. Taking into consideration that one of the fundamental characteristics of an emotion coach is that they are aware of their own emotions (and emotional states) as well as their child's emotions (and emotional states), the coach should have the ability to monitor and adjust their parental emotional style accordingly.

The present findings fit well with the Goodness of Fit Theory. As aforementioned, goodness of fit refers to the extent to which the demands of the environment are congruent with a child's characteristics, capacities, and style of behaving (Thomas & Chess, 1977). In terms of a parent-child paradigm, goodness of fit can be explained to refer to the extent that parenting characteristics and child characteristics are well matched. A good fit is present if a child possesses the characteristics that help him/her cope adequately with the expectations of the environment. Alternatively, a poor fit occurs when a child does not have the characteristics that are well suited to the environmental demands. In the former example, positive outcomes have been described and in the latter, deleterious outcomes may result.

Among children who were rated as having lower behavioural regulation abilities, maternal coaching was positively related to prosocial skills. To speculate, the emotion coaching style may be providing an arena for children to be socially adjusted even in the face of lower ratings of behavioural regulation. Presumably, that a coaching mother spends time with her child during heated emotional periods and perceives these times as

important opportunities to teach, seems to have an interactive influence on a child's predisposition to be socially adjusted. Therefore, the characteristics of this mother-child pair seems to be a good fit.

Further, among children who were rated as having higher emotional regulation abilities, a coaching style was associated with higher anxious behaviour. As already mentioned, this finding can be considered in reference to literature related to over-protective and over-solicitous parenting. In any event, these findings may provide indications of the Goodness of Fit Theory in action. In a situation where a well regulated child is parented by an emotion coaching mother, resulting relations with social outcomes may be at a psychological cost for the child. In this case, it would be beneficial for an emotion coaching parent to modify their parenting style in order that their characteristics fit the needs of the child. Thereby, the parent would be creating a situation that more closely resembles a good fit between herself and her child.

Emotion Dismissing. Significant interactions were found between emotion dismissing parenting style and behaviour regulation in the prediction of anxious behaviour; and emotion dismissing parenting style and negative affect in the prediction of anxious behaviours. Thus, emotion dismissing was related to child outcomes depending upon the regulatory characteristics of the child.

To begin with, the higher the regulation, the stronger was the relation between dismissing and anxiety. A similar pattern of results was indicated for emotion dismissing, negative affect and the prediction of anxiety. The lower the negative affect, the stronger was the relation between dismissing and anxiety. Thus, dismissing parenting style had a higher association with respect to maladjustment for children rated as higher in

behavioural regulation and as having lower ratings of negative affect in the prediction of anxiety in both cases.

It is known that dysregulation has been linked to adjustment problems in preschool (e.g., Coplan et al., 1999; Caspi et al., 1995). Overall, results from this study suggest that an emotion dismissing parenting style seems to have an association with maladjustment in preschool. However, the extent to which this relation is evident depends upon the child's regulatory characteristics. Results can be interpreted to suggest that a dismissing parenting style among dysregulated children is not associated with augmented maladjustment. Findings indicated that for children who are already dysregulated, whether or not the parent is dismissing is not linked to maladjustment. As aforementioned, it is well documented that dysregulated children may have adjustment problems in preschool. To speculate, emotion dismissing style may not be associated with additional maladjusted because these children may already be associated with problems due to their levels of regulation.

However, among well regulated children, dismissing parenting seems to have an additive effect. An interpretation of the results suggest that if a child is well regulated (higher behavioural regulation or lower negative affect) there is a positive association between dismissing parenting style and anxious behaviours. This can be interpreted to mean that more dismissing is associated with higher anxiety within preschool. However, on the other side of the coin, the results could be interpreted to suggest that less dismissing is associated with better adjustment in preschool.

At first glance, some of these results seem counterintuitive. One could assume that a child with better behavioural regulation, or lower negative affect, would not be

influenced by a dismissing style (i.e., more or less buffered from the influence). However, to speculate why these children are exhibiting indications of poorer social development, one can draw upon the characteristics of an emotion dismissing style. Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) and Gottman and Declaire (1997) have suggested that dismissing parents may feel anxious, fearful, and overwhelmed by their own emotions and the emotions of their children. In addition, these parents have feelings of under-control in emotional situations and lack the problem solving ability to deal with emotional climates as they arise. Given an emotionally-charged climate in the home, it is intuitive to suggest that even a child who is rated as having better regulation or lower negative affect would be influenced to some extent by their mother's inability to deal and function within emotional situations. In fact, one way to interpret these results may be to consider that the emotion dismissing parent's lack of emotional control overrides the child's regulatory abilities. That is to say, children may be predisposed to certain regulatory dispositions. But within a home where a mother is not able to deal effectively with her emotions, there may be some influence on the outcomes for children.

The emotional distance between dismissive mothers and their children may influence social outcomes. It may be that parental closeness, reinforcement, and encouragement is necessary to sustain and "grow" a child's regulatory abilities in social situations. Presumably, these characteristics of the parent-child relationship are absent. This would also suggest that the parent is not talking to their children about emotions, and therefore are not providing the emotional "tools" that Gottman et al (1996, 1997), and Gottman and Declaire (1997) suggest are fundamental to a child's social development. It can be speculated that even children who are better regulated are not

always well regulated and might need the influence of a parent to maintain a certain level of regulation and to aid in fine-tuning the tools necessary for positive social adjustment.

Regulation and Social Outcomes.

Results from this study also provide evidence to suggest that dysregulated children are a poor fit for the preschool classroom. In the current study, children who received lower ratings of maternal rated emotion regulation received higher teacher ratings of anxiety and aggression. The measure that was used to assess emotion regulation focussed on two distinct aspects of a child's ability: the ability to focus and the ability to shift attention towards task related channels. Presumably, teachers "pick-up" on these aspects of child behaviour in the classroom and rate children as having behaviour problems. One reason the children may be rated as having problematic behaviour is because they cannot remain "on-task" or shift their attention to the topic at hand. One can imagine a child within a class of 20 who, on average, has difficulty completing a work-task or does not respond when the teacher asks for everyone to return to their seats. Therefore, it's reasonable to suggest that in instances such as these that teachers would rate the child as exhibiting behaviour problems.

Indeed, these findings support past research within the area of regulation and child outcomes. For example, Rubin et al. (1995) reported links from the inability to regulate emotions to the prediction of social maladaptation (e.g., internalizing and externalizing problems). Specifically, emotion dysregulation was found to be associated with aggression for sociable children and anxiety for less sociable children. It may be that the findings from this study represent two distinct child groups, as was the findings in Rubin et al. (1995). Moreover, Kellam (1994) found that problems in concentration (i.e.,

a major characteristic of emotion regulation) played a central role in the development of aggressive behaviour in five-year old children. The results from the current study clearly suggest that emotional dysregulation is a poor fit for the preschool environment with peers because it is predictive of indices of maladjustment.

Further, low maternal ratings of behaviour regulation were associated with high teacher ratings of anxiety. The measure used to assess behavioural regulation included children's ability to control impulses and inhibit behaviours. It stands to reason that if a child is impulsive and has trouble inhibiting behaviours, that teachers would be cognizant of this and consider it to be an indication of maladjustment. It may also be that classroom peers take note of the child's behaviour and this produces anxiety in the child. These findings extend a longitudinal study with children which has reported that behavioural undercontrol is related to externalizing problems (Caspi, et al. 1995). Again, poor regulatory abilities are not a good fit within the class room because they signal behaviour problems.

On the other hand, one can speculate that better emotion and behavioural regulation would be associated with better adjustment. Certainly, the findings from this study suggest such a relation. Higher maternal ratings of emotion regulation abilities were positively associated with higher teacher ratings of prosocial behaviour. This idea fits with existing findings in the literature. It can be recalled that Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) supported the hypothesis that emotion regulation (i.e., measured as a physiological construct and parental report) was associated with positive social adjustment in children.

It is possible to speculate about the mechanisms that underlie the relations in the current study. For example, it may be that higher levels of emotion regulation are

associated with higher levels of prosocial behaviour because these children have better social skills. These social skills may be reflected in an overall augmented ability to respond better to conflict and challenges within the preschool classroom. This idea fits nicely with one of the characteristics of a well-regulated child: the ability to focus attention. Perhaps these children are able to focus their attention on solving problems and therefore are viewed as being more prosocial. As well, it can be speculated that these children do not react with strong emotions, and presumably are rated more favorably by their teachers.

The current study also report similar findings to that of Eisenberg's research (e.g., see Eisenberg and others 1995; 1996; 1997; 1998; 1999). A consistent finding from the volumes of research that has been conducted by Eisenberg and colleagues, is that emotion and behavioural regulation impacts on a number of child social and developmental domains. For example, Eisenberg et al. (1995) reported that socially appropriate behaviour (including low levels of aggressive and disruptive behaviour) was positively related to high levels of behavioural regulation. Additionally, Eisenberg and Fabes (1995) found that regulatory capabilities are associated with general social skills and sociometric status. Further, Eisenberg et al. (1998) reported that children's shyness was negatively related to the ability to regulate emotions and behaviours. Clearly, the ability to regulate emotions and behaviours has a profound impact on the social development of children. In all, the results from this study support this claim and further suggest that there is a goodness of fit element to regulatory behaviour and classroom assessments of adjustment.

The nonsignificant associations between negative affect and social adjustment are curious. One would expect negative affect to be particularly salient within the classroom. With this said, the relations are in the proper direction and with an increase in subjects may become significant. However, one interpretation of the lack of findings may be that the measure that was used was not indicative of long standing problems, but rather infrequent instances of negative emotion. Negative affect was measured as an indication of affect intensity rather than the traditional assessment of affect frequency. Perhaps the frequency of negative affect is more salient than the intensity and therefore would be more likely to be rated by teachers as being related to maladjustment. Or, the speculation can be made that children who were rated as displaying intense negative affect do so at home and do not exhibit these types of behaviours in the classroom. Further research should be done to look at differences between intensity and frequency of emotions of children within preschools.

Caveats and Future Direction

There are several theoretical and methodological issues have arisen from the two studies within this dissertation that merit further clarification and investigation in future studies. In the following section, these issues are briefly outlined and discussed.

The importance of fathers. Interest in the role of fathers has been of increasing interest to researchers (e.g., Blankenhorn, 1995; Eisenberg et al., 1999; Hawkins & Palkovitz, 1999; Parke, 1996, Szewczyk, et al., 2001). Fathers interact differently with their children than do mothers. For instance, fathers spend more time in playful interaction (Lamb, 1987), and play more physically with their children than do mothers (Yogman, 1981).

However, with respect to parental emotional styles little is known about the father's role. For example, Gottman and his colleagues (e.g., Gottman et al. 1997; Hooven et al., 1995) studied the meta emotions of fathers on a very limited sample and determined that, like mothers, father's knowledge about his own emotions aids in the emotional aspects of parenting his children. It was also found, that fathers were less aware of their own sadness than mothers and fathers assisted less with the coaching of children's sadness than mothers. But, it is not clear how a father's emotion coaching and dismissing interact with a child's regulation to predict social outcomes. Furthermore, the relations between mothers and fathers coaching and dismissing parenting styles have not been extensively studied. In fact, in this dissertation, fathers were invited to participate but the response rate was poor. Given the novel findings of this study, it would be most instructive to replicate this study with a sample of fathers.

