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ABSTRACT

This study examined relations between maternal emotion-related beliefs and behaviours, child characteristics, and narrative quality within 47 mother-child reminiscing conversations about past shared child emotional experiences during the middle childhood years of six to eight. Narratives from mother-child conversations about child anger, sadness, happiness, hope, and love were coded and analyzed. Mothers completed measures of maternal emotional expressivity in the family, maternal meta-emotion style, maternal restrictiveness towards child general expressivity, maternal reactions to child negative expressivity, and the child temperament factor of negative affectivity. Mothers and children also rated descriptive narrative characteristics. Finally, children’s language abilities were measured. When child negative affectivity and receptive language were controlled as covariates, mothers endorsing higher parental distress about child negative emotions were significantly more likely to have children who produced fewer negative emotion words during happiness reminiscing. Conversely, when child gender and receptive language were controlled as covariates, mothers endorsing less restrictive attitudes toward general child emotional expression were significantly more likely to have children who produced more emotion words during happiness reminiscing. Interestingly, following the control of child gender and expressive language as covariates, mothers reporting higher levels of personal positive expressivity produced significantly fewer emotion words during sadness reminiscing. However, when child negative affectivity and language ability (i.e., receptive or expressive) were controlled as covariates, higher maternal negative expressivity was significantly associated with fewer maternal emotion words across all narratives except happiness. Finally, when child gender and expressive language ability were controlled as covariates, a significant positive association was
found between maternal emotion coaching style and families' conversation lengths about happiness and the frequency of maternal elaborations about hope. Both child gender and narrative type were related to family narrative output. Analysis of hope and love narratives revealed themes about the nature of hope events, maternal hope supporting strategies, and emotional ambivalence and affectionate demonstrations during love reminiscence. This study makes a needed contribution as currently no published studies exist examining maternal emotion socialization beliefs in relation to parent-child reminiscing about negative and positive child emotions during the middle childhood years.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

In recent years there has been a trend towards research exploring links between parenting processes and children's understanding, experiences, regulation, and use of emotion (Lewis, 2000). This expansive topic is now often referred to as the "socialization of emotion" and it encompasses a number of emotion-related socialization behaviours including parental reactions to child emotion, parental emotional expressiveness, parental discussion of emotion, and parental selection of situations to provide certain child emotional experiences (Eisenberg, Cumberland, & Spinrad, 1998; Eisenberg, Spinrad, & Cumberland, 1998). The general area of inquiry of the current study falls squarely within the domain of one broad type of emotion socialization, parental discussion of emotion.

One particular type of parental discussion of emotion, namely parent-child discussions about past shared emotional experiences (i.e., reminiscing about emotions), is the focus of this study. The interrelations between mothers' emotion-related beliefs and behaviours, and child characteristics of gender, age, temperament, and language ability within mother-child discussions of past experienced emotions during the middle childhood years are examined. In addition to the previously studied emotions of sadness, anger, and happiness, the current research contains an initial exploration of mother-child reminiscing of shared experiences encompassing the positive emotions of hope and love, which have not been previously studied.

The social relevance of this study stems from its possible clinical utility to further educate parents and professionals about the process of emotional socialization and its impact on child emotional and social competence. The scholarly importance of this work includes further exploration of a mechanism of socialization of emotion that has been
studied in a more limited capacity, parental discussion of emotion, during a less
frequently studied developmental period, middle childhood. This study also incorporates
an initial examination of relations between measures of emotion-related parenting beliefs
or philosophies and actual narrative form and function in reminiscing conversations
between mothers and children. Additionally, the current study was designed to allow an
initial examination of how discussions of past shared child experiences with hope and
love are actually undertaken between mothers and children. Finally, the complex
interplay between child temperament and language ability, and the use of emotional
language among mothers and children during emotion based reminiscing is considered.

The following introduction entails a review of the literature on the following
primary topics: (a) influential models of parental socialization of emotion; (b) parent-
child discussion of emotion; (c) developmental progression of verbal communication
about emotions; (d) nature, function, and clinical significance of family narratives; (e)
phenomenon of parent-child reminiscing; (f) language, memory, emotion, and gender
within reminiscing; (g) most recent and future trends in reminiscing research; and (h) the
nature and relation of parent emotion-related beliefs and reminiscing. The introduction is
followed by a discussion of the study hypotheses and methodology. A discussion of the
findings will be organized according to the original order of the hypotheses. Finally, a
summary of the general implications and limitations of this study, and some possible
directions for future research will be outlined.

**Influential Models of Parental Emotion Socialization**

Parental socialization of emotion has significant implications for both child
socioemotional experience and competence. The complexity of this process was
highlighted by Denham (1998):
Both intrapersonal factors and interpersonal socialization of emotion within the preschool period contribute to the young child’s understanding and regulation of emotions (i.e., expression of and reaction to emotions), and ... these elements of emotional competence contribute to indices of social competence. (p.14)

Eisenberg, Cumberland, et al., (1998) defined emotional competence as “understanding of one’s own and others’ emotions, the tendency to display emotion in a situationally and culturally appropriate manner, and the ability to inhibit or modulate experienced and expressed emotion and emotionally derived behaviour as needed to achieve goals....” (p.242). Social competence was defined as “the ability to achieve personal goals in social interaction while simultaneously maintaining positive relationships with others over time and across situations” (p.242). With acknowledgement of both the intrapersonal factors and interpersonal dynamics of emotion socialization, two broad theoretical models of emotion socialization produced by Carolyn Saarni (1993,1999, 2000) and Nancy Eisenberg and her colleagues (Eisenberg, Cumberland, et al., 1998; Eisenberg, Spinrad, et al., 1998) influenced the initial conceptualization of the current research.

Saarni (1999) suggested that five key components of emotion are open to influence by developmental, familial, and cultural norms: (a) emotional elicitors (i.e., circumstances or contexts viewed as causes of our emotional reactions); (b) emotional receptors (i.e., structures that can moderate the link between emotion-eliciting situations and the person, such as temperament, scanning/vigilance, and arousability); (c) emotional states (i.e., bodily changes with emotional responding); (d) emotional expression (i.e., guidelines for how, when, and where to express what emotions); and (e) emotional experience (i.e., a cognitively mediated process requiring access to emotional language which facilitates reflection about the emotional processes of self and others).
This model suggests that emotional elicitors, expression, and experience are the clearest recipients of socializing influence.

Although the interrelations between emotional receptors and states to these processes has been less clearly elucidated, Saarni (1993) has suggested that the meaningfulness of emotional elicitors may in part influence what emotional receptors then mediate the resulting emotional state response. Key methods of socialization include direct instruction, imitation, contingency learning, identification with role models, and communication of expectancies. Saarni (2000) also explained that several aspects of social context colour relationships and, by extension, influence our emotional behaviour. Examples of important social contextual parameters include closeness of relationships between persons, relative difference in dominance between persons, the private or public nature of the emotionally expressive behaviour, and identity construction processes affected by socialization (e.g., gender identity). We can see some of these concepts discussed by Saarni also encapsulated within the model below.

In their 1998 reviews of the burgeoning area of parental socialization of emotion, Eisenberg and her colleagues (Eisenberg, Cumberland, et al., 1998; Eisenberg, Spinrad, et al., 1998) proposed a heuristic model which organized the existing literature on the general processes and moderators of socialization of emotion. As noted in Figure 1, this model suggests that there are various types of emotion-related parenting behaviours (e.g., parental reactions to child emotion, parental emotional expressiveness, parental discussion of emotion, and parental selection/modification of situations for certain child emotional experiences) which impact on child emotional and social competence through a variety of moderator variables (e.g., type and intensity of child and parental emotions, and child's temperament and sex). Eisenberg, Cumberland, et al.
Figure 1. A heuristic model of the socialization of emotion. Reproduced with the permission of the first author (Eisenberg, Spinrad, et al., 1998). See Appendix A.
(1998) also suggest that the emotion-related parenting practices themselves are influenced by child characteristics (e.g., sex, age, temperament), parental characteristics (e.g., childrearing values and philosophies, emotion-related beliefs, parental regulation and emotionality), cultural values (i.e., about emotion and parenting), and contextual variables (e.g., appropriateness of child's behaviour and potential for harm to someone). Although not noted in their explanatory figure above, these researchers also emphasized the likelihood of linear relations and interactions among the four predictors on the far left of the figure.

**Potential moderators in emotion socialization research.** As noted by Eisenberg, Cumberland et al. (1998), a number of moderating variables such as gender and developmental level (i.e., child age) have been identified in the empirical literature as important variables to consider in relation to parents' emotion socialization process with their children. Links between child temperament and socialization experiences have also been recently raised as important processes for consideration in the emotion socialization literature (Cross, 1998; Fabes, Leonard, Kupanoff, & Martin, 2001; Lengua, Wolchik, Sandler, & West, 2000). For example, Eisenberg and Fabes (1994) found significant associations between child temperament and mothers' reactions to their 4- and 6-year-old children's negative emotions in a variety of contexts as measured by a questionnaire included in the current study, the Coping with Children's Negative Emotions Scale (CCNES; Fabes, Eisenberg, & Bernzweig, 1990). Maternal reactions identified as influential to child outcome included minimizing/punitive responses, maternal distress reactions, mothers' encouragement of the expression of emotion and problem solving, and maternal comforting. In a series of longitudinal studies of preschool to school age children, Eisenberg and her colleagues (Eisenberg et al., 2001; Eisenberg, Valiente, et al.,
2003; Eisenberg, Zhou, et al., 2003) reported that child regulation also mediated the relation between positive maternal emotional expressivity/warmth and child functioning. Finally, in a recent review, Fivush, Haden, and Reese (2006) described linkages between maternal elaborations during reminiscing (i.e., production of questions and statements which include new information) and various dimensions of child temperament (e.g., interested and persistent, sociability, effortful control, negative reactivity, and activity level). Fivush et al. underlined the importance of continued study of connections between children’s individual characteristics, such as gender, age, language abilities, and temperament, and maternal reminiscing styles. These characteristics have been incorporated into the design of the present study.

Despite constructive critiques such as a lack of sufficient focus on cultural socialization (Gondoli & Braungart-Rieker, 1998; Gross, 1998), the Eisenberg, Cumberland, et al. (1998) model acknowledged important constructs in the area of emotion socialization that have also been highlighted by respected researchers such as Saarni (1993) and Denham (1998, 2007; Denham et al., 2003). This model provided a comprehensive summary which linked disparate research findings to increase our understanding of the components, mediators, and moderators of socialization of emotion. It also highlighted various issues which required more research attention in order to further the development of this field of study. For example, Eisenberg and her colleagues identified the emotion-related parenting practice of parent-child discussion of emotion as requiring further investigation. A foundational skill which underlies the function and form of parent-child discussions of emotions is a child’s ability to process and verbally communicate about current as well as past emotions and experiences. Thus, the following
sections provide a brief summary of existing literature pertaining to parent-child discussion of emotion and the past.

**Parent-Child Discussion of Current Emotion and the Past**

*Development of verbal communication about emotions.* Saarni (1999) noted that consideration of the development of emotional language must include sensitivity to factors such as individual differences, cultural influence, familial socialization, and age-related differences. She suggests that these factors will “affect not only what sort of emotion-related symbolic system is acquired but also how children develop their emotionally descriptive language” (p. 139). In a seminal review article, Bretherton, Fritz, Zahn-Waxler, and Ridgeway (1986) provided a synopsis of much of the early literature regarding children’s development of emotional talk. The first 18 months of life are marked by several important developmental milestones which set the stage for later discussion of emotions: (a) affective referencing, (b) shared reference, (c) cooperation in joint play, (d) intentional communication, and (e) increasing understanding that others, like the self, are motivated by affect and intention.

It is generally reported that around 18-20 months of age children begin to use emotion-related words with significant increases in such usage occurring throughout the third year. Between 18 to 36 months, most children attain the ability to (a) label their own emotions as well as those of others, (b) discuss past and future emotions, and (c) discuss the antecedents and consequences of emotional states (Bretherton et al., 1986). Young children’s emotion based utterances usually involve descriptive statements or commentary about their own or others’ feelings with occasional statements of a more instrumental nature (e.g., obtainment of sympathy) (Harris, 2000). Existing evidence also suggests that starting in toddlerhood, the young child begins to exhibit the ability to use
language to attribute pretend emotions to themselves, others, and inanimate objects such as dolls. Children are also able to make attempts to impact upon others’ feelings and behaviours through manipulation or rudimentary deceit (e.g., if you go on vacation again, I’ll cry...) (Bretherton et al., 1986).

The research pertaining to verbal communication about emotion during the preschool years and beyond involves two primary themes (Bretherton et al., 1986). First, as children develop, there appears to be increasing clarity and complexity in the manner in which children are able to verbally reflect upon antecedents, behaviours, and consequences related to emotion-related situations. More sophisticated understandings of complex causal inferences, long-lasting moods across situations, and differences in appraisals of antecedents by different individuals also become apparent as children develop. Several researchers have also described a sequence whereby children are gradually able to identify and express simultaneous emotions made complicated by variation in intensity of feeling, multiplicity and valence of emotions, and number of targets towards which emotions are directed (Gallander Wintre & Vallance, 1994; Harter, 1983; Harter & Buddin, 1987). For example, Gallander Wintre and Vallance asked children what emotions they would experience in a variety of emotion laden situations and found that:

Four-year-olds predict experiencing one emotion of varying intensity to a situation (Level A). They also predict experiencing multiple emotions, but at maximum intensity and the same valence (Level B). By age six, children predict experiencing multiple emotions of varying intensity but the same valence (Level C). Children around age 8 predict multiple emotions of varying intensity and
opposite valence (Level D). The number of emotions experienced at one time and accuracy also increased with development. (p. 509)

Second, children between three and five years and beyond gradually become aware of deliberate regulation of emotions, specifically that displayed emotions may differ from actual felt experience. As children grow older (e.g., six to ten years), they are able to identify many reasons why a person may want to hide their true emotions (e.g., to avoid trouble, embarrassment, and derision, and to support relationships). By age seven, many children are very proficient at using language to influence, regulate, and manipulate the feelings and responses of others (e.g., use of guilt induction or attempts to reduce distress by referring to possible positive outcomes).

Saarni (1999) noted that there can be tremendous individual variability in levels of emotion talk between children of three to six years. A prominent theme in emotion talk for many young children is conflict between themselves and their mother or their sibling(s), or even conflict on a triadic level with all three persons. Conflict based discussion typically involves more references to feelings in this age group than other types of conversation. Saarni suggested that although such conflict can be taxing for parents, these interactions teach children important emotion communication skills. This point was highlighted by Laible and Thompson’s (2002) subsequent research examining mother-child conflict in the toddler years across a variety of situations. They confirmed that a high level of mother-child conflict is normative at this developmental stage and that the frequency and nature of parent-toddler conflict is related to later child differences in socioemotional and moral development.

Eisenberg, Cumberland, et al. (1998) summarized a number of empirical findings linking parental styles of emotional discussion and children’s speech about emotion. The
following findings do not include research from the reminiscing literature which will be discussed in a subsequent section. Positive correlations have been found between maternal conversations about emotions and preschool children's use, awareness, and understanding of emotion language (e.g., affective perspective taking, understanding of conflicting emotions, and judgments about others' emotions). Eisenberg, Cumberland, et al. also reviewed literature indicating that toddlers who are able to talk about their emotional needs were better able to tolerate frustrating tasks and that mothers who discussed their feelings of sympathy and sadness during an experimental manipulation had elementary school-age sons that reported more sympathy than mothers who did not acknowledge these feelings. Parental discussion of their own emotions have been linked to higher cooperative, prosocial, and empathic ratings among preschoolers by their nursery teachers and with high social status with peers. Interestingly, the quality of mother-child conversations has been found to predict academic competency in areas such as story/narrative comprehension, print concepts, and vocabulary (Reese, 1995).

It is also now acknowledged that children between the ages of two and five years become increasingly proficient at participating in joint recollections of the past with adults, including emotion laden memories (Harris, 2000). Conversational styles of parents with children seem to be related to how well children are able to participate in these recollections (Reese, Haden, & Fivush, 1993). The issue of parent-child discussions of past shared experiences will be expanded upon in the later section on parent-child reminiscing. However, critical developmental precursors to parent-child reminiscing include not only a child's ability to talk about emotion but also an ability to talk about the past more generally.
Development of children’s abilities to talk about the past. Fivush and colleagues (Bauer & Fivush, 1992; Fivush, 2007; Fivush, Hamond, Harsch, Singer & Wolf, 1991; Nelson & Fivush, 2004) have reported that children as young as 18 to 20 months make rudimentary reference to the immediate past such as remembered persons, objects, locations, etc. By 30 months, many children can respond accurately to questions about past events as well as representations of temporally complex events. However, they still require external guidance to recount a coherent narrative as they often do not yet have the skills to discern the who, what, where, and when of events to a listener. For example, young children typically do not have grasp of the grammar and lexicon that is associated with talk about the past (e.g., “yesterday”, “before”, “after”, “while”, etc.). By 40 months, many children are able to move beyond simple memory scripts to give reasonably coherent accounts of past events that placed happenings in context with increasing evaluation of personal meaning (Fivush & Haden, 1997; Fivush, Haden & Adam, 1995).

With increasing age, children’s narratives become longer and more personally contextualized with more orienting (i.e., time, place, character, and background), referential (i.e., explicit statement of the actions that occurred), and evaluative comments (i.e., conveyance of why an event was interesting, significant, emotional and meaningful) (Reese, 1999). The cognitive advances signalled by the progression from discussion of simple chronologies to the generation of more temporally complex stories enables children to better understand their life experience in more coherent and meaningful ways. Fivush and her colleagues also highlighted the influence of gender in this process with reports that girls’ personal narratives may be more coherent and elaborate than those of boys. For example, girls have been found to recall more information about their personal pasts than boys at eight-years old (Fivush & Schwarzmueller, 1998).
Research also suggests that memory aids can increase recall of personal narratives. Re-enactment of events are a powerful source of rehearsal that may aid memory recall in very young children whereas for older children it appears that verbal rehearsal becomes a more important memory aid (Fivush & Hamond, 1989). Children as young as two-years-old can re-enact previous events that occurred in play conditions. Kuebli and Fivush (1994) reported that children between the ages of four and seven recalled more variable elements when probed with questions rather than relying on spontaneous recall. However, when young children are repeatedly asked the same question within the same interview, they frequently change their answer suggesting that they interpret the repetition as an indication that their first response was incorrect (Fivush & Schwarzmueller, 1995; Peterson, 2007). The development of a "theory of mind" helps children to communicate in a more coherent manner because it allows the child to understand the purpose of talking about the past and helps them to anticipate what to say which consequently contributes to their narrative skills. In turn, these narrative skills help children to effectively construct their mental representations thus contributing to more effective encoding and retrieval of memory traces (Kleinknecht, 2001). As summarized by Fivush and Schwarzmueller (1998):

Once children become able to reference past events in even a rudimentary way... they become able to participate in adult-guided reminiscing, through which they learn the more sophisticated forms of narrative organization. Thus, between the ages of 2 and 5 years, there is a gradual development of narrative skills, and as these skills develop so too do children’s ability to form and retain enduring autobiographical memories. Those events which are discussed in detail during this early developmental period may be the first events to take on this more
sophisticated form and thus become the first autobiographical memories that the individual will carry for a lifetime. (p.470)

This quote illuminates the close approximation of the processes of children beginning to reference the past in their own words, and parents engaging children in reminiscing.

In summary, the aforementioned literature indicates that from early infancy onward children are steadily developing a variety of skills which coalesce to form an impressive ability to converse about both present and past experiences and emotions by the school-age years. Parental styles of both emotion based discussions and discussions about the past can have significant ramifications for child outcome in a number of domains including emotional, social, memory, and even academic functioning (Fivush et al., 2006). Such findings have been an impetus for the recent increased focus on the role that discussion of emotion and experiences in the form of family narratives play in helping young children develop a coherent sense of self, a sense of how their unique social worlds operate, and an understanding of their role within such a world view (Saarni, 1999). Children gradually construct their theories about emotions and identity through the emotional and social environment of their family lives, including the discourse about emotion in their families (Denham, Cook, & Zoller, 1992; Eder, 1994; Fiese, Hooker, Kotary, Schwagler, & Rimmer, 1995; Harris, 2000; Pratt & Fiese, 2004). One important part of this process involves children developing the ability to form coherent narrative representations of emotional life situations which ultimately aids emotional processing and learning. This pattern of discourse co-creation between parents and children is critical to the process of emotional socialization. As noted by Harris (2000):
Throughout the lifespan, emotionally charged episodes are strong candidates for sharing, joint recall, and narrative restructuring. Young children are indeed better able to work out the psychological implications of an episode if they have encoded it in a coherent fashion. (p. 28)

**Nature and structure of family narratives.** Fiese et al. (1999) noted that family narratives share many of the same components as individual narratives. Personal narratives reflect identity issues in pieces of life stories, and often include a struggle with meaning-making and organizational structure. Typically, they are constructions of past events that are not necessarily factual accounts but rather accounts viewed in light of current context. Family narratives are unique in that they deal with dynamics about how the family understands events, how the family works together, and beliefs about relationships in the family and social world. As noted by Fiese et al.:

> The process of creating family narratives and the themes inherent in stories may be shared across generations, regulating family beliefs and interactions patterns. These narratives become a scrapbook of family history resulting from a process of meaning-making in the family. Examination of family narratives highlights the process of meaning-making and takes as its core the interpretation of experiences from the family’s perspective. (p.3)

Fiese et al. (1995) noted that although story telling has been an accepted area of study for years in the field of anthropology, there have been fewer psychological studies of the development of family narratives over time starting with young children. Fiese and her colleagues advocated that story telling provides an important means for family members to integrate their experiences and to construct both individual and family identities. This research team highlighted this point through their research with parents of
young children regarding the amount and type of personal storytelling (i.e., about their own childhood) they undertook with their children. The results revealed that the majority of these parents (96 percent) reported at least occasional storytelling of this nature. Themes of the storytelling varied across parent gender and child age. Fathers were more likely to tell stories involving achievement themes whereas mothers tended to recount stories with strong affiliation themes. Similar findings of gender variation in affective narrative themes for both parents and children have been noted in other studies (Chance & Fiese, 1999; Fiese & Skillman, 2000). Parents of infants were more likely to discuss affiliative themes with their children whereas parents of preschoolers tended to discuss stories with achievement themes. Such findings highlight the importance of family narratives in the development of cohesive interpersonal relationships in family life even when children are very young.

Past research has also explored the stability of individual differences in the use of emotion talk within families over time. Kuersten-Hogan and McHale (2000) taped emotional conversations between preschool children and their parents during a series of structured and unstructured play, and storytelling tasks. The tasks were undertaken when the children were 30 and 44 months of age. Mothers have a striking amount of consistency in emotion talk over the follow-up period. Fathers too have good consistency although to a lesser degree than the mothers. However, despite within-task consistency over time, there was a lack of consistency in parents’ emotional discussion between tasks within each time period (e.g., no significant correlations for both mother and father discussion during unstructured free-play periods and structured story-telling tasks at 30 months). These tasks provided different types of opportunities for parents to talk about emotions, and thus raised the issue of the importance of context in the study of narrative
tasks. The authors also suggested that parents’ relatively consistent emotion discussion style may be due to enduring parental variables such as prior experiences with emotions in their families of origin, personal comfort with emotions, and awareness of and interest in emotional events. In their longitudinal study of preschoolers’ personally relevant narratives, Fivush et al. (1995) noted that the narratives became more detailed and coherent over time and that the recall of same events was relatively stable over long periods of time.

**Clinical significance of family narratives.** Saarni (1999) suggests that “schemes and stories provide for an individualized conceptual elaboration of what exactly is emotionally salient for the child or adolescent. Unique and personal values, concerns, and expectancies are embedded in scripts and narratives” (p.160). Indeed, the content of narratives can both reflect and be related to salient personal issues in the emotional processing of both parents and children. For example, through the use of parental Thematic Apperception Test narratives and in-home observations, Strand, White, and Touster (1998) found a relation between characteristics of parental narrative production and measures of problematic parenting. Parental discussion of personal inadequacy and problems remaining on-task during story telling were significantly related to problems with remaining firm during moments of child disobedience with their primary school age children. In a study comparing maltreated preschool children with control peers on a structured story telling task, the narratives of children who had been abused were found to reflect more conflictual and fewer affiliative themes than children in the control group (Toth, Cicchetti, Macfie, Rogosch, & Maughan, 2000). Significantly, in statistical analyses, the conflictual narrative themes were found to partially mediate the relation between child maltreatment and higher rates of externalizing behaviour problems in
comparison to the control group. The clinical group also exhibited higher rates of internalizing behaviour problems than the controls.

In their longitudinal research exploring narrative co-construction between mothers and their preschool children, Oppenheim and his colleagues (Oppenheim, 2006; Oppenheim, Nir, Warren & Emde, 1997) found that mother-child narrative abilities were related to child emotional and behavioral regulation. Emotionally coherent narrative co-constructions between mothers and their 4-and-a-half-year-old children were defined as the degree to which children both acknowledged the positive and negative themes related to a separation/reunion story and were able to organize these themes into a coherent, resolved narrative. More emotionally coherent co-constructions were associated with more prosocial themes, fewer aggressive themes, and more emotional coherence in later ratings (i.e., at 5-and-a-half-years) on the MacArthur Story-Stem Battery, and with fewer behavioral problems at both times (Oppenheim, Nir et al., 1997). Similarly, significant associations have been found between child narratives marked by repeated aggressive/incoherent, distressed, and destructive themes as measured with the MacArthur Story Stem-Battery and behaviour problems among preschool children as reported by parents and teachers (von Klitzing, Kelsay, Emde, Robinson, & Schmitz, 2000; Warren, Oppenheim, & Emde, 1997).

Significant relations have also been noted between children’s narrative representations of their mothers, and both child and maternal socioemotional adjustment. Via the use of the MacArthur Story-Stem Battery, Oppenheim, Emde, and Warren (1997) revealed that preschool children with more disciplinary and positive maternal representations, and fewer negative representations of their mothers had fewer behavioural difficulties and their mothers were less psychologically distressed. Somewhat
similarly, when Shields, Ryan, and Cicchetti (2001) examined the narrative representations of caregivers produced by maltreated 8- to 12-year-olds compared to controls, they found that the maltreated group produced more negative/constricted and fewer positive/coherent narratives than the controls. Of significance, these negative representations were associated with aggression, dysregulation, and ultimately peer rejection.

To summarize, the preceding literature indicates that there is much validity to utilizing narrative paradigms as a means to study emotion socialization as there exists evidence of important linkages between families’ narrative forms, and various indices of both parent and child socioemotional, and behavioural adaptation. However, it is important to differentiate that the majority of the family narratives discussed above were generated by recounting (i.e., discussion of unshared past experiences), ongoing conversations in play based activities, or projective narrative techniques such as the MacArthur Story-Stem Battery.

Another influential type of family narrative is parent-child reminiscing, that is parent-child stories about past shared experiences. Fivush (1994) asserted that talk about past shared emotional experiences differs in both fundamental and significant ways from talking about ongoing events:

Because children were not directly experiencing the emotion, it is possible that they were better able to reflect on and interpret the past emotional experiences. This may be an important situation in which emotions are socialized; parents and children discuss what emotions are appropriate and how to deal with particular emotions in a situation in which the child is able to cognitively reflect on and possibly internalize these lessons. (p.145)
Phenomenon of Parent-Child Reminiscing: Emergence, Method, and Findings

Emergence and methodology. Fivush and her colleagues have broadly outlined the theoretical and empirical evolution of the field of parent-child reminiscing over the last twenty years (Fivush, 2007; Fivush et al., 2006). The first wave of research led to the emergence of individual differences in “maternal reminiscing styles” and the recognition of gender effects. Both would prove to be critically important findings which would be replicated many times over in the field. Studies linking maternal reminiscing styles and children’s development of autobiographical memory then became a parallel area of focus in the literature. Finally, step by step, the study of reminiscing styles, including those of fathers, has broadened into examinations of associations between parent-child reminiscing and a wide array of phenomena. This point was highlighted by Fivush et al. (2006):

... although level of elaboration may be partly a response to specific child characteristics, maternal reminiscing style uniquely predicts children’s autobiographical memory development, aspects of strategic memory, literacy and narrative skills, developing theory of mind, and understanding of self and emotion. Clearly, maternal reminiscing style is a powerful influence on multiple aspects of children’s cognitive and socioemotional development. (p. 1580)

The majority of this research has utilized some version of the reminiscing paradigm methodology to examine this subtype of parent-child discussions. Reminiscing paradigms have been tailored to explore both the quality of children’s memory for narrative events and the structure of parent-child narrative conversations (Fivush & Fromhoff, 1988; Haden, Haine, & Fivush, 1997; Reese & Fivush, 1993). These
paradigms have also been adapted to access parent-child conversations about past shared events with specific emotional content (Denham, Mitchell-Copeland, Strandberg, Auerbach, & Blair, 1997; Fivush, 1991a; Kuebli, Butler, & Fivush, 1995; Kuebli & Fivush, 1992). Essentially, the methodology of a reminiscing paradigm involves asking the parent and child to jointly discuss some type of past shared event when the child experienced a particular incident and/or feeling state. Typically, with the exception of short orienting instructions at the beginning of the task, the participants are left to talk about what they want for as long as they wish. These conversations are recorded and then later parsed down to focus on the specific sequences of conversations that pertain specifically to the past experience and/or emotion. Finally, some type of content coding of narrative form and/or function is undertaken by trained raters. A variety of coding systems have been developed for the various uses of this paradigm. For example, Susanne Denham and colleagues (Denham et al., 1992) have developed a coding system which has assessed communication about emotion during varied parent-child interactions including the reminiscing task discussed above (Denham et al., 1997), a storybook task (Denham & Auerbach, 1995), a photograph paradigm, and a simulated maternal emotion task (Denham et al., 1992).

The primary advantage of the reminiscing paradigm is that it provides a semi-naturalistic means to access a moment when a parent has the opportunity to discuss emotional issues with a child. Indeed, Fivush (1991a) stated that strength of this narrative modality is that it usually involves some type of internal emotional reaction because we usually talk about aspects of events that are particularly memorable often due in part to some emotional arousal. Thus, the reminiscing narrative paradigm provides researchers with excellent opportunities to gather rich clinical data in the area of parent-child
discussion of past child emotion. It is these advantages which influenced the decision to use this narrative paradigm in the research design of the current study.

**Maternal styles of reminiscing with children.** Parents typically encourage children to organize their recollections into a sensible narrative script. Children then internalize this script process resulting in the development of independent narrative ability eventually even in the absence of a conversational partner (Peterson & McCabe, 1994). Presently in the field, similarities between parents and children have been reported on a number of narrative measures including amount of information shared, the use of causal and temporal information, the amount of social embedding and talk about people, and the amount and nature of emotion talk, among others (Peterson & Roberts, 2003). More specifically, research has demonstrated that children's abilities to structure personal narratives are influenced by the way that parents, particularly mothers, structure conversations about the past in particular (Fivush, 1991b, 2007; Fivush & Fromhoff, 1988; Fivush et al., 2006; Haden et al., 1997; Peterson & McCabe, 1994, 1996).

For example, in the 1990s, several groups of researchers including Fivush and her colleagues (Fivush, 1989; Fivush, 1991a; Harley & Reese, 1999), Peterson and her colleagues (McCabe & Peterson, 1991; Peterson & McCabe, 1994, 1996), and Hudson (1990) identified a critical dimension in maternal reminiscing style referred to as "elaboration". Highly elaborative mothers tend to talk with their children in rich detail and great depth about past events. They frequently utilize questions and statements which include new information, use coherent narratives, reference spatial and temporal context, use many adjectives and modifiers to enrich the conversations, and provide much evaluative feedback to their children (e.g., confirmations, affirmations, and praise). Conversely, low elaborative mothers (previously known as a "repetitive" style in the early
reminiscing literature) tend to ask relatively simplistic factual based questions, provide little new information in their questions (i.e., often simply repeat questions without embellishment) and shift topics more frequently. In recent reviews of the current literature, Fivush and her colleagues (Fivush, 2007; Fivush et al., 2006) stated that the current evidence affirms that elaborativeness appears to be a consistent and unique parental style. For instance, highly elaborative mothers remain so over the course of one child’s development as well as across siblings. However, even more convincingly, mothers who are highly elaborative during reminiscing have not been found to be more talkative during other child activities (i.e., such as playtime, mealtime, etc.). Thus, highly elaborative mothers are not simply talkative in general, but rather are demonstrating a specific set of skills in a particular context of parenting.