Direction of effects and future longitudinal research. A problem with concurrent correlational studies is the direction of effects. For example, in the current study, relations were found between emotion dismissing parenting style and behaviour regulation. In terms of causality, it is not clear whether dismissing style leads to poor child regulation, or if poor child regulation evokes a dismissing style. Results from several studies have indicated that positive parental intervention is related to significant changes in how children relate to peers and others outside the home (e.g., Patterson, 1986; Tremblay et al., 1992). However, results from other studies have suggested that children evoke certain responses from adults (Plomin et al., 1977; Scarr & McCartney, 1983). One could speculate that a parent is emotion coaching because their child's temperament demands the style, or that a parent is dismissing because their child's dysregulation has prompted

feelings of helplessness in the parent. It is easy to imagine a parent who espouses a coaching style losing all resemblance of the style if their child is consistently temperamentally hard to soothe. Or, a parent espousing the characteristics of an emotion coaching style because their child has just awoken from a terrible nightmare. Future research needs to concentrate on longitudinal investigations to examine parental emotional styles over time. These investigations would allow conclusions to be made about the lasting influences of parental emotional styles.

Shared method variance. Mothers in this study reported on their own parental emotional styles and their children's regulatory abilities. Therefore, shared method variance may have contributed to some of the reported findings. With this said, it would add to the current knowledge about parental emotional styles to have different informants of parenting and child behaviour for future investigation. Recently, some researchers have had parents rate each other on parental styles. This method could be applied in this area. In the same vein, it would be beneficial to develop an observational taxonomy to assess parental emotional styles. If this task could be successfully undertaken, then independent observers could rate parental interaction and instances of child regulatory ability thereby overcoming the issue of shared method variance. On a similar note, a potential bias may be evident in parents who espouse a dismissing style reporting on their children's regulatory characteristics. Future research should examine the accuracy of such reports.

Gender differences. The investigation of gender differences in parental emotional styles was not the goal of this dissertation. Simple gender differences were explored with few significant findings. Sample size did not allow for an in-depth systematic

exploration of potential differences. Future gender difference research needs to be completed on a large sample. To date, very little is known about sex differences in early childhood as they relate to parental emotional styles. Parents have different expectations concerning a myriad of behaviours of their sons and daughters. For instance, results from some studies indicate that parents may respond differently to shyness from their sons and daughters. Shyness in girls is more likely to be rewarded and accepted by parents, whereas shyness in boys is more likely to be discouraged (Engfer, 1993; Stevenson-Hinde, 1989). Radke-Yarrow, Richters, and Wilson (1988) reported that mothers were less accepting of their sons who were shy, and more affectionate and tender to their shy daughters.

Recently, other researchers have examined differences in parental socialization of children's emotional knowledge as it relates to gender (Lim, Crnic, Bohnert, 2001). Findings suggest that socialization practices vary depending upon the gender of the child. Future research should consider examining gender differences to determine if there are differences in outcomes in relation to the interaction between parental emotional styles, regulation, and gender, for example. Further, it would be instructive to expand the knowledge about parental emotional styles by exploring the differences between fathers' and mothers' coaching and dismissing of same and opposite sex children. It may be that each parent is more likely to espouse a certain style with their same sex child more than the opposite sex child. This investigation would add to both the parenting and gender differences literature.

Emotions, outcomes, and regulation. The PESQ is based on parental responses to children's angry and sad emotions. In general, much of the literature on the socialization

of children's emotions has focussed on negative emotions. It would serve the literature well to examine responses to other emotions, including positive emotions. As well, three outcome variables were examined in this study. In addition to prosocial, aggressive, and anxious behaviours, future research may want to focus on shyness, withdrawal, inhibition, and other prosocial aspects of children's adjustment. As well, regulation has been examined from three different perspectives: emotion regulation, behavioural regulation, and negative emotionality. Researchers may want to re-examine these child regulatory characteristics, using different operational definitions. There are various ways that each have been defined in past studies, and various scales to measure each construct. Finally, other child characteristics such as shyness could be examined as a moderator in the relationship between parental emotional styles and child adjustment. Presumably different results may be found if different approaches to measurement were used.

Other parental emotional styles. Emotion coaching and emotion dismissing parental emotional styles were examined in this study. Findings have provided some provocative results to suggest that other parental emotional should be examined. For example, it was determined that emotion coaching parenting style was associated with positive adjustment for poorly regulated children, but associated with negative adjustment for children with higher regulation. Additionally, it was found that emotion dismissing parental emotional style has little association with maladjustment for lower-regulated children, but has additive maladjustment "effects" for children with higher regulation. These findings suggest that there must be another parental emotional style that is a somewhat intermediate style best suited for children with higher levels of regulation. Future research should examine the moderated and mediated relations

between laissez-faire and disapproving parental emotional styles (Gottman & Declaire, 1997) and child regulatory characteristics. This may aid in better understanding the roles of parental emotional styles in the lives of children.

Culture. This study represents a predominately white, middle class sample of mothers whose children attended daycare on a regular basis. Therefore, in the interpretation of the findings it must be kept in mind that there may be a culture bias. It would be beneficial for future researchers to focus on other cultures, for example, to elucidate the nature of parental emotional styles.

Examining relations beyond early childhood. On a final note, it needs to be restated that the data presented in this dissertation was collected from preschool samples. Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) examined children at five years and again at eight years. Given that this dissertation and Gottman and colleague's research are the only two that have focussed on emotion coaching and emotion dismissing parenting styles, it would benefit the literature if older samples of children were examined. It may be that moderated influences of parental emotional styles are noted in early childhood, but in adolescence the influence is no longer a factor. Perhaps at this time adolescents rely more on their peer group to socialize their emotional responses to social situations. Further research needs to be completed to examine this idea.

Conclusion

The results from this dissertation have elucidated a relatively new dimension to parenting research. In Study 1, a valid and reliable scale to measure parental emotional styles was developed. Conceptually consistent relations between disciplinary styles,

parenting belief systems, emotional responses, and parental emotional styles were also revealed.

Study 2 represents the first major endeavor to untangle the associations between coaching and dismissing parental emotional styles, various aspects of child regulation, and multiple indicators of child social outcomes. Overall, the results from this study have provided some unique insights into the characteristics of parental emotional styles. In particular, the importance of considering how different emotional styles were related to indices of adjustment for different types of children was clearly illustrated. Future research will help to continue to unravel the complex associations between parental emotional styles, child characteristics, and social adjustment in early childhood and beyond.

References

- Achenbach, T., Howell, C., Quay, H., & Conners, C. (1991). National survey of problems and competencies among four- to sixteen-year-olds. Monographs of the society for research in Child Development, 56 (3), 1-133
- Aiken, L.S. & West, S.G. (1991). Multiple Regression: Testing and interpreting interactions. Sage Publications.
- Anastasi, A. (1988). Psychological testing (6th ed.). New York: MacMillan.
- Bates, J (1989). Concepts and measures of temperament. In G. Konstantin, J. Bates, & M. Rothbart (Eds.), Temperament in childhood (pp. 3-26). Chichester: Wiley.
- Bates, J., Bayles, K., Bennett, D., Ridge, B., & Brown, M. (1991). Origins of externalizing behavior problems at eight years of age. In D. Pepler & K. Rubin (Eds.), Development and treatment of childhood aggression (pp. 93-120). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behaviour. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 75, 43-88.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monographs, 4 (no.1 pt.2).
- Baumrind, D. (1978). Parental disciplinary patterns and social competence in children. Youth and Society, 9(2), 239-276.

Baumrind, D. (1987). A developmental perspective on adolescent risk-taking in contemporary America. In C. Irwin (Ed.), New Directions for Child Development (Vol.37, pp93-126). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Beaver, B.R. (1997). The role of emotion in children's selection of strategies for coping with daily stresses. Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 43, 129-146.

Berk, L. (1997). Child Development. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon

Blake, J. (1989). Family size and achievement. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Blankenhorn, D. (1995). Fatherless america: Confronting our most urgent social problem. New York: Basic Books.

Bretherton, I., Fritz, J., Zahn-Waxler, C., & Ridgeway, D. (1986). Learning to talk about emotions: A functionalist perspective. Developmental Psychology, 57, 529-548.

Buss, A., & Plomin, R. (1975). A temperament theory of personality development. New York: Wiley.

Buss, A., & Plomin, R. (1984). Temperament: Early developing personality traits. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Calkins, S.D., Gill, K.L., Johnson, M.C., and Smith, C.L. (1999). Emotional reactivity and emotion regulation strategies as predictors of social behavior with peers during toddlerhood. Social Development, 8 (3), 310-334.

Campbell, S. (1997). Behavior problems in pre-school children. In T. H. Ollendick & R. J. Printz (Eds.), Advances in child psychology (Vol. 19, pp. 1-26). New York: Plenum Press.

- Campos, J., Barrett, K., Lamb, M., Goldsmith, H., & Sternberg, C. (1983). Sociemotional development. In M. Haith & J. Campos (Eds.), Handbook of child psychology (4th Ed, Vol. 4, pp. 783-915). New York: Wiley.
- Carey, W.B., Fox, M., & McDevitt, S.C. (1977). Temperament as a factor in early school adjustment. Pediatrics, 60, 621-624.
- Carson, J., & Parke, R. (1996). Reciprocal negative affect in parent-child interactions and children's peer competency. Child Development, 67, 2217-2226.
- Caspi, A., Henry, B., McGee, R., Moffitt, T., & Silva, P. (1995). Temperamental origins of child and adolescent behavioural problems: From age three to fifteen. Child Development, 66, 486-498.
- Caspi, A. & Silva, P. (1995). Temperamental qualities at age three predict personality traits in young adulthood: Longitudinal evidence from a birth cohort. Child Development, 66, 486-498.
- Cassidy, J., Parke, R., Butkovsky, L., Braungart, J. (1992). Family-peer connections: The roles of emotional expressiveness within the family and children's understanding of emotions. Child Development, 63, 603-618.
- Chen, F. (1999). Authoritative and authoritarian parenting of mothers with preschool children in Taiwan. Poster presented at the Society for Research in Child Development Conference, Albuquerque, N.M.
- Cohen, J. (1978). Partialled products are interactions: Partialled powers are curve components. Psychological Bulletin, 85, 858-866.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). Applied multiple regression/correlational analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Collins, W., & Kuczaj, S. (1991). Developmental psychology: Childhood and adolescence. New York: MacMillan.

Cook, W., Kenny, D., & Goldstein, M. (1991). Parental affective style risk and the family system: A social relations model analysis. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 100, 492-501.

Coolahan, K. (1999). Empirical relationships among parenting styles, determinants of parenting, and children's school readiness outcomes in urban head-start families. Poster presented at the Society for Research in Child Development Conference, Albuquerque, N.M.

Coopersmith, S. (1967). The antecedent of self-esteem. San Francisco: Freeman.

Coplan, R.J., Barber, A., & Lagace-Seguin, D. (1999). The role of child temperament as a predictor of early literacy and numeracy skills in preschoolers. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 14.

Coplan, R., Lagace-Seguin, D., Hastings, P., Moulton, C. (Under Review). "Parenting beliefs in style": Authoritative and authoritarian mothers' parenting goals, attributions, and emotions in response to hypothetical vignettes. Parenting: Science and Practice.

Coplan, R., Gavinski, M-H., Lagace-Seguin, D., & Wichmann, C.G. (in press). When girls versus boys play alone: Gender differences in the relations between nonsocial play and adjustment in kindergarten. Developmental Psychology.

Coplan, R., Wichmann, C., Lagace-Seguin, D., Rachlis, L., & McVey, M. (1999). The "degree" of instructor education and child outcomes in junior kindergarten: A comparison of certificated teachers and early childhood educators. Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 14 (1), 78-90.

Cowan, P (1996). Meta-thoughts on the role of meta-emotion in children's development: Comment on Gottman et al. (1996).). Journal of Family Psychology, 10 (3), 277-283.

Davies, M. ; Stankov, L., Roberts, R. (1998). Emotional intelligence : In search of an elusive construct. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75 (4), 989-1015.

Denham, S. (1989). Maternal affect and toddler socio-emotional competence. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 59, 368-376.

Denham, S. (1993). Maternal emotional responsiveness and toddler's social emotional responding. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 34, 725-728.

Denham, S. (1994). Mother-child emotional communication and preschoolers' security of attachment and dependency. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 155(1), 119-121.

Denham, S. (1998). Emotional Development in Young Children. New York: Guilford.

Denham, S. & Grout, L. (1993). Socialization of emotion: Pathway to preschoolers' affect regulation. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 17, 205-227.

Denham, S., Renwick-DeBardi, S., & Hewes, S. (1994). Emotional communication between mothers and preschoolers: Relations with emotional competence. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 40 (4), 488-508.

Derryberry, D. & Rothbart, M. (1988). Arousal, affect, and attention as components of temperament. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 958-966.

Dix, T. (1985). Parents beliefs about misconduct: Affect and attribution in socialization. In Goodnow, J. (Eds.), Parents' Ideas about Development and Parenting. Symposium presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Toronto Canada.

Dix, T. (1992). Parenting on behalf of the child: Empathetic goals in the regulation of responsive parenting. In I. Sigel, A. McGillicuddy-DeLisi, & J. Goodnow, (Eds.), Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children (second edition). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dix, T. (1993). Attributing dispositions to children: An interactional analysis of attribution in socialization. PSPB, 19 (5), 633-643.

Dix, T., & Grusec, J. (1985). Parental attribution process in the socialization of children. In Sigel (Ed.), Parental belief systems : Their psychological consequences for children (second edition) (pp. 201-233). Hillsdale, NJ : Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dix, T., Ruble, D., Grusec, J., Nixon, S. (1986). Social cognition in parents : Inferential and affective reactions to children of three age levels. Child Development, 57 (4) 879-894.

Dix, T., Ruble, D., & Zambarabo (1990). Mothers' implicit theories of discipline: Child effects, parental effects, and the attribution process. Child Development, 60, 1373-1391.

Dunn, J., Brown, J., Beardsall, L. (1991). Family talk about feeling states and children's later understanding of other's emotions. Developmental Psychology, 27, 448-455.

Dunn, J., Brown, J., Slomkowski, C., Tesla, C., & Youngblade, L. (1991). Young children's understanding of other people's feelings and beliefs: Individual differences and their antecedents. Child Development, 62, 1352-1366.

Durrant, J. E., Broberg, A.G., & Rose-Krasnor, L. (1999). Predicting mother's use of physical punishment during mother-child conflicts in Sweden and Canada. New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 86, 25-41.

Easterbrook, J. (1959). The effect of emotion on cue utilization and the organization of behavior. Psychological Review, 66, 183-200.

Eisenberg, N. (1996). Meta-emotion and socialization of emotion in the family-A topic whose time has come: Comment on Gottman et al. (1996).). Journal of Family Psychology, 10 (3), 269-276.

Eisenberg, N. & Fabes, R. (1992). Emotion, regulation, and the development of social competence. In M.S. Clark (Ed.), Review of personality and social psychology: Vol. 14 Emotion and social behavior (pp. 119-150). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Eisenberg, N. & Fabes, R. (1994). Mothers' reactions to children's negative emotions: Relations to children's temperament and anger behavior. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 40, 138-156.

Eisenberg, N. & Fabes, R. (1995). The relation of young children's vicarious emotional responding to social competence, regulation, and emotionality. Cognition and Emotion, 9 (2/3), 203-228.

Eisenberg, N. & Fabes, R. (1998). Prosocial development. In Damon, W., Eisenberg, N. (Eds.), Handbook of Child Psychology, 5th Ed., Vol 3, Social, Emotional and Personality Development. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Eisenberg, N. Fabes, R., & Murphy, B. (1995). The relations of shyness and low sociability to regulation and emotionality. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 505-517.

Eisenberg, N. Fabes, R., & Murphy, B. (1997). Parent's reactions to children's negative emotions: Relations to children's social competence and comforting behavior. Child Development, 45, 1112-1123.

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R., Karbon, M., Murphy, B., Wosinski, M., Polazzi, L., Carlo, G., & Juhnke, C. (1996). The relations of children's dispositional prosocial behaviour to emotionality, regulation, and social functioning. Child Development, 67, 974-992.

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R., Murphy, B., Maszk, P., Smith, M., & Karbon, M. (1995). The role of emotionality and regulation in children's social functioning: A longitudinal study. Child Development, 66, 1360-1384

Eisenberg, N. & Fabes, R., Shepard, S., Guthrie, I., Murphy, B., & Reiser, M. (1999). Parental reactions to children's negative emotions: Longitudinal relations to quality of children's social functioning. Child Development, 70 (2), 513-534.

Eisenberg, N., Shepard, S., Fabes, R., Murphy, B., & Guthrie, I. (1998). Shyness and children's emotionality, regulation, and coping: Contemporaneous, longitudinal, and across-context relations. Child Development, 69, 767-790.

Emde, R. (1980). Emotional Availability: A reciprocal reward system for infants and parents with implications for prevention of psychotic disorders. In P.M. Taylor (Ed.), Parent-infant relationships. Orlando, FL: Grune & Stratton.

Engfer, A. (1993). Antecedents and consequences of shyness in boys and girls: A 6-year longitudinal study. In K. H. Rubin & J. B. Asendorpf (Eds.), Social withdrawal, inhibition, and shyness in childhood (pp. 49-79). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Fabes, R., Eisenberg, N., Karbon, M., Troyer, D., & Switzer, G. (1994). The relations of children's emotion regulation to their vicarious emotional responses and comforting behaviors. Child Development, 65, 1678-1693.

Fabes, R., Eisenberg, N., Jones, S., Smith, M., Guthrie, I., Poulin, R., Shepard, S., & Friedman, J. (1999). Regulation, emotionality, and preschoolers' socially competent peer interactions. Child Development, 70 (2), 432-442.

Fainsilber Katz, L., Gottman, J., & Hooven, C (1996). Meta-emotion philosophy and family functioning: Reply to Cowan (1996) and Eisenberg (1996). Journal of Family Psychology, 10 (3), 284-291.

Feinman, S. (1982). Social referencing in infancy. Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 28, 445-470.

Fish, M., Stifter, C., & Belsky, J. (1991). Conditions of continuity and discontinuity in infant negative emotionality: Newborn to five months. Child Development, 57, 1507-1518.

Fox, N.A., & Field T.M. (1988). Individual differences in preschool entry behavior. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 10, 527-540

Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind. New York: Basic Books.

Ginott, H. (1965). Between Parent and Child. New York: Avon Books.

Ginott, H. (1971). Between Parent and Teenager. New York: Avon Books.

Ginott, H. (1975). Teacher and Child. New York: Avon Books.

Goldsmith, H. & Campos, J. (1982). Toward a theory of infant temperament. In R. Emde & R. Hanson (Eds.), The development of attachment and affiliative systems (pp.161-193). New York: Plenum.

Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ. New York: Bantam.

Goleman, D. (1998). Working with emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam Books.

Goodnow, J., Cashmore, J. Cotton, S., & Knight, R. (1984). Mothers' developmental timetables in two cultural groups. International Journal of Psychology, 19, 193-205.

Goodnow, J. & Collins, W. (1990). Development according to parents: The nature, sources, and consequences of parent's ideas. Hove, England: Erlbaum.

Goodnow, J., Knight, R., Cashmore, J. (1985). Adult social cognition: Implications for parents' ideas for approaches to development. In M. Perlmutter (Ed.), Cognitive perspectives and behavioral development: Vol 18. The Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology (pp. 287-329). Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum.

Gottman, J. (1997a). Meta-Emotion: The Measures. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Gottman, J. & Declaire, J. (1997). Raising and emotionally intelligent child: The heart of parenting. New York: NY: Fireside.

Gottman, J., Fainsilber, L., & Hooven, C. (1996). Parental meta emotion philosophy and the emotional life of families: Theoretical models and preliminary data. Journal of Family Psychology, 10 (3), 243-268.

Gottman, J., Fainsilber, L., & Hooven, C. (1997). Meta-Emotion: How families communicate. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gretarsson S. & Gelfand, D. (1988). Mothers' attributions regarding their children's social behavior and personality characteristics. Developmental Psychology, 24(2), 264-269.

Grusec, J., Dix, T., & Mills, R. (1989). The effect of type, severity, and victim of children's transgressions on maternal discipline. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Sciences, 14, 276-289.

Grusec, J. & Goodnow, J. (1994). Impact of parental discipline methods on the child's internalization values: A reconceptualization of current points of view. Developmental Psychology, 30 (1), 4-19.

Grusec, J.E., & Lytton, H. (1988). Social Development: History, Theory, and Research. Springer-Verlag: New York Inc

Guthrie, I., & Reiser, M. (1999). The relations of negative emotionality and regulation on children's problem behavior: A longitudinal study. Poster presented at the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM.

Harrington-Lueker, D. (1997). Students need emotional intelligence. The Educational Digest, September, 27-35.

Hart, C., Nelson, D., Robinson, C., Olsen, S., & MacNeilly-Choque, M. (1998). Overt and relational aggression in Russian nursery school age children: Parenting style and marital linkages. Developmental Psychology.

Hart, C., Yang, C., Nelson, D., Jin, S., Bazarskaya, N., & Nelson, L (1997). Peer contact patterns, parenting practices, and preschoolers' social competence in China,

Russia, and the United States. In P. Slee, & K. Rigby (Eds.), Peer relations amongst children: Current issues and future directions. London, Routledge.

Hastings, P. (1995). The nature and functions of parents goals during parent-child conflict. Poster presented at the 1995 SRCD Conference in Indianapolis.

Hastings, P., & Coplan, R. (in press). Maternal beliefs about child rearing and children's preschool behaviours. New Directions in Child Development.

Hastings, P., & Grusec, J. (1998). Parenting goals as organizers of responses to parent-child disagreement. Developmental Psychology, 34, 465-479.

Hastings, P., & Rubin, K. (1999). Predicting mothers beliefs about preschool aged children's social behaviour: Evidence for maternal attitudes moderating child effects. Developmental Psychology, 25, 324-343.

Hawkins, A.J. & Palkovitz, R. (1999). Beyond ticks and clicks: The need for more diverse and broader conceptualizations and measures of father involvement. The Journal of Men's Studies 8,(1), 11-32.

Holden, G.W. (1983). Avoiding conflict: Mothers as tacticians in the supermarket. Developmental Psychology, 54(1), 233-240.

Holden, G.W. (1995). Parental attitudes towards childrearing. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.) Handbook of parenting, Vol. 3: Status and social conditions of parenting (pp. 359-392). Mahwah, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hooven, C., Gottman, J., & Katz, L. (1995). Parental meta emotion structure predicts family and child outcomes. Cognition and Emotion, 9, 229-264.