Given the findings regarding the consistency of maternal elaborativeness over time, it is perhaps not that surprising that a series of studies have now clearly shown that by the end of their preschool years, children of highly elaborative mothers provide richer, better organized, and more detailed personal narratives both in conversations with their mothers and others (e.g., Beck & Clarke-Stewart, 1998; Farrant & Reese, 2000; Fivush & Vasuveda, 2002; Hudson, 1990; Peterson, Jesso, & McCabe, 1999; Reese & Brown, 2000). Again, Fivush (2007) has pointed out that these findings are specific to reminiscing skills and not simply that children of elaborative mothers are highly talkative. Fivush (2007) and her colleagues (Fivush et al., 2006) explained that child language abilities are modestly related to children’s specific reminiscing abilities. Whereas some studies have suggested that stronger child language skills are linked to higher levels of elaborativeness in the early preschool years (e.g., Farrant & Reese, 2000; Welch-Ross, 1997), still others have not found such connections as children reach later preschool years.
(e.g., Reese & Brown, 2000). Fivush (2007) suggested that once children reach a certain level of language development, language may no longer be as critical a component in parent-child reminiscing.

Past literature also highlights the bidirectional accommodation that both mothers and children make to their partner’s interactional style over time via additional evidence that child development also influences narrative maternal styles (Peterson & McCabe, 1994; Reese et al., 1993). Two models have been proposed to account for these findings. As noted by both Peterson, Fivush, and their colleagues, parental modelling or teaching of reminiscing skills to children has been framed within the Vygotskyian theory of scaffolding. Scaffolding refers to a process whereby parents initially perform a certain developmental task for a child while the child learns the necessary skills and processes. Ultimately, with parental help over time, the child becomes more and more capable of performing the task independently (Fivush, Haden, & Reese, 1996). Within this theory is the concept of a “zone of proximal development” which necessitates parental insight into the level of their child’s current development and the degree of parental stimulation that can help that child develop a little further without overwhelming the child’s potential abilities (Palacios, Gonzalez, & Moreno, 1992). The theory of scaffolding as it applies to reminiscing would generally predict that as the parent provides less information, the child provides more. However based upon sensitivity to bidirectional effects within parent-child reminiscing as noted above, Fivush et al. have suggested that the more appropriate model for reminiscing may be a collaborative spiral rather than a scaffold:

... in the spiral model both participants provide more information as the dyad becomes increasingly collaborative in the retelling. Essentially, in the scaffolding model of the development of reminiscing, the adult’s underlying goals are to teach
the child to recount their past experiences coherently and independently. In contrast, in a spiral model of the development of reminiscing, the adult's underlying goal is to share experiences and collaboratively recount richly embellished narratives about past experiences with the child. (p.343)

In summary, the field of parent-child reminiscing has matured to the point that it can now be confidently stated that the elaborative style of maternal reminiscing is a critical and unique parenting process which has direct impact on the way in which children discuss their past experiences. So, why is this important? Highly elaborative mothers also include more emotion focused information in their narratives which moves conversations beyond simply what happened in an experience to what does it all mean (Fivush, 2007). Fivush and her colleagues as well as others (Bluck & Alea, 2002; Fivush & Nelson, 2006; Nelson & Fivush, 2004) have asserted that reminiscing is a crucial process because it is a core factor in the gradual development of an autobiographical past which encompasses vital insight into the core self in relation to others (e.g., family, community, and culture) as well as evaluations of personal experience, identity, morality, and emotional processing. Illuminating the relations between reminiscing, basic memory development, and development of an autobiographical past allow us to fully acknowledge the developmental significance of parent-child reminiscing to socio-emotional growth.

*Links between reminiscing, basic memory development, and development of an autobiographical past.* Gradual development of new testing methodologies in the late 1950s (e.g., conditioning and habituation paradigms and deferred imitation tasks) allowed researchers to discover that infants are able to store, retain, and retrieve memories shortly after birth, and possibly even prior to birth (e.g., recognition of maternal voice almost immediately after birth) (Simcock & Hayne, 2003). Simcock and Hayne noted that past
research regarding children's nonverbal memory development via various testing methodologies has revealed that the rate of encoding information and the duration of information retention increases as children age. In addition, the specificity of effective retrieval cues decreases with age meaning that older children can retrieve and utilize memories in a wider range of situations than younger children. Simcock and Hayne also explained that assorted large scale studies on verbal memory have confirmed that most three-year-old children can produce reasonably organized verbal accounts especially when the accounts are generated during conversations with parent. Additionally, three-year-old to five-year-old children can generally provide verbal reports of both naturally occurring and contrived events even with extensive delays after the event and when interviewed by unfamiliar adults. Still other researchers such as Peterson and her colleagues (Peterson, 2007) have demonstrated that even children as young as two-and-a-half-years can verbally recall long-term memories for highly distinctive and salient events although their recall is vulnerable to interference from others (e.g., poor or misleading interviewing and suggestions). Young children's verbal recall of events tends to lag behind their nonverbal recall and even their general verbal skill suggesting that possible underlying differences exist in the way events are cognitively represented (Nelson & Fivush, 2004; Simcock & Hayne, 2003). Language abilities have also been found to be related to both verbal and nonverbal memory in young children. Similarly, various types of narrative skills have been found to be connected to memory performance (Fivush et al., 2006; Haden, Ornstein, Eckerman, & Didow, 2001).

Greater understanding of young children's basic memory abilities has opened the door to the study of interactions between basic memory processes, other developmental processes (e.g., language and emotional development), and environmental factors (e.g.,
parent effects and macro level effects such as community and culture). One example of this research is the growing theoretical and empirical literature about autobiographical memory (AM) which has only received sustained academic focus since the 1980s (Nelson & Fivush, 2004). Since its inception, this field has been coloured with various debates including controversies regarding the absence of autobiographical memory in the early years (i.e., childhood amnesia) (Fivush & Schwarzmueller, 1998; Howe & Courage, 1997) and the accuracy of autobiographical memories throughout the life cycle (Rubin, 2000). Fivush and her colleagues (Fivush & Nelson, 2004; Fivush & Nelson, 2006; Nelson & Fivush, 2004) have contributed to this literature with their development of a "social cultural developmental theory" of AM. The process of parent-child reminiscing is characterized as a key component of this theory. In their influential review paper on this theory, Nelson and Fivush (2004) defined AM as the following:

Autobiographical memory is defined here as an explicit memory of an event that occurred in a specific time and place in one's personal past (a detailed discussion of the definition follows). The components that contribute to the emergence of autobiographical memory include basic memory systems, the acquisition of complex spoken or signed language, narrative comprehension and production, memory talk with parents and others, style of parent talk, temporal understanding, representation of self, person perspective, and psychological understanding (i.e., theory of mind). (p. 486)

Nelson and Fivush (2004) asserted that the development of three levels of temporal organization eventually culminates with a mature AM: (a) recall of the sequence within the event, including settings, plans, goals, actions, outcomes, achievements, and the temporal and causal relations among them; (b) placement of the event narrative at a
specific time in the past via the use of labels such as "my birthday", "last summer" as young children have no external measures of time; and (c) placement of memories in a life span pattern in relation to an external sequence, such as school years, jobs, or family events. This last stage is beyond the abilities of the preschool child and is obviously impacted upon by culture. In describing their model, Nelson and Fivush highlighted that there is a gradual emergence of AM across the preschool years and that language is a fundamental culturally influenced tool in the development of AM. These researchers also asserted that there are cultural, gender, and individual differences in autobiographical memory across the lifespan that need to be further explained. Please see Figure 2 for a visual representation of the influential components of autobiographical memory. The more cognitive components of this theory are positioned along the top of the diagram, and the social and cultural components, below the central arrow.

Nelson and Fivush (2004) stated that a strength of their theory is that it takes into account current research regarding autobiographical memory from developmental, cognitive, and cultural perspectives. However, these authors cautioned that their theory focuses on the development of individual personally salient episodes experienced at specific points in the past, thus differentiating it from a great deal of self-knowledge that is more like semantic facts about the self (e.g., date and place of birth). They also suggested that during the adolescent period these singular episodes eventually coalesce into a more holistic life narrative with various encapsulated themes.
Figure 2. Sources and sequence of the emergence of autobiographical memory.

Reproduced with permission of the first author (Nelson & Fivush, 2004). See Appendix B.
Nelson and Fivush (2004) pointed out that as children begin to use language to communicate, their parents begin to discuss with them past and future events. As discussed in the preceding section of this introduction, these narratives can vary in terms of frequency and style. However, parent-guided discussions about the child’s past and about likely upcoming events support the child’s developing concept of time which is a necessary component for the establishment of AM. Indeed, as summarized by Fivush, “The finding that mothers who engage in highly elaborative reminiscing have children who develop better autobiographical memory skills has now been widely replicated both in the United States and cross-culturally, as well as for different types of past events” (Fivush et al., 2006, p. 1571). Such narratives, and particularly the negotiation of disagreement and conflicts that can occur in these discussions, sensitize the child to the distinctiveness of self and others as well as the differences between mental states of the self and of others. Thus, it is also perhaps not surprising that significant correlations between theory of mind understanding and AM have been found. Nelson and Fivush stressed that different forms of narrative (e.g., in play, in stories, in reminiscing) provides blueprints for organizing one’s own episodic memories into the coherent types of narratives that are typical of one’s surrounding culture. As summarized by Nelson and Fivush (2004):

Although all adults may have autobiographical memories, the content, organization, and density of autobiographical memories are highly variable, across culture, gender, and individuals .... Much of this may be due to the ways in which autobiographical experiences are discussed early in development. Furthermore, as children develop the language and narrative skills to organize and recall their past through participating in adult-guided reminiscing, they are also beginning to
differentiate the past as past, that is, the understanding of time and sequence and how past experiences fit along a developing time line. This understanding is critical to the development of autobiographical memory in two ways. First, it allows children to locate a specific past event at a specific point in time and space. Second, through locating past events in time, children begin to develop the idea of a continuous self, a self that exists through time. (p. 499)

Thus, in spite of the theoretical debates of the past, recent findings suggest that autobiographical memory development appears to be a collaborative process in which both child development and parental contributions interact to form a child’s reminiscing style (Farrant & Reese, 2000; Harley & Reese, 1999). As suggested in the initial introduction to this paper, parent-child reminiscing is indeed a social interactional process. As parents and children collaboratively construct their past experiences, these stories also become a means for social bonds to be strengthened through construction of shared histories (Fivush et al., 1996). In addition to such relational bonds, recent research also suggests that stories of personal experience may also be an important means of gender socialization. Research suggests that girls and boys are differentially exposed to emotional semantics in talk about personal experiences (Chance & Fiese, 1999).

Certainly, evidence of such gender effects exists within the parent-child reminiscing literature.

**Narratives styles and gender socialization.** Meta-analytic analysis has re-confirmed earlier findings that gender effects occur in parents’ general conversations with children (Leaper, Anderson, & Sanders, 1998). These recent results revealed that mothers were likely to talk more as well as use more supportive and negative language than fathers, whereas fathers were more likely to use more instrumental speech involving
directives, informing statements, and questions than mothers. These findings among mothers were thought to possibly result from mothers’ greater levels of expressivity and care giving interactions. Mothers were also found to talk more and used more supportive speech with daughters than with sons. Child age level was a moderator of child gender effects on mothers’ amount of talking with larger effect sizes found among mothers of toddler-age children and directed towards females to a greater extent than boys whereas mothers of school-age children used more directive speech with daughters than with sons. Finally, mother-father language differences were more likely to be found in studies that were set in more naturalistic home settings, involved relatively unstructured interactive activities, and were of greater duration in length.

This type of gender typed communication appears to have profound effects for children’s understanding of gender issues. For example, in a review pertaining to event scripts and gender (Levy & Fivush, 1993), it has been noted that young children better recall, sequence, and imitate more components of own-sex than other-sex gender scripts. Levy and Fivush noted that such gender sensitivity may be more evident among boys than girls in part because of differential and selective attention, internal motivation, competence versus performance distinctions, and external reinforcement. In an interesting twist with regards to personal events, Eisenmann (1997) studied maternal ways of communicating about an imminent future emotional event, a brief separation from their preschool child. Mothers tend to be more elaborative with their daughters than with sons with regards to announcements about the imminent separation.

Similar findings regarding child gender and reminiscing were found by Fivush and her colleagues in a longitudinal study of parent-child reminiscing during the preschool years. Although it is now recognized that fathers also vary along the continuum
of an elaborative style akin to mothers (Fivush, 2007), Reese and Fivush (1993) found that variation in the degree to which parents differed on elaborative or repetitive styles was not due to parental sex when the children were 36 months old. However, parents of girls were discovered to be more elaborative (i.e., lengthier and more detailed conversations) with their children than parents of sons. It was also noted that girls participated more in past event discussion than did boys. The results did not seem to indicate that parents were simply responding to conversational participation skills as girls and boys did not differ in terms of linguistic abilities or in a tendency to drift off topic.

Continued research with this sample of families when the children were five years revealed that over time mothers, but not fathers, increased in their elaboration replies to children’s memory responses (Haden et al., 1997; Reese, Haden, & Fivush, 1996). Mothers were more likely to reply with evaluations (i.e., parental confirmation or negation of children’s responses by repeating children’s utterances along with an obvious evaluation) to daughters’ memory responses and placeholders than were fathers. Fathers were also found to be more repetitive than mothers at the last time point and were more likely to reply to sons’ memory responses with evaluation than were mothers. Mothers were generally found to be differentiating their responses more on the basis of child gender than were fathers. Fivush and her colleagues noted that this was an unusual finding in that it has been generally reported that mothers do less gender typing than fathers. It was suggested that this unexpected finding may stem from the fact that mothers engage in more reminiscing and conversing with their children that could lead to greater attention and possibly a greater tendency towards gender typing than is the case for fathers. Finally, it was reported that children recalled more when talking about the past with their fathers than with their mothers or the experimenter. It was suggested that
because the mother performed the primary caretaker role in the family that the opportunity to converse alone with Dad in such a way may have been marked as a more unique event for children thus leading to greater recall.

Buckner and Fivush (2000) found few differences between mothers and fathers reminiscing with their children in their longitudinal sample at three and five years via use of a both a reminiscing task and a task involving parental storytelling about their own childhood. It was found that adult males mentioned their children and other people to the same degree as females when reminiscing with their children in their own home. Recent literature notes that such findings of equivalent behaviour among mothers and fathers throughout the Fivush sample contradicts other literature which highlighted gender differences in parental reminiscing (Reese et al., 1996). It has been suggested by Fivush and colleagues (Reese et al., 1996) that:

In our study, mothers and fathers reminisced in their own homes and with an intimate partner – their child. Moreover, mothers and fathers engaged in conversations with their children, in which parents and children jointly recounted experiences they shared together in the past, as opposed to an experimenter eliciting recall from an “experimental subject.” Any or all of these aspects of the context of recalling personal past events may be contributing to the differences in findings. When the context is more familiar, intimate, and relational, men and women may appear similar to each other in their conversational style of talking about the past. (p.50)

In the Buckner and Fivush (2000) study, in both reminiscing tasks, parent-daughter conversations focused more on people and relationships than did parent-son discussions. More than half of the parent-daughter narratives had social themes whereas
two-thirds of the parent-son narratives held themes of autonomy. Boys and girls were found to engage in these conversations in very different ways with girls' recollections involving more references to self, to others, and affiliative themes. Children's themes during parent-child communications also varied as a function of the gender of the parent. Both boys and girls made more references to the self and others with their fathers as opposed to discussions with their mothers. Again, Buckner and Fivush suggested that perhaps because fathers are less frequent conversational partners and thus perhaps more exciting, children may work harder to be engaged in the discussion. Finally, in a study of middle childhood (i.e., children were 8-years-old) utilizing the Children's Self-View Questionnaire (CSVQ), Buckner and Fivush (1998) found that girl's autobiographical narratives were more socially contextual and relational than were the narratives of boys. Compared to boys' narratives, girls narratives were longer, more coherent and detailed, more likely to place their narratives in a social context with affiliative themes, and more likely to mention more people and emotions than were boys.

In summary, the preceding research suggests that when considering the style and content of parent-child reminiscing discussions, gender is indeed an important issue. Though a group of lab based studies have suggested that mothers and fathers may vary in their reminiscing styles, more recent work by Fivush and her colleagues suggest the importance of contextual factors (e.g., nature and intimacy of task) as important moderating variables of parental reminiscing. Although not every published study has found child gender differences (Fivush et al., 2006), they do appear consistently enough to suggest that parents tend to be more elaborative and make greater efforts to place narratives within relational and affiliative frames when they are talking with daughters as opposed to sons. Perhaps not surprisingly then, research has also found that girls tend to
produce richer, more detailed, and “peopled” narratives than boys. Finally, there is some suggestions that children may find reminiscing conversations with fathers to be particularly salient and unique possibly due to the novelty of such occasions with their fathers. As noted by Buckner and Fivush (2000) it appears which stories we are telling to whom and for what purpose influences what aspects of the experience is selected and reported.

**Gender and emotion specific socialization within narratives.** The 1998 study by Buckner and Fivush in the preceding section raised an important, albeit perhaps not a surprising finding that girls in middle childhood may reference emotion more frequently in their narratives than boys. Such findings parallel the literature on general emotion discourse which shows that, with the exception of the emotion of anger, women tend to be more emotionally expressive than men across a number of emotions including happiness, sadness, and fearfulness (Brody, 1985; Fivush & Buckner, 2000). Children often begin using emotion words as early as 18-20 months with increasing emotional discussion throughout the preschool years (Denham et al., 1992). It has also been found that mothers talk more about emotions with girls than boys and that girls begin to talk more about emotions than boys as early as 24 months (Dunn, Bretherton, & Munn, 1987; Fivush, 1994). However, as noted by Fivush, much of these findings have focused on current, ongoing emotions as opposed to reminiscing moments where the child must both remember the episode and their emotional reaction. Fivush (1998) suggests that emotional aspects of past events serve an important role in reminiscing:

> By including emotional states and reactions in our narratives about the past, we provide information about our involvement with an event.... explicit mention of emotion conveys information about the meaning of an event that is deeper and
more personal than many of the narrative evaluative devices discussed previously. Emotions are really what tie our autobiographical narratives to our self-concept. It is the emotional tone and texture of an event that gives it personal meaning, that moves the narrative beyond an interesting story to a self-defining one. (p. 91)

A series of studies have found parent and child gender differences in the emotional content of reminiscing conversations during the preschool years (Adams, Kuebli, Boyle, & Fivush, 1995; Chance & Fiese, 1999; Fivush, 1989, 1993, 1994, 1998; Fivush & Buckner, 2000; Haden et al., 1997; Kuebli et al., 1995; Kuebli & Fivush, 1992; Reese & Fivush, 1993). Eisenberg, Cumberland, et al. (1998) as well as Fivush and her colleagues (Fivush, 2007; Fivush et al., 2006) summarized a number of the gender based findings from this literature. First, both mothers and fathers tend to discuss emotions, particularly sadness, more frequently and in greater depth with their daughters than sons. Second, it also appears that mothers focus more on the emotional state itself with daughters whereas negative emotions (e.g., anger and disgust) and the antecedents and consequences of emotions were more frequently discussed with sons. Finally, mothers seem to place more emphasis on increasing empathic involvement of daughters in discussion of others’ emotions than with sons.

The past literature pertaining to positive emotions has been somewhat equivocal across the preschool age range and the reminiscing tasks (i.e., emotionally prompted memories versus spontaneous memories with no prompt). Indeed, at times, it is almost difficult to discern the findings on positive reminiscing in the previous literature as such discussions are quite minimized and overshadowed by focus on the negative emotions. In a series of three studies involving both prompted and spontaneous reminiscing with children up to 40 months it was suggested that parents may attribute to and discuss with
daughters more positive emotions than with sons (Fivush, 1993). However, other research
involving spontaneous memories and older children (40 to 70 months) has also reported
that mothers may attribute to and discuss with sons more positive emotions than
daughters (Kuebli et al., 1995). Finally, research involving a sample of 32 to 35 months
old children with emotionally prompted reminiscing (Fivush, 1991a) and samples of
children 30 to 35 months old (Fivush, 1989) and 40 to 70 month olds (Adams et al., 1995)
with no prompting reported little to no differences regarding use of positive emotions
with sons and daughters by mothers and fathers. Clearly, more work is required to better
elucidate the dynamics surrounding gender differences and reminiscing about positive
emotions.

Three interesting articles illuminate many of the prominent themes regarding
recorded twenty-one children (40-45 months old) and their parents while discussing four
different past shared events which contained the emotional content of happy, angry, sad,
or scared. These interviews were taped in their homes. Analysis revealed that mothers
talked more in general and used more emotional words about emotional experiences than
did fathers. These results contradict earlier findings by Fivush and her colleagues (e.g.,
Reese & Fivush, 1993) where little difference was found in the discourse of mothers and
fathers. However, these gender differences appeared in the study by Fivush et al. (2000)
when parents were explicitly asked to talk about emotion-based experiences with their
children. That explicit type of instruction was not the protocol in the earlier study by
Reese and Fivush (1993).

With regard to child gender, Fivush et al. (2000) found that girls talked more
about the emotional parts of their experiences and used more emotion words when
discussing fear (as opposed to sadness, anger, and happiness) than did boys. Girls’ use of more emotion words than boys (i.e., by 70 month of age) has also been found in previous work (Fivush, 1998). Both parents talked in greater depth (i.e., more utterances and greater discussion of causation) with their daughters about sad experiences than with their sons, although daughters did not talk about sadness more than sons. In addition, parents discussed causality of happy, angry, and sad emotions in similar ways with sons and daughters. The narratives of parent-daughter dyads also framed emotional experiences in a more interpersonal manner than was the case with parent-son dyads. Indeed, about half of the narratives with daughters as opposed to one-third with sons were interpersonally focused. Finally, in a study of families with preschool children, Chance and Fiese (1999) asked mothers and fathers to tell their children a story about when they were disappointed as a child. Mothers were found to tell disappointment stories with a frame of sadness whereas fathers tended to use no emotional frame in their stories. Again, mothers were also more likely to tell daughters as opposed to sons stories with sadness themes.

Although the reminiscing literature is sometimes conflicted about differences in the nature of emotion-focused communication by mothers and fathers (most likely in part due to contextual influences), clearly the research suggests that parents often process and focus on different aspects of past emotional experiences with their daughters and sons. These differences will most likely have significant impact upon the way little girls and boys grow up thinking about and expressing emotions. Fivush (1993) suggested that such parenting styles will likely teach daughters to focus more on thinking about emotions when thinking about the past, and encourage girls to incorporate emotions into their personal memories more than boys. In addition, such styles may allow girls to see their own and others’ emotional lives as richer and more complex than boys, and possibly
engender greater sensitivity in daughters about their own emotions and the emotions of others. Consequently, a more communal and sociorelational focus is encouraged for girls as opposed to boys. However, Fivush also cautions that there will be individual families for whom these effects will not stand as is the case with most research findings.

To summarize, the research area of parental socialization of emotion has matured significantly in recent years. The body of research summarized in the preceding pages describes a series of findings that are now well accepted in the field. First, parents’ styles of narrative reminiscing (and mothers’ styles in particular) have significant impact on how children gradually begin to think and talk about emotions. Second, Fivush and others (Nelson & Fivush, 2004) have convincingly argued that parent-child reminiscing is one component of a series of cognitive/developmental as well as environmental factors that profoundly impact on children’s developing understanding of their own autobiographical timeline and their conceptualizations of “self” and others. Finally, the literature also demonstrates that gender (both parent and child) is a critical issue which researchers need to consider when studying parent-child reminiscing. Following the establishment of these important findings, researchers began to ponder areas for future focus in the field. In 2000, Harris made three suggestions for future research trends that could be helpful to the field including exploration of the links between family talk and attachment styles, exploration of individual differences regarding children’s understandings of mind and emotion, and greater focus on developmental abilities to recall past events especially those of an emotionally charged nature. As will be briefly acknowledged in the following section, Harris’ past suggestions have indeed evolved into some of today’s areas of active research.
Most Recent Trends in Reminiscing Research

Attachment security. Attachment security manifests itself in terms of cognitive, affective, and behavioural adaptations. A parent-child relationship with secure attachment is typically characterized by relaxed, coherent communication particularly with regard to emotions (Kerns, Tomich, Aspelmeier, & Contreras, 2000). McCabe, Peterson, and Connors (2006) reported two studies with findings of associations between maternal attachment styles and general discourse with children, and parent narratives about their own childhood experiences with their parents. However, Fivush et al. (2006) noted that there are only a few studies exploring maternal attachment style and parent-child reminiscing which have produced somewhat conflicting results. In one such study, Fivush and Sales (2006) found that more anxiously attached mothers, as measured by the Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory, were more elaborative when reminiscing about a traumatic medical experience with their 9- to 12-year-old children. When the same families reminisced about a past conflict, again more anxiously attached mothers talked more about other peoples’ emotions than securely attached mothers. Such findings might suggest links between mother’s anxious attachment style and a tendency to be even more engaged in an anxious, vigilant manner in discourse at a moment of stress.

Fivush and her colleagues have rightly suggested that much remains to be studied about a range of maternal characteristics and reminiscing. However, Fivush and her colleagues (Fivush et al., 2006; Fivush & Reese, 2002) as well as McCabe et al. (2006), noted that several studies have consistently reported connections between children’s attachment styles and narrative form (e.g., Fivush & Vasudeva, 2002; Laible & Thompson, 2002; Raikes & Thompson, 2006; Reese & Farrant, 2003). Specifically, mothers of securely attached children tend to (a) be more elaborative about emotional and
evaluative aspects of past events and (b) demonstrate more sensitive adaptation to children’s memory development via their output in maternal elaboration. Interestingly, McCabe et al. (2006) also discovered that as early as 4 years of age, children’s type of attachment security was correlated with the likelihood that they would use autobiographical storytelling with unfamiliar adults outside their family units, albeit of a less emotional nature than with mothers. Currently, there are no published studies examining the relations between children’s attachment security and nonfamily relationships. Much opportunity for study still remains in this arena of knowledge.

**Understanding of mind.** The term “theory of mind” generally refers to children’s early psychological understanding of people (Fivush et al., 2006). Over much of the last twenty years, the primary means of evaluating this development was via the “false belief” task which most typically developing children successfully negotiate by the time they are 4-years-old. However recently, various researchers have conceptualized “theory of mind” as a broader “social cognitive understanding” including many distinct domains such as emotions, beliefs, and thinking (de Rosnay & Hughes, 2006; Fivush et al., 2006; Lagattuta & Wellman, 2001). In their comprehensive review on this topic, de Rosnay and Hughes (2006) noted that several streams of research (i.e., twin studies, longitudinal studies, studies in training theory of mind, and studies of deaf children) have identified a number of social influences which are supportive of social cognitive understanding including the presence of siblings and older relatives, maternal discipline which encourages children to consider the emotional perspective of victims, higher socio-economic status, and secure attachment. These results in part underscore a direct link between the development of theory of mind and exposure to language. Consistently, maternal discourse, such as discussion of different mental states, has been flagged as
important influences on children’s developing understanding of mind (Harris, 2006; Ruffman, Slade, Devitt, & Crowe, 2006).

As noted in the earlier section on autobiographical memory, Fivush and colleagues (Fivush et al., 2006) have argued that parent-child reminiscing is a crucial learning pathway to understanding links between past events and mental states, and current internal states and behaviours. As outlined by Fivush et al., a group of studies have now revealed associations between mothers’ elaborations and discussions of mental states during reminiscing and children possessing a more advanced understanding of mind and more frequently discussing their own past mental states, respectively. For instance, in their study of mothers and their preschool children, Reese and Sutcliffe (2006) reported that maternal reminiscing style, in the form of maternal elaborations and metamemory comments, was linked to children’s understanding of mind, in particular their understanding that visual access leads to knowledge. Although well beyond the ability of this brief overview to summarize, the depth and breadth of the developing knowledge on understanding of mind is indeed impressive with connections between social relationships, social discourse, and theory of mind becoming clearer. However, much remains to be further understood about this area including possible differential effects of emotional versus nonemotional mental state talk, greater understanding of theory of mind beyond the preschool years, and increased sensitivity to contextual effects (e.g., particular topic, setting/activity, and partner), among others (de Rosnay & Hughes, 2006).

**Cultural socialization.** Research suggests that family narratives in general can reflect unique narrative and emotion socialization themes across cultural groups (Cole, Tamang, & Shrestha, 2006; Gleason & Melzi, 1997; Le, Berenbaum, & Raghavan, 2002;
Miller, Wiley, Fung, & Liang, 1997; Wang & Fivush, 2005; Wigglesworth & Stavans, 2001). Cross cultural research has slowly begun to appear in the field of parent-child reminiscing with the research to date indicating that in general European-American mothers tend to use a more elaborative style when discussing the past than mothers from Maori, Korean, Chinese, or Indian cultures (Fivush, 2007). For example, Wang and her colleagues (Fivush & Wang, 2005; Wang, 2001; Wang & Fivush, 2005) studied Chinese parents reminiscing with their preschool children. When asked to reminisce in their homes about past shared experiences when the child experienced the emotions of happiness, sadness, fear, or anger, Chinese mother-child conversations were less elaborative, less focused on personal themes, and less focused on children's roles and experiences as compared to American families (Wang, 2001). Similarly, when mother-child dyads in home based interviews were asked to discuss one highly positive and one highly negative past shared experience, comparable findings were noted (Fivush & Wang, 2005; Wang & Fivush, 2005). American families tended to have more interactive, elaborative conversations that were more focused on the child’s role and feeling states than the Chinese families. The Chinese mothers were described as being more directive about clarifying memory questions, exploring social interaction with emphasis placed on discipline and proper conduct, and using more negative emotion words overall. However, some similarities were noted with both sets of families using more negative than positive words and confirming a shared emotional perspective during the positive events. All families were more likely to negotiate emotions during the negative event reminiscing.

In her most recent review article, Fivush (2007) stressed that findings of less elaboration among mothers from nonwestern cultures should be understood with the caveat that these mothers varied along the elaborative dimension with some more
elaborative than others. It is also clear that their children’s narratives reflect these maternal dynamics as well. Interestingly, preliminary research also suggests that the role and nature of narratives may differ across different socio-economic groups; however, more research is needed in this area before definitive conclusions can be made (Fivush, 1994; Fivush et al., 2006; Flannagan & Perese, 1998; Miller, 1994). With calls for greater cultural sensitivity in emotion socialization research (Cole & Dennis, 1998), much potential remains for informative research in this area of parent-child reminiscing.

**Memory and narratives about stressful versus positive events.** Exploration of the effects of trauma on narratives about the past has been longstanding with the first experimental evidence for memory distortion being reported in the early 1900s (Toth & Cicchetti, 1998). Many outstanding questions continue to generate ongoing research in this area including possible differences between individuals’ memory narratives about past negative versus positive experiences. The essence of this question is whether the emotional valence of an event may differentially affect memory, meaning, and thus, the content of the narrative. In a review of the adult memory literature, Bohanek, Fivush, and Walker (2004) noted differences that have been found between positive and negative events on narrative measures such emotion content, coherence, clarity, and vividness, among others. Significantly in this research literature, not only valence, but also intensity of emotion was also highlighted as important variables for consideration. In the child literature, Fivush, Hazzard, Sales, Sarfati and Brown (2003) also reported differences in independent narration about past positive and negative events among a sample of 5- to 12-year-old predominantly African-American children from an inner-city environment. Children were able to report significant amounts of information about both events; however, they used more information about thoughts and emotions and were more
coherent when narrating negative experiences. These children also made more references to objects and people as well as descriptive details when discussing positive events. As a number of the negative events identified by the children and their mothers were traumatic experiences known to the child's parent and/or community, Fivush et al. also emphasized that these findings cannot be generalized to intensely negative events that may be more secretive such as episodes of abuse.