Isen, A. (1987). Positive affect, cognitive processes, and social behavior. In L Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (pp.203-253). New York: Academic Press.

Izard, C. (1982). Measuring emotions in human development. In C. Izard (Ed.), Measuring emotions in infants and children (pp.3-20). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jewsuwan, R., Luster, T., & Kostelnick, M. (1993). The relation between parents' perceptions of temperament and children's adjustment to preschool. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 8, 33-51.

Kalish, C. (1997). Preschoolers' understanding of mental and bodily reactions to contamination: What you don't know can hurt you, but cannot sadden you. Developmental Psychology, 33, 79-91.

Karavasilis, L., Doyle, A., & Magolese, S. (1999). Links between parenting styles and adolescent attachment. Poster presented at the Society for Research in Child Development Conference, Albuquerque, N.M.

Kellam, S. (1994). The social adaptation of children in classrooms: A measure of family child-rearing effectiveness. In R. Parke & S. Kellam (Eds.), Exploring family relationships with other social contexts (pp. 147-168). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Keogh, B. (1986). Temperament and Schooling: Meaning of "Goodness of Fit"? New Directions for Child Development, 31, 89-108.

Klein, H. (1982). The relationship between children's temperament and adjustment to kindergarten and head start settings. Journal of Psychology, 112, 259-268.

Krueger, R., Schmutte, P., Caspi, A., Moffit, T., Campbell, K., & Silva, P. (1994). Personality traits are linked to crime among men and women: Evidence from a birth cohort. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 103, 328-338.

Kochanska, G, Murray, K., Coy, K. (1997). Inhibitory control as a contributor to conscience in childhood: From toddler to early school years. Child Development, 68, 263-278.

Kuczynski, L., Kochanska, G., Radke-Yarrow, M., & Girnius-Brown, O. (1987). A developmental interpretation of young children's non-compliance. Developmental Psychology, 23, 799-806.

Kyrios, M., & Prior, M. (1990). Temperament, stress, and family factors in behavioural adjustment of 3-5 year old children. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 13, 67-93.

Ladd, G. W. & Profilet, S.M. (1996). The child behavior scale: A teacher-report of young children's aggressive, withdrawn, and prosocial behaviors. Developmental Psychology, 32 (6), 1008-1024.

Lagace-Seguin, D.G. (1999a). Maternal disciplinary styles and beliefs: Conceptual and theoretical Links. Poster session presented at the Carleton University Conference on Child Development, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, March 26, 1999.

Lagace-Seguin, D.G. (1999b). Bridging the parenting gap: Relations between maternal disciplinary styles, goals, attributions, and emotions. Poster session presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, New Mexico, April 15-18, 1998.

Lamb, M.E. (1987). The father's role: Cross-cultural perspectives. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Larsen, R. (1984). Theory and measurement of affect intensity as an individual difference characteristic. Dissertation Abstracts International, 85, 2297B. (University Microfilms No. 84-22112)

Larsen, R. & Diener, E. (1987). Affect intensity as an individual difference characteristic: A review. Journal of Research in Personality, 21, 1-39.

Lazarus, R. & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. New York: Springer.

Leeper, R. (1948). A motivational theory of emotions to replace "emotions as disorganized response". Psychological Review, 55, 5-21.

Lim, K.G.; Crnic, K.A., & Bohnert, A.M. (2001). Parental socialization of children's emotional knowledge: Supportive and nonsupportive practices. Poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Minneapolis, MN, April 18-22, 2001.

Luster, T. & Okagaki, L. (1993). Parenting: An ecological perspective. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Maccoby, E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology (Vol 4) (pp.1-101). New York: Wiley.

Malatesta, C. Z., Culver, C., Tesman, J. R., & Shepard, B. (1989). The development of emotional expression during the first two years of life. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 54, Serial No. 219, Nos. 1-2.

Martin, J. A. (1981). A longitudinal study of the consequences of early mother-infant interaction: A microanalytic approach. Monographs of the society for research in Child Development, 46 (3, serial No. 190).

Martin, R. (1989) Activity level, distractibility and persistence: critical characteristics in early schooling. In G. A. Kohnstamm, J. E. Bates & M. K. Rothbart (Eds), Temperament in childhood (pp. 283-298). Chichester: Wiley.

Martinez-Pons, M. (1997/98). The relation of emotional intelligence with selected areas of personal functioning. Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 17 (1), 3-13.

Martinez-Pons, M. (1998/99). Parental inducement of emotional intelligence. Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 18 (1), 3023.

Mayer, J. & Beltz, C. (1998). Socialization, society's emotional contract, and emotional intelligence. Psychological Inquiry, 9 (4), 300-303.

Mayer, J. & Geher, C. (1996). Emotional intelligence and the identity of emotion. Intelligence, 22, 89-114.

Mayer, J. & Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. Intelligence, 197, 433-442.

Mayer, J., & Salovey, P (1995). Emotional intelligence and the construction and regulation of feelings. Applied and Preventive Psychology, 4, 197-208.

Miller, S. (1995). Parents' attributions for their children's behaviours. Child Development, 66, 1557-1584

Mills, R., & Rubin, K. (1990). Parental beliefs about problematic social behaviour in early childhood. Child Development, 61, 138-151.

Mize, J. & Pettit, G. (1997). Mother's social coaching, mother-child relationship style, and children's peer competence: Is the medium the message? Child Development, 68, 291-311.

Moller, J. S. (1983). Relationships between temperament and development in preschool children. Research in Nursing and Health, 6, 25-32.

Morand, D (1999). Family size and intelligence: The role of emotional intelligence. Psychological Reports, 84 (2), 643-649.

Moulton, C. (1998). Child rearing in the home and in the classroom: Linking daycare teachers' parenting beliefs with classroom practices. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Novick, R. (1998). The comfort corner: Fostering Resiliency and emotional intelligence. Childhood Education, Sum, 200-204.

Nunally (1978). Psychometric testing. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Parke, R.D. (1996). Fatherhood. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Patterson, G (1986). Performance models for antisocial boys. American Psychologist, 41, 432-444.

Paterson, G., & Sanson, A. (1999). The association of behavioural adjustment to temperament, parenting, and family characteristics among 5-year-old children. Social Development, 8, (3), 293-309.

Pervin, L. (1989). Goal concepts in personality and social psychology. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.

Piaget, J. (1952). The Origins of Intelligence. New York: International Universities Press.

Plomin, R., DeFries, J., & Loehlin, J. (1977). Genotype-environment interaction and correlation in the analysis of human behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 84, 309-322.

Prior, M. (1992). Child Temperament. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 33 (1), 249-279.

Pullis, M., & Cadwell, J. (1982). The influence of children's temperament characteristics on teachers' decision strategies. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 165-181.

Radke-Yarrow, M., Ritchers, J., & Wilson, W. E. (1988). Child development in a network of relationships. In R. A. Hinde & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), Relationships within families: Mutual influences (pp. 48-67). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Robinson, C., Mandleco, B., Frost Olsen, S., & Hart, C. (1995). Authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting practices: Development of a new measure. Psychological Reports, 77, 819-830.

Rothbart, M. (1988). Attention and emotion in the development of temperament. In M.I. Posner, symposium organizer, The role of attention in normal development and psychopathology. University of Oregon, Center for the Study of Emotion (Technical Report No. 88-3, Eugene, OR).

Rothbart, M. (1996). Child Behaviour Questionnaire. University of Oregon.

Rothbart, M., Ahadi, S., & Hershey, H. (1994). Temperament and social behaviour in children. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 40, 21-39.

Rothbart, M. & Derryberry, D. (1981). Development of individual differences in development. In M. Lamb & L. Brown (Eds.), Advances in Developmental Psychology (Vol.1). Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rothbart, M., Ziaie, H., & O'Boyle, C. (1992). Self-regulation and emotion in infancy. In N. Eisenberg & R. Fabes (Eds.), Emotion and self-regulation in early development: New directions in child development (pp. 7-24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rubin, K. (1990). Maternal beliefs about adaptive and maladaptive social behaviour in aggressive, normal, and withdrawn preschoolers. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 18(4), 419-435.

Rubin, K. H., Bukowski, W., & Parker, J. G. (1998). Peer interactions, relationships, and groups. In Damon, W., Eisenber, N. (Eds.), Handbook of Child Psychology, 5th Ed., Vol 3, Social, Emotional and Personality Development. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Rubin, K., Cheah, C., & Fox, N. (2001). Emotion regulation, parenting, and the display of social reticence in preschoolers. Early Education and Development: Special Issue on Emotion Regulation, 12 (1), 75-97.

Rubin, K., Coplan, R., Fox, N., & Calkins, S. (1995). Emotionality, emotion regulation, and preschoolers' social adaptation. Development and Psychopathology, 7, 49-62.

Rubin, K., Hastings, P., Chen, X., Stewart, S., McNichol, K. (1998). Intrapersonal and maternal correlates of aggression, conflict, and externalizing problems in toddlers. Child Development, 69 (6), 1614-1629.

Rubin, K., & Mills, R. (1991). Conceptualizing developmental pathways to internalizing disorders in childhood. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 23 (3), 300-317.

Rubin, K., Nelson, L., Hastings, P., Asendorpf, J. (1999). The transaction between parent'' perceptions of their children'' shyness and their parenting styles. International Journal of Behavioural Development, 23, 937-958.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. (1989-90). Emotional intelligence. Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9, 185-211.

Scarr, S., & McCartney, K. (1983). How people make their own environments: A theory of genotype environment effects. Child Development, 54, 424-435.

Schaefer, E. (1959). A circumplex model for maternal behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59, 226-235.

Schaefer, L., Gilmer, B., & Schoen, M. (1940). Psychology. New York: Harper and Brothers

Scott-Little, M., & Holloway, S. (1994). Caregivers attributions about children's misbehaviours in child care centers. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 15 (2), 241-253.

Sears, R., Maccoby, E., Levin, H. (1957). In search of fathers: A narrative of an empirical journey. In I. Sigel & G. Brody (Eds.), Methods of family research: Biographies of research projects (Vol. 1): Normal families (pp153-188). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Showers, C. (1988). Motivational Consequences of Considering Negative Possibilities for Upcoming Events. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum

Sigel, I., McGillicuddy-DeLisi, A., & Goodnow, J. (1992). Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children (second edition). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Skarpness, L.R., & Carson, D.K. (1987). Correlates of kindergarten adjustment: temperament and communicative competence. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 2, 367-376.

Slee, P. (1986). The relation of temperament and other factors to children's kindergarten adjustment. Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 17 (2), 104-112.

Spector (1992). Summated rating scale construction: An introduction. Newbury Park: Sage.

Sputa, C., Paulson, S. (1995). Birth order and family size: Influences on adolescent's achievement and related parenting behaviour. Psychological Reports, 76, 43-71.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S., Darling, N., Mounts, N., Dornbusch, S. (1994). Over time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful families. Child Development, 65, 754-770.

Stern, D. (1985). The interpersonal world of the infant: A view from psychoanalysis and developmental psychology. New York: Basic Books.

Sternberg, R. (1998). In search of the human mind. Fortworth, TX: Harcourt Brace, & Company.

Stevens, J. (1996). Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Stevenson-Hinde, J. (1989). Behavioral inhibition: Issues of context. In J.S. Reznick (Ed.) Perspectives on behavioral inhibition (pp. 125-138). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stewart, A., Pickens, J., Morris, E. (1999). The influence of parenting style on the quality of observed parent-child interactions during play. Poster presented at the Society for Research in Child Development Conference, Albuquerque, N.M.

Stice, E. & Gonzales, N. (1998). Adolescent temperament moderates the relation of parenting to antisocial behavior and substance use. Journal of Adolescent Research, 13 (1), 5-31.

Szewczyk, M., Neff, C., Dranger, E., Mangelsdorf, S., Schoppe, S. (2001). Personality, social-contextual, and child temperament correlates of mothers' parenting quality. Poster presented at the Biennial Society for Research in Child Development, Minneapolis, Minnesota, April 26-29th, 2001.

Terwogt, M., & Stegge, H. (1995). Children's understanding of strategic control of negative emotions. In J.A. Russell, J. Fernandez-Dols, A.S.R. Mastead, & J.C. Wellencamp (Eds.), Everyday conceptions of emotion: An introduction to psychology, anthropology, and linguistics of emotion. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Thomas, A. & Chess, S. (1977). Temperament and Development. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Thomas, A., Chess, S., & Birch, H. (1968). Temperament and behaviour disorders in children. New York: New York University Press.

Thomasgard, M. & Metz, W.P. (1993). Parental overprotection revisited. Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 24, 67-80.

Thompson, R. (1999). The individual child: Temperament, emotion, self, and personality. In M. Bornstein & M. Lamb (Eds.), Developmental psychology: An

advanced textbook (4th Ed., pp. 377-410). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.

Tompkins, S. (1962). Affect, imagery, and consciousness (Vol.1). New York: Springer.

Tremblay, R., Vitaro, F., Gagnon, C., Piche, C., & Royer, N. (1992). A prosocial scale for the Preschool Behavior Questionnaire: Concurrent and predictive correlates. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 15, 227-245.

Vellet, N., Assel, M., Landry, S., Swank, P., & Smith, K. (1999). Maternal warm responsiveness: A discrete aspect of parenting or a part of a broader parenting style? Poster presented at the Society for Research in Child Development Conference, Albuquerque, N.M.

Watson, D., & Clark, L. (1984). Behavioral disinhibition versus constraint: A dispositional perspective. In D. Wegner & J. Pennebaker (Eds.), Handbook of mental control (pp. 506-527). New York: Prentice Hall.

Wellman, H.M. (1994). From desires to beliefs: Acquisition of theory of mind. In A. Whitten (Ed.), Natural Theories of Mind: Evolution, Development and Simulation of Every Day Mind Reading, pp 19-38. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell, Inc.

Yogman, M.W. (1981). Development of the father-infant relationship. In H. Fitzgerald, B. Lester, & M.W. Yogman (Eds.), Theory and research in behavioural pediatrics (Vol 1, pp 221-279). New York: Plenum

Young, P (1936). Motivation of Behavior. New York: JohnWiley and Sons.

Zajdeman, H.S., & Minnes, P.M. (1991). Predictors of children's adjustment to daycare. Early Child Development and Care, 74, 11-28

Zeman, J., Penza, S., Shipman, K., & Young, G. (1997). Preschoolers as functionalists: The impact of social context on emotion regulation. Child Study Journal, 27 (1), 41-67.

Appendix A--Original Item Pool

A. Emotion Coaching Parenting Style

1. Items relating to sadness

When my child is sad, it's time to problem solve

When my child gets sad, it's time to get close

When my child is sad, I try to help him/her explore what is making him/her sad

When my child is sad, I show my child that I understand

I want my child to experience sadness

The important thing is to find out why a child is feeling sad

When my child is sad we sit down to talk over the sadness

When my child is sad, I try to help him figure out why the feeling is there

2. Items relating to anger

Anger is an emotion worth exploring

When my child is angry its an opportunity for getting close

When my child is angry, I take some time to experience this feeling with my child

I want my child to experience anger

I think it is good for kids to experience anger sometimes

The important thing is to find out why the child is feeling angry

When my child is angry, I try to be understanding of his mood

I want my child to get angry, to stand up for himself

When my child is angry, I want to know what he/she is thinking

It is important to help my child find out what caused his/her anger

A child's anger is important

Table 1 (Continued)

When my child is angry, it's time to problem solve

Children have a right to feel angry

B. Emotion Dismissing

1. Items relating to sadness

Children really have very little to be sad about

When my child is sad, I am expected to fix the world and make it perfect

I really have no time for sadness in my life

If you ignore a child's sadness it tends to go away and take care of itself

I think sadness is okay as long as it's under control

Sadness is something that one has to get over, to ride out, not to dwell on

I don't mind dealing with children's sadness as long as it doesn't last too long

I prefer a happy child to a child who is overly emotional

I help my child get over sadness quickly so he/she can move onto other things

I don't see a child being sad as any kind of opportunity to teach the child much

I think that when kids are sad they have over emphasized the negative in life

I'm not really trying to teach my child anything in particular about sadness

I don't make a big deal out of my child's sadness

2. Items relating to anger

I think that anger is okay as long as it is under control

I try to change my child's angry moods into cheerful ones

Table 1 (Continued)

Children really have very little to be angry about

Childhood is a happy-go-lucky time, not a time for feeling angry or sad

When my child gets angry, my goal is to get him/her to stop

I don't make a big deal about a child's anger

When my child is mad, I just find out what is making him/her mad

When my child is angry, I usually don't take it that seriously

When my child gets angry with me I think "I don't want to hear this"

When my child gets angry I think "if only he/she could roll with the punches"

When my child gets angry I think "why can't he/she accept things as they are"

Appendix B

The Parent's Emotional Style Questionnaire

This self-test asks questions about your feelings regarding sadness, and anger-both in yourself and your child(ren). For each item please decide to what degree you agree with the statements and circle your choice. While this questionnaire requires you to answer lots of questions, try to stick with it. The lengthy design ensures that we cover most aspects of your parenting style.

***1. Children really have very little to be sad about**

Disagree					Agree
1	2	3	4	5	

***2. I think that anger is okay as long as it is under control**

Disagree					Agree
1	2	3	4	5	

3. When my child is sad, it's time to problem solve

Disagree					Agree
1	2	3	4	5	

4. Anger is an emotion worth exploring

Disagree					Agree
1	2	3	4	5	

5. When my child is sad, I am expected to fix the world and make it perfect

Disagree					Agree
1	2	3	4	5	

6. When my child gets sad, it's a time to get close

Disagree Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***7. When my child is sad, I try to help him/her explore what is making him/her sad**

Disagree Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***8. I really have no time for sadness in my life**

Disagree Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***9. If you ignore a child's sadness it tends to go away and take care of itself**

Disagree Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***10. When my child is sad, I show my child that I understand**

Disagree Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***11. I want my child to experience sadness**

Disagree Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***12. The important thing is to find out why a child is feeling sad**

Disagree Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***13. I think sadness is okay as long as it's under control**

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

14. Sadness is something that one has to get over, to ride out, not to dwell on

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***15. I don't mind dealing with children's sadness, so long as it doesn't last too long**

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***16. When my child is sad we sit down to talk over the sadness**

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

17. I prefer a happy child to a child who is overly emotional

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

18. I help my child get over sadness quickly so he/she can move onto other things

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***19. When my child is sad, I try to help him figure out why the feeling is there**

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

20. When my child is angry, it's an opportunity for getting close

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

21. When my child is angry, I take some time to try to experience this feeling with my child

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***22. I want my child to experience anger**

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***23. I don't see a child being sad as any kind of opportunity to teach the child much**

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***24. I think that when kids are sad they have overemphasized the negative in life**

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***25. I think it is good for kids to experience anger sometimes**

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***26. The important thing is to find out why the child is feeling angry**

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***27. When my child is angry, I try to be understanding of his mood**

Disagree

Agree

1

2

3

4

5

28. I try to change my child's angry moods into cheerful ones

Disagree

Agree

1

2

3

4

5

***29. Children really have very little to be angry about**

Disagree

Agree

1

2

3

4

5

30. Childhood is a happy-go-lucky time, not a time for feeling sad or angry.

Disagree

Agree

1

2

3

4

5

***31. I'm not really trying to teach my child anything in particular about sadness**

Disagree

Agree

1

2

3

4

5

32. When my child gets angry my goal is to get him to stop

Disagree

Agree

1

2

3

4

5

***33. I want my child to get angry, to stand up for himself**

Disagree

Agree

1

2

3

4

5

34. When my child is angry I want to know what he/she is thinking

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***35. I don't make a big deal of a child's anger**

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***36. When my child is mad, I just find out what is making him/her mad**

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***37. It's important to help my child find out what caused his/her anger**

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***38. When my child is angry, I usually don't take it that seriously.**

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***39. When my child gets angry with me, I think, "I don't want to hear this"**

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***40. A child's anger is important**

Disagree

Agree

1 2 3 4 5

***41. When my child is angry I think "if only he/she could roll with the punches"**

Disagree

Agree

1

2

3

4

5

***42. When my child gets angry I think, "Why can't he/she accept things as they are?"**

Disagree

Agree

1

2

3

4

5

43. When my child is angry, it's time to solve a problem

Disagree

Agree

1

2

3

4

5

***44. I don't make a big deal out of my child's sadness**

Disagree

Agree

1

2

3

4

5

***45. Children have a right to feel angry**

Disagree

Agree

1

2

3

4

5

Appendix C

Dear Parents:

In the past, researchers have found that the way parent's parent influences the social and cognitive development of children. Currently, a project concerned with the influence of parenting styles and parenting beliefs on child development is being conducted by researchers at Carleton University. The purpose of this letter is to ask if you would like to participate in this study.

If you should decide to participate, you would be required to fill out two questionnaires only one time. For these questionnaires you will be asked to rate the extent to which you agree with the statements regarding a variety of emotions and behaviours. We anticipate this task to take approximately 30 minutes of your time. If you agree to participate you will have two weeks to complete the questionnaires. And, mothers who return completed questionnaires will be **eligible to win a \$250.00** gift certificate for the Rideau Center Mall.

This project has been approved by the Ethics Committee of the Psychology Department at Carleton University. All information collected for this study is completely confidential. Questionnaires will be reviewed by only the researchers named at the bottom of this page and will be used only for data analysis. Study results will be reported in ways to ensure complete confidentiality of all participants. Also, we will not be analyzing the data on any one mother's ratings. Instead we are focusing on average responses of participating mothers.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may choose to withdraw at any time. Your cooperation in this study would be greatly appreciated. If you have any questions please feel free to contact Daniel Lagace-Seguin (225-2948, 850-7396, or 520-2600, ext. 1979) or Dr. Robert Coplan (520-2600, ext. 8691). Should you have further concerns with regard to this study, please feel free to contact Dr. Mary Gick (Chair of the Department of Psychology Ethics Committee, 520-2600, ext. 2664), or Dr. Kim Matheson (Chair, Department of Psychology, 520-2600, ext. 2548). And, should you desire to have more information on parenting styles and beliefs you can consult the book: Raising an Emotionally Intelligent Child by John M. Gottman. **If you would like to participate in this study, please fill out the attached form and return it within one week. A package of questionnaires will follow shortly after.**

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Daniel G. Lagace-Seguin, M. A., Ph.D (Candidate)

Dr. Robert J. Coplan

Appendix D

CONSENT FORM

The information collected for this project is confidential and protected under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 1989

I have read and understood the request for my participation in this study about parenting styles and beliefs.