Although the above research is suggestive of dissimilar aspects amongst both adults and children's independent memory and narration of past positive and negative events, they do not refer to narration that is generated via joint parent-child discourse. Lagattuta and Wellman (2002) more specifically examined how parents and preschool children talked about both positive and negative emotions in samples of everyday conversations (i.e., not exclusively reminiscing discourse). Negative emotion among parents and children varied from that of positive emotion in several ways including more talk about the past, more explanations for the causes of emotions, more talk about mental states by children, a richer, more descriptive vocabulary of terms, more talk about other peoples' emotions and more open-ended questions. These differences appeared before the children were 3-years-old. These results were described as possibly indicating that discourse about negative emotions may be more conducive to emotion socialization than discourse focused upon positive emotions in daily conversations.

In their 2006 review, Fivush et al. acknowledged that a relatively small number of studies have explored parent-child reminiscing about very stressful events (e.g., Fivush & Sales, 2006; Peterson, Sales, Rees, & Fivush, 2007; Sales, Fivush, & Peterson, 2003). Fivush et al. summarized several findings from this research: (a) mothers who are highly elaborative during reminiscing about positive events also tend to be elaborative when
reminiscing about highly negative, even traumatic events; (b) when discussing negative experiences, there is a tendency for mothers to ask more open-ended, wh-questions, that require the child to participate more independently in the reminiscing process; conversely, when discussing positive experiences, mothers tend to ask more closed-ended, yes/no questions; (c) mothers talk more about the causes of negative events and try to gather more information about the causes of these events from their children than with positive events; (d) with children in middle childhood, mothers who utilize more proactive coping strategies are better able to co-construct emotionally expressive and explanatory narratives of stressful events with their children who consequently have fewer internalizing and externalizing behaviour problems; (e) few gender differences have been found in these studies possibly suggesting that parents may reminisce with sons and daughters more similarly when a traumatic events has occurred. Peterson et al. (2007) also recently reported that preschool children with more elaborative parents were able to recall more about the specific details of a prior hospital visit associated with an injury.

In conclusion, the literature on highly stressful events is still a developing one. The initial research above in part appears to indicate that family narratives about negative emotions may be imbued with more opportunity for rich emotion socialization as compared to positive emotion. However, still other research points to the importance of factoring in the nuance of emotional intensity (e.g., highly negative versus highly positive experience) as yet another important influence to consider when trying to understand the process of parent-child recall and narration. In reality, the current state of the reminiscing literature is only beginning to address what differences may occur when we compare highly negative versus positive emotions with some caveats about emotional intensity as
well. Fivush (2007) theorized that a possible differentiation of functions between positive and negative emotions may be driving maternal styles during reminiscing:

In reminiscing about positive events, mothers are focused on creating a shared history that maintains emotional bonds, and therefore telling a story such that mother and child will have a shared understanding of what occurred may be critical. In contrast, reminiscing about negative experiences may serve a more didactic function; mothers may be trying to help their children to understand how and why such experiences occur, and possibly help their children avoid such experiences in the future. To this end, mothers may be more focused on eliciting and formulating the child’s understanding of the event. (p. 43)

The reminiscing literature has not yet reached the point of richly exploring the unique function that specific individual positive emotions, and discourse about them, may play in the lives of children. This outstanding issue and others will be discussed in the next section.

New Directions for the Field of Parent-Child Reminiscing

Fivush et al. (2006) outlined a number of broad topics as important future directions for research within the field of parent-child reminiscing. Three of these topics in particular are relevant as they have been encapsulated in the research design of the current project: (a) the importance of further reminiscing research at different developmental stages, (b) further exploration of reminiscing style on various aspects of child development including the understanding of emotion, and (c) the importance of further research of connections between maternal reminiscing styles and maternal individual characteristics such as aspects of personality and self concept. The current study addresses parent-child reminiscing in relation to middle childhood, the processing
of positive emotions in addition to negative emotions, and maternal emotion-related beliefs and behaviours in relation to reminiscing styles. Accordingly, literature pertinent to each of these topics is reviewed below.

Reminiscing during middle childhood years. The contents of the current literature review attest to the fact that the vast majority of the reminiscing literature is focused upon the preschool years (Fivush et al., 2006; Kuebli et al., 1995; Peterson & Roberts, 2003). Indeed, a recent comprehensive literature review conducted by the primary researcher revealed only a comparative handful of studies focused upon the area of general family discourse and autobiographical narratives in middle childhood (i.e., approximately six to twelve years). For example, Peterson and Roberts (2003) interviewed parents and children independently about a past visit (mean average of six days previously) to an emergency room due to an injury. The data revealed impressive similarities between mothers and their 8- to 13-year-old daughters on several narrative measures including length, elaboration, cohesion, coherence, and contextual embedding. Analysis also suggested these findings were not due to simple similarities in talkativeness. Such correspondences were neither found between daughters and their fathers nor same age sons and either parent suggesting the possibility of a special bond between mothers and daughters in term of how narratives about the past become formed. As reviewed earlier in this introduction, Buckner and Fivush (1998) found that 8-year-old girls' autobiographical narratives on the Children's Self-View Questionnaire (CSVQ) were more socially contextual and relational than were the narratives of boys. Compared to boys' narratives, girls' narratives were longer, more coherent, and more detailed. In addition, girls were more likely to place their narratives in a social context with affiliative themes, and more likely to mention more people and emotions. Again as noted in an
earlier section, Fivush et al. (2003) reported narrative content differences in 5- to 12-year-old children's independent narration (i.e., not joint discourse with parents) about past positive and negative events among a sample of predominantly African-American children from an inner-city environment. Although interesting and certainly pertinent to narrative development in middle childhood, these studies do not speak directly to the process of parent-child reminiscing in the middle childhood years. The following studies speak somewhat more specifically to that issue.

In 1998, Fivush and Schwarzmueller examined memory for early childhood events among 8-year-old children who had participated in a previous study that involved reminiscing about past events with their mother and/or father and an experimenter at four points throughout their preschool years. Fivush and Schwarzmueller found that children were able to recall much about the original events including the most distant memories. Interestingly, at age eight, the children discussed new and different aspects about the events (possibly suggesting they encoded more than they were able to verbally share at the earlier ages) and no association was found between rehearsal effects and the amount of recall. Girls were also found to recall more than boys. Dunsmore, Robinson, and Trzaskos (2001) utilized a reminiscing task with mothers and their 9- to 11-year-old children taped in their homes. The findings of this study contradicted much of the preschool literature. These researchers found that sons tended to state their emotional reactions more often and tended to use more sophisticated emotional language than daughters. Sons were also found to be more likely to focus on their emotional experience compared to daughters. Dunsmore et al. speculated that there may be varying level of gender expressivity across developmental level. They suggested that girls may be more expressive in preschool and boys may be more expressive in middle childhood followed by a
decrease in expressiveness as boys transition into late adolescence and adulthood. This suggested pathway of expressivity is unique as it proposes perhaps a discontinuity in the development of emotional expressivity. However, the authors also acknowledged that their findings may have been an artifact of their sample as the majority of their families were upper-middle class, European-American families in which the children were enrolled in gifted classes. It should also be noted that the reminiscing task did not prompt for clear and specific emotional experiences. Once again, Fivush and Sales (2006) recently found that more anxiously attached mothers, as measured by the Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory, were more elaborative when reminiscing about a traumatic medical experience with their 9- to 12-year-old children. When the same families reminisced about a past medically related conflict, again more anxiously attached mothers talked more about other peoples’ emotions than securely attached mothers.

The somewhat perplexing findings from Dunsmore et al. (2001) and the small number of available studies targeting this age group illuminates the need for further research into the nature of parent-child reminiscing in middle childhood. Indeed, there is recognition that the middle childhood years in general are poorly understood despite the fact that major cognitive, social, and interpersonal transitions occur in this age group (DeFries, Plomin, & Fulker, 1994; Sameroff & Haith, 1996). In addition, the nature and impact of parent-child relationships after early childhood has largely been inferred from correlational research rather than from direct research on the qualities of the dyadic relationships at this stage (Collins & Russell, 1991).

Reminiscing about positive emotions. Much of the research in the area of emotion socialization has tended to focus on the exploration of negative emotions (Cowan, 1996). Indeed, one criticism of the model of emotion socialization forwarded by Eisenberg and
her colleagues (Eisenberg, Cumberland et al., 1998) was that their model was primarily focused upon prototypical emotions of fear, anger and sadness to the detriment of both positive and self-conscious emotions (Fredrickson, 1998a). Frederikson pointedly stated that most parents wish to have their children experience positive emotion; however, very little is known about how parents go about cultivating such emotions. As noted by Larson (2000), “Development, after all, is a process of growth and increasing competence. In the important subdomain of social and emotional development, however, we are often more articulate about how things go wrong than how they go right” (p. 170). This paucity of focus on the nature and function of positive emotions is in opposition to a recent trend towards positive psychology which advocates for research in the area of positive subjective experience, positive individual traits, and positive institutions in the new millennium (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000).

This lack of attention on positive emotion in the general area of emotion socialization certainly extends into the specific area of parent-child reminiscing as happiness has been the only discrete positive emotion studied and its significance has been minimized in this literature. As outlined in earlier sections of this introduction, the reported findings pertaining to possible child gender effects on parental discussion of positive emotions during reminiscing in the preschool years has been conflicting across the preschool age range and varied reminiscing tasks (Adams et al., 1995; Fivush, 1989, 1991a, 1993; Kuebli et al., 1995). The recent literature comparing reminiscing about highly stressful events with “positive” ones pointed out preliminary findings that may pertain to parent-child reminiscing styles for some positive emotions. As summarized by Fivush (2007), these studies have suggested that mothers tend to ask more closed-ended, yes/no questions when discussing positive experiences, and mothers talk in a more in-
depth manner about the causes of negative events with their children than with positive events. Fivush additionally suggested that the purpose of reminiscing about positive emotions may be more about the creation of a shared history that maintains emotional bonds rather than a didactic teaching moment which may be the case with negative emotions, particularly highly intense ones. Other researchers have also underlined the likelihood of variation in the experience of positive emotions across different developmental stages (e.g., middle childhood versus adolescence) (Stegall, Zeman, & Suveg, 2002). As will be suggested in the following sections, positive emotions such as hope and love have important functions and processes in their own right which warrant further consideration in both the larger emotion socialization literature and the parent-child reminiscing literature in particular.

**The emotion of hope.** Historically, hope has been cynically described in philosophical circles as a vain, ill-fated emotional process (Babb & Levine, 1999). For example, the philosophers Sophocles and Nietzsche described hope as a human failing that only extended suffering (Snyder, 2000b). However, over time and across the broad fields of philosophy, theology, sociology, nursing, and psychology, hope has become conceptualized in more positive ways such as an experiential process, a spiritual or transcendent process, a rational thought process, or even a relational process encouraging hope (Farran, Herth, & Popovich, 1995). Psychological thought about this emotion has vacillated between ignorance and complexity. In a detailed discussion of psychological theories pertaining to emotions, Cornelius (1996) noted that most emotion theorists have not considered hope to be a prototypical emotion despite its apparent salience in the emotional lives of most people. Cornelius explained that hope was neither mentioned by Darwin in his early study of emotions nor by Ekman or Izard (i.e., contemporary theorists
within the Jamesian perspective of emotion) in their theories of basic emotions. With regard to Ekman’s perspective, hope was reportedly not included because it failed to have a distinguishable facial expression which was considered critical to the definition of an emotion. Similarly, Lazarus (1991) expressed ambivalence about conceptualizing hope as a discrete emotion:

A test of whether a state should be regarded as an emotion is whether we can construct a core relational theme and an appraisal pattern for it. Another test, one that is more equivocal, is that we can specify an action tendency. A third test is whether or not physiological changes can be identified. In the case of hope, there is no problem with core relational theme and appraisal pattern, but there is considerable uncertainty about the action changes and physiological changes apparent with the expression of it, a not unusual state of affairs with some emotions. (p. 282)

However, as noted by Cornelius, within the recent social-constructivistic theory of emotion, hope is considered to be an important and basic emotion to study given its importance and acceptance within western culture. Moreover, this intellectual tradition also suggests that notions and ideas about hope are strongly culturally and historically relative.

Cognitively oriented theorists in general have demonstrated greater acceptance of the emotion of hope as a discrete emotion. Christopher Peterson (2000) noted that a social-cognitive theory of hope involves discussions of individuals’ expectations that goals can be achieved. Babb and Levine (1999) further explained that the “cognitive theories propose that emotional experience occurs in response to an appraisal of one’s environment as it relates to personal values and goals, rather than as a direct behavioural
reaction to a specific type of situation” (p. 354). In this conceptualization, hope has a prospective future oriented relationship to goals rather than a retrospective one as is seen in other emotions such as sadness and happiness.

The late C. R. Snyder and his colleagues (Snyder, 1993, 2000b,c; Snyder, Cheavens, & Symson, 1997) were leaders in this cognitive school of thought with their elucidation of hope as a thinking process that includes a sense or belief of agency and pathway thinking towards one’s goals. In this model, agency is defined as the belief that one can initiate and sustain a drive along the imagined pathways to goals. Pathway thinking refers to a perceived ability to develop possible routes to goals which can involve primary, multiple, and/or alternative pathways. As visualized in Figure 3, Snyder, Feldman, and Rand (2002) stressed that although pathway thinking and agency are distinct components of the hope model, they are innately intertwined such that a change in one brings a change in the other. Hopeful goals are conceptualized as having some level of uncertainty, as being the ending of mental action sequences, and needing to be purposefully pursued.

Snyder (1993, 2000b) differentiated hope from such constructs as optimism, self-efficacy, helplessness, expectancy for success, and resourcefulness because the latter do not tend to emphasize both the agency component and the pathway thinking. For example, Snyder (1993) suggested that optimism can involve only agency without pathway thinking. Likewise, Christopher Peterson (2000) described optimism as “a mood or attitude associated with an expectation about the social or material future – one which the evaluator regards as socially desirable, to his or her advantage, or his or her pleasures” (p. 44). Furthermore, Snyder’s (2000b) model suggested that cognitive processes actually precede or even precipitate the emotional experience of hope. Thus, hope stems from
Figure 3. Conceptualization of hope as a goal-directed cognitive process (Snyder et al., 2002). Constructed by primary researcher.
one’s thoughts about goal pursuits with positive emotions reflecting perceived success in the pursuit and negative emotion, perceived failures.

More recently, Snyder et al. (2002) described that in addition to a goal-directed cognitive process, the experience of hope includes an organized system of beliefs regarding one’s ability to successfully engage goal processes. As pictured in Figure 4, Snyder and his colleagues discussed three levels of hope/goal abstraction including: (a) global or trait hope which refers to a person’s feeling of ability to achieve goals in general if so desired, (b) domain-specific hope refers to feelings of hopefulness concentrated in a particular life domain such as academics, work, leisure, romance, etc., and (c) goal-specific hope which refers to hope about possible attainment of a particular goal in a specific domain (e.g., an “A” in mathematics exam). Snyder and his colleagues suggested that in order to understand the role of hope in an individual’s life (e.g., students’ goals for their education), an assessment of all levels of goal abstraction would be most beneficial because each level of hope beliefs greatly affects the others although there can be some variation in levels of hopefulness across the three.

The development of the positive emotions is most likely strongly influenced by a number of shared influences from parents including genetic predispositions, transmittal of belief systems via social modelling, and through shared experience (Peterson, 2000). Snyder and his colleagues (2000c; Snyder, Cheavens, et al., 1997) identified a number of developmental processes believed to support children’s conceptualization of hope as early as the toddler stage. Snyder suggested that pathway thinking is related to the child’s developing abilities of sensing and perceiving external stimuli, learning temporal linkages for events, and the forming of goals. Agentic thinking is proposed to be connected to self-recognition, view of one’s self as the initiator of actions, and, again, the forming of goals.
Figure 4. Hierarchical system of hope beliefs (Snyder et al., 2002). Constructed by primary researcher.
Snyder also suggests that barriers to goals play an important role as they encourage the development of positive emotion when frustration is overcome following the effort of crossing a barrier. As noted by Snyder, Cheavens, et al. (1997), “through the encouragement of role models....high-hope children learn to find and maintain pathways and agentic thoughts for their goals in the face of barriers...” (p. 108). Snyder (2000a) also suggests that development of the cognitive and emotional experience of hope is likely intertwined with other developmental tasks and achievements in the later childhood years. For example, developing language skills, increasing awareness of scripted sequences of events, and increasing ability to take the perspective of others facilitate and refine the development of hope processes. For middle childhood years, it has been suggested that developing reading skills, increasing size and speed of memory, decreasing egocentricism, and increasing perspective taking may be related to increasing hopefulness. Finally, developing intimate relationships and consolidating personal identities often have significant impact on hope-related processes such as goal definition during adolescence.

Snyder developed a number of brief self-report measures for various ages which measure his definition of hope (Snyder, Hoza, et al., 1997). Synder’s measure of hope for children has been utilized with success in research exploring the coping processes and outcome of children experiencing various forms of chronic and acute medical illness (Barnum, Snyder, Rapoff, Mani, & Thompson, 1998; Lewis & Kliewer, 1996). High hope has also been found to be related to higher grade point averages, quality of athletic performances, positive affect, elevated perceptions of self worth and better health indices across a varied of clinical and community populations of varying ages (Curry, Snyder, Cook, Ruby, & Rehm, 1997; Richman et al., 2005; Snyder, 2000a). Other hope focused
measures (i.e., Beck Hopelessness Scale; the Hopefulness Scale for Adolescents) have been linked to depression and self-esteem measures among children in a psychiatric care unit, parental coping among families with paediatric cancer patients, and intervention progress with children in substance abuse treatment (Farran et al., 1995).

Several qualitative studies primarily utilizing interviewing techniques have attempted to capture the nature of hope among various samples of children; however, these findings need to be viewed with caution due to unclear methodologies. Outcomes of these studies as summarized by Farran et al. (1995) include the idea that hope structures in children with long-term disabilities include some positive valence, either a present time orientation in very young children or a future time orientation in older children, and a lack of realistic probability of outcome in young children. Finally, definitions of hopefulness have been pursued among various clinical adolescent populations including substance abuse and cancer patients. One such definition was “the degree to which an adolescent possesses a comforting or life-sustaining, reality-based belief that a positive future exists for self or others” (Farran et al., 1995, p. 174).

Carlson, Randall, Graham, and Kessler’s (2001) findings that higher levels of hope among undergraduates as measured by one of Snyder’s hope measures was positively correlated with their ratings of parental warmth, democratic control, and authoritativeness alludes to the role that particular parenting beliefs and styles may have in the fostering of hope in children. Indeed, Snyder (2000c) called attention to the importance of elucidating how “coaches” (e.g., parents, other important adults) foster hopeful thinking in young children. Snyder suggested these coaches may encourage hope in children by helping the child to better articulate goals, exposing the child to stories about other children successfully striving towards their goals, and employment of
imagery techniques. Additional suggested strategies included helping the child to remember past personal examples of successful pathways, setting up a reward system for agential behaviours, training of skills in specific areas helpful to the child, teaching how to re-goal tasks in which the person has become stuck, and fostering healthy humour about the self and one’s circumstances (Snyder, 1993).

As is the case with most developing theoretical models, others have forwarded criticism about social-cognitive theories of hope such as Snyder’s (1993). Elliott and Sherwin (1997) suggested that social-cognitive theory fails to sufficiently and fully emphasize important familial and cultural influences that are integral to an understanding of hope. For example, a sense of hope for a person from a more collectivistic culture or ethnic group may be very different than one from a more individualistic background. Despite ongoing theoretical debates regarding the nature, origins and functions of hope, recent literature suggests that the construct of hope is beginning to be considered as an important factor in various areas of social research. Snyder (2000c) identified a number of clinical topics wherein theoretical or empirical work pertaining to hope is evolving such as the role of hope theory in psychotherapeutic process, particularly for victims of trauma and prevention of suicide. Hope theory is also now being discussed with regards to health psychology including pain tolerance, medication adherence, and disease prevention and treatment. Proposed areas of future investigation include the role of individual differences in hope processes (e.g., the roles of cognitive flexibility and gender) as well as the role of hope processes within the work setting. Finally, as alluded to earlier, the role of parental influence and other developmental antecedents of hope is a critical area open for inquiry, thus the decision to include the emotion of hope in the current study is well-timed.
The emotion of love. The feeling of love has often been overlooked in most modern emotion theories despite its clear importance in the “lay psychology” of emotion. Many different theoretical reasons have been offered for this omission including suggestions that love is simply a mixture of other emotions, or a sentiment or attitude. Other reasons include that it requires an “object” to occur, that it is a multi-person process rather than an emotion, that it is a culturally sanctioned process, and that it fails to have a unique facial expression or feeling state (Cornelius, 1996; Shaver, Morgan, & Wu, 1996). However, it has also been argued that the omission of love within many broad emotion typologies is not theoretically well defended. For example, Shaver et al. note that the emotion theorist Ekman rejected love as a basic emotion because it often involves a characteristic or “scripted” plot between two people; however, the emotion of contempt, which Ekman accepted as a basic emotion, is a very similar multi-person, scripted emotion.

An additional argument supporting greater inclusion of love in contemporary emotion theory is that love has been demonstrated to be a cognitively basic and prototypical emotion among community samples. For example, Fehr and Russell (1991) have found that although their participants did not seem to have precise boundaries for the concept of love, the emotion of love had been shown to have internal structure in that sub-types of love could be reliably ordered from poorer to better examples of love (e.g., maternal love, romantic love, affection, love of work, self-love, infatuation, in addition to other subtypes). Fehr and Russell also suggested that scientists subscribe to a much narrower view of love (i.e., primarily romantic in nature) than do most individuals (e.g., inclusion of love between family members). For example, Sternberg’s triangular theory (1986) and Lee’s typology of lovestyles (1973, 1988) focus primarily upon the
components and styles of romantic relationships. These theories have received criticism for their neglect of the phenomenon of "care giving", different kinds of commitment, the varying influences on commitment that have little to do with love (e.g., social approval, economic considerations, etc.) and the differentiation between a momentary surge of love and a more long-standing, "dispositional" form of love (Shaver & Hazan, 1988; Shaver et al., 1996).

Indeed, Shaver et al. (1996) have suggested that most emotions, including anger, happiness, and sadness, can encompass both ends of this continuum from short, intense bursts of feeling to more enduring feelings. Shaver et al. note that the emotion theorist Lazarus (1991) intimated that love can refer to both a social relationship that can involve the emotion of love as well as other emotions. Shaver et al. asserted that existing research provides preliminary evidence that the "surge" form of love (including various forms of love such as romantic, maternal, etc.) can meet some of the typical "basicness" criteria of emotion. This research includes findings of distinctive universal signs (e.g., romantic love: flushing, giddy smile, raised shoulders, and sideways glances), distinctive feeling state (i.e., warm rush with fascination and desire to be close), presence in other mammals (e.g., affectionate postures, desire for bodily contact), characteristic eliciting conditions (i.e., viewing another as especially desirable and open to special closeness), quick onset and brief duration (i.e., a rush of intense feeling which comes and goes in response to noticing the other's special qualities), and unbidden occurrence (cannot be willed), among others. These researchers also suggest that recent anthropological data indicates that romantic love, in addition to maternal love, has some cross-cultural and trans-historical universality which contradicts earlier positions that love failed to meet this criteria of a
basic emotion (e.g., past view that romantic love was solely invented in 12\textsuperscript{th} century Europe).

Throughout their early review of “love” theory, Shaver and Hazan (1988) forwarded the argument that a lifespan perspective on attachment theory can offer a helpful framework for elucidating the functions, dynamics, origins, and developmental pathways of love. Shaver and his colleagues (Levy, Blatt, & Shaver, 1998; Shaver et al., 1996) suggested that love (including more longstanding love or dispositional love) can be integrated within an attachment framework with “love” being a name for complicated, varied emotions related to the three intertwined attachment-behavioural systems of attachment, care giving, and sex. As noted by Shaver et al.:

Emotion that we call surge love is, in one of its guises, a natural consequence of appreciating, at a particular moment, that an attachment figure is available, responsive, and caring.... surges of love might include slightly different facial expressions, body language, and behavioral tendencies, depending on whether they are grounded primarily in motives related to attachment, care giving, or sexual attraction.... Love is unusual, to the extent that it is unusual, because it is so integrally wrapped up with the attachment, care giving, and sexual systems-biological systems as ancient as emotion itself. If the neurological and ethological basis of love is ever to be fathomed, attachment will have to be addressed in the process. (p.93-94)

Shaver et al. suggested that examining love within this attachment framework also allows researchers and theorists to broaden the focus of love to include some of the most important emotional experiences in humanity including parental love, child love for a parent, sibling love, and love among friends, in addition to romantic love. Shaver et al.
argued that because the feeling of "love" is so intensely salient to the average person that, despite all the theoretical debates, it deserves greater consideration in emotion theories. This argument has special relevance when applied to child development as the topic of "love" is one that is frequently discussed, or at the very least, acknowledged by most individuals when thinking about or describing parent-child relations (even if that acknowledgement bemoans a lack of "love").

Moving beyond the more traditional theoretical debates about love, Fredrickson (1998a, 1998b, 2001) has more recently presented a new model outlining the unique effects of positive emotions referred to as the "broaden and build theory of positive emotions". Fredrickson argued that past conceptualizations of negative emotions along a spectrum of "action tendencies" (i.e., evolutionarily adaptive actions stemming from emotion such as the action of flight or fight often associated with fear) may not be an appropriate level of analysis for the functions and benefits of positive emotions. Instead, Fredrickson's (2001) primary thesis in this theory is that:

...certain discrete positive emotions – including joy, interest, contentment, pride, and love – although phenomenologically distinct, all share the ability to broaden people's momentary thought-action repertoires and build their enduring personal resources, ranging from physical and intellectual resources to social and psychological resources. (p. 219)

As an example, Fredrickson described the broadening of thought-action repertoires that occurs with love as the creation of recurring cycles of wishes "to play with, explore, and savor experiences with loved ones" (p. 220). Based upon her own program of research and that of others (Fredrickson, 2001; Fredrickson & Losada, 2005; Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005; Waugh & Fredrickson, 2006), Fredrickson outlined several empirically
based benefits of positive emotions. These include undoing lingering negative emotions, supporting psychological resilience, moving beyond resilience into enhanced emotional well-being, and the lasting personal and social engagement/benefits of a number of positive emotions including gratitude and happiness.

In summary, the ongoing theoretical debate described in detail above suggests that both the emotional processes of hope and love are open for further study. One of the few discernable specific references to either hope or love in the parent-child reminiscing literature reviewed for this chapter involved a brief reference to the fact that both mother-daughter and mother-son dyads used a similar frequency of positive emotion words such as happy, love and like in a sample of 30 to 35 month old children (Fivush & Buckner, 2000). Recognition of the role that narratives can play in the developmental process of such positive emotions as hope has also been highlighted (McDermott & Hastings, 2000). Internal stories that children learn to tell about themselves are significantly related to their sense of self and quite possibly a sense of themselves as a hopeful person. As noted by McDermott and Hastings (2000):

Narrative researchers believe that stories represent a primary means for conveying the manner in which people make sense of intentional actions in time. These constructed stories represent a basic way of understanding life and integrating the past and present.... In helping children to develop higher hope, narratives can play several valuable roles.... children can write about difficult events in their lives that they succeeded in resolving. Children can also write about future events describing a goal they have set, the routes they might take, potential problems they could encounter, and the way they would feel in working for the goal. Such a
narrative is a rehearsal for the event to come and, as such, is a way of anticipating problem and discovering solutions without actually experiencing them. (p.193)

McDermott and Hastings (2000) also reiterate Snyder’s (2000c) earlier point regarding the importance of parents actively encouraging such narration and pointing out relationships between events and emotions in the child’s life. Such ideas raise questions regarding potential interrelations between parent-child narration and parental comfort with emotion coaching in parenting. In addition, recent assertions that the reminiscing field is lacking research of connections between maternal reminiscing styles and maternal individual characteristics (Fivush et al. 2006) also suggest a rich avenue for exploration. One such individual parental characteristic that has been explored in various capacities in emotion socialization is the idea, as noted by Hooven, Gottman, and Katz (1995), that “a parental cognitive structure that supports emotional connections supports social interaction that is inclusive of emotion” (p.257). This point alludes to a critical variable in Eisenberg, Cumberland, et al.’s (1998) heuristic model, the importance of parental emotion-related beliefs (i.e., a parental cognitive structure) as one of the possible determinants of emotion-related parenting practices such as parental discussion of emotion (i.e., of which shared reminiscing is a variant). In addition, a call has been made encouraging exploration of the links between varied emotion-related practices such as parental reactions to children’s emotions, family expression of emotion, and parents’ discussion of emotions (Halberstadt, 1998). Thus, in the following section, I would like to further elaborate on the work of Gottman and his colleagues (Gottman, Katz, & Hooven, 1996; 1997) and Halberstadt and her colleagues (Halberstadt, 1991) as their work uniquely demonstrates links between parental emotion-related beliefs and child socioemotional functioning. Both bodies of work will be incorporated in the current study
to focus on the issues raised above, interrelations between parental emotion-related beliefs and the varied emotion-related practices of parental reactions to children’s emotions, family expression of emotion, and parents’ discussion of emotions. Following these discussions, the constructs and research specifically pertinent to the hypotheses of the present study will be highlighted.

**Parental Emotion-Related Beliefs**

The theoretical model outlined by Eisenberg, Cumberland, et al. (1998) and the longitudinal work by Gottman and his colleagues (Gottman et al., 1996) suggest that styles of emotional responding by parents are most likely connected to child rearing philosophies and emotion-related beliefs. As discussed in the Eisenberg, Cumberland, et al. (1998) review, results of longitudinal research by Gottman and his colleagues (Gottman et al., 1996, 1997; Katz, Wilson, & Gottman, 1999) provide support for the idea that parental coaching of emotion, which includes sensitive parent-child discussion about emotion-related issues as well as parental meta-emotion philosophy, can influence a variety of child outcome measures. Gottman et al. (1996) defined parental meta-emotion philosophy as “an organized set of feelings and thoughts about one’s own emotions and one’s children’s emotions” (p. 243). Gottman et al. have reported finding a wide variability of feelings and thoughts among parents with regards to their own emotions and those of their children. These researchers have defined a spectrum of meta-emotion philosophy which captures the variability noted above.

At one end of the spectrum, the emotion-coaching parenting philosophy entails awareness of emotion in themselves and their children, and the perception of their children’s negative emotion as a chance for intimacy or teaching. Additionally, parents with this emotion philosophy typically validate their children’s emotions, help their
children to verbally label their own emotions, actively involve themselves in problem solving with their children in addition to establishment of behavioral limits, and discuss goals and strategies for dealing with the event that led to the emotion. Approaching the other end of the spectrum, dismissing meta-emotion philosophy involves parents who felt that the experience of being sad or angry might be harmful to their children so they attempt to change the children's emotions as quickly as possible. Minimization of the importance of negative emotions and parental responsibility to teach the child that she or he could ride out the negative emotions without harm were components of a dismissive philosophy. Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) noted that these parents appeared to wish for the emotions to go away quickly in sharp contrast to a view of emotions as a moment for intimacy or teaching. These parents were neither insightful about their children's experiences nor did they move their children towards a problem-solving stance.

Gottman et al.'s work (1996) has received criticism that the meta-emotion constructs of parental coaching and awareness may be simply additional markers of effective parenting which may add no new insight to our understanding of emotional processes between parents and children (Cowan, 1996; Eisenberg, 1996). However, Katz, Gottman, and Hooven (1996) continue to assert that their meta-emotion philosophy is more accurately understood as an attitudinal approach to child emotion based upon information from their quantitative analyses and qualitative narrative examples. Indeed, initial empirical work (i.e., gathered through the meta-emotion semi-structured interview) supports parental meta-emotion philosophy as a construct which can further our understanding of links between parenting philosophy and child social outcome. Empirical work conducted by Gottman et al. found, in part, that parents who were high in emotion coaching had children who were physiologically well regulated, which predicted
children's abilities to manage their arousal and ultimately their social behavior in peer social contexts. The link between coaching and later peer competence also appeared partially mediated by low parental derogation of the child. The awareness construct also appeared to have a direct effect on quality of peer relations and the degree of negative emotionality.

In addition to highlighting the possible importance of emotion-related beliefs in her recent review of socialization of emotion, Eisenberg, Cumberland, et al. (1998) noted that the emotion-related parenting practice of parental expression of emotion may actually be a mediator or correlate of other aspects of parenting that affect child competence. The family is frequently conceptualized as a primary agent for socializing emotional expression as this environment is typically the milieu within which individuals first attempt to communicate needs and desires (Halberstadt, 1984). Halberstadt (1991) defines expressiveness as "a persistent pattern of exhibiting emotional expressions in a variety of socioemotional situations, and our judgements about a person's style of expressiveness are based on aggregates of that individual's emotion expression over time and across situations" (p. 107). Dunsmore and Halberstadt (1997) suggested that family emotional expressiveness can differ in many ways including the overall frequency, intensity, type and duration of positive and negative emotions. It has also been suggested that family emotional expressiveness is a very influential variable related to children's understanding of self-and world-schemas.

In 2002, Halberstadt and Eaton conducted a meta-analytic review which grouped together findings from a large body of research on family expressivity (e.g., Burrows & Halberstadt, 1987; Denham et al., 2000; Halberstadt, 1983, 1984, 1986, 1991). In general, this review confirmed relations between emotional expressiveness in the family and
children’s expressiveness. There was some differentiation of findings with emotional valence. In general, effects for both global and positive expressiveness were quite robust across age whereas the relationship of negative expressiveness between families and children was significant, but small. For negative expressiveness, the relationships between family and child were strongest when children were quite young and again when they reach young adulthood. Halberstat and Eaton stated that the impact of parental negative expressiveness may decline gradually with age as children experiment with styles that differ from those of their parents, and increase once again in college as differentiation from the parental model is less important. Familial positive expressiveness was not related to children’s emotion understanding. However, for global and negative-submissive emotions, familial expressiveness tended to be increasingly related to emotion understanding from the preschool years to the elementary school years, but was negatively related by the college years.

Recent literature in family expressivity has begun to make use of the Self-expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire (SEFQ) which is closely based upon Halberstadt’s (1986) Family Expressiveness Questionnaire (FEQ). The 40-item SEFQ is constructed to measure the frequency of emotional expressiveness of an individual within the family context (Halberstadt, Cassidy, Stifter, Parke, & Fox, 1995). Shortly after the development of the FEQ, various researchers began to use this measure as a measure of individual expressiveness in family contexts because no questionnaire existed which adequately captured this experience. Halberstadt et al. reported that mothers’ positive expressiveness was positively associated with marital satisfaction whereas fathers’ negative expressiveness was negatively correlated with marital satisfaction. Mothers’ positive and total expressiveness has also been found to be negatively correlated with
loneliness whereas fathers' negative expressiveness was positively correlated with loneliness. In addition, significant relations were found between mothers' positive expressiveness and extraversion and mothers' negative expressiveness and neuroticism. Mothers' expressiveness was positively correlated with trait anxiety and anger whereas negative expressivity only was correlated with depression. Self-expressiveness was not correlated with anger suppression. Finally, expressivity as measured by the SEFQ was not related to a measure of social desirability.

In conclusion, the literature reviewed in this introduction has acknowledged numerous child, parent, and family characteristics which feed into the interactional processes associated with child emotional development. The critical role that discussion of emotion, and in particular discussion of past emotional experiences, plays in the development of emotional competence in children appears clear. In addition, parental styles of emotional expressivity, both at a verbal and nonverbal level, and parental emotion-related beliefs appear to be related to the social and emotional functioning of children. However, little research exists to elucidate how this process actually occurs in discussions between parents and children, and more specifically, in parent-child reminiscing about past shared child emotions. It is also clear that the majority of the parent-child reminiscing research produced thus far has tended to predominately focus upon negative emotion and interactions between very young children and their parents. The forthcoming hypotheses for the current study were formulated to push forward new areas of exploration, specifically examining interrelations between mothers' emotion-related beliefs and behaviours, and child gender, age, temperament, and language abilities within parent-child discussions of past experienced child positive and negative emotions (i.e., anger, sadness, happiness, hope, and love) during the middle childhood years. The
following section will briefly summarize those research findings which directly pertain to the theoretical conceptualization of the hypotheses for the current study.

**The Rationale for the Current Study: Important Constructs and Relevant Research**

The reminiscing literature suggests that maternal reactions to child negative affect will be related to child production of negative emotion words during mother-child reminiscing. As alluded to in the earlier section on temperament, child negative affectivity was treated as a control variable throughout the current research as it has been highlighted as an important construct in research exploring connections between child temperament and emotion-related parenting styles (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1994; Lengua et al., 2000). A series of studies have identified harsh and distressed parental coping style as correlates of child temperament and child socioemotional adjustment (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1994; Lengua et al., 2000; Fabes et al., 2001). Buck’s (1984) theory suggests that parental use of nonsupportive strategies to control children’s negative emotions teaches children to suppress negative emotions, which may in turn eventually increase their negative arousal and dysregulation when the emotion is finally expressed. Thus, this theory suggests that even though the child’s experiences with the emotion may be greater, their ability to cognitively process and verbalize is lower. Eisenberg and Fabes’ (1994) research has provided some support for this theory with findings that maternal reports of harsh parental coping and parental distress were related to relatively low levels of child emotional displays in anger contexts (i.e., venting and anger intensity scores). Fabes et al. (2001) also reported that harsh parental coping strategies in relation to child negative expression were related to proportionately fewer displays of negative emotions by children when parents exhibited high levels of distress in relation to negative child emotion. Additionally, the combination of harsh parental coping and high parental
emotional distress upon exposure to children's negative emotions was related to proportionately fewer, albeit more intense, verbal and behavioral expression of negative child emotions during observed peer interactions.

Previous research supports probable relations between parental expressivity and restrictiveness toward general child affect and both child and maternal production of total emotion words during mother-child reminiscing about emotions. Particularly pertinent are Haberstadt and Eaton's (2002) findings of confirmed relations between emotional expressiveness in the family and children's expressiveness, although with some differentiation of findings with different emotional valence. Effects for both global and positive expressiveness were quite robust across age whereas the relationship of negative expressiveness between families and children was significant, but small. For negative expressiveness, the relationships between family and child were strongest when children were quite young and again when they reach young adulthood. In addition, Eisenberg et al. (1992) have reported that maternal restrictiveness was related to emotionally expressive reactions in both boys and girls. In this research, boys and girls' sad facial reactions during observation of a sympathy-inducing film were negatively related to maternal restrictiveness and positively correlated with girls' facial distress and high heart rate. Consistent with the Halberstadt findings as well as Gottman's meta-emotion theory (Gottman et al., 1996, 1997), it would be expected that a parent who is more consistently emotionally expressive in the family and holds less restrictive beliefs regarding emotional expression in children would likely be more comfortable with the use of emotional language in discourse with their children. It is conceivable that levels of maternal restrictiveness towards child expression may also be similarly related to child verbal
expression of emotion (i.e., less maternal restrictiveness related to more child verbal expression of emotion).

Findings stemming from Gottman et al.'s (1996, 1997) meta-emotion theory support possible relations between maternal emotion coaching styles and maternal narrative production during mother-child reminiscing. Gottman et al.'s research highlighted the importance of parental awareness of emotion in themselves and their children, the degree to which parents perceived their children's negative emotion as a chance for intimacy or teaching, and parental validation of their children's emotions. High emotion coaching parents help their children verbally label their own emotions, actively involve themselves in problem solving with their children in addition to providing behavioral limits, and discuss goals and strategies for dealing with an event that led to the emotion. As parental emotion coaching is associated with a greater cognitive and verbal processing of emotional content, the current study investigated the link between maternal meta-emotion philosophy and actual verbal output regarding child emotional issues.

Previously established links between child gender and maternal narrative output suggest child gender will be related to maternal discourse in the reminiscing stories about past child experiences of hope and love. In research with other positive and negative emotions (i.e., not specifically hope and love), parents generally used more emotion words and a greater variety of emotion words with girls than boys (Fivush, 1998; Fivush et al., 2000; Kuebli & Fivush, 1992). Parents also discussed girls' emotional experiences in a more "sociorelational" way than with boys (Buckner & Fivush, 2000). As noted earlier in this review, the reminiscing literature pertaining to the only specifically studied positive emotion, happiness, is somewhat contradictory. In addition, one reference
regarding gender effects and the mention of "love" within a reminiscing task (Fivush & Buckner, 2000) is based on a much younger sample of children (i.e., 30-35 months) with a different reminiscing task (i.e., spontaneous reminiscing versus specifically emotion prompted reminiscing in the current study), thus it does not appear prudent to place primary emphasis on that finding. In that particular study, mother-son and mother-daughters dyads were found to use positive emotion words such as happy, love, and like with comparable frequency.

No empirical evidence currently exists regarding possible thematic content in mother-child reminiscing about child experiences of hope and love. Snyder (1993) theorized that parents might utilize a number of means to encourage hope in children including helping the child to better articulate goals, exposing the child to stories about other children successfully striving towards their goals, employment of imagery techniques, helping the child to remember past personal examples of successful pathways, training of skills in specific areas helpful to the child, teaching how to re-goal tasks in which the person has become stuck, and fostering healthy humour about the self and one's circumstances. Given the typical social environments of middle childhood, it is likely that mother-child narrative themes will involve fewer references to romantic love and more references to love among family members (perhaps including pets), and possibly peers (DeFries et al., 1994). Given the acknowledgement of the complexity of family relationships at this developmental stage (Furman & Buhrmester, 1985; Graeme & Russell, 1987), it is possible that ambivalent feelings will also be acknowledged with regards to the emotion of love.
Hypotheses of the Current Study

Hypothesis I: Maternal reaction to child negative affect and child production of negative emotion words. The first hypothesis for the present study was that negative maternal reactions to children’s expression of negative emotions would be related to the total number of negative emotion words produced by the children across the five emotional reminiscing events beyond the influence possibly accounted for by child age, gender, language abilities, and temperament (i.e., negative affectivity). More specifically, it was predicted that higher levels of negative maternal reactions (i.e., harsh and distressed parental coping styles) would be associated with fewer child negative emotion words.

Hypothesis IIa and IIb: Maternal expressivity and restrictiveness toward general child affect and child and maternal production of total emotion words. The second hypothesis was twofold in nature stating that positive maternal emotional expressivity in the family and maternal restrictiveness towards general child emotional expressiveness (i.e., including both positive and negative child emotional expression) would be related to the number of total emotion words used by both children and mothers across the five emotional reminiscing events beyond the influence accounted for by child age, gender, language abilities and temperament (i.e., negative affectivity). It was predicted that higher levels of maternal positive expressivity and lower levels of maternal restrictiveness towards children would be associated with greater frequency of child and parent emotion words.
Hypothesis III: Maternal emotion coaching style and maternal narrative production. The third hypothesis was that maternal emotion coaching would be associated with maternal reminiscing beyond the possible influence accounted for by child age, gender, language abilities, and temperament (i.e., negative affectivity). Specifically, it was hypothesized that mothers with higher emotion coaching ratings would engage in longer family reminiscing conversations with their children, produce more nonrepetitive questions (i.e., maternal elaborations) during the reminiscing narratives, and evidence increased socialization of emotion (i.e., maternal production of emotion words) in their reminiscing activities with their children.

Hypothesis IVa: Child gender and maternal narrative content in hope and love narratives. Hypothesis IVa focuses on particular types of maternal narrative content within the reminiscing stories about hope and love only. It was predicted that mothers would use more emotion words and a greater variety of emotion words with girls than boys during their hope and love stories. In addition, it was predicted that mothers would discuss girls’ emotional experiences in a more “sociorelational” way than with boys as predicted in previous research. So, it was expected that mothers of girls would make more specific references to their female children (e.g., single words such as “you” or the child’s proper name), to the mother herself (e.g., “I” in the case of a mother taking about herself), to other individuals (e.g., single words such as “father”, “brother” “friend” or proper names for people of such relationships), and to affiliation (i.e., independent clauses characterized with a positive or a negative tone about the state of a relationship) than would mothers of boys while discussing the past shared child emotional experiences of hope and love.
Hypothesis IVb: Thematic content in hope and love narratives. There was no empirical evidence available regarding possible thematic content that may occur between parents and children in reminiscing tasks regarding hope and love. Snyder (1993) theorized that parents might utilize a number of means to encourage hope in children such as helping the child to better articulate goals, exposing the child to stories about other children successfully striving towards their goals, employment of imagery techniques, helping the child to remember past personal examples of successful pathways, training of skills in specific areas helpful to the child, teaching how to re-goal tasks in which the person has become stuck, and fostering healthy humour about the self and one’s circumstances. Thus, the current work investigated what themes arose in the parent-child discourse regarding methods of hope building among parents and children. With regards to discourse regarding the emotion of love, it was predicted that the mother-child narrative themes would involve both fewer references to romantic love and more references to love among family members (perhaps including pets), and possibly peers. It was also anticipated that ambivalent feelings may also be acknowledged with regards to this emotion. For example, love for a sibling may be accompanied by sibling conflict.
CHAPTER II

Method

Participant Recruitment

Following clearance by the University of Windsor Research Ethics Board, successful efforts to gather participants for this study involved recruitment from four primary sources: (a) the undergraduate psychology participant pool at the University of Windsor, (b) a local parenting magazine widely dispersed in the targeted community, (c) advertisements posted at central locations at the University of Windsor and in the local community, and (d) a children's camp program at the University of Windsor. Please see Appendices C, D, E, F, and G for samples of recruitment written materials, statistics on each successful recruitment source, and a list of unsuccessful recruitment sources.

Initially, data were gathered from 54 families; however, that number was decreased by seven families due to two factors: (a) a decision to remove 5 fathers from the current study due to their small $n$ and (b) the necessity of reporting two families to child welfare authorities. These two protection situations arose during the parent-child reminiscing narratives when discussions revealed that a child was at risk of serious physical harm from a parent. All parents had been forewarned that such material would be reported to child protection officials through the research consent forms. See Appendix H. Both decisions were made in close consultation with the faculty research supervisor for this project, Dr. J. Hakim-Larson. The head of the child clinical program at the University of Windsor, (Dr. S. Voelker), as well as the professor who was responsible for teaching the departmental coursework in ethics were also consulted about these issues. Ultimately, the University of Windsor Research Ethics Board was also informed of the process around these reports as per their standard procedures.
Participants

The participants in the present study were 47 mothers (M age = 34.53, SD = 5.26) and their children, 23 daughters (M age = 6.83, SD = .65) and 24 sons (M age = 7.0, SD = .83) recruited from Windsor, Ontario and its surrounding suburban communities. The inclusion criteria for families were: (1) at least one child between the ages of six and eight years, and (2) comfortable fluency in the English language for both the mother and the child. Data were gathered from only one child and one parent within each family. Families involving foster parents or other nonparental guardians were excluded. There were no step-parenting relationships among the 47 parent-child dyads. As can be seen in Table 1, approximately 66 percent of the participants self-identified as Caucasian whereas the remaining 34 percent were split across varied racial backgrounds. This diversity is not surprising given that Windsor has consistently been found to be among the top ten most ethnically diverse cities in the country (Statistics Canada, 2008).

Measures

Background Information Form. This form requests information about variables such as participants’ age, marital status, socio-economic status, education, and cultural background (see Appendix I for details).

Self-expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire (SEFQ; Halberstadt, Cassidy, Stifer, Parke, & Fox, 1995). This self-report questionnaire was constructed to measure the frequency of emotional expressiveness of an individual within the family context (Halberstadt et al., 1995). It is comprised of 40 written scenarios detailing potential episodes of emotional expressiveness common to everyday life in families.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n (Percent of total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15 (31.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21 (44.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11 (23.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>31 (66.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2 (4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal or Metis</td>
<td>3 (6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific</td>
<td>6 (12.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed ethnicity or other</td>
<td>5 (10.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>20 (42.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>4 (8.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>3 (6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian other</td>
<td>5 (10.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>15 (31.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or common-law</td>
<td>36 (76.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated or divorced</td>
<td>8 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>3 (6.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

Summary of Demographic Characteristics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n (Percent of total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family of origin income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20,000</td>
<td>4 (8.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 to 40,000</td>
<td>12 (25.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001 to 60,000</td>
<td>7 (14.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,001 to 99,000</td>
<td>15 (31.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 or more</td>
<td>9 (19.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th to 11th grade</td>
<td>1 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or GED</td>
<td>1 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to three years college or university</td>
<td>34 (72.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>5 (10.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional school</td>
<td>6 (12.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th to 11th grade</td>
<td>2 (4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or GED</td>
<td>8 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post high school – trade or technical</td>
<td>9 (19.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to three years college or university</td>
<td>13 (27.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>1 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional school</td>
<td>11 (23.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children in family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 (12.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23 (48.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (4.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 1 (continued)

*Summary of Demographic Characteristics of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n (Percent of total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at parenting classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40 (85.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7 (14.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to discuss emotions in average day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 mins or less</td>
<td>11 (23.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 mins to 60 mins</td>
<td>9 (19.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 mins to 90 mins</td>
<td>3 (6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 mins to 2 hours</td>
<td>3 (6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 hours</td>
<td>9 (19.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>6 (12.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiscernable answer</td>
<td>6 (12.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This questionnaire consists of four subscales that entail both affect and power dimensions (i.e., Positive-Dominant, "Showing forgiveness to someone who broke a favorite possession."); Positive-Nondominant, "Seeking approval for an action."); Negative-Dominant, "Threatening someone"); Negative-Nondominant, "Crying after an unpleasant disagreement."). Questions are built on a nine-point likert scale with higher scores suggesting a higher frequency of emotional expression in the home.

The SEFQ is closely based on Halberstadt's (1986) 40 item Family Expressiveness Questionnaire (FEQ) which was originally designed to be completed by one family member who responds to items with a collective score about the family as a whole unit. The FEQ has a history of usage across varied samples and good internal consistency and reliability. The FEQ has been successfully utilized across a variety of studies with adolescents, college students, and adults (Halberstadt et al., 1995). Internal consistencies of the scales have been reported to range between .75 and .88 with a retest reliability for the four scales ranging between .89-.92 [r (30), p<.05]. Evidence for discriminant validity is found in the low to moderate relations with shyness [r (62) = -0.49 for males; r (62) = 0.00 for females] and self-expressiveness [r (67) = 0.35 for males; r (62) = 0.16 for females] which suggests these constructs are related, but different variables (Halberstadt, 1986; Halberstadt et al., 1995). Finally, college students' ratings on the FEQ have been found to be significantly correlated with reports of close friends and family members (Burrows & Halberstadt, 1987; Halberstadt, 1986). Shortly after the development of the FEQ, various researchers began to use this questionnaire as a measure of individual expressiveness in family contexts because no questionnaire was in existence which adequately captured this experience. As the FEQ was not originally standardized for this purpose, Halberstadt and her colleagues (Halberstadt et al., 1995) eventually
published a series of four studies regarding the psychometrics of the SEFQ based upon data from a sample of 499 mothers and 362 fathers.

Results of these studies suggested that responses to the SEFQ appear to be internally reliable and stable over both an 8-month-period (mean $r = .72$) across both parents and also over a 1-year-period with a sample of fathers (mean $r = .57$) (Halberstadt et al., 1995). Evidence for convergent, discriminant, and construct validity were found in relation to a series of other measures across these four studies. For example, Halberstadt et al. reported that the SEFQ scales correlated strongly with the Anger Expression Scale (Spielberger, 1986) which measures individuals' reactions within situations where they already feel angry. In addition, it was reported that the SEFQ did not correlate with measures of social desirability and with suppression of anger. As noted by Halberstadt et al., at least five studies presented or published prior to this SEFQ validation article have found similar evidence of construct validity with evidence of significant relations between parents' expressiveness and various measures of child emotional and social competencies. Finally, Halberstadt et al. reported that the results of four factor analyses suggested a very consistent two-factor solution with one positive and one negative factor. This finding is similar to published factor analytic data focused on the FEQ.

For the current study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the Positive Expressivity scale was .87 and for the Negative Expressivity scale, .77.

*Children's Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ; Rothbart, Ahadi, & Evans, 2000).*

This questionnaire was designed to assess temperamental characteristics in children aged four to eight years (Goldsmith, Buss, & Lemery, 1997; Rothbart & Ahadi, 1994; Rothbart, Ahadi, & Hershey, 1994; Sanson & Rothbart, 1995). This measure has 195 items with seven point likert-type item responses. It is typically completed by a person
who is very familiar with the child such as a parent or sometimes a teacher (Fabes et al., 1999). In a review article, Rothbart, Ahadi, and Evans (2000) explained that the dimensions explored by the CBQ were theoretically derived from broad based temperament dimensions previously identified in research with infants, toddlers, and adults. As described by Rothbart, Ahadi, Hershey, and Fisher (2001), this instrument assesses child temperament along 15 dimensions/subscales: Activity Level (gross motor activity), Anger/Frustration (negative affect related to the interruption of tasks or the blocking of goals), Approach (excitement and positive affect to expected pleasurable activities), Attentional Focusing (capacity to maintain attention on tasks), Discomfort (amount of negative affect related to sensory qualities of stimulation, including intensity, rate or complexity of light, movement, sound, texture), Falling Reactivity and Soothability (rate of recovery from peak distress, excitement, or general arousal), Fear (negative affect related to anticipated pain, distress or potential threat), High Intensity Pleasure (positive affect derived from situations involving high stimulus intensity, rate, complexity, novelty, and incongruity), Impulsivity (speed of response initiation), Inhibitory Control (capacity to plan and to suppress inappropriate action), Low-Intensity Pleasure (pleasure derived from situations involving low stimulus intensity, rate, complexity, novelty, and incongruity), Perceptual Sensitivity (detection of slight or low-intensity stimuli from the external environment), Motor Activation (excess motor movement, such as finger tapping), Sadness (negative affect and/or diminished energy related to suffering, disappointment and object loss), Shyness (inhibited approach and/or discomfort in novel or uncertain social situations), and Smiling and Laughter (positive affect in response to changes in stimulus intensity, rate, complexity, and incongruity).
Rothbart et al. (2001) reported adequate internal consistency with a mean coefficient alpha of .73 (range of .64-.92) in a sample of 4- and 5-years-olds, and a mean coefficient alpha of .75 (range of .67-.92) in a sample of 6- and 7-years-olds. Putnam and Rothbart (2001) have also reported an average alpha coefficient of .77 (range of .59-.94) for a sample of 6- to 8-year-olds. Factor analyses of the CBQ across varied samples suggest that this measure reliably clusters into three global factors, Extraversion (surgency), Negative Affectivity, and Effortful Control (Rothbart et al., 2001). Rothbart et al. (2000, 2001) also reported that this measure has demonstrated good temporal stability over a two year period, moderate to high levels of agreement between parents and across samples, and significant correlations with social outcomes such as aggression, empathy, guilt/shame, tendency to help, and negativity. Importantly, convergent validation of laboratory assessments of temperament and parent report on the CBQ has also been demonstrated (Kochanska, Murray, Jacques, Koenig, & Vadergeest, 1996).

For the purposes of the present study, only the factor scale of Negative Affectivity was analyzed. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the CBQ subscales whose average comprises the Negative Affectivity scale were as follows: (a) Anger/Frustration = .75, (b) Discomfort = .71, (c) Falling Reactivity and Soothability = .67 (which negatively loads on this factor), (d) Fear = .65, and (e) Sadness = .52. Thus the average Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for this factor was .66 in the present study.

Coping with Children’s Negative Emotions Scale (CCNES; Fabes, Eisenberg, & Bernzweig, 1990). This 12-item likert questionnaire measures the degree to which parents perceive themselves as reactive to young children’s (i.e., 4- to 12- year-olds) negative affect in distressful situations (Fabes et al., 1990). Each item presents a typical situation in which children are described as experiencing negative affect and distress. From the
parent responses, six subscales are derived that reflect the specific types of coping responses parents tend to use in these situations. These subscales include distress reactions, punitive reactions, expressive encouragement, emotion-focused reactions, problem-focused reactions, and minimization reactions.

The CCNES scale has been found to have good internal reliability and test-retest reliability. For example, Eisenberg, Fabes, and Murphy (1996) reported the following alpha coefficients for mothers and fathers, respectively: (a) Parental Distress Reactions, .71 and .72; (b) Punitive Responses, .73 and .78; (c) Expressive Encouragement of Emotion, .88 and .89; (d) Emotion-Focused Socialization Reactions, .77 and .78; (e) Problem-Focused Socialization Reactions, .70 and .76; and (f) Minimizing Responses, .80 and .80. Eisenberg et al. (1999) reported alpha coefficients of .73 to .79 across four measurement points for the Parental Distress subscale, .68 to .78, for the Punitive Responses subscale, and .72 to .86, for the Minimization Responses. In addition, Eisenberg et al. reported that evidence of both concurrent and construct validity had been obtained via findings that the negative response scales of the CCNES have been correlated in expected directions with a number of parental measures such as parental empathy, parental anger, personal distress, parental control of emotions, and harsh parental control. Scores on the CCNES questionnaire have also been found to correlate with measures of child social functioning. For example, Eisenberg et al. (1996) reported that emotion-focused and problem-focused maternal reactions and encouragement of the expression of emotion were associated with the comforting behavior of both male and female children.

The Harsh Coping factor (i.e., mean of the punitive and minimization subscales) is a common measure utilized from the CCNES (Fabes et al., 2001). Cronbach's alpha
coefficients for the CCNES subscales utilized in this study were as follows: (a) Minimization = .79, (b) Punitive = .84, and (c) Distress = .76.

**Parent Attitude Toward Children’s Expressiveness Scale (PACES; Saarni, 1990).** This scale is a 20-item multiple choice format questionnaire which provides a measure of the parent’s degree of acceptance-control towards a child’s emotional-expressive behavior (Saarni, 1985). The emotional-expressive behaviors of children involved in the vignettes on the PACES include distress/sadness, fear, anxiety or nervousness, interest or curiosity, and happiness/pleasure. Higher scores on this measure suggest more restrictive or controlling attitudes towards children’s emotional expressiveness.

Saarni (1990) reported that the PACES has demonstrated adequate test-retest reliability, and internal consistency. The test-retest reliability for 36 respondents over a four week period was .77. With regards to internal consistency, based upon a sample of 207 parents, the Cronbach’s alpha for this measure has been reported to be .76. In addition, based upon the results of two exploratory factor analyses, Saarni concluded that the PACES is a unidimensional scale. Evidence of construct validity has also been reported via correlations between the PACES and other related measures. The PACES has not been found to correlate with measures of social desirability, marital conflict over child-rearing, and marital affective communication. PACES did obtain significant correlations with Dissatisfaction with Children subscale of the Marital Satisfaction Inventory and several subscales of the Family Environment Scales (e.g., negative correlation with the Expressiveness subscale and positive correlation with the Control scale). Finally, independent researchers have also produced evidence for the validity of the PACES. For example, Eisenberg et al. (1992) reported that maternal restrictiveness as
measured by the PACES was negatively related to boys’ sad facial reactions and marginally related to girls’ during observation of a sympathy-inducing film. Maternal restrictiveness was also positively correlated with girls’ facial distress and high heart rate.

Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the PACES Total score with the current sample was .67.

*Emotion-Related Parenting Styles Self-Test (ERPSST; Gottman, 1997; Hakim-Larson, Parker, Lee, Goodwin, & Voelker, 2006)*. The ERPSST is a recently revised measure designed to explore parental meta-emotion philosophy (MEP). MEP refers to parents’ feelings and thoughts about their own and their children’s emotions (Gottman et al., 1996). The four subscales of the ERPSST are Emotion-Coaching (i.e., valuing emotions as opportunities for teaching emotional understanding), Laissez-Faire (i.e., permissive acceptance of children’s emotions with little teaching of emotional regulation and management), Dismissing (i.e., minimization of emotions with no effort to teach the child emotional problem-solving), and Disapproving (i.e., criticism and punishment of children’s emotions with overemphasis on conformity and limits) (Gottman, 1997). MEP has been typically determined through a five-part, semi-structured interview that requires time-intensive training to score (Katz & Gottman, 1986). In a published parent guide, Gottman (1997) published an 81-item True-False self-report questionnaire, the Parenting Styles Self-Test that was derived from the lengthy interview. Following the scale’s conversion from a true false format to a likert scale format by the University of Windsor Emotional Competence Research Group, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficients ranged from .72 to .91 across all four scales (Hakim-Larson et al., 2006). The Emotion Coaching subscale utilized in that study obtained an alpha coefficient of .82. Preliminary validity evidence was also found via significant correlational relations between the ERPSST and
other emotion-related parents questionnaires such as the SEFQ and the CCNES (Duff, Hakim-Larson, Lee, & Voelker, 2001; Goodwin, Lee, Hakim-Larson, Duff, & Wild, 2001; Hakim-Larson et al., 2006; Lee, Hakim-Larson, & Voelker, 2000).

In the current study, the analyses involving the ERPSST were exclusively focused upon the Emotion Coaching subscale as will be discussed in the results section of Hypothesis III. Cronbach's alpha for the Emotion Coaching ERPSST subscale in the current study was .79.

**Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – 3rd Edition (PPVT-III; Dunn & Dunn, 1997).** Like the original PPVT and PPVT-R, the PPVT-III (Dunn & Dunn, 1997) is a measure of listening comprehension for spoken words in standard English and a screening test of verbal ability. This individually administered, norm-referenced instrument is offered in two parallel forms, IIIA and IIIB, for reliable testing and re-testing. It produces various standardized scores including age-based standard scores, percentile ranks, and stanines. The third edition of the PPVT has several advantages including national norms extended from ages 2.5 to 90+ years, no reading or writing required of examinee, and better gender and ethnic balance than its predecessors (Washington & Craig, 1999). The PPVT-III has been found to have adequate psychometric characteristics (American Guidance Service, 2002). Several types of reliability data have been reported for both forms of the test including internal consistency (alpha of .92 to .98 with a median of .95), split-half method (.86 to .97 with a median of .94), alternate-form (.88 to .96 with a median of .94), and test-retest (.91 to .94 with a median of .92). In terms of adequate validity, the PPVT-III has been reported to have an average correlation of .69 with the OWLS Listening Comprehension scale and .74 with the OWLS Oral Expression scale. Its correlations with measures of verbal ability are: .91 (WISC-III VIQ), .89 (KAIT
Crystallized IQ), and .81 (K-BIT Vocabulary). The PPVT-III mean scores of six special populations (language delayed, language impaired, mentally retarded, reading disabled, and hearing impaired) have also been found to be significantly different from demographically matched control groups.

The mean PPVT-III standard score of 103.47 with a standard deviation of 13.28 places the current sample of 47 families in this study generally within the expected average range of scores for a community sample (M = 100, SD = 15).

Expressive Vocabulary Test (EVT; Williams, 1997). The EVT (Williams, 1997) is an individually administered, norm-referenced test of expressive vocabulary and word retrieval. The EVT and the PPVT-III were standardized on the same population of 2,725 examinees ranging in age from 2-6 to 90+ years and stratified to match the most recent U.S. Census on gender, race/ethnicity, region, and socioeconomic status. This co-norming allows direct comparisons of receptive and expressive vocabulary across the two measures. Like the PPVT-III, the EVT produces various standardized scores including age-based standard scores, percentile ranks, and stanines. As reported by American Guidance Service (2002), the EVT reliability analyses indicate a high degree of internal consistency. Split-half reliabilities range from .83 to .97 with a median of .91. Alpha coefficients range from .90 to .98 with a median of .95. Test-retest studies with four separate age samples resulted in reliability coefficients ranging from .77 to .90, indicating a strong degree of test stability. Criterion-related validity has also been established with EVT. For example, an average correlation of .73 was found across two groups also tested with the OWLS Oral Expression. The following correlations have also been found with measures of cognitive ability: .72 (WISC-III VIQ), .54 (KAIT Crystallized IQ), and .79 (K-BIT Vocabulary). The EVT mean scores of six special populations (language delayed,
language impaired, mentally retarded, reading disabled, and hearing impaired) have also been found to be significantly different from demographically matched control groups.