_____ I am willing to participate in this study

_____ I am not willing to participate in this study

Date: _____

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Appendix E

Demographic Questionnaire

Mother's name: _____

Mother's Birth date (yr/mo/day): _____

Mother's Occupation: _____

Mother's Marital Status:	Single	_____
	Married	_____
	Common Law	_____
	Divorced	_____
	Separated	_____
	Widowed	_____
	Other	_____

Mother's Education Completed:	Elementary School	_____
	High school	_____
	College	_____
	University	_____
	Graduate School	_____
	Other	_____

Mother's country of birth: _____

Mother's ethnic group:	Caucasian	_____
	Asian	_____
	Black	_____
	Hispanic	_____
	Native Canadian	_____
	Other	_____

Child's Name: _____ Child's Age (Y, M, D) _____

Child's Gender: Male _____ Female _____ Number of Siblings _____

Appendix F

The Parenting Practices Questionnaire

DIRECTIONS:

The following pages contain a list of 62 behaviours that parents may exhibit when interacting with their children. The questions are designed to measure how often you exhibit certain behaviours towards your child. If you have more than one child, think specifically about how you behave with your child in preschool or daycare who has been the focus of this situation thus far. Please do not discuss the items with other family members, until you have finished the questionnaire: we are interested in your responses.

For each of the 62 items, make a rating using the following five point scale: 1=never, 2=once in a while, 3=about half the time, 4=very often, 5=always

1. I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles. _____
2. I guide my child by punishment more than by reason. _____
3. I know the names of my child's friends. _____
4. I find it difficult to discipline my child. _____
5. I give praise when my child is good. _____
6. I spank when my child is disobedient. _____
7. I joke and play with my child. _____
8. I withhold scolding and/or criticism even when my child acts contrary to my wishes. _____
9. I show sympathy when my child is hurt or frustrated. _____
10. I punish by taking privileges away from my child with little if any explanations. _____
11. I spoil my child. _____
12. I give comfort and understanding when my child is upset. _____
13. I yell or shout when my child misbehaves. _____
14. I'm easygoing and relaxed with my child. _____
15. I allow my child to annoy someone else. _____
16. I tell my child my expectations regarding behaviour before he/she engages in an activity. _____
17. I scold and criticize to make my child improve. _____
18. I show patience with my child. _____
19. I grab my child when he/she is being disobedient. _____
20. I state punishments to my child and do not actually do them. _____

I exhibit this behaviour 1=never, 2=once in a while, 3=about half the time, 4=very often, 5=always

21. I am responsive to my child's feelings or needs. _____
22. I allow my child to give input into family rules. _____
23. I argue with my child. _____
24. I appear confident about my parenting abilities. _____
25. I give my child reasons why rules should be obeyed. _____
26. I appear to be more concerned with my own than with my child's feelings. _____
27. I tell my child that I appreciate what he/she tries or accomplishes. _____
28. I punish by putting my child off somewhere alone with little if any explanations. _____
29. I help my child to understand the impact of behaviour by encouraging him/her to talk about the consequences of his/her actions. _____
30. I am afraid that disciplining my child for misbehaviour will cause him/her to not like me. _____
31. I take my child's desires into account before asking him/her to do something. _____
32. I explode in anger towards my child. _____
33. I am aware of problems or concerns about my child in daycare/preschool. _____
34. I threaten my child with punishment more often than actually giving it. _____
35. I express affection by hugging, kissing, and holding my child. _____
36. I ignore my child's misbehaviour. _____
37. I use physical punishment as a way of disciplining my child. _____
38. I carry out discipline after my child misbehaves. _____
39. I apologize to my child when I make a mistake in parenting. _____
40. I tell my child what to do. _____
41. I give in to my child when he/she causes a commotion about something. _____
42. I talk it over and reason with my child when he/she misbehaves. _____
43. I slap my child when he/she misbehaves. _____
44. I disagree with my child. _____
45. I allow my child to interrupt others. _____

I exhibit this behaviour 1=never, 2=once in a while, 3=about half the time, 4=very often, 5=always

46. I have warm and intimate times together with my child. _____
47. When two children are fighting, I discipline children first and ask questions later. _____
48. I encourage my child to freely express himself/herself even when disagreeing with his/her parents. _____
49. I bribe my child with rewards to bring about compliance. _____
50. I scold or criticize when my child's behaviour doesn't meet my expectations. _____
51. I show respect for my child's opinions by encouraging him/her to express them. _____
52. I set strict well established rules for my child. _____
53. I explain to my child how I feel about his/her good and bad behaviour. _____
54. I use threats as punishment with little or no justification. _____
55. I take into account my child's preferences in making plans for the family. _____
56. When my child asks why he/she has to conform, I state: Because I said so, or: I am your parent and I want you to. _____
57. I appear unsure on how to solve my child's misbehaviour. _____
58. I explain the consequences of my child's behaviour. _____
59. I demand that my child does things. _____
60. I channel my child's misbehaviour into a more acceptable activity. _____
61. I shove my child when he/she is disobedient. _____
62. I emphasize the reasons for rules. _____

Appendix G

Child Behaviour Vignettes

Instructions:

There are five brief stories in this part of the questionnaire. Each story describes a child engaging in some type of behaviour. As you read each story, please imagine that it is your child being described. Maybe something like this has happened before, and you can remember how you felt and what you did. If nothing like what is described in a story has happened before, please imagine what it is like to be in that situation and see your child behaving that way.

After each story there are 14 questions. Each of these describes a thought or emotion you may have if you saw your child behaving that way. With each one, there is a 5 point rating scale. After you read an item, please use the scale to rate how much you agree with that item. For example, if you would want your child to behave properly right away, and this was very important to you, you might rate that item as a 4 or 5 out of 5.

Please try to answer every question. If you're not sure about any of the items, just take your best guess. Also, we're interested in what you think, and what you do, so please don't talk about the stories and questions with other people until after you have given us your answers.

Story One

Your child is out front of your home, playing with a few other children. You are watching them from one of your windows. They are having fun, playing a game like "tag", and your child seems to be one of the leaders. One of the other children trips over something, and starts crying. Your child goes to the crying child, helps him/her to sit up, and sits together with the other child until he/she stops crying. Your child has done this kind of thing before.

The following five items describe things that you might be concerned about, goals you might have, or things you might want to achieve in this situation. Please rate each one from 1: Not at all important, to 5: Extremely important.

1. I would want my child to behave properly, right away.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

2. I would want my child to feel good, or to be happy.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

3. I would want my child to know that I love him/her, and he/she can love and trust me.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

4. I would want my child to understand that I expect him/her to behave properly.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

5. I would want my child and I both to feel good about this situation.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

The following four items describe reasons why you think your child may have behaved in the way described in this story. Please rate each one from 1 to 5.

6. My child might have acted this way because it was in his/her nature or personality to act this way, or it might have been due to the situation.

1	2	3	4	5
completely due to personality	mostly due to personality	equally due to both	mostly due to situation	completely due to situation

7. My child might have acted this way on purpose, or my child might not have meant to act this way.

1	2	3	4	5
definitely did this on purpose	probably did this on purpose	it could be either way	probably did not mean to do this	definitely did not mean to do this

8. My child might be going through a phase or stage that will end soon, or my child might keep on acting this way.

1	2	3	4	5
definitely a stage that will pass	probably a stage that will pass	it could be either way	probably will act this way in future	definitely will act this way in future

9. This behaviour is typical of my child or my child never acts this way.

1	2	3	4	5
this is just like how my child behaves	my child act this way sometimes	my child could act this way	this does not sound much like my child	my child never acts this way

The following five items describe emotions that you might feel in this situation. Please rate how strongly you would feel each emotion from 1: not at all, to 5: very strong.

		Not at all	Little	Medium	Strong	Very strong
10.	Angry	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Happy	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Responsible	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Worried	1	2	3	4	5

Story Two

One afternoon you go to pick up your child from his/her daycare center or preschool. When you get there, your child is in the playground with some other children. One of the other children has a toy your child wants, and you see your child grab the toy and push the other child down. You have seen your child do this a few times before.

The following five items describe things that you might be concerned about, goals you might have, or things you might want to achieve in this situation. Please rate each one from 1: Not at all important, to 5: Extremely important.

1. I would want my child to behave properly, right away.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

2. I would want my child to feel good, or to be happy.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

3. I would want my child to know that I love him/her, and he/she can love and trust me.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

4. I would want my child to understand that I expect him/her to behave properly.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

5. I would want my child and I both to feel good about this situation.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

The following four items describe reasons why you think your child may have behaved in the way described in this story. Please rate each one from 1 to 5.

6. My child might have acted this way because it was in his/her nature or personality to act this way, or it might have been due to the situation.

1	2	3	4	5
completely due to personality	mostly due to personality	equally due to both	mostly due to situation	completely due to situation

7. My child might have acted this way on purpose, or my child might not have meant to act this way.

1	2	3	4	5
definitely did this on purpose	probably did this on purpose	it could be either way	probably did not mean to do this	definitely did not mean to do this

8. My child might be going through a phase or stage that will end soon, or my child might keep on acting this way.

1	2	3	4	5
definitely a stage that will pass	probably a stage that will pass	it could be either way	probably will act this way in future	definitely will act this way in future

9. This behaviour is typical of my child or my child never acts this way.

1	2	3	4	5
this is just like how my child behaves	my child act this way sometimes	my child could act this way	this does not sound much like my child	my child never acts this way

The following five items describe emotions that you might feel in this situation. Please rate how strongly you would feel each emotion from 1: not at all, to 5: very strong.

	Not at all	Little	Medium	Strong	Very strong
10. Angry	1	2	3	4	5
11. Happy	1	2	3	4	5
12. Responsible	1	2	3	4	5
13. Embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5
14. Worried	1	2	3	4	5

Story Three

One morning, you have dropped your child off at his/her daycare center or preschool. After you say good-bye, you decide to stay and watch the children for a little while, and find a spot where you can see your child, but he/she doesn't know you're watching. You see your child standing against the wall, watching some of the other children playing with a fun toy. Your child looks interested, but stays against the wall and keeps his/her chin down. You have seen your child act like this at other times.

The following five items describe things that you might be concerned about, goals you might have, or things you might want to achieve in this situation. Please rate each one from 1: Not at all important, to 5: Extremely important.

1. I would want my child to behave properly, right away.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

2. I would want my child to feel good, or to be happy.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

3. I would want my child to know that I love him/her, and he/she can love and trust me.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

4. I would want my child to understand that I expect him/her to behave properly.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

5. I would want my child and I both to feel good about this situation.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

The following four items describe reasons why you think your child may have behaved in the way described in this story. Please rate each one from 1 to 5.

6. My child might have acted this way because it was in his/her nature or personality to act this way, or it might have been due to the situation.

1	2	3	4	5
completely due to personality	mostly due to personality	equally due to both	mostly due to situation	completely due to situation

7. My child might have acted this way on purpose, or my child might not have meant to act this way.

1	2	3	4	5
definitely did this on purpose	probably did this on purpose	it could be either way	probably did not mean to do this	definitely did not mean to do this

8. My child might be going through a phase or stage that will end soon, or my child might keep on acting this way.

1	2	3	4	5
definitely a stage that will pass	probably a stage that will pass	it could be either way	probably will act this way in future	definitely will act this way in future

9. This behaviour is typical of my child or my child never acts this way.

1	2	3	4	5
this is just like how my child behaves	my child act this way sometimes	my child could act this way	this does not sound much like my child	my child never acts this way

The following five items describe emotions that you might feel in this situation. Please rate how strongly you would feel each emotion from 1: not at all, to 5: very strong.