The mean EVT standard score of 101.06 with a standard deviation of 6.25 places the current sample of 47 families in this study within the expected average range of scores for a community sample (M = 100, SD = 15). Recent studies of mother-child narratives have utilized standard scores on the PPVT and the EVT as controls for language ability (Fivush & Sales, 2006; Reese & Cleveland, 2006).

**Reminiscing Paradigm Coding System.** The data reduction and coding strategies imposed on the current study's narrative data were primarily guided by a methodological approach known as "a priori coding" in content analysis. As outlined by Stemler (2001):

When dealing with *a priori* coding, the categories are established prior to the analysis based upon some theory. Professional colleagues agree on the categories, and the coding is applied to the data. Revisions are made as necessary, and the categories are tightened up to the point that maximizes mutual exclusivity and exhaustiveness. (p. 17)

To a lesser extent, a content analysis process known as emergent coding was also utilized in the third round of coding. As described by Stemler, emergent coding, essentially refers to the development of categories or codes following some preliminary examination of the data. The theoretical and methodological approach to this study's coding system was strongly influenced by several sources including the Emotion Competence Research Group at the University of Windsor led by Drs. Julie Hakim-Larson and Sylvia Voelker; Dr. Robyn Fivush and various colleagues (e.g., Buckner & Fivush, 2000; Fivush et al., 2000); Dr. Susanne Denham and various colleagues (PACT system; e.g., Denham et al., 1992); Dr. Susan Harter (Harter & Pike, 1984); and Dr. Rick Snyder (1993).
All narrative data used in this research are frequency data as opposed to proportional data. As explained by Fivush et al., (2000), proportions have been used in some past conversational based research in order to correct for overall “talkativeness” of participants. However, Fivush and her colleagues have stated that frequencies were appropriate measures in reminiscing research for two reasons. First, since all parents are given the same instructions and the length of conversations are determined solely by the participants, time spent talking is dyad determined and thus provides important insight into how such emotional discussions actually evolve in everyday life. Second, it has been reported in past research that it is the frequencies of particular utterance types or forms of language (e.g., frequency of maternal discussion of emotion), and not the proportions of language used, that are the most predictive of child socioemotional outcomes (Dunn, Brown, & Beardsall, 1991; Farrant & Reese, 2000; Fivush, 1991b; Hoff-Ginsberg, 1991; McCabe & Peterson 1991).

This system involved three levels of coding rounds in order to convert the parent-child discussions into usable narrative data. Prior to actual coding of the data, between three to seven weeks of intensive training occurred with each of the three coding teams on their level of coding via the transcripts from three pilot families. The first round of coding involved narrative boundary setting and then segmentation of the lines of communication into a series of constructs knows as “propositions” and “fragments”. Please see Part One of the provided Coding Manual (Appendix J) for the specifics of this level of coding which was undertaken by the primary investigator. An inter-rater reliability check was undertaken by a second rater who coded the propositions on 26 percent of the original 50 narrative transcripts or 13 transcripts in total. As is common in previous research in this area, percent agreements were calculated between the two raters on the propositions. On
11 of 13 transcripts, agreement ranged from approximately 82 percent to 91 percent. The remaining two had agreements of 76 percent and 68 percent. Thus, the average percent agreement for the coding of the propositions within all 13 transcripts was 84 percent.

Two additional raters undertook the second round of coding which involved coding all 50 transcripts (i.e., three pilot families and 47 study participants) for the core narrative emotion and function codes as outlined in Appendix J. This level of coding involved implementation of the following general code types: (a) parent-child narrative descriptors, (b) child and parent emotion words, (c) unique parent emotion words, (d) parental elaborations and repetitions, and (e) parental sociorelational frames. Procedures involved both raters coding the same three transcripts (a batch), and then meeting to review the codes, and discuss and resolve any discrepancies in codes. This was done for four batches (i.e., 24 percent of the transcripts). The primary investigator attended each meeting to answer any process questions, and further refine the content of the manual as needed. The primary researcher did not become directly involved in the resolution of codes unless: (a) it was clear the coders were not understanding the core theoretical construct of the code, or (b) the two raters could not come to a resolution on a discrepancy and then the primary investigator acted as the tie breaker.

As shown in Table 2, inter-rater reliability scores were computed for each type of general code across each of the four joint batches. Following calculation of the inter-rater reliabilities for the first two batches, it became clear that the coding definitions for the emotion words “love” and “like” as well as “want” and “wish” (as outlined in Appendix J) required further clarity as their definitions were too broad (e.g., inclusion of “loving” an object versus “loving” someone). To make these corrections, the two raters independently reviewed the six transcripts they had previously coded in order to identify
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Inter-rater reliabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Narrative descriptors</td>
<td>Batch 1 – percent agreement = 73.3%; kappa = .55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 2 – percent agreement = 86.7%; kappa = .66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 3 – percent agreement = 93.3%; kappa = .82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 4 – percent agreement = 73.3%; kappa = .46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stability – percent agreement = 100%; kappa = 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Combined parent and child emotion codes</td>
<td>Batch 1 – percent agreement = 95.7%; kappa = .90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 2 – percent agreement = 87.8%; kappa = .77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 3 – percent agreement = 90%; kappa = .82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 4 – percent agreement = 92%; kappa = .82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stability – percent agreement = 97.0%; kappa = .94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Unique parental words for each emotion</td>
<td>Batch 1 – percent agreement = 81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 2 – percent agreement = 73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 3 – percent agreement = 71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 4 – percent agreement = 71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stability – percent agreement = 91.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Parental elaborations</td>
<td>Batch 1 – percent agreement = 73.9%; kappa = .59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 2 – percent agreement = 78.7%; kappa = .67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 3 – percent agreement = 85.7%; kappa = .77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 4 – percent agreement = 88%; kappa = .79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stability – percent agreement = 95.3%; kappa = .92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Parental socioemotional frame for hope and love</td>
<td>Batch 1 – percent agreement = 86.0%; kappa = .80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 2 – percent agreement = 90.9%; kappa = .87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 3 – percent agreement = 94.6%; kappa = .92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 4 – percent agreement = 91.8%; kappa = .89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stability – percent agreement = 98.0%; kappa = .89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* According to Watkins & Pacheco (2001), the following are guides for interpreting kappa: < .40 = poor, .40 to .60 = fair agreement, .60 to .75 = good agreement, and above .75 = excellent agreement. A batch was comprised of three transcripts.
potentially problematic coding of these emotion words. In the following weekly review meeting, the raters jointly reviewed any problematic initial codes and then jointly decided whether a change in the coding decision was warranted. Coding of the third batch then continued.

Following these four rounds of joint coding, the two raters were split off to code independently. The weekly meetings between the two raters and the primary investigator continued to provide support to the raters as they coded independently. After each rater had completed 11 more transcripts (thus, 22 in total), one more transcript was coded jointly to undertake a coding stability check. Once again, inter-rater reliability analyses were performed across the codes on this transcript to ensure the quality of coding had not significantly degraded. As can be seen in Table 2, it had not degraded. The remaining 15 transcripts were coded independently by the raters once the stability check was completed.

Finally, two additional raters undertook the third round of coding which involved coding all available hope and love transcripts for the thematic level codes outlined in Appendix J (i.e., hope goals, hope parental strategies, love partners, love ambivalence, and means of love expression). The procedures for this last round of coding were similar to those of the second round with the exception that the two raters independently coded and then jointly resolved all transcripts together as opposed to a subsample of the transcripts as in the second level coding. This decision was made because of the exploratory nature of the hope and love coding and the fact that both raters were jointly providing very insightful comments during the resolution discussions which appeared to provide better coverage of the data. The two raters also met with the primary investigator on a weekly basis to share, discuss, and resolve codes. Again the primary researcher did
not become directly involved in the resolution of codes at this meeting unless: (a) it was clear the coders were not understanding the core theoretical construct of the code, or (b) the two raters could not come to a resolution on a discrepancy and then the primary investigator acted as the tie breaker. The final jointly resolved codes were used as the data in the current study. A review and re-coding of the means of love expression codes within the first batch of nine transcripts was undertaken by the raters as it had become evident that those codes were not being applied consistently. Although ultimately the final jointly resolved codes were used as data for all transcripts in this level of coding, inter-rater reliability analyses were undertaken on the first three batches of the initially independently coded transcripts (comprising 27 transcripts in total) for training purposes.

Please see Table 3.

Procedure

Recruitment and consent process. During the initial recruitment contact, the families were provided with a written (see Appendix C, D, E, or F) and/or verbal explanation (i.e., based upon the information from the above appendices in the case of participants recruited through public posters or the participant pool who were initially contacted over the telephone) of the nature and procedures of the study by the researcher. In the case of potential snowball participants, a referring agent (i.e., another parent who had participated in the study) provided the initial information to the potential participant based upon written information sheets provided by the researcher (see Appendix F).

Once a family verbally indicated a willingness to participate in the research, an appointment was set at a mutually agreeable time for the family and the primary researcher. During that scheduling discussion, an effort was made by the researcher to ensure that the family understood the nature of the research and that they had
### Table 3

*Inter-Rater Reliability Statistics for the Third Level of Narrative Coding*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Inter-rater reliabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Hope goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 1 – percent agreement = 80%; kappa = .74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 2 – percent agreement = 77.8%; kappa = .67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 3 – percent agreement = 66.7%; kappa = .60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Parental hope strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 1 – percent agreement = 66%; kappa = .40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 2 – percent agreement = 81.8%; kappa = .60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 3 – percent agreement = 100%; kappa = 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Love partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 1 – percent agreement = 100%; kappa = 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 2 – percent agreement = 88.9%; kappa = .84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 3 – percent agreement = 77.8%; kappa = .70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Love ambivalence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 1 – percent agreement = 100%; kappa = 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 2 – percent agreement = 100%; kappa = 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 3 – percent agreement = 100%; kappa = 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Means of love expression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 1 – percent agreement = 66.7%; kappa = .55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 2 – percent agreement = 94.0%; kappa = .92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batch 3 – percent agreement = 78.6%; kappa = .70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* A batch was comprised of nine transcripts.
opportunities to ask any questions. All research appointments were completed at the Child Study Centre of the Department of Psychology, Chrysler Hall South, University of Windsor. This centre provided a pleasant sitting room filled with comfortable couches, chairs, and tables which helped to place the families at ease and an adjoining small office space with tables. At the beginning of the research appointment, the process of informed consent was completed. This process involved another thorough discussion of the research tasks, and review of the principles of confidentiality included the nature of provincial child protection laws. Every effort was made to include the children in this process in a developmentally appropriate manner (e.g., leading a child in discussion about the nature of emotions). The families were once again informed that their data would be identified through a numerical coding system and that they had the right to discontinue participation at any point during the appointment. The researcher also reviewed the written consent and assent forms with the parent and child during this process (see Appendix H). The family was offered a copy of this consent form.

Data collection. Prior to the research appointment, four white index cards with either anger, sadness, hope, or love written on each were placed in a random order for each family via the use of a random numbers table. A fifth card, happiness, was positioned as the last story in order to provide an opportunity for the mothers and children to end the research experience with reflection on a shared positive experience.

Data collection began with the mothers being escorted to the adjoining office away from the sitting room so that they could complete the background demographic questionnaire and receive the explanation of the parent-child reminiscing paradigm (Fivush, 1991a). During these discussions between the primary researcher and the mothers, the children were next door in the sitting room playing with a research assistant
and a variety of toys. Prior to the mothers' departures from the sitting room, the children were taken to the adjoining office so that they could witness the close proximities of their mothers. Children were also told they could see their mothers at any time they wished by simply asking the research assistant.

All mothers were given the following general introduction to the reminiscing task by the primary researcher:

We are interested in what parents teach their children about emotions when they discuss it after a shared emotional event has occurred. A shared emotional event is one in which you and your child were present and your child experienced an emotion. I would like you to talk with your child about one specific event that you and your child experienced together during which your child felt each of the following emotions (the five cards discussed above were then shown). Please tell me some details of each event so that I can understand the event.

In follow-up to the standard prompt above, mothers were encouraged to talk in as natural a way as possible about the five specific past shared events, to exclude events such as birthdays or Christmas because they tend to be routines for which children can have problems recalling a specific instance, and to exclude movies, plays, or activities with a story line, to guard against children retelling the story line instead of talking about themselves. If mothers further questioned how to undertake the task, they were reassured that parents and children have varied ways of discussing emotional events and that they should just talk to their children much as they would in their home setting as there were no right or wrong answers to the task. They were asked to discuss the stories in the order that the cards were given to them and to not let the children read the cards in order to ensure that the stories were introduced via reminiscing. During the actual reminiscing
sessions, a couple of mothers inadvertently mixed up the order of the card presentations, and thus, the order of the stories. In order to maintain as much researcher non-interference during the actual reminiscing conversations, the researcher did not step in to correct these rare errors.

Prior to the reminiscing between the mothers and children, the primary researcher spent sufficient individual time with the mothers to encourage the retrieval of a specific past, shared episode for each emotion. For each narrative discussed in the parents-researcher sessions, the researcher wrote down a couple of cue words about the experience on the back of the respective emotion cards for the mothers’ use. These cue words were discussed with the mothers to ensure they accurately captured the mothers’ descriptions of the past events. Several mothers later remarked this technique was helpful as it cued them to the specifics of each of the stories they had planned to discuss during the reminiscing task. Following the generation of each of the stories and the cue words, the mothers were also asked to rate aspects of the past shared emotional experience for each of the five emotional memories through the use of a series of likert scales. The aspects explored were child intensity of emotion, duration of the children’s expression of the emotion, the recency of the experience as well as the rehearsal schedule of the memory (i.e., how often the parent-child dyads may have talked about or looked at pictures of the event since it occurred) (see Appendix K). The use of likert scales to capture the nature of affective experience within parent-child relationships has been previously used in the emotion literature (Sander, Dadds, Johnston, & Cash, 1992).

Once the mothers and researcher rejoined the children in the sitting room, the research assistant left the research area, and the primary researcher discussed the generalities of the reminiscing task with both the mothers and children together. The
children were asked about what location in their own homes was often a place where parent-child talks would spontaneously occur. After the children volunteered a location (often a kitchen, living room or bedroom), the researcher would explain to the children that they should pretend they were in this place with their mothers and that their mothers were simply going to talk to them about some times in the past when they were together with their moms and they had felt certain feelings. The children were encouraged to listen to their mothers and answer any questions as best they could. Following a brief description of the recording equipment, the researcher turned on an audio and a video tape recorder prior to initiation of the reminiscing task. As reported in other recent reminiscing research (Bohanek, Marin, & Fivush, 2008; Bohanek, Marin, Fivush, & Duke, 2006), the primary researcher then removed herself to an inconspicuous corner of the room to minimize her influence on the conversations and told the family to begin. She quietly made notes of the general flow of the stories in order to aid exploration of the children’s emotional experience later in the session, and spoke only when asked a direct question by the families. If parents asked if they were doing the task correctly, they were essentially told that whatever approach to the task seemed appropriate to them was correct. No time restrictions were placed on the length of the conversations and the families were told to simply move to the next story when they had nothing further to discuss about a particular story. If a behavioral issue arose during the task, mothers were left to deal with the behavior as they saw fit unless the behavior was seriously interfering with the data collection (e.g., a child had moved out of the range of the video or audio equipment).

Following completion of the reminiscing task, the next step of the procedure involved maternal completion of the remaining questionnaires. The mothers were once
again removed to the adjoining office where the questionnaires (i.e., SEFQ, CBQ, ERPSST, CCNES, PACES) were presented in a random order for completion. The instructions for the questionnaires were reviewed with the mothers by the primary researcher. While the mothers and researcher were reviewing the questionnaires, the children remained in the sitting room with the research assistant. Once the primary researcher was comfortable that the mothers were appropriately settled, the researcher and the research assistant traded places so that the researcher could complete two tasks with the children in the sitting room and the assistant would be available for any questions from the mothers in the adjoining room.

First, the children were asked to rate the intensity of their emotional experience for each of the five memories through the use of likert scales. The emotions were presented to the children in the same order (e.g., the last emotion being happiness) as was presented to the parent-child dyads. As concerns have been raised about young school age children’s tendencies to endorse extreme responses when rating emotional states and the possible resulting erroneous impact on the interpretation of children’s self-reports, Chambers and Johnston (2002) suggested that brief training procedures utilizing visual aids might enhance children’s abilities to use rating scales. Thus, in the current research, prior to use of the likert scale, the children were given a brief training procedure which involved representing response choices on the likert scale with different size circles reflecting the idea of a continuum from lesser to greater intensity (see Appendix L). In addition, a researcher used the brief information gathered about the five emotion stories as a means to cue the children regarding each emotional experience before they attempted to rate it with the likert scales. After the likert ratings, the children were administered the two language measures (PPVT, EVT) by the researcher.
Upon completion of the language assessments, the children remained in the sitting area with developmentally appropriate toys, art supplies, and educational videos in order to minimize disruption to the mothers. The mothers were given the opportunity to screen all video choices before the children viewed the selections. The children were also offered a small snack if the mothers approved. At this point, the research assistant was typically given the opportunity to leave the research appointment. The researcher interacted with the children as appropriate in order to prevent significant disruption to the mothers during the questionnaire phase. The researcher also continued to be available to the mothers in the event that the mothers had further questions. If the mothers found it necessary to leave the appointment before the questionnaires were finished (e.g., the mother’s time was short due to other responsibilities), then the researcher allowed the mothers to take the questionnaires home to complete. If the family made that arrangement, then a time was set for the researcher to later pick up the materials and the mothers were instructed to complete these questionnaires independent of other persons (e.g., second parent). Three mothers were unable to finish the questionnaires during the actual research appointment. When the data collection was complete, all materials were placed in a manila envelope marked with a numerical code. All data were then locked in secure cabinets until transcription was undertaken at a later date. Transcription was undertaken by either the primary researcher or one of three additional transcriptionists. All narratives transcribed by the three additional transcriptionists were re-checked for accuracy by the primary researcher.

Following completion of the research appointment, the mothers were provided with a debriefing information sheet (see Appendix M) further detailing the purposes of the study and ten dollars to help reimburse potential costs associated with the research
(e.g., university parking and babysitting fees). Most mothers gave the money to their children much to the children's delight. However in the case of four families, the mothers chose to donate the money back to the project. Mothers were also asked to sign a form acknowledging any cash reimbursement (see Appendix N). In addition, those mothers who were recruited through the university participant pool received bonus points for an undergraduate course as per the participant pool contract. Mothers were given the opportunity to ask any questions about the study that they may have had.

At the end of the research appointment, the mothers were asked if they knew of any other families who may be willing to participate. If so, then the primary researcher instructed the mothers to contact the second parent and obtain her permission to be contacted by the researcher. An information sheet was provided to the current participant to facilitate this process (see Appendix F). A verbal agreement was made regarding a time when the researcher could contact the current participant to ascertain whether the new potential participant wished to participate and to gather their contact information. Mothers were also asked if they were willing to be contacted again to participate in future research. Mothers were also informed that they would be mailed written feedback regarding the general results of the study if they indicated a desire to receive such information. Interested parents provided their mailing address on the consent forms for this purpose. The methodological stages and timelines of this dissertation research are outlined in Table 4 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Approximate timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data recruitment of 54 families and three pilots</td>
<td>Two years (spring, 2002 - spring, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription and verification of data from audio tapes to narrative transcripts</td>
<td>11 months full time hours (summer, 2004 - summer, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring and entry of questionnaire data during clinical internship year</td>
<td>One year part-time basis (fall, 2005 - summer, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Began designing coding manuals during clinical internship year</td>
<td>One year part-time basis (fall, 2005 - summer, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing refinement of coding manuals including review of initial drafts by supervisor</td>
<td>Six months (September, 2006 - March, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active recruitment of five research assistants to code qualitative research</td>
<td>Three months (October - December, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of training and then first round coding with first coder</td>
<td>Three months (December - March, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of training and then second round coding with next two coders</td>
<td>Six months (February - August, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of training and then third round coding with final two coders</td>
<td>Four months (May - August, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis, manuscript preparation, and internal committee review</td>
<td>September 2007 to December 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III
Results

Preparation of the Data

Prior to beginning analyses, data screening was undertaken which involves a plan to manage issues of missing data, the possible presence of outlier scores amongst the data, and consideration of issues related to the normality of score distributions (Kinnear & Gray, 2006).

Missing items. Individual missing items on the various questionnaires were replaced using the mean value for that subscale where appropriate (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). The one exception was the Child Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ), in which researchers are instructed to not include missing item scores in determining the number of items to be used during calculation of the averages for subscales on this measure (http://www.bowdoin.edu/~sputnam/rothbart-temperament-questionnaires/).

As outlined in the coding manual (see Appendix J), missing narrative data could occur if a particular story was judged to be of a “nonshared” or “disagree” nature by the coders. Removal of such data is in keeping with past research (R. Fivush, personal communication, June 27th, 2002; Fivush et al., 2000; McCabe & Peterson, 1991). A “nonshared” narrative is a narrative about the past where a mother identified an event in which she did not directly participate with her child despite explicit prompting for a shared experience by the researcher. A “disagree” narrative referred to one where the parent and child clearly could not come to agreement on what primary child emotion(s) characterized their past shared experience. If a family spontaneously produced a second appropriate story during their reminiscing as was sometimes the case, then that narrative was used as a substitute narrative. However, if no substitute narrative was available, then
missing data occurred on individual codes pertaining to that particular narrative.

Consequently, across various study variables, there were different numbers of participants included in the statistical analyses. The total number of mother-child narratives available for coding across the various emotions were as follows: 44 anger, 41 sadness, 45 happiness, 44 hope, and 44 love narratives.

**Outliers and normality of scores.** As the presence of "extreme" scores can be problematic during some analyses (Kinnear & Gray, 2006), it is important that outlier screening occur. Thus, a series of boxplots were utilized to identify possible outliers for each of the main variables. For all quantitative variables, only one case on one variable was deemed to be of an extreme outlier nature. Boxplots identified a total of seven extreme outlier cases amongst all narrative variables involved in the four sets of hypotheses. In addition, as a primary theoretical presumption underlying many statistical tests is that variables are normally distributed, the primary variables involved in the current analyses were screened for skewness and kurtosis as recommended by Field (2005) and Tabachnick and Fidell (1996). Tabachnick and Fidell note, "Conventional but conservative (.01 or .001) alpha levels are used to evaluate the significance of skewness and kurtosis with small to moderate samples" (p. 73). Thus, as recommended by Field, the skewness and associated kurtosis values in the present study were converted to z scores and those greater than 2.58 (i.e., .01 level) in either a positive or negative direction were identified as being significantly skewed. Among the primary quantitative variables, only one variable was identified as being significantly skewed in a positive direction, the CCNES Harsh Parental Coping factor. However, all narrative data were significantly positively skewed with the exception of total maternal emotion words for sadness and the maternal references to parent for hope. Significant skewness is a frequent problem
reported with “count based” data (D. Jackson, personal communication, September 20, 2007).

As outlined in both Field (2005) and Tabachnick and Fidell (1996), statistical transformation of the values of problematic variables is a highly recommended method to deal with problems of both extreme outliers and skewed data. Logarithmic transformation is a commonly used procedure particularly when the skewness is positive. Indeed, recent publications from the parent-child reminiscing and child memory literature have utilized log transformation prior to correlational or regression analyses (Parker, Bahrick, Fivush, & Johnson, 2006; Reese & Cleveland, 2006). However, Field (2005) states:

You can’t get a log value of zero or negative numbers, so if your data tend to zero or produce negative numbers, you need to add a constant to all the data before you do the transformations. For example, if you have zeros in the data then do log(Xi + 1). (p. 80)

Thus, all quantitative and qualitative variables that were significantly positively skewed (including those skewed variables that did not have zero scores) were given the same transformation treatment of adding a constant of one to the score prior to the performance of log transformation to minimize further variability in the data. This decision was made after discussion with a statistics consultant (D. Jackson, personal communication, May 17, 2007).

Field (2005) advises that, “even if you only have one variable that has a skewed distribution, you should still transform any other variables in your data set if you’re going to compare differences between that variable and others that you intend to transform” (p.79). Thus, in the event of analysis involving means testing between variables, all pertinent variables were treated to the same log(Xi + 1) transformations if one of the
variables involved in the analysis was significantly skewed. However, as correlational and regression analyses are much less affected by inclusion of log transformed and non-log transformed variables in the same analysis (D. Jackson, personal communication, January 24, 2007), no transformations were undertaken with the normally distributed variables in correlational analyses. Every skewed variable in the current data set that was transformed with a log($X_i + 1$) transformation was significantly improved in terms of their degree of skewness. For simplicity, henceforth, all quantitative and narrative variables treated with a log($X_i + 1$) transformation will have a suffix of "(t)" added to the end of their names.

**Preliminary Descriptive Data: Perceptions of Nominated Memories**

*Descriptions of nominated memories.* As noted in the method section, mothers rated various aspects of the past shared child emotional experience they nominated for reminiscing through the use of a series of likert scales. The aspects that were rated included mother’s perceptions of child intensity of emotion, duration of the child’s expression of the primary emotion, the recency of the experience as well as the rehearsal schedule of the memory (i.e., how often the mother-child dyad may have talked about or looked at pictures of the event since it occurred). Children were also asked to rate the intensity of their emotional experience for each of the five memories through the use of likert scales with associated visual aids.

As shown in Table 5, across all five emotions, the majority of child emotional experiences nominated and rated by the mothers (i.e., over 86 percent in each emotion) fell within the range of mid to high intensity ratings (i.e., somewhat, quite a bit, and a lot of intensity). Greater variability was found in the maternal ratings of the duration of the
Table 5

*Nature of Memories Nominated For Parent-Child Reminiscing*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Memory</th>
<th>AN</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>HO</th>
<th>LO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternal rating of child intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all intense</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(2.6)</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little intense</td>
<td>3(7.0)</td>
<td>1(2.6)</td>
<td>3(6.8)</td>
<td>6(14.0)</td>
<td>2(4.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat intense</td>
<td>7(16.2)</td>
<td>3(7.7)</td>
<td>4(9.0)</td>
<td>13(30.2)</td>
<td>8(18.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit of intensity</td>
<td>17(39.5)</td>
<td>13(33.3)</td>
<td>18(40.9)</td>
<td>18(41.9)</td>
<td>14(32.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of intensity</td>
<td>16(37.2)</td>
<td>21(53.8)</td>
<td>18(40.9)</td>
<td>6(14.0)</td>
<td>18(41.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal rating of emotion duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefly – few seconds or minutes</td>
<td>12(27.9)</td>
<td>3(7.7)</td>
<td>6(13.6)</td>
<td>2(4.7)</td>
<td>14(32.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than a few minutes but less than an hour</td>
<td>24(55.8)</td>
<td>14(35.9)</td>
<td>8(18.2)</td>
<td>10(23.3)</td>
<td>14(32.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than an hour but not all day</td>
<td>4(9.3)</td>
<td>8(20.5)</td>
<td>11(25.0)</td>
<td>10(23.3)</td>
<td>5(11.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than a day but less than a week</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
<td>6(15.4)</td>
<td>11(25.0)</td>
<td>5(11.6)</td>
<td>3(7.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A week or longer</td>
<td>2(4.7)</td>
<td>8(20.5)</td>
<td>8(18.2)</td>
<td>16(37.2)</td>
<td>7(16.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*

*Note. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. The range of n varies from 39 to 44 due to missing cases.*
Table 5 (continued)

Nature of Memories Nominated for Parent-Child Reminiscing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Memory</th>
<th>AN</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>HO</th>
<th>LO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recency of primary emotional experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within last 24 hours</td>
<td>16(37.2)</td>
<td>6(15.4)</td>
<td>13(29.5)</td>
<td>8(18.6)</td>
<td>18(41.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within last week</td>
<td>19(44.2)</td>
<td>7(17.9)</td>
<td>12(27.3)</td>
<td>10(23.3)</td>
<td>14(32.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within last month (+ seven days)</td>
<td>6(14.0)</td>
<td>9(23.1)</td>
<td>7(15.9)</td>
<td>13(30.2)</td>
<td>4(9.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within last one to two months</td>
<td>2(4.7)</td>
<td>2(5.1)</td>
<td>5(11.4)</td>
<td>4(9.3)</td>
<td>2(4.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within last two to three months</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(2.6)</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within last three to four months</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>4(9.3)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within last four to five months</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within five to six months</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>4(9.0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within last six to seven months</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>2(5.1)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within last seven to eight months</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(2.6)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within last eight to nine months</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(2.6)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. The range of n varies from 39 to 44 due to missing cases.*
Table 5 (continued)

Nature of Memories Nominated for Parent-Child Reminiscing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Memory</th>
<th>AN</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>HO</th>
<th>LO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within last nine to ten months</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within last ten to eleven months</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within last eleven to twelve months</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>6(15.4)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over one year to two years</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>3(7.7)</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over two to three years</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over three to four years</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(2.6)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal rating of memory rehearsal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently (one to three times)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat frequently (four to nine times)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very frequently (ten or more times)</td>
<td>14(32.6)</td>
<td>6(15.4)</td>
<td>10(22.7)</td>
<td>9(20.9)</td>
<td>26(60.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(table continues)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. The range of n varies from 39 to 44 due to missing cases.
Table 5 (continued)

*Nature of Memories Nominated for Parent-Child Reminiscing*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Memory</th>
<th>AN</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>HO</th>
<th>LO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child's self rating of intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all intense</td>
<td>2(4.7)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little intense</td>
<td>9(20.9)</td>
<td>2(5.1)</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>2(4.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat or in the middle intense</td>
<td>12(27.9)</td>
<td>7(17.9)</td>
<td>1(2.3)</td>
<td>2(4.7)</td>
<td>3(7.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit of intensity</td>
<td>5(11.6)</td>
<td>8(20.5)</td>
<td>5(11.4)</td>
<td>9(20.9)</td>
<td>7(16.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot or very intense</td>
<td>15(34.9)</td>
<td>22(56.4)</td>
<td>37(84)</td>
<td>32(74.4)</td>
<td>31(72.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. The range of n varies from 39 to 44 due to missing cases.*
child’s expression of emotion across all five narratives. With the exception of sadness, over 80 percent of the nominated stories of anger, happiness, hope, and love, had been experienced by the child within the two months preceding the interview. According to maternal report, the majority of the past experiences of anger, sadness, happiness, and hope had been rehearsed (i.e., discussed or viewed in some manner) between one to ten times. However, over 60 percent of the love narratives were described by mothers as having never been rehearsed. Finally, when children were asked to rate how intensely they may have experienced each of the mother nominated stories/emotions, between 74 to 100 percent of each of the five types of stories were rated as within the range of mid to high intensity ratings (i.e., somewhat, quite a bit, and a lot of intensity).

Mixed child emotional states and mother–child disagreements. As acknowledged in the literature review, given the age span of the children in this research (6- to 8-year-olds), the potential existed for the reminiscing narratives to include the following themes: (a) mother-child discussions of secondary or mixed child emotions in the past shared emotional experiences and (b) obvious disagreement between the mother and child about either the child’s primary emotion or mixed emotions within the past shared emotional event. Indeed, during data collection, various parents ask about the possibility of mixed child emotion states in relation to their nominated events. The primary researcher instructed parents to try to identify a story that from their perspective was as “pure” an example of one of the identified emotions as possible. Parents were also informed that if the child had a difference in perspective on the nature of the emotion, they were to just process that as they typically would at home. Each of the available emotional narratives was then later coded for whether the mother-child narratives entailed discussion of mixed child emotional states or disagreements about the state of child
emotion. If a story was coded as a “disagree” it was dropped from further coding. However, if a second story happened to be available, that story was coded for that emotion.

All five types of emotion narratives contained mixed child emotional states. Of 45 stories with available anger narrative data, nine contained discussions regarding children’s mixed emotional states, two were situations where a second story was substituted for coding due to a mother-child disagreement on the emotional state of the first story, and one narrative was dropped from coding due to mother-child disagreement on the first story with no available second story to code. Of 42 available sadness narratives, 21 contained discussions regarding children’s mixed emotional states and one was a situation where there was mother-child disagreement regarding the child emotional state but no second story was available for coding. Of 45 available happiness narratives, nine contained discussions regarding children’s mixed emotional states. Of 45 available hope narratives, 21 contained discussions regarding children’s mixed emotional states and one narrative was dropped from coding due to mother-child disagreement on the first story with no available second story to code. Finally, of 45 available love narratives, 15 contained discussions regarding children’s mixed emotional states and one narrative was dropped from coding due to mother-child disagreement on the first story with no available second story to code.

Thus, overall, approximately 27 percent of the anger narratives, 52 percent of the sadness narratives, 20 percent of the happiness narratives, 49 percent of the hope narratives, and 36 percent of the love narratives involved either a discussion of two or more simultaneous child emotions or a situation where the child obviously disagreed with the mother’s perception of the primary emotional state of the past shared events. These
percentages may actually be somewhat of an underestimate of the occurrence of such phenomena in everyday conversations among mothers and their middle childhood offspring because of the instructions given to parents to try to identify a story that from their perspective was as "pure" an example of one of the identified emotions as possible.

Outline of Primary Study Variables

In the following sections, variables stemming from the questionnaire data will be referred to as the “quantitative” data and those from the mother-child interactions for anger, sadness, happiness, hope, and love will be referred to as the “narrative” data. Tables 6 and 7 below summarize the names of scales, psychometric measures, and narrative descriptors of the primary variables utilized in each hypothesis. This outline of the primary variables will be followed by discussions of the intercorrelations among the primary quantitative and narrative variables, and the analyses for each of the primary hypotheses. Given that the direction of the relations between a number of the primary quantitative and narrative measures could be specified based upon previous research, and that the first three hypotheses involved unidirectional predictions, correlational analyses undertaken in the following sections were one-tailed in nature.

Descriptive Analyses of Primary Study Variables

The untransformed mean scores, standard deviations, range of existing scores, and possible range of scores for the primary quantitative study variables included in the four main hypotheses of the present study are presented in Table 8. These variables reflect measures of parental distress when children express negative affect (CCNES Distress), a
Table 6

*Primary Quantitative Variables Utilized in Hypotheses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary variables</th>
<th>Quantitative measures</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCNES Distress subscale</td>
<td>Coping with Children’s Negative Emotions Scale (Fabes, Eisenberg, &amp; Bernzweig, 1990)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNES Harsh Parental Coping factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEFQ Positive Expressivity scale</td>
<td>Self-Expressiveness in the Family Scale (Halberstadt, Cassidy, Stifer, Parke, &amp; Fox, 1995)</td>
<td>IIa &amp; b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACES Total score</td>
<td>Parent Attitude Toward Children’s Expressiveness Scale (Saarni, 1990)</td>
<td>IIa &amp; b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERPSST Emotion Coaching subscale</td>
<td>Emotion-Related Parenting Styles Self-Test (Gottman, 1997; Hakim-Larson, Parker, Lee, Goodwin, &amp; Voelker, 2006)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBQ Negative Affectivity factor</td>
<td>Children’s Behavior Questionnaire (Rothbart, Ahadi, Hershey, &amp; Fisher, 2001)</td>
<td>I, II, III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPVT (standard score)</td>
<td>Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - 3rd Edition (Dunn &amp; Dunn, 1997)</td>
<td>I, II, III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVT   (standard score)</td>
<td>Expressive Vocabulary Test (Williams, 1997)</td>
<td>I, II, III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
*Primary Narrative Variables Utilized in Hypotheses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary variables</th>
<th>Narrative variables descriptions</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child negative emotion words</td>
<td>Total number of negative emotion words produced by child</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total child emotion words</td>
<td>Total number of positive and negative emotion words produced by child</td>
<td>IIa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total maternal emotion words</td>
<td>Total number of positive and negative emotion words produced by mother</td>
<td>IIb, III, IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family conversation length</td>
<td>Number of propositions produced during the mother-child communication</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal elaborations</td>
<td>Number of instances of maternal scaffolding during reminiscing</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Within the hope and love narratives exclusively</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of maternal emotion words</td>
<td>Total variety of maternal emotion words produced in the emotion narrative</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal references to child</td>
<td>Total number of references to the child in the emotion narrative</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal references to parent</td>
<td>Total number of references to the mother herself in the emotion narrative</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal references to others</td>
<td>Total number of references to others in the emotion narrative</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal references to affiliation</td>
<td>Total number of references to shared feeling or togetherness in relationships</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

*Descriptive Statistics for Untransformed Primary Quantitative Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Score ranges</th>
<th>Possible ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PACES Total Score</td>
<td>39.31</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>25 - 52</td>
<td>20 - 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNES Distress subscale</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.08 - 5.08</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNES Harsh Coping</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1 - 5.50</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERPSST Emotion Coaching</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>2.83 - 4.7</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEFQ Positive Expressivity</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4.48 - 8.74</td>
<td>1 - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBQ Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.84 - 5.15</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPVT</td>
<td>103.47</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>76 - 133</td>
<td>40 - 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVT</td>
<td>101.06</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>87 - 118</td>
<td>40 - 160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* PACES = Parent Attitude Toward Children's Expressiveness Scale; CCNES = Coping with Children's Negative Emotions Scale; ERPSST = Emotion-Related Parenting Styles Self-Test; SEFQ = Self Expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire; CBQ = Children's Behavior Questionnaire; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – III; EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test.
harsh parental coping style towards child negative expressivity (CCNES Harsh Parental Coping factor – an average score of the Minimization and Punitive subscales), the parental style of positive expressivity within the family (SEFQ Positive Expressivity), the parental restrictiveness towards a child’s general (i.e., positive and negative) emotional-expressive behavior (PACES Total), a parental meta-emotion theory which values emotions as opportunities for actively teaching emotional understanding (ERPSST Emotion Coaching), and a parental rating of child negative affectivity reflecting combined temperamental factors/subscales of Anger/Frustration, Discomfort, Soothability, Fear, and Sadness (CBQ Negative Affectivity factor). In addition, measures of children’s one word expressive language ability (EVT) and one word receptive language ability (PPVT) are also included.

The mean scores, standard deviations, and range of existing scores for the untransformed primary narrative study variables are presented in Table 9. These variables are measures of the following frequency data: child production of all negative emotion words summed within each of the five narratives (i.e., both discrete and behavioral expressions of negative emotions such as anger, sadness, fear; child negative emotion words), total child and parent production of all emotion words (i.e., combination of both positive and negative emotion words) summed individually within each of the five narratives (total child and maternal emotion words), the total number of propositions within on-topic discussions, a measure of the family’s conversation length within each of the five narratives (family conversation length), total number of maternal elaborations within each of the five narratives (i.e., maternal statements and questions to scaffold children’s remembering and discussion of new information during reminiscing; maternal elaborations), total variety of emotion words produced in the emotion narratives of hope
Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for Untransformed Primary Narrative Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child negative emotion words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>0 - 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0 - 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total child emotion words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>0 - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0 - 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0 - 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0 - 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0 - 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total maternal emotion words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>0 - 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>1 - 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>0 - 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1 - 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>1 - 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 9 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family conversation length (number of propositions)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>50.86</td>
<td>38.13</td>
<td>7 - 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>43.49</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>9 - 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>42.20</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>11 - 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>39.30</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>12 - 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>41.64</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>9 - 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal elaborations (number of propositions)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>17.39</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>2 - 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>4 - 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>2 - 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>5 - 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>3 - 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variety of maternal emotion words</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1 - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1 - 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal references to child</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>3 - 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>2 - 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal references to parent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>0 - 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 9 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternal references to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0 - 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>0 - 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal references to joint experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0 - 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1 - 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and love (variety of maternal emotion words), total number of maternal references to the child in the emotion narratives of hope and love (maternal references to child), total number of maternal references to the parent in the emotion narratives of hope and love (maternal references to parent), total number of maternal references to others in the emotion narratives of hope and love (maternal references to others), total number of references to shared feelings or togetherness in relationships in the emotion narratives of hope and love (maternal references to affiliation).

**Zero Order Intercorrelations of Primary Quantitative Variables**

As summarized in Table 10, significant correlations in expected directions were found between the various emotion-related measures. In interpreting this table, it is important to be cognizant that a high score on the PACES represents a more restrictive stance towards general child emotional expression. Thus, as expected, higher PACES scores were significantly positively related to distressed and harsh parental coping in relation to child negative emotion as measured by the CCNES. As well, higher parental restrictiveness on the PACES was significantly negatively correlated with parental positive expressivity as measured by the SEFQ. Positive expressivity on the SEFQ was positively correlated with the Emotion Coaching subscale of the ERPSST. Higher levels of distressed parental coping in relation to child negative emotion on the CCNES was significantly negatively correlated with the Emotion Coaching subscale and significantly positively correlated with child negative affectivity on the CBQ. Not surprisingly, both CCNES subscales were highly positively correlated as were both child language measures. Interestingly, the CCNES Harsh Parental Coping factor(t) was significantly negatively correlated with the standard score on the PPVT whereas the ERPSST Emotion Coaching subscale was positively correlated with the EVT.
Table 10

Zero Order Intercorrelations of the Primary Quantitative Variables (N = 47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CCNES Distress</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-.24&lt;sup&gt;l&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-.25&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.30&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CCNES Harsh Coping&lt;sup&gt;t&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.21&lt;sup&gt;t&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.34&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SEFQ Positive</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>.27&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.25&lt;sup&gt;t&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PACES Total</td>
<td>-.24&lt;sup&gt;t&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.22&lt;sup&gt;t&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.21&lt;sup&gt;t&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ERPSST Emotion Coaching</td>
<td>-.21&lt;sup&gt;t&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.30&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CBQ Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PPVT</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. EVT&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PACES = Parent Attitude Toward Children's Expressiveness Scale; CCNES = Coping with Children's Negative Emotions Scale; ERPSST = Emotion-Related Parenting Styles Self-Test; SEFQ = Self Expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire; CBQ = Children's Behavior Questionnaire; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – III; EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test. All variables above are raw scores except for the CCNES Harsh Coping - T variable which involved a log(X<sub>i</sub> + 1) transformation due to skewness.

<sup>a</sup>n = 36 due to missing data.

<sup>l</sup>p < .10, one tailed. <sup>*</sup>p < .05, one-tailed. <sup>**</sup>p < .01, one-tailed.
Zero Order Intercorrelations of Primary Narrative Variables

As shown in Tables 11 through 15, a series of Pearson product-moment correlations were computed to examine expected relations among the child and maternal narrative variables utilized in the study hypotheses including: child negative emotion words(t), total child emotion words(t), total maternal emotion words(t), maternal elaborations(t), variety of maternal emotion words(t), maternal references to child(t), maternal references to parent(t), maternal references to others(t), and maternal references to affiliation(t) as well as family conversational length(t).

In keeping with past findings regarding parental socialization of discussion of emotion, a number of significant correlations were found linking maternal usage of emotion words and children's production of both negative emotion words and total number of emotion words across the various narratives. To a slightly lesser extent, the frequency of maternal elaborations was also linked to children's use of negative and total emotion words. As expected, the family conversation lengths (i.e., number of family propositions per narrative) were positively correlated with both maternal production of total emotion words and maternal elaborations. To a less frequent extent, family conversation length was also significantly positively associated with children's use of both negative and total number of emotion words. A number of the sociorelational narrative data for both the hope and love reminiscing tasks were significantly positively correlated with child and maternal emotion specific narrative data, and family conversational length.
Table 11

Zero Order Intercorrelations of Maternal and Child Emotion Specific Narrative Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total maternal emotion words</th>
<th>Total maternal elaborations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AN(t) SA HA(t) HO(t) LO(t)</td>
<td>AN(t) SA(t) HA(t) HO(t) LO(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative child emotion words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN(t)</td>
<td>.36** .22* .22* .43** .43**</td>
<td>.43** .25* .27* .23* .24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA(t)</td>
<td>.13 .08 -.07 -.05 -.10</td>
<td>.29* .03 .01 -.01 .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA(t)</td>
<td>.17 .10 -.23* -.08 .44**</td>
<td>.10 -.03 -.20* -.34* -.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO(t)</td>
<td>-.01 .24* -.12 .33* -.12</td>
<td>-.11 .13 -.02 .15 -.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO(t)</td>
<td>.20* .45** .05 .32* .28*</td>
<td>.25* .30* .09 .15 .19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All correlations above involve log(X + 1) transformations with the exception of those involving Total Maternal Emotion Words for Sadness which was retained as a raw score as it was not skewed. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. The range of n varies from 40 to 45 due to missing cases.

* p < .10, one tailed. *p < .05, one tailed. **p < .01, one-tailed.
Table 11 (continued)

Zero Order Intercorrelations of Maternal and Child Emotion Specific Narrative Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total maternal emotion words</th>
<th>Maternal elaborations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AN(t)</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total child emotion words</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN(t)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA(t)</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA(t)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO(t)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All correlations above involve log($X_i + 1$) transformations with the exception of those involving Total Maternal Emotion Words for Sadness which was retained as a raw score as it was not skewed. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. The range of n varies from 40 to 45 due to missing cases.

$p < .10$, one tailed. $p < .05$, one tailed. $**p < .01$, one-tailed.
Table 12

Zero Order Intercorrelations of Frequency of Child Emotion Words and Family Conversational Length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AN(t)</th>
<th>SA(t)</th>
<th>HA(t)</th>
<th>HO(t)</th>
<th>LO(t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child negative emotion words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN(t)</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.24¹</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA(t)</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.23¹</td>
<td>.26¹</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA(t)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.20¹</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO(t)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.22¹</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22¹</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO(t)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All correlations above involve log(Xi + 1) transformations. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. The range of n varies from 40 to 45 due to missing cases.

¹p < .10, one tailed. *p < .05, one tailed. **p < .01, one-tailed.
Table 12 (continued)

Zero Order Intercorrelations of Frequency of Child Emotion Words and Family Conversational Length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AN(t)</th>
<th>SA(t)</th>
<th>HA(t)</th>
<th>HO(t)</th>
<th>LO(t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total child emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN(t)</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.25†</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA(t)</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA(t)</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.25†</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO(t)</td>
<td>.21†</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO(t)</td>
<td>.23†</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All correlations above involve log(X₁ + 1) transformations. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. The range of n varies from 40 to 45 due to missing cases.

†p < .10, one tailed. *p < .05, one tailed. **p < .01, one-tailed.
Table 13

Zero Order Intercorrelations of Maternal Emotion Specific Narrative Data and Family Conversational Length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family conversation length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AN(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total maternal emotion words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN(t)</td>
<td>.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA(t)</td>
<td>.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO(t)</td>
<td>.23¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO(t)</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*

Note. All correlations above involve log(Xi + 1) transformations with the exception of those involving Total Maternal Emotion Words for Sadness which was retained as a raw score as it was not skewed. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. The range of n varies from 40 to 45 due to missing cases.

¹p < .10, one tailed. *p < .05, one tailed. **p < .01, one-tailed.
Table 13 (continued)

Zero Order Intercorrelations of Maternal Emotion Specific Narrative Data and Family Conversational Length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family conversation length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AN(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total maternal elaborations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN(t)</td>
<td>.92**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA(t)</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA(t)</td>
<td>.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO(t)</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO(t)</td>
<td>.57**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All correlations above involve log(X + 1) transformations with the exception of those involving Total Maternal Emotion Words for Sadness which was retained as a raw score as it was not skewed. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. The range of \( n \) varies from 40 to 45 due to missing cases.

\(^1 p < .10, \) one tailed. \(^* p < .05, \) one tailed. \(^{**} p < .01, \) one-tailed.
Table 14

Zero Order Intercorrelations of Child and Maternal Emotion Specific Narrative Data, Family Conversational Length, and Sociorelational Narrative Data for the Hope Reminiscing Task (n = 44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion specific narrative data and conversational length</th>
<th>Child negative words(t)</th>
<th>Child total words(t)</th>
<th>Maternal total words(t)</th>
<th>Maternal elabs(t)</th>
<th>Family length(t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociorelational data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHOTOT(t)</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.25†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORCH(t)</td>
<td>.25†</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORPA</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.23†</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOROT(t)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.20†</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22†</td>
<td>.20†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOAFFILIATION(t)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.25†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations involve log(X + 1) transformations except for normally distributed HORPA. VHOTOT(t) = total maternal variations of all emotion words for hope(t); HORCH(t) = total maternal references to child for hope(t); HORPA = total maternal references to parent for hope; HOROT(t) = total maternal references to others(t); HOAFFILIATION(t) = maternal references to shared positive and negative emotional experiences for hope(t); elabs = elaborations.

† p < .10, one-tailed. *p < .05, one-tailed. **p < .01, one-tailed.
Table 15

Zero Order Intercorrelations of Child and Maternal Emotion Specific Narrative Data, Family Conversational Length, and Sociorelational Narrative Data for the Love Reminiscing Task (n = 44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion specific narrative data and conversational length</th>
<th>Child negative words(t)</th>
<th>Child total words(t)</th>
<th>Maternal total words(t)</th>
<th>Maternal elabs(t)</th>
<th>Family length(t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociorelational data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLOTOT(t)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LORCH(t)</td>
<td>.24^</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LORPA(t)</td>
<td>.23^</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOROT(t)</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.21^</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOAFFILIATION(t)</td>
<td>.20^</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All correlations above involve log(X+1) transformations. VLOTOT(t) = total maternal variations of all emotion words for love(t); LORCH(t) = total maternal references to child for love(t); LORPA(t) = total maternal references to parent for love(t); LOROT(t) = total maternal references to others for love(t); LOAFFILIATION(t) = maternal references to shared positive and negative emotional experiences for love(t); elabs = elaborations.

^p < .10, one tailed. *p < .05, one tailed. **p < .01, one-tailed.
Hypothesis 1: Maternal Reaction to Child Negative Affect and Child Production of Negative Emotion Words

The first hypothesis stated that negative maternal reactions to children's expression of negative emotions (i.e., as measured by the CCNES Harsh Parental factor or the Distress subscale) would be related to the total number of negative emotion words produced by the children across the five emotional reminiscing events beyond the influence possibly accounted for by child age, sex, language abilities, and temperament. More specifically, it was predicted that higher levels of negative maternal reactions would be associated with fewer child negative emotion words.

Zero order correlations. As outlined in Tables 16 and 17, a series of Pearson product-moment correlations revealed the nature and degree of statistical relation between the maternal variables (i.e., CCNES Harsh Parental Coping Style(t), and the Parental Distress Style), the child quantitative variables (i.e., child age, gender, language abilities, and the CBQ Negative Affectivity), and the narrative variables of child negative emotion words(t) for the anger, sadness, happiness, hope, and love narratives.

Significant positive correlations were noted between the two CCNES subscales as well as the two child language measures. Ratings on the CCNES Harsh Coping Style(t) were significantly negatively correlated with the measure of child receptive language ability, the PPVT. The CCNES Parental Distress subscale was significantly positively correlated with the CBQ Negative Affectivity factor. There was also a nonsignificant positive trend between the CCNES Harsh Coping Style(t) and the CBQ Negative Affectivity factor. Child gender was significantly negatively correlated with both the measure of child expressive language ability, the EVT, as well as with the
Table 16

Zero Order Correlations Between Maternal and Child Variables in Hypothesis I (N = 47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CCNES Harsh Coping(t)</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21¹</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CCNES Parental Distress</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Child gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Child age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CBQ Negative Affectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PPVT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EVT*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. CCNES = Coping with Children’s Negative Emotions Scale; CBQ = Children’s Behavior Questionnaire; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – III; EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test. In interpreting findings related to child gender, female = 1 and male = 2.

*¹n = 36 due to missing data.
*¹p < .10, one tailed. *p < .05, one tailed. **p < .01, one-tailed.
Table 17

Zero Order Correlations Between Maternal and Child Variables and Frequency of Child Negative Emotion Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>AN(t)</th>
<th>SA(t)</th>
<th>HA(t)</th>
<th>HO(t)</th>
<th>LO(t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CCNES Harsh Coping(t)</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CCNES Parental Distress</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Child gender</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Child age</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CBQ Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PPVT</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EVT</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CCNES = Coping with Children's Negative Emotions Scale; CBQ = Children's Behavior Questionnaire; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - III; EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test. All correlations above involve log(X_i + 1) transformations. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. The range of n varies between 32 to 35 for the EVT and between 41 to 45 for the rest of the variables due to missing cases. In interpreting findings related to child gender, female = 1 and male = 2.

*p < .10, one tailed. *p < .05, one tailed.
child negative emotion words for love(t) suggesting girls are more likely to have advanced expressive language abilities and to produce a greater number of negative emotion words in their love co-narratives with their mothers.

**Partial correlations.** Given the zero order relations between the CBQ Negative Affectivity factor and the PPVT with the CCNES maternal parenting styles, a series of partial correlations were conducted examining the relations between the CCNES maternal parenting styles and the child negative emotion words(t) for the anger, sadness, happiness, hope, and love narratives with the CBQ Negative Affectivity factor and the PPVT as covariates. It was predicted that higher levels of negative maternal reactions would be associated with fewer child negative emotion words.

As seen in Table 18, after controlling for the CBQ Negative Affectivity factor and the PPVT, mothers who endorsed higher levels of parental distress reactions in relation to displays of child negative emotion were found to be significantly more likely to have children who produced fewer negative emotion words during mother-child discussions about past shared child experiences of happiness. Interestingly, after controlling for the covariates, none of the additional maternal or child characteristics examined in previous zero order correlations such as the CCNES Harsh Parental Coping Factor(t), child age, and child gender were significantly related to the frequency of child negative emotion words across the various narratives. In summary, these results provide support for Hypothesis I in relation to the happiness narrative. Although a series of regression analyses had been originally planned to further explore this hypothesis, they were not undertaken due to the small frequency of negative child emotion words produced across some of the individual emotion narratives (see Table 9).
Table 18

Partial Correlations Between CCNES Subscales and Frequency of Child Negative Emotion Words With CBQ Negative Affectivity and Receptive Language as Covariates (n = 40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCNES negative parenting styles</th>
<th>Distress</th>
<th>Harsh Coping(t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child negative emotion words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN(t)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA(t)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA(t)</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO(t)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO(t)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. All correlations above involve log(Y + 1) transformations. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love.

* p < .05, one-tailed.
Hypotheses IIa and IIb: Maternal Expressivity and Restrictiveness Towards General Child Affect and Child and Maternal Production of Total Emotion Words

The second hypothesis was twofold in nature stating that maternal positive emotional expressivity in the family and maternal restrictiveness towards general child emotional expressiveness (i.e., including both positive and negative child emotional expression) would be related to the number of total emotion words used by both children and mothers across the five reminiscing events beyond the influence accounted for by child age, sex, language ability, and the CBQ Negative Affectivity. It was predicted that higher levels of maternal positive expressivity and lower levels of maternal restrictiveness towards children would be associated with greater frequency of child and parent emotion words.

Hypothesis IIa: Child Production of Total Emotion Words

Zero order correlations. As shown in Tables 19 and 20, the relations between the maternal variables (i.e., SEFQ Positive Expressivity scale, and the PACES Total), the child quantitative variables (i.e., child age, gender, language ability, and negative affectivity), and the narrative variables of total child emotion words(t) for the five narratives in this hypothesis were examined via a series of Pearson product-moment correlations.

As would be expected, a significant negative correlation was found between parental levels of positive emotional expressivity (SEFQ Positive) and parental restrictiveness towards child general emotional expressiveness (PACES). The SEFQ Positive was significantly positively correlated with child age. The PACES was significantly negatively correlated with child gender suggesting a tendency for
Table 19

Zero Order Correlations Between Maternal and Child Variables in Hypothesis II (N = 47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. SEFQ Positive</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PACES Total</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Child gender</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Child age</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CBQ Negative Affectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PPVT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EVT*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. PACES = Parent Attitude Toward Children's Expressiveness Scale; SEFQ = Self Expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire; CBQ = Children's Behavior Questionnaire; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – III; EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test. In interpreting findings related to child gender, female = 1 and male = 2.

*n = 36 due to missing data.

*p < .10, one-tailed, *p < .05, one-tailed. **p < .01, one-tailed.
Table 20

Zero Order Correlations Between Maternal and Child Variables and Frequency of Total Child Emotion Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>AN(t)</th>
<th>SA(t)</th>
<th>HA(t)</th>
<th>HO(t)</th>
<th>LO(t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternal variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. SEFQ Positive</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PACES Total</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Child gender</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Child age</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CBQ Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.23\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PPVT</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.21\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EVT</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PACES = Parent Attitude Toward Children’s Expressiveness Scale; SEFQ = Self Expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire; CBQ = Children’s Behavior Questionnaire; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – III; EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test. All correlations above involve log(X\textsubscript{i} + 1) transformations. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. The range of N varies between 32 to 36 for correlations involving the EVT and between 41 to 45 for the rest of the variables due to missing cases. In interpreting findings related to child gender, female = 1 and male = 2. \textsuperscript{1} p < .10, one-tailed.\* p < .05, one-tailed.
parents of girls to be more restrictive towards general child emotional expression than
parents of boys. Not surprisingly, the two language measures were significantly positively
correlated. As reported in Hypothesis I, child gender was also significantly negatively
correlated with child expressive language ability (EVT). Interestingly, the EVT was also
positively correlated with the total child emotion words for anger(t). Child Negative
Affectivity was positively correlated with the total child emotion words for love(t).

**Partial correlations.** Given the significant findings above related to child gender
and language ability, a series of partial correlations were conducted to more specifically
examine the relations between maternal scores on the SEFQ Positive, the PACES, and the
total child emotion words(t) for the five narratives with the effects of child gender and
language ability controlled as covariates. The PPVT was initially utilized as the language
covariate in these analyses because (a) it would have been redundant to include both the
PPVT and the EVT as covariates as they were significantly positively correlated ($r(36) =
.52, p < .01$), and (b) eleven more participants completed the PPVT than the EVT. Due to
the relatively narrow expanse of ages included in the current research (6 to 8 years old)
and the lack of significant zero order correlations between child age and the child
narrative variables in this hypothesis, a decision was made to not control for the effect of
child age as a covariate in this hypothesis.

As seen in Table 21, after controlling for child gender and the PPVT, a significant
negative partial correlation was found between the PACES and the total child emotion
words(t) produced in the happiness narrative. Thus, as predicted, mothers who endorsed
less restrictive attitudes toward general child emotional expression were found to be
significantly more likely to have children who produced more emotion words
Table 21

Partial Correlations Between SEFQ Positive and PACES and Frequency of Total Child Emotion Words With Child Gender and Receptive Language as Covariates ($n = 40$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child total emotion words</th>
<th>SEFQ Positive</th>
<th>PACES Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN(t)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA(t)</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA(t)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO(t)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO(t)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PACES = Parent Attitude Toward Children’s Expressiveness Scale; SEFQ = Self Expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire.

$p < .10$, one-tailed. $^* p < .05$, one-tailed.
during mother-child reminiscing about past shared experiences of child happiness. In addition, a negative relation between the PACES and the total child emotion words(t) for the anger narrative approached significance as well. These results provide support for Hypothesis IIa in relation to the happiness narrative and some indication of a trend towards such an association in the anger narrative. After controlling for child gender and language ability, neither the CBQ Negative Affectivity factor nor child age attained statistical significance in relation to the total child emotion words(t) across the narratives. Interestingly, an exploratory analysis with the EVT utilized as the language covariate in conjunction with child gender (consequently lowering the n available for analysis to 31) revealed neither significant nor relations approaching significance between the maternal PACES and SEFQ Positive, child age, and the child total emotion words across the five narratives. The larger n provided by the inclusion of the PPVT as the language covariate may have provided greater statistical power to examine the relations between the maternal variables and the total child emotion words in this hypothesis.

Regression analyses. As shown in Appendix O, five separate hierarchical multiple regressions were run on the total child emotion words for each narrative with child gender and the PPVT entered in the first step and the PACES and the SEFQ Positive entered in the second step. It is important to emphasize that because almost all of the regression analyses involved in the current project involve prediction of transformed variables, the interpretations of unstandardized coefficients (i.e., $B$ and $SE$ $B$) need to be viewed cautiously. In this case, the interpretation of standardized coefficients (i.e., $\beta$) is more appropriate (D. Jackson, personal communication, January 10, 2008). The following is a description of standardized coefficients by Field (2005):
They tell us the number of standard deviations that the outcome will change as a result of one standard deviation change in the predictor. The standardized beta values are all measured in standard deviation units and so are directly comparable; therefore, they provide a better insight into the importance of a predictor in the model. (p.193)

None of the final models for the prediction of the total child emotion words(t) within each narrative attained significance.

**Hypothesis IIb: Maternal Production of Total Emotion Words**

**Zero order correlations.** As shown in Table 22, Pearson product-moment correlations were computed to examine the relation between the maternal variables (i.e., SEFQ Positive and the PACES), the child quantitative variables (i.e., child age, gender, language abilities, and Child Negative Affectivity), and the total maternal emotion words across the five narratives. Child gender was significantly negatively correlated with the total maternal emotion words for hope(t) indicating that mothers of girls were more likely to produce more total emotion words than mothers of boys. The EVT was significantly positively correlated with narrative production, specifically, the total maternal emotion words for hope(t). Finally, the SEFQ Positive was negatively correlated with the total maternal emotion words for love(t) indicating that mothers who reported more positive expressivity in their families actually tended to produce fewer emotion words during this narrative.

**Partial correlations.** Given the significant findings related to child gender and language ability in Tables 19 and 22, a series of partial correlations were conducted to more specifically examine the relations between maternal scores on the SEFQ Positive and the PACES, and the total maternal emotion words(t) for the five narratives with child
Table 22

Zero Order Correlations Between Maternal and Child Variables and Frequency of Total Maternal Emotion Words (N = 47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>AN(t)</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>HA(t)</th>
<th>HO(t)</th>
<th>LO(t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternal variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. SEFQ Positive</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.25†</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PACES Total</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Child gender</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Child age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.23†</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CBQ Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PPVT</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EVT*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PACES = Parent Attitude Toward Children’s Expressiveness Scale; SEFQ = Self Expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire; CBQ = Children’s Behavior Questionnaire; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – III; EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test. All Total Maternal Emotion Words involve log(Xi + 1) transformations except sadness which was not significantly skewed. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. The range of n varies from 40 to 45 due to missing cases. In interpreting findings related to child gender, female = 1 and male = 2.

† p < .10, one-tailed. * p < .05, one-tailed. ** p < .01, one-tailed.
gender and language ability as covariates. In keeping with the reasoning in Hypothesis IIa, the PPVT was initially utilized as the language covariate in these analyses. As seen in Table 23, after controlling for child gender and the PPVT, the negative partial correlations between the PACES and the total maternal emotion words(t) for anger, and the SEFQ Positive and total maternal emotion words(t) for love only approached significance. Child age was significantly positively correlated with total maternal emotion words(t) for happiness ($pr(36) = .35, p<.05$).

However, unlike the findings in Hypothesis IIa, partial correlations between the maternal variables and the total maternal emotion words for each narrative with the EVT and child gender as covariates revealed significant findings in relation to the maternal variables despite the available sample size of only 31 mother-child pairs. As can be seen in Table 24, the SEFQ Positive was significantly negatively correlated with the total maternal emotion words for sadness suggesting that mothers who reported higher levels of personal positive expressivity in their families produced fewer emotion words during parent-child reminiscing about past shared experiences where children experienced sadness. In addition, a negative correlation approaching significance was found between the SEFQ Positive and the total maternal emotion words for love. Child age was again significantly positively correlated with total maternal emotion words(t) for happiness ($pr(27) = .33, p<.05$). These results suggest that when the influence of child gender and expressive language are controlled, mothers who report higher levels of positive self expressiveness in their families tend to produce fewer total emotion words during reminiscing about some types of child emotional experiences. These findings directly contradict the hypothesized relations discussed for the maternal positive expressivity in Hypothesis IIb.
Table 23

Partial Correlations Between SEFQ Positive and PACES and Frequency of Total Maternal Emotion Words With Child Gender and Receptive Language as Covariates \((n = 40)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEFQ Positive</th>
<th>PACES Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total maternal emotion words</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN(t)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA(t)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO(t)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO(t)</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* PACES = Parent Attitude Toward Children’s Expressiveness Scale; SEFQ = Self Expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. All Total Maternal Emotion Words involve \(\log(X_i + 1)\) transformations with the exception of those for sadness which was retained as a raw score as it was not skewed.