	Not at all	Little	Medium	Strong	Very strong
10. Angry	1	2	3	4	5
11. Happy	1	2	3	4	5
12. Responsible	1	2	3	4	5
13. Embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5
14. Worried	1	2	3	4	5

Story Four

You and your child are in the local grocery store. Your child asks for a very sugary cereal. You tell him/her it's not very good for him/her. Then, your child sees some stuffed animals and says he/she wants one. You tell him/her that he/she has toys at home, and you can't buy another one today. Then, your child grabs a candy bar, and when you try to put it on the shelf, your child screams "I want it!" People turn and look.

The following five items describe things that you might be concerned about, goals you might have, or things you might want to achieve in this situation. Please rate each one from 1: Not at all important, to 5: Extremely important.

1. I would want my child to behave properly, right away.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all important	a little important	moderately important	very important	extremely important

2. I would want my child to feel good, or to be happy.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all important	a little important	moderately important	very important	extremely important

3. I would want my child to know that I love him/her, and he/she can love and trust me.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all important	a little important	moderately important	very important	extremely important

4. I would want my child to understand that I expect him/her to behave properly.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all important	a little important	moderately important	very important	extremely important

5. I would want my child and I both to feel good about this situation.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all important	a little important	moderately important	very important	extremely important

The following four items describe reasons why you think your child may have behaved in the way described in this story. Please rate each one from 1 to 5.

6. My child might have acted this way because it was in his/her nature or personality to act this way, or it might have been due to the situation.

1	2	3	4	5
completely due to personality	mostly due to personality	equally due to both	mostly due to situation	completely due to situation

7. My child might have acted this way on purpose, or my child might not have meant to act this way.

1	2	3	4	5
definitely did this on purpose	probably did this on purpose	it could be either way	probably did not mean to do this	definitely did not mean to do this

8. My child might be going through a phase or stage that will end soon, or my child might keep on acting this way.

1	2	3	4	5
definitely a stage that will pass	probably a stage that will pass	it could be either way	probably will act this way in future	definitely will act this way in future

9. This behaviour is typical of my child or my child never acts this way.

1	2	3	4	5
this is just like how my child behaves	my child act this way sometimes	my child could act this way	this does not sound much like my child	my child never acts this way

The following five items describe emotions that you might feel in this situation. Please rate how strongly you would feel each emotion from 1: not at all, to 5: very strong.

	Not at all	Little	Medium	Strong	Very strong
10. Angry	1	2	3	4	5
11. Happy	1	2	3	4	5
12. Responsible	1	2	3	4	5
13. Embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5
14. Worried	1	2	3	4	5

Story Five

One day, you and your child are at home and you are expecting some friends to drop by soon. You look in the front room of your home, and your child's toys are all over the floor. Your child is watching TV. You ask your child to pick up his/her toys, and your child says "Later, when this show is over." You ask your child to pick his/her toys up now, and your child says "You're not being fair."

The following five items describe things that you might be concerned about, goals you might have, or things you might want to achieve in this situation. Please rate each one from 1: Not at all important, to 5: Extremely important.

1. I would want my child to behave properly, right away.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

2. I would want my child to feel good, or to be happy.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

3. I would want my child to know that I love him/her, and he/she can love and trust me.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

4. I would want my child to understand that I expect him/her to behave properly.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

5. I would want my child and I both to feel good about this situation.

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	a little	moderately	very	extremely
important	important	important	important	important

The following three items describe reasons why you think your child may have behaved in the way described in this story. Please rate each one from 1 to 5.

6. My child might have acted this way because it was in his/her nature or personality to act this way, or it might have been due to the situation.

1	2	3	4	5
completely due to personality	mostly due to personality	equally due to both	mostly due to situation	completely due to situation

7. My child might have acted this way on purpose, or my child might not have meant to act this way.

1	2	3	4	5
definitely did this on purpose	probably did this on purpose	it could be either way	probably did not mean to do this	definitely did not mean to do this

8. My child might be going through a phase or stage that will end soon, or my child might keep on acting this way.

1	2	3	4	5
definitely a stage that will pass	probably a stage that will pass	it could be either way	probably will act this way in future	definitely will act this way in future

9. This behaviour is typical of my child or my child never acts this way.

1	2	3	4	5
this is just like how my child behaves	my child act this way sometimes	my child could act this way	this does not sound much like my child	my child never acts this way

The following five items describe emotions that you might feel in this situation. Please rate how strongly you would feel each emotion from 1: not at all, to 5: very strong.

	Not at all	Little	Medium	Strong	Very strong
10. Angry	1	2	3	4	5
11. Happy	1	2	3	4	5
12. Responsible	1	2	3	4	5
13. Embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5
14. Worried	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix H
The Parental Emotional Style Questionnaire

On this page you will see statements that describe feelings in yourself and your child. We would like to know your opinions about each of these statements. For each statement please decide to what extent you agree or disagree and circle your choice. Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers. And please use the following scale to indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements:

	1 = strongly disagree	2=disagree	3= neutral	4=agree	5=strongly agree
1 When my child is sad, it's time to problem solve	1	2	3	4	5
2 Anger is an emotion worth exploring	1	2	3	4	5
3 When my child is sad I am expected to fix the world and make it perfect	1	2	3	4	5
4 When my child gets sad, it's a time to get close	1	2	3	4	5
5 Sadness is something that one has to get over, to ride out, not to dwell on	1	2	3	4	5
6 I prefer my child to be happy rather than overly emotional	1	2	3	4	5
7 I help my child get over sadness quickly so he/she can move onto other things	1	2	3	4	5
8 When my child is angry, it's an opportunity for getting close	1	2	3	4	5
9 When my child is angry, I take some time to try to experience this feeling with him/her	1	2	3	4	5
10 I try to change my child's angry moods into cheerful ones	1	2	3	4	5
11 Childhood is a happy-go-lucky time, not a time for feeling sad or angry	1	2	3	4	5
12 When my child gets angry my goal is to get him/her to stop	1	2	3	4	5
13 When my child is angry I want to know what he/she is thinking	1	2	3	4	5
14 When my child is angry, it's time to solve a problem	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix I

Child's name or ID _____ Date _____

Rated by (teacher) _____ School _____

Child Behavior Scale

Please consider the descriptions contained in each of the following items below and rate the extent to which each of these descriptions applies to this child, particularly in the context of his/her behavior with peers. For example, circle 3-"Certainly applies" if the child often displays the behavior described in the statement, circle 2-"Applies sometimes" if the child occasionally displays the behavior, and circle 1-"Doesn't apply" if the child seldom displays the behavior. Please circle only one response per item.

1=Doesn't apply 2=Applies sometimes 3=Certainly applies

- 1 2 3 1. Restless. Runs about or jumps up and down. Doesn't keep still
- 1 2 3 2. Squirmy, fidgety child
- 1 2 3 3. Destroys own or others' belongings
- 1 2 3 4. Fights with other children
- 1 2 3 5. Not much liked by children
- 1 2 3 6. Is worried. Worries about many things
- 1 2 3 7. Irritable; "quick to fly off the handle"
- 1 2 3 8. Appears miserable, unhappy, tearful, or distressed
- 1 2 3 9. Has twitches, mannerisms, or tics of the face and body
- 1 2 3 10. Is disobedient
- 1 2 3 11. Has poor concentration or short attention span
- 1 2 3 12. Tends to be fearful or afraid of new things or new situations
- 1 2 3 13. Fussy or over-particular
- 1 2 3 14. Tells lies
- 1 2 3 15. Has speech difficulty
- 1 2 3 16. Bullies other children

1=Doesn't apply 2=Applies sometimes 3=Certainly applies

- 1 2 3 17. Inattentive
- 1 2 3 18. Doesn't share toys
- 1 2 3 19. Cries easily
- 1 2 3 20. Blames others
- 1 2 3 21. Gives up easily
- 1 2 3 22. Inconsiderate of others
- 1 2 3 23. Kicks, bites or hits other children
- 1 2 3 24. Stares into space
- 1 2 3 25. Prefers to play alone
- 1 2 3 26. Helps other children
- 1 2 3 27. Peers refuse to let this child play with them
- 1 2 3 28. Shows a recognition of the feelings of others; is empathetic
- 1 2 3 29. Tend to react to other children's distress by teasing them or making things worse
- 1 2 3 30. Not chosen as playmate by peers
- 1 2 3 31. Likes to be alone
- 1 2 3 32. Keeps peers at a distance
- 1 2 3 33. Peers avoid this child
- 1 2 3 34. Seems concerned when other children are distressed
- 1 2 3 35. Aggressive child
- 1 2 3 36. Taunts and teases other children
- 1 2 3 37. Often unoccupied
- 1 2 3 38. Threatens other children

<u>1=Doesn't apply</u>			<u>2=Applies sometimes</u>	<u>3=Certainly applies</u>
1	2	3	39. Takes turns with play material	
1	2	3	40. Kind toward peers	
1	2	3	41. Can be trusted, is dependable	
1	2	3	42. Listens to classmates	
1	2	3	43. Excluded from peers' activities	
1	2	3	44. Compromises in conflict with peers	
1	2	3	45. Is ignored by peers	
1	2	3	46. Cooperative with peers	
1	2	3	47. Loses temper easily in conflicts with peers	
1	2	3	48. Argues with peers	
1	2	3	49. Friendly toward other children	
1	2	3	50. Annoys or irritates other children	
1	2	3	51. Solitary child	
1	2	3	52. Disrupts peers' activities	
1	2	3	53. Shows concern for moral issues (e.g., fairness, welfare or others)	
1	2	3	54. Ridiculed by peers	
1	2	3	55. Avoids peers	
1	2	3	56. Offers help or comfort when other children are upset	
1	2	3	57. Withdraws from peer activities	
1	2	3	58. Will continue to bother or hurt other children even when they are clearly upset	
1	2	3	59. Bossy toward peers	

Appendix J

Dear Parents:

In the past, researchers have found that the way parent's parent influences the social and cognitive development of children. Currently, a project concerned with the influence of parenting styles and parenting beliefs on child development is being conducted by researchers at Carleton University. The purpose of this letter is to ask if you would like to participate in this study.

If you should decide to participate, you would be required to fill out three questionnaires only one time. For these questionnaires you will be asked to rate the extent to which you agree with the statements regarding a variety of emotions and behaviours. We anticipate this task will take you approximately 45 minutes to complete. If you agree to participate you will have two weeks to complete the questionnaires. And, mothers who return completed questionnaires will be **eligible to win a \$250.00** gift certificate to the Rideau Center Mall.

This project has been approved by the Ethics Committee of the Psychology Department at Carleton University. All information collected for this study is completely confidential. Questionnaires will be reviewed by only the researchers named at the bottom of this page and will be used only for data analysis. Study results will be reported in ways to ensure complete confidentiality of all participants. Also, we will not be analyzing the data on any one mother's ratings. Instead we are focusing on average responses of participating mothers.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may choose to withdraw at any time. Your cooperation in this study would be greatly appreciated. If you have any questions please feel free to contact Daniel Lagace-Seguin (225-2948, 850-7396, or 520-2600, ext. 1979) or Dr. Robert Coplan (520-2600, ext. 8691). Should you have further concerns with regard to this study, please feel free to contact Dr. Mary Gick (Chair of the Department of Psychology Ethics Committee, 520-2600, ext. 2664), or Dr. Kim Matheson (Chair, Department of Psychology, 520-2600, ext. 2548). And, should you desire to have more information on parenting styles and beliefs you can consult the book: Raising an Emotionally Intelligent Child by John M. Gottman. **If you would like to participate in this study, please fill out the attached form and return it within one week. A package of questionnaires will follow shortly after.**

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Daniel G. Lagace-Seguin, M. A., Ph.D (Candidate)

Dr. Robert J. Coplan

Appendix K

CONSENT FORM

The information collected for this project is confidential and protected under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 1989

I have read and understood the request for my participation in this study about parenting styles and beliefs.