*\(^1\) p < .10, one-tailed.*
Table 24

*Partial Correlations Between SEFQ Positive and PACES and Frequency of Total Maternal Emotion Words With Child Gender and Expressive Language as Covariates (n = 31)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total maternal emotion words</th>
<th>SEFQ Positive</th>
<th>PACES Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN(t)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA(t)</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO(t)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO(t)</td>
<td>-.25&lt;1</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. PACES = Parent Attitude Toward Children's Expressiveness Scale; SEFQ = Self Expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. All Total Maternal Emotion Words involve log(Xi + 1) transformations with the exception of those for sadness which was retained as a raw score as it was not skewed.*

<1 p < .10, one-tailed. *p < .05, one-tailed.
Regression analyses. In order to further explore the relations between variables within Hypothesis IIb, a series of hierarchical regression analyses were undertaken. As shown in Appendix O, five separate hierarchical multiple regressions were run on the total maternal emotion words for each narrative with child gender and the EVT entered in the first step and the PACES and the SEFQ Positive entered in the second step. Again, none of the final models for the prediction of the total maternal emotion words within each narrative attained significance.

Additional analyses: Maternal negative expressivity and child and maternal production of total emotion words. As noted above, Hypothesis II stated that levels of maternal positive emotional expressivity in the family (in addition to maternal restrictiveness towards general child emotional expressiveness) would predict the number of total emotion words used by both children and mothers across the five emotional reminiscing events beyond the influences of several other possible covariates. However, subsequent consideration was also given to the idea that it is theoretically possible that higher levels of maternal negative emotional expressivity in the family (i.e., as measured by the SEFQ Negative subscale) may be related to production of fewer child and parent emotion words across the five emotion narratives.

Child production of total emotion words. Thus, as shown in Tables 25 and 26, the relations between the maternal SEFQ Negative Expressivity subscale, the child quantitative variables (i.e., child age, gender, language ability, and negative affectivity), and the narrative variables of total child emotion words(t) for the five narratives in this hypothesis were examined via a series of Pearson product-moment correlations. Given
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Maternal SEFQ Negative</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Child gender</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Child age</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CBQ Negative Affectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PPVT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EVT*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SEFQ = Self Expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire; CBQ = Children's Behavior Questionnaire; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – III; EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test. In interpreting findings related to child gender, female = 1 and male = 2.

*n = 36 due to missing data.

*p < .10, one-tailed. *p < .05, one-tailed. **p < .01, one-tailed.
Table 26

Zero Order Correlations Between Maternal SEFQ Negative, Child Variables and Frequency of Total Child Emotion Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>AN(t)</th>
<th>SA(t)</th>
<th>HA(t)</th>
<th>HO(t)</th>
<th>LO(t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Maternal SEFQ Negative</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Child gender</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Child age</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CBQ Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PPVT</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EVT</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SEFQ = Self Expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire; CBQ = Children's Behavior Questionnaire; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – III; EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. All correlations above involve log(X + 1) transformations. The range of n varies between 32 to 36 for correlations involving the EVT and between 41 to 45 for the rest of the variables due to missing cases. In interpreting findings related to child gender, female = 1 and male = 2.

* p < .05, one-tailed. * p < .05, one-tailed.
the significant findings related to the CBQ Negative Affectivity variable and child language ability outlined above, a series of partial correlations were conducted to more specifically examine the relations between maternal scores on the SEFQ Negative and the total child emotion words(t) for the five narratives with the effects of the CBQ Negative Affectivity and language ability controlled as covariates. As described in Hypothesis II, the PPVT was initially utilized as the primary language covariate. As seen in Table 27 below, maternal negative expressivity in the family was not related to child total emotion words across all five narratives, even with the effects of the PPVT and the CBQ Negative Affectivity variables controlled. Given the relation between the EVT and total child emotion words on the anger narrative outlined in Table 26 above, an exploratory analysis was also undertaken with the CBQ Negative Affectivity variable and EVT treated as covariates while the relations between the SEFQ Negative and the child total emotion words were explored. Once again, as noted in Table 27, maternal negative expressivity in the family was not related to child total emotion words across all five narratives.

*Maternal production of total emotion words.* A similar pattern of analysis was undertaken this time examining the associations between the SEFQ Negative subscale and the frequency of total maternal emotion words. Given the relations between the CBQ Negative Affectivity variable, child language abilities and the frequency of total maternal emotion words outlined in Table 25 above and Table 28 below, a series of partial correlations were conducted to more specifically examine the relations between maternal scores on the SEFQ Negative and the total maternal emotion words(t) for the five narratives with the effects of the CBQ Negative Affectivity and language ability controlled as covariates. The PPVT was initially utilized as the primary language
Table 27

Partial Correlations Between SEFQ Negative and Frequency of Total Child Emotion Words With CBQ Negative Affectivity and Child Language Abilities as Covariates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child total emotion words</th>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>CBQ Negative / PPVT SEFQ Negative&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>CBQ Negative / EVT SEFQ Negative&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN(t)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA(t)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA(t)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO(t)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO(t)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SEFQ = Self Expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire; CBQ = Children's Behavior Questionnaire; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – III; EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love.

<sup>a</sup>n = 36. <sup>b</sup>n = 27.
Table 28

Zero Order Correlations Between SEFQ Negative, Child Variables, and Frequency of Total Maternal Emotion Words (N = 47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>AN(t)</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>HA(t)</th>
<th>HO(t)</th>
<th>LO(t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Maternal SEFQ Negative</strong></td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.21†</td>
<td>-.22†</td>
<td>-.20†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Child gender</strong></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Child age</strong></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.23†</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. CBQ Negative Affectivity</strong></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. PPVT</strong></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. EVT</strong></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SEFQ = Self Expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire; CBQ = Children's Behavior Questionnaire; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – III; EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. All Total Maternal Emotion Words involve log(Xi + 1) transformations except sadness which was not significantly skewed. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. The range of n varies from 40 to 45 due to missing cases. In interpreting findings related to child gender, female = 1 and male = 2.

† p < .10, one-tailed. * p < .05, one-tailed. ** p < .01, one-tailed.
covariate followed by a secondary exploratory analysis utilizing the EVT. Please see Table 29. As predicted, higher levels of maternal negative expressivity were significantly associated with fewer total maternal emotion words across all of the emotion narratives except happiness regardless of which language covariate was utilized in the analysis.

**Hypothesis III: Maternal Emotion Coaching Style and Narrative Production**

The third hypothesis stated that maternal emotion coaching would be associated with maternal reminiscing beyond the possible influence accounted for by child age, sex, language abilities, and temperament (i.e., negative affectivity). Specifically, it was hypothesized that mothers with higher emotion coaching ratings would engage in longer family reminiscing conversations with their children, produce more nonrepetitive questions (i.e., maternal elaborations) during the reminiscing narratives, and evidence increased socialization of emotion (i.e., maternal production of emotion words) in their reminiscing activities with their children.

**Zero order correlations.** Pearson product moment correlations were undertaken examining the relations between all quantitative variables involved in Hypothesis III. Please see Table 30. As noted in earlier sections, the two language measures are significantly positively correlated, and child gender and the EVT are significantly negatively correlated. Interestingly, the ERPSST Emotion Coaching variable and the EVT were also significantly positively correlated suggesting that higher maternal levels of emotion coaching philosophy are associated with higher levels of expressive language ability in middle childhood.

Subsequently, Pearson product moment correlations were undertaken to explore the relations between both the quantitative and narrative variables as demonstrated in
Table 29
Partial Correlations Between SEFQ Negative and Frequency of Total Maternal Emotion Words With CBQ Negative Affectivity and Child Language Abilities as Covariates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maternal total emotion words</th>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>CBQ Negative / PPVT SEFQ Negative&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>CBQ Negative / EVT SEFQ Negative&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN(t)</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA(t)</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO(t)</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO(t)</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>Note.</sup> SEFQ = Self Expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire; CBQ = Children's Behavior Questionnaire; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - III; EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love.

<sup>a</sup><sub>n=36</sub>. <sup>b</sup><sub>n = 27</sub>.  
<sup>*</sup><sub>p< .05, one-tailed.</sub> <sup>**</sup><sub>p< .01, one-tailed.</sub>
Table 30

Zero Order Intercorrelations of Quantitative Variables in Hypothesis III (N = 47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternal variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ERPSST Emotion coaching</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Child age</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Child gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CBQ Negative Affectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PPVT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EVTa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ERPSST = Emotion-Related Parenting Styles Self-Test; CBQ = Children’s Behavior Questionnaire; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – III; EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test. In interpreting findings related to child gender, female = 1 and male = 2.

*a* N = 36 due to missing data.

* *p* < .10, one-tailed. * *p* < .05, one-tailed. ** *p* < .01, one-tailed.
Table 31. Total maternal emotion words(t) for the hope narrative was significantly negatively correlated with child gender and significantly positively correlated with the EVT. The Emotion Coaching variable was found to be significantly positively correlated with both the family conversation lengths(t) for the sadness and hope narratives, and the maternal elaborations(t) for the hope narrative. These findings indicate that mothers who were higher in an emotion coaching style also produced more elaborative questions during parent-child reminiscing about past shared experiences when the child experienced hope. In addition, relatively higher emotion coaching mothers also jointly produced longer family conversations when reminiscing with their children about their past experiences of hope as well as sadness. Interestingly, no significant correlations were found between the Emotion Coaching variable and the total number of maternal emotion words across the narratives.

**Partial correlations.** The findings above highlighted significant relations between child gender and language ability, and the production of maternal emotion words. Additionally, significant associations were found between Emotion Coaching and language ability (EVT), and the EVT and child gender. Thus, in order to more specifically examine the particular effects of Emotion Coaching on the narrative measures, a series of partial correlations were undertaken which controlled for child gender and language ability. Once again, the PPVT was initially utilized as the language covariate.

As outlined in Table 32, no significant partial correlations were found between the Emotion Coaching variable and the total maternal emotion words across all five narratives. Positive associations approaching significance were found between Emotion
Table 31

Zero Order Correlations Between Child and Maternal Variables and Narrative Variables in Hypothesis III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERPSST Emotion Coaching</th>
<th>Child age</th>
<th>Child gender</th>
<th>PPVT</th>
<th>EVT</th>
<th>CBQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family conversation length</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN length(t)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA length(t)</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA length(t)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO length(t)</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO length(t)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal elaborations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN elabs(t)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA elabs(t)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA elabs(t)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO elabs(t)</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO elabs(t)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal emotion words</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN(t)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA(t)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.23\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO(t)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO(t)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1}p < .10, one-tailed. *p < .05.

Note. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. All narrative variables were $\log(X_i + 1)$ transformation due to skewness except the total maternal emotion words for sadness. $n$ varies between 32 to 35 for correlations involving the EVT and between 41 to 45 for the rest of the variables due to missing cases.
Table 32

Partial Correlations Between Maternal Emotion Coaching and Narrative Variables with Child Gender and Language as Covariates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family conversation length</th>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Covariates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child gender/ PPVT</td>
<td>Child gender/ EVT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotion coaching&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Emotion coaching&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN length(t)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.29&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA length(t)</td>
<td>.25&lt;sup&gt;t&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.31&lt;sup&gt;t&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA length(t)</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.35&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO length(t)</td>
<td>.23&lt;sup&gt;t&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.30&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO length(t)</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal elaborations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN elabs(t)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA elabs(t)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA elabs(t)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO elabs(t)</td>
<td>.33&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.34&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO elabs(t)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal emotion words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN(t)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA(t)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO(t)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO (t)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AN = anger; SA = sadness; HA = happiness; HO = hope; LO = love. All narrative variables were log(X<sub>i</sub> + 1) transformation due to skewness except the total maternal emotion words for sadness.

<sup>a</sup>n = 40 due to missing data. <sup>b</sup>n = 31 due to missing data.

<sup>t</sup>p < .10, one-tailed. <sup>*</sup>p < .05, one-tailed.
Coaching and the family conversation length(t) for the hope and sadness narratives. Emotion Coaching was significantly positively correlated with the maternal elaborations(t) in the hope narrative. In addition, child age was found to be significantly correlated with the total maternal emotion words(t) for happiness ($pr(36) = .35, p < .05$) and maternal elaborations(t) in the hope narrative ($pr(36) = .31, p < .05$). Children rated by mothers as having higher CBQ Negative Affectivity factor scores were also found to be more likely to have mothers who produced fewer elaborations(t) in the hope narrative ($pr(36) = -.37, p < .05$).

Partial correlations examining relations between the Emotion Coaching variable and the maternal narrative variables with the EVT (instead of the PPVT) and child gender as covariates highlighted a greater number of notable findings despite the reduced sample size of 31 cases. Please see Table 32 above. A significant positive association was found between Emotion Coaching and the family conversation length(t) for happiness. Emotion Coaching also had relations approaching significance with the family conversation length(t) for the hope, sadness, and anger narratives. In addition, Emotion Coaching was again found to be significantly positively correlated with the maternal elaborations(t) in the hope narrative.

Following use of the EVT and child gender as covariates, child age was found to be significantly correlated with the total maternal emotion words(t) for happiness ($pr(27) = .33, p < .05$), maternal elaborations(t) in the hope narrative ($pr(27) = .44, p < .01$) and family conversation length(t) for hope ($pr(27) = .33, p < .05$). The CBQ Negative Affectivity factor was found to be significantly negatively correlated with maternal elaborations(t) in the hope ($pr(36) = -.38, p < .05$) and anger narratives ($pr(27) = -.31, p < .05$), as well as family conversation length(t) for hope ($pr(27) = .33, p < .05$).
Thus, the use of the EVT as the language covariate in addition to child gender appears warranted in these analyses and the resulting findings provide partial support for Hypothesis III. After controlling for child gender and expressive language ability, mothers with higher Emotion Coaching scores were found to have more elaboration filled reminiscing conversations with their children during the hope narratives. In addition, mothers with higher Emotion Coaching scores produced longer joint conversations with their children during the happiness narratives and evidenced a trend approaching significance in the same direction for the hope, sadness, and anger narratives. No evidence was found for connections between the maternal Emotion Coaching Subscale and the Total Maternal Emotion Words across any of the five narratives.

**Regression analyses.** As shown in Appendix O, three sets of five hierarchical multiple regressions were run on the family conversational length, maternal elaborations, and total maternal emotion words for each narrative with child gender and the EVT entered in the first step and Emotion Coaching and the CBQ entered in the second step. Again, given the narrow ranges of child age in this study, child age was not specifically examined in these regressions. None of the final models for the prediction of the total maternal narrative output within each narrative attained significance.

**Hypothesis IVa: Child Gender and Maternal Narrative Content in Hope and Love Narratives**

With the exception of the total maternal emotion words(t) below, Hypothesis IVa focuses on particular types of maternal narrative content within the reminiscing stories about hope and love only. Based upon the literature with previously studied emotions, mothers were expected to use more emotion words and a greater variety of emotion words with girls than boys during their hope and love stories. In addition, it was predicted that
mothers would discuss girls' emotional experiences in a more "sociorelational" way than with boys. So, it was expected that mothers of girls would make more specific references to their female children (e.g., single words such as "you" or the child's proper name), to the mothers themselves (e.g., "I" in the case of a mother taking about herself), to other individuals (e.g., single words such as "father", "brother", "friend" or proper names for people of such relationships), and to affiliation (i.e., independent clauses characterized with a positive or a negative tone about the state of a relationship) than would mothers of boys while discussing the past shared child emotional experiences of hope and love.

Consistent with recommendations by Tabachnick and Fidell (1996) and French and Poulson, (2002), given the high degree of intercorrelation between a number of the dependent variables in this hypothesis, it was decided that a series of repeated measures analysis of variance was appropriate to test the predictions described above. This analytic approach with the same types of codes has been utilized in previous research (e.g., Buckner & Fivush, 2000). The means and standard deviations organized by gender and narrative for all dependent variables in this hypothesis are reported in Table 33 below.

**Child gender and maternal production of total emotion words.** A Two-Way (2 x 5) Mixed Design ANOVA with independent measures on child gender and repeated measures on type of narrative (i.e., anger, sadness, happiness, hope or love) was computed to examine the effects of child gender and type of emotion narrative on the total maternal emotion words(t). A significant interaction effect was evident for type of emotion narrative and child gender, \( F(4, 152) = 2.44, p < .05 \), and a significant main effect was found for type of emotion narrative, \( F(4, 152) = 4.27, p < .01 \). No significant main effect was found for child gender, \( F(1, 38) = 1.42, p > .05 \). As recommended in the
Table 33

*Means and Standard Deviations of Transformed Maternal Emotion Words, Variety of Maternal Emotion Words, and Sociorelational Terms by Child Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total maternal emotion words(t)$^a$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of maternal emotion words(t)$^b$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal references to child(t)$^b$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal references to parent(t)$^b$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal references to others(t)$^b$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal references to affiliation(t)$^b$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a n = 40$ due to missing data. $^b n = 43$ due to missing data.
presence of a significant interaction effect (McGuinness, 2004), the significant main effect was not interpreted further. The significant interaction was broken down via pairwise contrasts examining the impact of child gender for each type of narrative. A significant effect for child gender was found for the total maternal emotion words(t) within the hope narrative with mothers of daughters producing significantly more emotion words than mothers of sons, $(t(38) = 2.78, p<.01)$.

**Child gender and variety of maternal emotion words.** A Two-Way (2 x 2) Mixed Design ANOVA with independent measures on child gender and repeated measures on type of narrative (i.e., hope or love) was computed to examine the effects of child gender and type of emotion narrative on the variety of maternal emotion words(t) for hope and love. A significant main effect was found for type of emotion narrative with the variety of maternal emotion words(t) for love being significantly higher than that of hope, $(F(1, 41) = 12.18, p<.001)$. The main effect for child gender, $(F(1, 41) = 0.03, p>.05)$, and the interaction between child gender and type of emotion narrative, $(F(1, 41) = 0.08, p>.05)$, failed to reach statistical significance.

**Child gender and maternal references to child.** A Two-Way (2 x 2) Mixed Design ANOVA with independent measures on child gender and repeated measures on type of narrative (i.e., hope or love) was computed to examine the effects of child gender and type of emotion narrative on the frequency of maternal references to child(t) for hope and love. The main effects for both child gender, $(F(1, 41) = 0.09, p>.05)$, and type of narrative, $(F(1, 41) = 0.09, p>.05)$, did not reach significance. However, the interaction between child gender and type of emotion narrative did attain significance, $(F(1, 41) = 4.64, p<.05)$, with mothers of boys making more specific references to their children.
during the love narrative while mothers of girls made more significant references to their children during the hope narrative.

**Child gender and maternal references to parent (i.e., herself).** A Two-Way (2 x 2) Mixed Design ANOVA with independent measures on child gender and repeated measures on type of narrative (i.e., hope or love) was computed to examine the effects of child gender and type of emotion narrative on the frequency of maternal references to herself(t) for hope and love. Again, a significant main effect was found for type of emotion narrative with the maternal references to herself(t) for love being significantly higher than that of hope, \( F(1, 41) = 9.81, p<.01 \). The main effect for child gender, \( F(1, 41) = .51, p>.05 \), and the interaction between child gender and type of emotion narrative, \( F(1, 41) = 0.02, p>.05 \) also failed to reach statistical significance.

**Child gender and maternal references to others.** A Two-Way (2 x 2) Mixed Design ANOVA with independent measures on child gender and repeated measures on type of narrative (i.e., hope or love) was computed to examine the effects of child gender and type of emotion narrative on the frequency of maternal references to others(t) for hope and love. A significant main effect was found for type of emotion narrative with the maternal references to others(t) for love being significantly higher than that of hope, \( F(1, 41) = 8.73, p<.01 \). The main effect for child gender, \( F(1, 41) = .23, p>.05 \), and the interaction between child gender and type of emotion narrative, \( F(1, 41) = 2.35, p>.05 \) also failed to reach statistical significance.

**Child gender and maternal references to affiliation.** Finally, a Two-Way (2 x 2) Mixed Design ANOVA with independent measures on child gender and repeated measures on type of narrative (i.e., hope or love) was computed to examine the effects of child gender and type of emotion narrative on the frequency of maternal references to
affiliation(t) for hope and love. A significant main effect was found for type of emotion narrative with the maternal references to affiliation(t) for love being significantly higher than that of hope, \(F(1, 41) = 57.46, p<.0001\). The main effect for child gender, \(F(1, 41) = 1.34, p>.05\), and the interaction between child gender and type of emotion narrative, \(F(1, 41) = 1.02, p>.05\) also failed to reach statistical significance.

**Summary.** To summarize, the predictions for Hypothesis IVa were partially supported. When the effects of child gender were examined with regard to the total maternal emotion words(t) produced across the five narratives, a significant interaction effect was evident for type of emotion narrative and child gender. Via pairwise contrasts, a significant effect for child gender was found for the total maternal emotion words(t) within the hope narrative with mothers of daughters producing significantly more emotion words than mothers of sons. Another significant interaction between child gender and type of emotion narrative was found with regards to the specific maternal references to their children. Mothers of boys made more specific references to their children during the love narrative while mothers of girls made more significant references to their children during the hope narrative. The four other dependent variables (variety of maternal emotion words(t), and references to parent(t), others(t), and affiliation(t)) all had in common significant main effects for type of narrative with mothers consistently producing more of these sociorelational terms in the love narrative as compared to the hope narrative regardless of their children’s gender.

**Additional analyses: Child gender, narrative type and other primary narrative outcomes.** Examination of relations between child gender, type of emotion narrative, and total maternal emotion words(t) were included in Hypothesis IVa. Given the ubiquitous presence of gender influences in the reminiscing literature, the connections between child
gender, narrative type, total child emotion words(t), and maternal elaborations(t) were additionally explored. The transformed mean number of total emotion words for children as well as the mean number of maternal elaborations are reported in Table 34. A series of Two-Way (2 x 5) Mixed Design ANOVAs with independent measures on child gender and repeated measures on type of narrative (i.e., anger, sadness, happiness, hope or love) were computed. For the total child emotion words(t), a significant effect was found for type of emotion narrative, \(F(4, 152) = 4.84, p<.01\). Neither the main effect for child gender \(F(1, 38) = 0.89, p>.05\) nor the interaction between child gender and type of narrative \(F(4, 152) = 1.09, p>.05\) reached statistical significance. Further examination of the significant main effect for type of emotion narrative via a series of pairwise comparisons with a Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons indicated that overall children produced a greater number of emotion words during the anger narratives than during the hope narratives \(p<.05\) regardless of child gender. None of the other pairwise comparisons revealed statistically significant differences between narratives with regard to the total child emotion words(t). Again, a similar examination of pairwise comparisons with a less conservative post hoc test for multiple comparisons, the Sidak adjustment, revealed the same results. Finally, for maternal elaborations(t), the results of the two way mixed ANOVA revealed no significant main effects for type of narrative \(F(4, 152) = 1.76, p>.05\), child gender \(F(1, 38) = .082, p>.05\), or an interaction effect \(F(4, 152) = .92, p>.05\).
Table 34

*Means and Standard Deviations for Transformed Child Total Emotion Words and Maternal Elaborations (n = 40)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Child gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total child emotion words(t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal elaborations(t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis IVb: Thematic Content in Hope and Love Narratives.

As noted in the literature review, no empirical evidence exists which directly speaks to the possible thematic content that may occur between parents and children in reminiscing tasks regarding children's experiences of hope and love. Thematic results for both the hope and love narratives may provide new data regarding possible emotional and cognitive processes that may emerge in mother-child reminiscing about these positive emotions. Thus, the following five questions stemming from relevant theory, its associated empirical research, and, to a lesser extent, emergent coding, were the overarching constructs under which the development, application, and analysis of individual codes was undertaken in a manner consistent with a priori coding methodology.

I. When mothers are asked to remember shared events in which their children experienced "hope", what types of events do they identify? Snyder and his colleagues (Snyder, 1993, 2000b, c; Snyder, Cheavens et al., 1997) conceptualized hope as involving a sense or belief of agency and pathway thinking towards one's goals. This raises a further question of what potential goals would a child in middle childhood value and wish to pursue? Harter and Pike's (1984) research exploring measurement of the nature of children and adolescents' perceived competence and perceived social acceptance was the foundation for the following codes: (a) cognitive/scholastic, (b) physical/athletic, (c) extracurricular achievement, (d) peer acceptance, (e) maternal acceptance, (f) paternal acceptance, (g) family acceptance, (h) teacher acceptance, (i) conduct/behaviour, (j) appearance, (k) valued possession, and (l) other. Please see Appendix J for the operational definitions of each of these codes. The "valued possession" code was generated via an emergent coding process by the primary researcher. Following the application of this
coding scheme as outlined in the methodology section, the hope narratives were categorized as encompassing the goals outlined in Table 35. As can be seen below in Table 36, approximately 38.6 percent of the total narratives could not be accurately coded into the existing a priori codes, thus an emergent coding approach was undertaken which organized the remaining narratives into three further broad groupings: (a) goals of daily living which encompassed hopes related to day to day child experiences and activities, (b) event anticipation which described hopes clearly linked to anticipation of a specific upcoming pleasurable event, and (c) complex hopes which contained hopes which were not readily in the child’s control, coloured with the potential or aftermath of a loss and sometimes distant future oriented.

II. Would parents discuss hope supporting strategies during the shared reminiscing about hope with their children?

Snyder’s theory of hope (1993) suggested various means that parents may utilize to encourage the experience of “hope” in children as he defined it. These parental strategies were distilled into six core strategies that were then applied to the hope narratives. These codes were not mutually exclusive, meaning that one narrative may contain discussion of more than one strategy. The strategies included (a) clarifying or discussing further the nature of the child’s goal, (b) reminding the child about any aspect of a possible past success the child achieved in relation to their current goal or some other goal, (c) telling or providing the child with stories (e.g., movies, storybooks, family stories) of other children or adults pursuing similar goals, (d) encouraging the child to imagine him or herself in a particular situation and being successful at pursuing or attaining some part of the goal (i.e., use of imagery), (e) any type of parental
Table 35

*Parent Generated Types of Hopeful Goals Experienced by Children in Past Shared Experiences Organized via Harter’s Template (n = 44)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Goals</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Obtainment of valued possessions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Cognitive/scholastic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Physical/athletic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Extracurricular achievement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Peer acceptance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Paternal acceptance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Family acceptance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Teacher acceptance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Other goals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 36

*Nature of Hope Goals Not Captured in Apriori Harter Codes (n = 17)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual narrative theme</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Organizational theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding a lost toy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Goals of daily living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cavities at the dentist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go swimming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad fix three wheeler bike</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipation regarding birthday</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Event anticipation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizza party at school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipation for Lent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reunion with peers/teachers post Christmas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*table continues*
Table 36 (continued)

*Nature of Hope Goals Not Captured in Apriori Harter Codes (n = 17)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual narrative theme</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Organizational theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wanting Dad to give back Nintendo post-divorce</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Complex hopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting a sibling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals for the “future” (e.g., car, career, baby)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents to reunite after separation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope for a grandparent to get well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope through a serious, life threatening illness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teaching related to how to intellectually attack, work towards, or achieve goals, (f) fostering humour about the self and/or one’s circumstances, (g) no strategy discussed, (h) other strategy discussed. See Appendix J for further details on these codes.

Thirty-five of the 44 narratives (79.5 percent) available for coding encompassed discussion of one parental strategy for supporting or encouraging child hope. Of those 35 narratives, 34 involved “clarifying or discussing further the nature of the child’s goal”. Only one narrative contained discussion consistent with the code of “any type of parental teaching related to how to intellectually attack, work towards, or achieve goals”. Seven of the 44 narratives (15.9 percent) available for coding, encompassed discussion of two strategies. All seven of those narratives contained references to the same two parental strategies of “clarifying or discussing further the nature of the child’s goal” and “any type of parental teaching related to how to intellectually attack, work towards, or achieve goals”. Only one narrative (2.3 percent) included discussion of three parental strategies which included “clarifying or discussing further the nature of the child’s goal”, “any type of parental teaching related to how to intellectually attack, work towards, or achieve goals”, and “reminding the child about any aspect of a possible past success the child achieved in relation to their current goal or some other goal”. One mother essentially discussed no specific hope gendering strategies during the reminiscing task. Thus in total, parents discussed three potential hope supportive parenting strategies while reminiscing about past shared child experiences of hope. Of the three, “clarifying or discussing further the nature of the child’s goal” followed by “any type of parental teaching related to how to intellectually attack, work towards, or achieve goals” were the most frequently referenced parental support strategies in the hope narratives.
III. Who are the partners discussed during the love narratives? Given the developmental tasks of this age group, it was predicted that the parent and child joint narratives would involve both fewer references to romantic love and more references to love among family members (perhaps including pets), and possibly peers (DeFries et al., 1994). This theory in conjunction with an emergent coding process throughout the pilot narratives produced the following codes which were applied to the narratives: (a) mother, (b) father, (c) sibling, (d) other family member – one person, (e) multiple family members at once, (f) peer or peers, (g) romantic love, (h) pet(s), (i) combination of family and pet(s), (j) teacher, and (k) others. Please see Table 37 below for results. The results of this table provide support for the above prediction that family members, pets, and peers would be the primary partners discussed in the joint reminiscing about love.

IV. Will children express ambivalent feelings about the object of their affections in the love narrative? For example, a child may describe how they love their sibling but also acknowledge anger towards the sibling or a child may state they love their mom but also make reference to a recent discipline episode where they were angry with the parent. This question stems from long standing findings that indicate both parent-child and sibling relationships during the middle childhood years can be marked with simultaneous, contradictory positive and negative emotions (Furman & Buhrmester, 1985; Graeme & Russell, 1987). However, in this group of 44 narratives, only one child acknowledged any level of ambivalence towards their partner(s) (i.e., a mother). Thus, among stories of past child experiences of love, ambivalence was not a prominent theme among these middle childhood participants.

V. What methods of demonstrating love between partners were discussed by the parent-child dyads during the joint reminiscing about love? Based upon an emergent
Table 37

*Primary Partner(s) Discussed in Conjunction With the Children During the Parent-Child Reminiscing About Children's Experiences of Love (n = 44)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mothers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Multiple family members</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sibling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fathers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Combination of family and pet(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pet(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Peers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Unclear relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
coding process undertaken by the primary investigator during the pilot coding narratives, the following codes were developed to explore this question in relation to the love narratives: (a) “sharing an activity as part of affection”, (b) “talking about feelings”, (c) “physical affection”, (d) “doing something for someone” and (e) “other”.

Nineteen of the 44 families (43.2 percent) discussed one method of demonstrating love: eight discussed “physical affection”, five discussed “talking about feelings”, five discussed “sharing an activity as part of affection”, and one discussed “doing something for someone”. Eighteen (40.9 percent) of the families discussed two methods: eleven discussed “physical affection” and “talking about feelings”, four discussed “physical affection” and “doing something for someone”, and three discussed “physical affection” and “sharing an activity as part of affection”. Five (11.4 percent) of the families discussed three methods: three discussed “physical affection”, “talking about feelings”, and “sharing an activity as part of affection”; one discussed “physical affection”, “sharing an activity as part of affection”, and “doing something for someone”; and one also discussed “physical affection”, “doing something for someone” and “talking about feelings”.

Finally, two families (4.5 percent) did not raise any specific methods of demonstrating love. During the parent-child reminiscing about past shared child experiences of love, “physical affection” and “talking about feelings” were the top two most common methods discussed during the love narratives.