_____ I am willing to participate in this study

_____ I am not willing to participate in this study

Date: _____

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Appendix L Demographic Questionnaire

Mother's name: _____

Mother's Birth date (yr/mo/day): _____

Mother's Occupation: _____

Mother's Marital Status:	Single	_____
	Married	_____
	Common Law	_____
	Divorced	_____
	Separated	_____
	Widowed	_____
	Other	_____

Mother's Education Completed:	Elementary School	_____
	High school	_____
	College	_____
	University	_____
	Graduate School	_____
	Other	_____

Mother's country of birth: _____

Mother's ethnic group:	Caucasian	_____
	Asian	_____
	Black	_____
	Hispanic	_____
	Native Canadian	_____
	Other	_____

Child's Name: _____ Child's Age (Y, M, D) _____

Child's Gender: Male _____ Female _____ Number of Siblings _____

Appendix M

Affect Intensity Measure

DIRECTIONS: The following questions refer to the emotional reactions to typical life-events. Please indicate how your child would react to these events by placing a number from the following scale in the blank space preceding each item. Please base your answers on how you think **your child would react**, not on how you think your child should react.

Never	Almost Never	Occasionally	Usually	Almost Always	Always
1	2	3	4	5	6

1. ___ When my child accomplishes something difficult he/she feels delighted or elated
2. ___ When my child feels happy it is a strong type of exuberance
3. ___ My child enjoys being with people very much
4. ___ My child feels pretty bad when he/she tells a lie
5. ___ When my child solves a small personal problem, he/she feels euphoric
6. ___ My child's emotions tend to be more intense than his/her friend's emotions
7. ___ My child's happy moods are very strong
8. ___ My child gets overly enthusiastic
9. ___ If my child completes a task that he/she thought was impossible, he/she is ecstatic
10. ___ My child's heart races at the anticipation of some exciting event
11. ___ Sad movies deeply touch my child
12. ___ When my child is happy he/she feels untroubled and content rather than feeling
zestful and aroused
13. ___ My child gets nervous talking to a group of peers for the first time
14. ___ When something good happens, my child is usually much more jubilant than
others
15. ___ My child is emotional
16. ___ My child is likely to be content and peaceful rather than zestful and enthusiastic

Almost Never	Never	Occasionally	Usually	Almost Always	Always
1	2	3	4	5	6

17. ___ The sight of someone who is hurt badly affects my child strongly
18. ___ When my child is feeling well it is easy for him/her to go from being in a good mood to really joyful
19. ___ "Calm and cool" could easily describe my child
20. ___ When my child is happy, he/she bursts with joy
21. ___ Seeing some picture of a violent car crash makes my child feel sick
22. ___ When my child is happy, he/she feels energetic
23. ___ When my child receives an award he/she becomes overjoyed
24. ___ When my child succeeds at something, his/her reaction is calm contentment
25. ___ When my child does something wrong, he/she has strong feelings of guilt and shame
26. ___ My child usually remains calm
27. ___ When things are going good, my child feels "on top of the world".
28. ___ When my child gets angry, it is possible for him/her to still be rational and not to overreact
29. ___ When my child knows that he/she did something very well, he/she feels relaxed and content rather than excited and elated
30. ___ When my child feels anxious, it is usually very strong
31. ___ My child's negative moods are mild in intensity
32. ___ When my child is excited about something he/she wants to share his/her feelings with everyone
33. ___ When my child feels happiness it is a quiet type of contentment
34. ___ My child is tense and high strung
35. ___ When my child is happy, he/she bubbles over with energy

Almost Never	Never	Occasionally	Usually	Almost Always	Always
1	2	3	4	5	6

36. ___ When my child feels guilty, the emotion is quite strong
37. ___ I would characterize my child's happy moods as closer to contentment than joy
38. ___ When someone compliments my child, he/she gets extremely happy
39. ___ When my child gets nervous, he/she gets shaky all over
40. ___ When my child is happy, the feeling is more like contentment and inner calm than one of exhilaration and excitement.

Appendix N Children's Behavior Questionnaire

Subject No. _____

Date of Child's Birth:

Today's Date _____

Month Day Year

Sex of Child _____

Age of Child _____
Years months**Instructions:** Please read carefully before starting:

On the next pages you will see a set of statements that describe children's reactions to a number of situations. We would like you to tell us what your child's reaction is likely to be in those situations. There are of course no "correct" ways of reacting; children differ widely in their reactions, and it is these differences we are trying to learn about. Please read each statement and decide whether it is a "true" or "untrue" description of your child's reaction within the past six months. Use the following scale to indicate how well a statement describes your child:

Circle #	If the statement is:
1	extremely untrue of your child
2	quite untrue of your child
3	slightly untrue of your child
4	neither true nor false of your child
5	slightly true of your child
6	quite true of your child
7	extremely true of your child

If you cannot answer one of the items because you have never seen the child in that situation, for example, if the statement is about the child's reaction to your singing and you have never sung to your child, then circle NA (not applicable).

Please be sure to circle a number or NA for every item.

MY CHILD:

1. Can lower his/her voice when asked to do so.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

2. Is hard to get her/his attention when s/he is concentrating on something.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

3. Usually rushes into an activity without thinking about it.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

4. When picking up toys or other jobs, usually keeps at the task until it's done.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

5. Is good at games like "Simon Says," "Mother, May I?" and "Red Light, Green Light."

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

6. Sometimes interrupts others when they are speaking.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

7. Can easily shift from one activity to another.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

8. Has a hard time following instructions.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

9. When practicing an activity, has a hard time keeping her/his mind on it.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

MY CHILD:

10. Decides what s/he wants very quickly and goes after it.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
11. Will move from one task to another without completing any of them.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
12. Often rushes into new situations.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
13. Prepares for trips and outings by planning things s/he will need.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
14. Takes a long time in approaching new situations.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
15. Can wait before entering into new activities if s/he is asked to.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
16. Usually stops and thinks things over before deciding to do something.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
17. Is slow and unhurried in deciding what to do next.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
18. Has difficulty waiting in line for something.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
19. Has a lot of trouble stopping an activity when called to do something else.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
20. Tends to say the first thing that comes to mind, without stopping to think about it.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

MY CHILD:

21. Has trouble sitting still when s/he is told to (at movies, church, etc.).
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
22. When eager to go outside, sometimes rushes out without putting on the right clothes.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
23. Is able to resist laughing or smiling when it isn't appropriate.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
24. When drawing or coloring in a book, shows strong concentration.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
25. Is good at following instructions.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
26. Approaches slowly places where s/he might hurt her/himself.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
27. When building or putting something together, becomes very involved in what s/he is doing, and works for long periods.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
28. Approaches places s/he has been told are dangerous slowly and cautiously.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
29. When s/he sees a toy or game s/he wants, is eager to have it right then.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
30. Has difficulty leaving a project s/he has begun.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

MY CHILD:

31. Is not very careful and cautious in crossing streets.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

32. Can easily stop an activity when s/he is told "no."

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

33. Is among the last children to try out a new activity.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

34. Is easily distracted when listening to a story.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

35. Has an easy time leaving play to come to dinner.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

36. Is "slow to warm up" to others.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

37. Sometimes doesn't seem to hear me when I talk to her/him.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

38. Is usually able to resist temptation when told s/he is not supposed to do something

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

39. Sometimes becomes absorbed in a picture book and looks at it for a long time.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

MY CHILD:

40. Has a hard time concentrating on an activity when there are distracting noises.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

41. Has trouble concentrating when listening to a story.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

42. When watching TV, is easily distracted by other noises or movements.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

43. Is distracted from his/her projects when you enter the room.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

44. Often shifts rapidly from one activity to the next.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

45. Will ignore others when playing with an interesting toy.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

46. Has a hard time shifting from one activity to another

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

47. Is good at games with rules, such as card games.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

48. Can easily leave off working on a project if asked.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

49. Often doesn't seem to hear me when he/she is working on something

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

MY CHILD:

50. Sometimes has a dreamy quality when others talk to him/her, as if s/he were somewhere else.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

51. Needs to complete one activity before being asked to talk to start on another one.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

52. Seems to follow her/his own direction, even when asked to do something different.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

Please check back to make sure you have completed all the pages of the questionnaire. Thank you very much for your help!

Appendix O

Hierarchical Regression Analyses

Hierarchical Regression Results for Interactions Involving Emotion Coaching and Child Regulation Variables to Predict Outcomes

1. Interaction between Emotion Coaching and Behaviour Regulation in the Prediction of Child Outcomes

Dependent Variable	Main effects(β)		Interaction term (ΔR^2)
	Emotion Coaching	Behaviour Regulation	EC x BR
Anxiety	.09	-.21*	.001
Aggression	.04	-.16	.001
Prosocial Behaviour	.08	.06	.110**

2. Interaction between Emotion Coaching and Emotion Regulation in the Prediction of Child Outcomes

Dependent Variable	Main effects(β)		Interaction term (ΔR^2)
	<u>Emotion Coaching</u>	<u>Emotion Regulation</u>	<u>EC x ER</u>
Anxiety	.08	-.21*	.040*
Aggression	.04	-.21*	.002
Prosocial	.08	.20*	.010

3. Interaction between Emotion Coaching and Negative Affect in the Prediction of Child Outcomes

Dependent Variable	Main effects(β)		Interaction term (ΔR^2)
	Emotion Coaching	Negative Affect	EC x NA
Anxiety	.08	.09	.002
Aggression	.04	.18+	.001
Prosocial	.08	-.09	.001

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

Hierarchical Regression Results for Interactions Involving Emotion Dismissing and Child Regulation Variables to Predict Outcomes

1. Interaction between Emotion Dismissing and Behaviour Regulation in the Prediction of Child Outcomes

Dependent Variable	Main effects(β)		Interaction term (ΔR^2)
	<u>Emotion Dismissing</u>	<u>Behaviour Regulation</u>	<u>ED x BR</u>
Anxiety	-.10	-.22*	.040*
Aggression	.01	-.15	.012
Prosocial	.05	.08	.001

2. Interaction between Emotion Dismissing and Emotion Regulation in the Prediction of Child Outcomes

Dependent Variable	Main effects (β)		Interaction term (ΔR^2)
	<u>Emotion Dismissing</u>	<u>Emotion Regulation</u>	<u>ED x ER</u>
Aggression	.05	-.21*	.003
Prosocial	.03	.20*	.005
Anxiety	-.05	-.20*	.002

3. Interaction between Emotion Dismissing and Negative Affect in the Prediction of Child Outcomes

Dependent Variable	Main effects(β)		Interaction term (ΔR^2)
	<u>Emotion Dismissing</u>	<u>Negative Affect</u>	<u>ED x NA</u>
Anxiety	-.07	.09	.050*
Aggression	.02	.18+	.019
Prosocial	.05	-.10	.030+

* $p < .05$