Summary. The results section of this study summarizes various significant interrelations between maternal emotion-related beliefs, individual child characteristics such as age, gender, language, and temperament, and child and maternal narrative production during mother-child reminiscing about past shared child experiences of anger, sadness, happiness, hope and love in the middle childhood years. In addition, the thematic
analysis of the hope and love narratives have allowed existing theory regarding the possible nature of parental socialization of these emotions to be examined in relation to actual parent-child reminiscing conversations. The following discussion section of this study will explore the individual findings of each section of the results and link them to past findings in the literature and possible ideas for future research.
CHAPTER IV  
Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to examine the relations between (a) maternal emotion-related beliefs and behaviours, and child gender, age, temperament, and language ability, and (b) narrative form and function within mother-child discussions of past shared child emotional experiences during the middle childhood years of six-to-eight-years-old. In addition to the previously studied emotions of sadness, anger, and happiness, the current research contained an initial exploration of mother-child reminiscing of shared past experiences encompassing the child positive emotions of hope and love, which have not been previously studied. Across the various hypotheses, maternal emotion-related beliefs and behaviours were found to be associated with child and maternal narrative variables, often in the presence of moderating child characteristics. Additionally, examination of the hope and love narratives from both quantitative and qualitative perspectives has provided innovative information about the narrative form and function, and core reminiscing themes of these positive emotions during the middle childhood years.

The ensuing discussion of the research findings starts with a brief discussion of preliminary narrative descriptive analyses followed by review of the correlational findings within the primary quantitative and narrative variables and comments pertinent to each of the primary hypotheses. Finally, the general implications and limitations of this study and some possible directions for future research are presented.

**Preliminary Descriptive Data: Perceptions of Nominated Memories**

Analysis of both the maternal and child reported nature of the memories revealed interesting information about the qualities of the reminiscing stories shared in the
research. The potential for the saliency of the events appears to have been relatively high given the mid to high range of intensity of the majority of the events from both the child and maternal perspective, the relatively recent nature of many of the memories, and the high degree of rehearsal that had happened around the majority of the stories with the exception of the love narratives. Perhaps an even more interesting finding is the degree to which the mother-child reminiscing across all of the narratives were characterized by discussions about either a simultaneity of child emotions or obvious disagreement between the child and mother’s perception of the primary emotional state of the past shared events. These results replicate previous findings that by the early school age years, many children are gradually able to identify and express simultaneous emotions made complicated by variation in intensity of feeling, and multiplicity and valence of emotions (Gallander Wintre & Vallance, 1994; Harter, 1983; Harter & Buddin, 1987). In addition, evidence of disagreement in mother-child reminiscing highlights important developmental progressions characteristic of this age group and the impact of such discussions upon the development of theory of mind and, ultimately, autobiographical memory. As noted by Fivush and Nelson (2004):

In mother-child reminiscing, there are critical conversational junctures at which mothers and children disagree about what occurred. Sometimes this is at the level of the “facts” of the event .... Often, disagreements in recollections are not about facts but about emotions and evaluations...... These points of conflict highlight for children that they may have a different interpretation of, evaluation of, or emotional reaction to an event than others do. This awareness is clearly related to concomitant developments in children’s theory of mind. (p. 575)
Intercorrelations of Primary Quantitative and Narrative Variables

An initial examination of relations between the study’s primary quantitative variables revealed the existence of a number of theoretically expected relations. For example, the three measures which directly tap parental attitudes toward child expressivity were significantly intercorrelated. Mothers with more restrictive attitudes towards their children’s expression of both positive and negative emotions also tended to score higher on distressed and harsh parental attitudes towards children’s expressions of negative emotions. These results are akin to Eisenberg et al.’s (1996) findings of associations between various emotion-related parental measures. Relatedly, mothers in the current study who scored higher on emotion coaching, were also significantly less likely to express distressed reactions towards children’s expressions of negative emotions and more likely to describe themselves as people who frequently express positive emotion in their immediate family environments. These findings parallel the theoretical and empirical literature related to meta-emotion theory (Gottman et al., 1996, 1997) and literature which has suggested that parental expression of emotion may be a correlate of other aspects of parenting that affect child competence (Eisenberg, Cumberland, et al., 1998; Halberstadt, 1991). Significant correlations among these theoretically analogous measures of emotion-related beliefs and behaviors also provide a foundation that allows more confident acceptance of the significant links found between the maternal attitudinal measures and actual child and maternal narrative production in the current study.

The interrelation of maternal positive expressivity in the family and maternal restrictiveness towards children’s expression of negative emotion with the ERPSST is particularly noteworthy because the ERPSST is a relatively new adaptation of an initial questionnaire designed by Gottman and his colleagues to operationalize the theoretical
constructs of their parental meta-emotion theory (Gottman et al., 1996; 1997). Evidence of such correlates for this measure within the current study will further assist with the establishment of the ERPSST as a sound and useful psychometric tool (Hakim-Larson et al., 2006).

In addition, significant relations in expected directions between maternal scores on the harsh parental coping and emotion coaching and children's scores on measures of one-word receptive and expressive vocabulary, respectively, provides supportive evidence of possible bi-directional relations between aspects of maternal emotion socialization and children's cognitive and/or language development in the middle childhood years. These findings parallel evidence that has previously linked early parenting beliefs and behaviors (e.g., authoritarian parenting beliefs and maternal responsivity) and language development (Karrass & Braungart-Rieker, 2003; Yaghoub Zadeh & Im-Bolter, 2007) as well as maternal elaborative reminiscing style with children's development of language, narrative and print skills (Reese, 1995; Peterson et al., 1999).

The intercorrelations between the study's primary narrative variables revealed a series of significant positive correlations between the frequency of maternal production of emotion words and elaborative comments/questions and child production of negative emotion words and total emotion words across the five narratives. This is an important finding as it provides additional replication of one of the most well established findings in the field of parent-child reminiscing, and indeed the larger emotion socialization literature. That is, mothers who directly model and scaffold communication about emotion for their children tend to have children who are more verbally expressive about
emotions certainly by the school age years (Eisenberg, Cumberland, et al., 1998; Fivush, 2007; Fivush et al., 2006).

In addition, the current findings stemming from the sociorelational data coded in the hope and love narratives also provide novel information about relations between making social references and an elaborative maternal reminiscing style in the middle childhood years. The sociorelational codes utilized in the current study are based upon the work of Buckner and Fivush (2000). In both the hope and love narratives, mothers who produced more elaborations also tended to make more frequent direct social references to the child, themselves, and comments about the state of relationships (i.e., positive or negative affiliative remarks) when discussing these past shared experiences with their children. High elaborative mothers also made more direct social references to “others” (e.g., other partners in emotional experiences such as fathers, peers, siblings, etc) during the love narratives with a similar finding approaching significance also revealed in the hope narratives. Thus, it would seem at least for these two positive emotions that high elaborative mothers tend to “people” their reminiscing with their children (Buckner & Fivush, 2000) and make evaluative comments about social relationships while reminiscing with their school age children.

Maternal Reaction to Child Negative Affect and Child Production of Negative Emotion Words

The core prediction from the first hypothesis was that more distressed or harsh maternal attitudes (minimizing/punitive reactions) toward child expression of negative emotions would be associated with children’s production of fewer negative emotion words during parent-child reminiscing. This hypothesis was confirmed in that after controlling for the covariates of child temperament (i.e., negative affectivity) and
language ability (i.e., receptive language), mothers who endorsed higher levels of parental
distress reactions in relation to displays of child negative emotion were found to have
children who produced fewer negative emotion words during mother-child discussions
about past shared child experiences of happiness. Interestingly, after controlling for the
covariates, none of the additional maternal or child characteristics such as harsh parental
coping, child age, and child gender were significantly related to the frequency of child
negative emotion words across the five narratives.

These findings are in keeping with Buck’s (1984) theory that the use of
nonsupportive strategies to control children’s negative emotions may teach children to
suppress expression of negative emotions. It is important to highlight that this finding in
the present study was found exclusively within reminiscing conversations about past
positive child emotion. Examination of the range of scores of untransformed narrative
variables in Table 9 of this study reveals that, not surprisingly, children tended to produce
fewer negative words during the positive emotion conversations than negative focused
conversations. Thus, in a social exchange where the implied expectation would be to be
primarily focused on positive emotion, (a) a number of children still produced negative
emotion words (i.e., approximately 27 percent in the happiness narrative) and (b) those
children with mothers who held less accepting attitudes towards child negative
expressivity produced fewer negative emotion words. One possibility is that this
phenomenon did not manifest itself in the narratives which are more clearly focused on
negative emotion (i.e., anger and sadness) because expression of negative emotion in
those contexts may have been perceived by either mothers and/or their children as being
more socially appropriate or expected. However, in a context where the expectation is for
greater focus on positive emotion, children with mothers who are less accepting of
negative emotion in general may perceive even less permission to express negative emotion words.

Maternal Positive Expressivity and Restrictiveness Toward General Child Affect and Child and Maternal Production of Total Emotion Words

The primary prediction from the second hypothesis was that higher levels of maternal positive expressivity and lower levels of maternal restrictiveness towards children would be associated with greater frequency of both child and maternal emotion words. In terms of child narrative production, after controlling for child gender and language ability (i.e., one-word receptive language), mothers who endorsed less restrictive attitudes toward general child emotional expression were found to be significantly more likely to have children who produced more total emotion words during mother-child reminiscing about past shared experiences of child happiness. In addition, a negative relation between restrictive maternal attitudes toward general child emotional expression and the total child emotion words(t) for the anger narrative approached significance. After controlling for child gender and language ability, maternal positive expressivity, child negative affectivity and child age were not significantly related to the total child emotion words(t) within each of the five narratives.

Thus, the hypothesis with regard to child narrative output was supported for the reminiscing conversations about happiness and, to a lesser extent, for anger. These findings are similar in nature to a body of past literature on parental reaction to child emotion summarized by Eisenberg, Cumberland, et al., (1998) which essentially indicates that moderately high levels of encouragement of the expression of emotion are associated with various aspects of positive socioemotional development for children such as the production of more emotion words in the current study. Conversely, nonsupportive
parental reactions have been linked to less optimal socio-emotional adaptation. The current findings are particularly consistent with Gottman’s meta-emotion theory (Gottman et al., 1996, 1997) which would suggest that parents with more restrictive attitudes towards child expressivity would be less effective emotion coaches in discussions of either positive or negative child emotions.

After controlling for child gender and expressive language ability, mothers who reported higher levels of positive expressivity actually tended to produce fewer total emotion words during mother-child reminiscing about past shared experiences where children experienced sadness. In addition, a negative correlation approaching significance was also found between maternal positive expressivity and the total maternal emotion words for love. Child age was significantly positively correlated with total maternal emotion words(t) for happiness.

These findings directly contradict the hypothesized relations discussed for the maternal positive expressivity in Hypothesis IIb at least for the sadness narrative. Varied influences could be at play in these somewhat surprising findings. First, it may be possible that mothers’ tendencies to discuss episodes of positive affect in the daily family environment may be related to some aspect of their reminiscing style with their children, but not specifically to the production of individual emotion words during reminiscing. Some other narrative form such as maternal elaboration or more specifically production of positive emotion words as opposed to total emotion words may be more positively linked to general positive expressivity. Second, Fivush and her colleagues (Fivush, 1997; Fivush et al., 2006) summarized findings that suggest that a particular style of parental discussion of emotion in one parent-child milieu does not necessarily translate to others. For example, research has revealed that high maternal elaborative style during mother-
child reminiscing did not translate to a similar style during playtime, mealtime, etc. Thus, measures of high maternal positive expressivity across various day to day family interactions may not directly translate into increased emotion word usage in mother-child reminiscing. Third, as individual child characteristics are increasingly being identified as influential variables in the process of emotion socialization in various models of emotion socialization (Eisenberg, Cumberland, et al., 1998; Fivush et al., 2006; Saarni, 1999), it is quite possible that some other child characteristic such as age (mentioned above in relation to the happiness narrative) or another temperamental factor other than negative affectivity may be a more influential determinant of maternal narrative outcome than maternal positive expressivity. Fourth, it is also conceivable that mothers who highly value positive expressivity in the family may simply be less comfortable or avoidant of discussing a lot of emotion in stories about sadness. Finally, it is possible that a measure of maternal negative expressivity in the family may be more related to maternal reminiscing style than positive expressivity. Such a possibility is discussed in the next section.

Maternal Negative Expressivity and Child and Maternal Production of Total Emotion Words

As alluded to above, it is theoretically possible that maternal negative emotional expressivity in the family, may also be an important correlate of the nature of child and maternal emotional discussion. Given the content of the literature review (e.g., Fivush, Cumberland, et al., 1998), levels of negative maternal emotional expressivity in the family may be related to less frequent production of child and maternal emotion words across the five emotion narratives. Analysis revealed that maternal negative expressivity in the family was not related to the frequency of total child emotion words within each of
the five narratives even after the effects of the covariates of child language and negative affection were controlled for. However, once the effects of child negative affectivity and language ability were controlled as covariates, as predicted, higher level of maternal negative expressivity was associated with fewer total maternal emotion words for each of the emotion narratives except happiness. These results underline the importance of considering emotion-related beliefs and behaviors from both ends of the emotion valence spectrum when studying aspects of emotion socialization.

Maternal Emotion Coaching Style and Narrative Production

The third hypothesis proposed that mothers with higher emotion coaching would engage in longer family reminiscing conversations with their children, produce more nonrepetitive questions (i.e., maternal elaborations) during the reminiscing narratives, and evidence increased socialization of emotion (i.e., maternal production of emotion words) in their reminiscing activities with their children. After controlling for child gender and language ability (i.e., one-word expressive language), mothers higher in emotion coaching were found to have more elaboration filled reminiscing conversations with their children during the hope narratives. Mothers higher in emotion coaching also produced longer joint conversations with their children during the happiness narratives and evidenced a nonsignificant trend in the same direction for the hope, sadness, and anger narratives. In addition, following control of child gender and language ability, child age was found to be significantly correlated with the total maternal emotion words(t) for happiness, maternal elaborations(t) in the hope narrative, and family conversation length(t) for hope. The child temperament dimension of negative affectivity was found to be significantly negatively correlated with maternal elaborations(t) in the hope and anger narratives as well as family conversation length(t) for hope. No evidence was found for
connections between maternal emotion coaching and the number of maternal emotion words produced in each of the five narratives. The significant link between maternal emotion coaching and maternal elaborations in the hope narrative and family conversation length in the happiness narrative is quite interesting. These findings coupled with the lack of association between this meta-emotion style and maternal production of emotion words underlines the importance of not exclusively relying on frequency of emotion words as a sole measure of maternal narrative output during study of parental discussion of emotion.

**Child Gender and Maternal Narrative Content in Hope and Love Narratives**

The first part of Hypothesis IV was designed to explore the basic narrative structure of the hope and love narratives given that no such published research was found in the literature review for this study. Based upon the literature with previously studied emotions, this hypothesis was also designed to examine the influence of gender within these conversations, given that a common finding across the parent-child reminiscing literature to date is some differentiation of parental narrative output on the basis of child gender (Adams et al., 1995; Chance & Fiese, 1999; Fivush, 1989, 1993, 1994, 1998; Fivush & Buckner, 2000; Haden et al., 1997; Kuebli et al., 1995; Kuebli & Fivush, 1992; Reese & Fivush, 1993). Based upon previous findings, mothers were expected to use more emotion words and a greater variety of emotion words with girls than boys during their hope and love stories (Fivush, 1998; Fivush et al., 2000; Kuebli & Fivush, 1992). In addition, it was predicted that mothers would discuss girls' emotional experiences in a more "sociorelational" way than with boys as predicted in previous research (Buckner & Fivush, 2000). So, it was expected that mothers of girls might make more specific references to their female child (e.g., single words such as "you" or the child's proper
name), to the mother herself (e.g., “I” in the case of a mother taking about herself), to other individuals (e.g., single words such as “father”, “brother” “friend” or proper names for people of such relationships), and to affiliation (i.e., independent clauses characterized with a positive or a negative tone about the state of a relationship) than would mothers of boys while discussing the past shared child emotional experiences of hope and love.

These predictions were partially supported. When child gender was examined across the five narratives for total number of maternal emotion words, a significant interaction effect was evident for type of emotion narrative and child gender. Mothers of daughters were found to produce a significantly greater number of emotion words than mothers of sons within the hope narrative. This finding that mothers of daughters produce significantly more emotion words than mothers of sons once again replicates the earlier finding of higher maternal production of emotion words for girls but this time in a new emotional domain, hope. It should be noted that in terms of the present hypothesis, only the total maternal emotion words was coded for each of the five narratives. The remaining narrative measures discussed below were solely coded for the emotions of hope and love.

Among four other variables coded for hope and love narratives (i.e., variety of maternal emotion words, and references to parent, others, and affiliation), mothers consistently producing a greater number of these sociorelational terms in the love narrative as compared to the hope narrative regardless of their children’s gender. With regard to specific maternal references to their children, the results also revealed that mothers of boys made a greater number of specific references to the child during the love narrative while mothers of girls made a greater number of references to the child during the hope narrative. With regard to the variety of maternal emotion words(t), and specific
maternal references to herself(t), others(t), and affiliation(t), child gender was not found to be significantly influential.

The finding that mothers were consistently producing a greater number of sociorelational terms in the love narrative compared to the hope narrative regardless of their children’s gender is certainly a new finding to the emotion literature. Two factors become interesting when considering this finding. First, Snyder’s (Snyder, 1993, 2000b, c; Snyder, Cheavens et al., 1997) seminal works exploring facets of hope have revealed a strong cognitive component as a core feature of a “hopeful process”. Maternal production of fewer types of emotions words and social referencing might reflect a less relational or emotion specific focus during hope discussions possibly due in part to a greater discussion of phenomena such as pathway thinking and agency cognitions. Secondly, based upon the primary researcher’s first hand observations of parents trying to generate a past shared child emotional experience of “hope”, it was clear that parents struggled more with conceptualizing this emotion in their children’s lives as opposed to more familiar daily emotions such as anger or love. Parents frequently asked for a definition of hope (which was put back to them to generate) or made remarks about not having thought a great deal about their children’s experiences of hope. It is possible that the discussion of hope among these families is a more novel experience tapping into a true teaching moment between mothers and children about less familiar emotional processes. This may be contributing in some way to a different emotional discussion than say a possibly more familiar daily emotional experience of love.

Child Gender, Narrative Type and Other Primary Narrative Outcomes

In addition to the Hypothesis IVa findings above regarding maternal production of total emotion words, analysis across the five narratives was undertaken to explore how
child gender and narrative type would relate to the production of total child emotion words(t) and maternal elaborations(t). Children produced more total emotion words during the anger narratives than during the hope narratives regardless of child gender. This finding parallels previous research which has suggested that family narratives about negative emotions may produce more opportunity for emotion socialization as compared to positive emotion (Fivush et al., 2006; Fivush & Sales, 2006; Lagattuta & Wellman, 2002; Peterson et al., 2007; Sales et al., 2003). Interestingly, neither child gender, narrative type nor an interaction of the two proved to differentiate the frequency of maternal elaborations(t).

**Thematic Content in Hope and Love Narratives**

As noted in the literature review, no empirical evidence was found that directly speaks to the possible thematic content that may occur between parents and children in reminiscing tasks regarding children's experiences of hope and love. Thus, any information stemming from such an investigation is an original contribution to both the reminiscing literature and the discussions about parent-child emotion socialization processes and functions of positive emotions (Fredrickson, 1998a, 1998b, 2001; Peterson, 2000).

It is clear from the broad array of events generated by mothers as examples of “hope” experiences (eleven different categories) that hope has many applications in the lives of children from their mothers’ perspectives. Interestingly, most of Harter’s (1984) areas of perceived competence were applicable to the hope themes; however, almost 40 percent of the hope narratives did not clearly fit within those thematic categories. The additional themes of: (a) goals of daily living, (b) event anticipation, and (c) complex hopes generated via emergent coding reflect a number of intriguing themes in the
mothers' description of their children's hope filled experiences. These themes included two dichotomies: (a) discussion of daily, short-term goals versus more emotionally intense, long-term goals and (b) hope narratives obviously tinged with excitement and positive anticipation versus those concerned with more difficult, possibly loss-filled experiences. Each of these themes are interesting to consider.

In addition, Snyder's (1993) theoretical musings about possible socialization pathways of hope indeed had some applicability to the current data in that three of his proposed strategies (i.e., "clarifying or discussing further the nature of the child's goal", "any type of parental teaching related to how to intellectually attack, work towards, or achieve goals" and "reminding the child about any aspect of a possible past success the child achieved in relation to their current goal or some other goal") were referenced by mothers in their discussions. This is particularly salient when you consider that mothers were raising these strategies without a great deal of prompting or discussion of how they might engender hope during the narrative paradigm. Much obviously remains to be understood in the emotion socialization process of hope.

Findings from the thematic analysis of love confirmed the prediction that the mother-child joint narratives would involve both fewer references to romantic love and more references to love among family members, pets, and peers (DeFries et al., 1994). Additionally, this analysis revealed that "physical affection" and "talking about feelings" were the top two most common methods of demonstrating love during the narratives. However, the prediction that children may acknowledge some ambivalence in their loving experiences with others was not supported. This prediction was based upon findings that both parent-child and sibling relationships during the middle childhood years can be marked with simultaneous, contradictory positive and negative emotions (Furman &
Buhrmester, 1985; Graeme & Russell, 1987). However, it is possible that some aspects of that proposed ambivalence may have been captured in other parts of the current narrative data. For example, anger with regard to a sibling was a common theme in the anger narratives and yet siblings were at times discussed in the love narratives. Further analysis would have to be undertaken to examine concordance between the love and anger narratives.

**Consideration of the Findings: Strengths and Challenges of the Study**

As in any new pursuit of knowledge, critical consideration of the findings above must include a measured review of both the positive and negative aspects of the source of the information including the philosophical approach to the design of the project. A strength of the current study began in its original genesis. The early conceptualization of the project came out of the primary researcher's years of clinical practice in the mid to late 1990s. Daily clinical contact with stressed family systems produced repetitive examples of the importance of phenomena such as typical versus atypical developmental pathways, the nuances of parent-child emotion socialization (e.g., numerous powerful ways parents transmit important information about emotional processes and its impact on how children progress socially and emotionally), the bidirectional interactions between parents and children, particularly the importance of factoring in both child and indeed parent individual characteristics, and the realization that many families and community institutions including the larger mental health community at that time were focused upon management of negative emotion with little consideration given to the question of how one engenders positive emotions as a protective factor for children. Thus, the current study is an example of one type of study needed in the field of clinical psychology. That is, we need research originating from psychological issues that frequently present in
clinical settings and that may have some ability to better inform the work of supporting more positive daily living among clients (Blount, Bunke, & Zaff, 2000; Shonkoff, 2000). For child mental health professionals who work at the nexus of child development, family systems, and psychopathology, the process of parent-child emotion socialization is not a theoretical discussion; it is a live, fluid process witnessed each day.

In addition to the clinical orientation driving the development of this project, methodological rigour is an important consideration. Methodological strengths of this project include: (a) a lengthy recruitment process to access a more generalizable sample of families from across the Windsor community (as opposed to exclusive reliance on the university participant pool); (b) gathering of data via various modalities including quantitative questionnaire data as well as observational, qualitative data, and from more than one person’s perspective, that is data collection from both parents and children; (c) careful attempts to undertake both the transcriptions and apriori and emergent coding of the qualitative data in a manner consistent with best currently available standards; and (d) implementation of best ethical practices throughout the research including consulting and dealing sensitively with ethical concerns that arose during the project. This included devising ways to explain the research and informed consent in a developmental appropriate fashion to children, managing some children’s discomfort with parts of the narrative reminiscing paradigm, providing referral for pre-existing clinical needs of families that became apparent during the research process, and managing reportable child safety concerns to child protection authorities.

The moving of theoretical ideas to practical research can sometimes be a most challenging task. One obvious challenge for the project was attempting to recruit as many families as possible. Two years to recruit 52 families caused tensions between the need
for a timely completion of the project and the need to have sufficient numbers to ensure some appropriate level of statistical power in analyses and generalizability of the findings. Although the ultimate sample of 47 families is in keeping with many of the published studies in the field of parent-child reminiscing, it was at times an issue in the type of statistical analyses that could be undertaken (e.g., problems with insufficient sample size to support use of multiple predictors in regression analyses) and most likely an influence on the number of significant findings given the likelihood that the strength of the relations between some of the study variables is likely small to moderate at best. Problems with recruitment of sufficient numbers of fathers necessitated dropping the father data which further compounded concerns about sample size. In addition, realities about recruiting in the multi-ethnic community of Windsor and within the university community meant that this sample is quite ethnically diverse and has a fairly high educational level among the mothers. Given the recent sensitivity towards the effects of cultural influences and individual maternal characteristics on emotion socialization, the nature of the sample in this regard needs to be considered. An additional challenge during the statistical analysis was the differences in sample size for families with available measures of child receptive language abilities versus child expressive language abilities. The smaller number of families with completed child expressive language measures necessitated consideration at times as to which language measure was most appropriate and efficient to use within the various analyses. Finally, it is important to acknowledge that although every attempt was made to make families comfortable in our meeting environment, this study is a laboratory-based study. As there has been some discussion of context as a possibly significant factor during parent-child reminiscing, it is important to acknowledge this reality.
**General Implications of the Current Study and Possibilities for Future Study**

The findings of significant relations between maternal measures of emotion-related beliefs and behaviors in the current study and narrative outcome produced by the families addresses Fivush and her colleagues' (Fivush et al., 2006) call for increased study of the impact of individual parental characteristics upon parent-child reminiscing. In addition, it is important to note that many of these significant links between the maternal measures and narrative outcome in the current study were found within the positive emotion narratives. This finding underlines the great importance of more fully embracing the positive psychology model within our study of parental socialization of emotion. With increasing evidence of relations between positive emotion and various areas of human adjustment such as mental and physical health, performance in sport, and academics (Fredrickson, 1998a, 1998b, 2001; Snyder, 1993, 2000b, c), the fields of developmental, family, and clinical psychology cannot ignore this paradigm if they wish to grasp a full and rich understanding of human functioning. Indeed, recent worldwide reactions to public messages charged with positive emotions (i.e., hope, curiosity, courage) by Barack Obama (Obama, 2006), and Randy Pausch (Pausch & Zaslow, 2008) suggest that these ideas resonate with many individuals from various cultures.

The finding of significant interrelations between maternal emotion-related beliefs, family narrative production, and individual child characteristics such as age, gender, language, and temperament speaks to the importance of continuing to push forward the study of parent-child reminiscing with great sensitivity toward possible moderating influences of individual child variables. For all the new information this study brings forward, perhaps one of its greatest contributions is that it stimulates new thinking in terms of possible future paths of exploration for both the current data and the field at
large. For example, next steps of study for the available data in the current research could involve: (a) examination of the impact of additional child temperament characteristics other than Rothbart's negative affectivity (Rothbart et al., 2000) on the production of narrative function and form; (b) examination of possible concordance or discordance within the mother-child dyads ratings of emotional intensity and an examination of these rates in relation to maternal emotion-related beliefs; (c) exploration of whether findings of significant links between aspects of maternal social references and elaborations in the emotions of hope and love also stand in the emotions of happiness, anger, and sadness; (d) across the five narratives, exploration of whether there are different narrative outcomes between those emotion narratives identified as primarily focused on one pure emotion versus those identified to be manifesting a simultaneity of two or more child emotions; and (e) thematic analysis of the happiness narratives as very few data exist regarding the more qualitative nature of the parent-child reminiscing conversations regarding this positive emotion.

Additionally, Fivush et al. (2006) has made a call for examination of the nonverbal aspects of parent-child reminiscing. Although not coded for the current study, videotaping of almost all of the current families was undertaken during the data collection of this project. It would be fascinating to begin to examine phenomena such as verbal tone, facial expression, and body language during the mother-child reminiscing conversations. Immediate areas of inquiry could include whether there are any differences in these nonverbal behaviors for each family across negative versus positive emotions, and whether child gender would once again play a significant role in differentiation of both child and maternal performance. Exploration of possible relations between the
maternal emotion-related beliefs and actual maternal nonverbal performance during
parent-child reminiscing would also be informative.

A recent series of studies by Bohanek and her colleagues (Bohanek et al., 2008; Bohanek et al., 2006) has examined the process of shared family reminiscing about past events at a triadic interactional level during the middle childhood years (i.e., both parents and their 9- to 12-years old child). The examination of social references (i.e., references to others and affiliative qualities of relationships) among the hope and love narratives of the current study highlighted the reality that parent-child socialization of emotion often occurs with more than two participants and sometimes includes nonparent participants such as siblings or even nonfamily members. This certainly speaks to the importance of continued research in a similar vein to that of Bohanek and her colleagues’ work. In addition, there is continued need for reminiscing research which explores the issues of positive emotion, parental socialization, and narrative construction within the stories of additional cultural groups (e.g., Native Canadians, recent immigrants) and a wider range of developmental stages (e.g., adolescents, adults, and seniors).

Finally, greater understanding of the theoretical and family system dynamics that occur in parent-child reminiscing and the impact of such narratives on child development leads to the inevitable question about how to use such knowledge to directly contribute to clinical and/or community based interventions. A few thinkers in the field of emotion socialization have begun to explore this idea. These include: (a) Snyder’s (2002) discussions of implementing hope constructs in school settings, (b) Oppenheim’s (2006) advocacy of narratives as an assessment tool for clinical intervention and as a means for enhancing parental insightfulness or reflectiveness, and (c) Peterson and McCabe’s (2004) year long intervention focused on teaching effective scaffolding of contextual
information in parent-child reminiscing to economically disadvantaged families. This intervention study revealed subsequent documented increases in the children’s receptive vocabulary, an increased use of references to spatial-temporal context, and improved informativeness of their narratives compared to controls. Such studies are exciting and represent one of the next logical steps in the journey of understanding the power of parent-child reminiscing.

In summary, a primary implication of this study is that it has opened up new avenues of research in the field of parent-child reminiscing. At the current time, the primary researcher is unaware of any published studies that have examined maternal emotion socialization beliefs in relation to narrative outcome in parent-child reminiscing. The placement of this study within the middle childhood years also makes a needed contribution to greater understanding of a pivotal developmental period that has been studied to a much lesser degree than the preschool period. Finally, the inclusion of a positive psychology focus in the research has provided the field with new findings not only about the narrative form and functions that pertain to positive emotion but also with rich thematic data for hope and love.
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Appendix A
Permission to Reproduce Figure 1

No problem, Jackie.
Nancy

Nancy Eisenberg, Regents' Professor
Psychology
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-1104

From: Jackie Goodwin
Sent: Monday, December 31, 2007 3:07 PM
To: Nancy Eisenberg
Subject: permission re. academic material

Hello Dr. Eisenberg:

Happy New Year. I am a Doctoral student in Child Clinical Psychology at the University of Windsor in Ontario, Canada. My dissertation is in the area of parent-child reminiscing about emotions. I am familiar with many of your publications in the area of parental socialization of emotion. Indeed, I have utilized your "Coping With Children's Negative Emotions Scale" (CCNES) in my dissertation under the supervision of Dr. Julie Hakim-Larson who originally requested your measure for use in our Windsor lab.

I am currently in the data analysis stage of my dissertation (yeah!) and further refining my introduction for defence. My introduction acknowledges your seminal 1998 papers in *Psychological Inquiry, volume 9*. I am writing to inquire whether I could have your permission (and your colleagues?) to reproduce your revised heuristic model of the socialization of emotion (page 320) in my dissertation? I have received feedback from my committee that a diagram may be helpful to my explanation of the model. These papers were very influential for me in the early stages of my dissertation proposal, so I would like to appropriately acknowledge their importance.....

Regards, Jacqueline Goodwin, M.Sc.
Appendix B
Permission to Reproduce Figure 2

Dear Jackie,
I am pleased to give my permission to reproduce the figure from the article cited below. As APA holds the copyright, you would need official permission from that body to reproduce in a publication.

Perhaps you could send me an abstract of your dissertation when it is available, as I continue to follow related work in the field with interest.

Katherine Nelson
Distinguished Professor Emerita
Ph.D. Program in Psychology
City University of New York Graduate Center
Home address for correspondence:
50 Riverside Drive #4B
New York, NY 10024
knelson@gc.cuny.edu

From: Jackie Goodwin
Sent: Fri 2/1/2008 11:43 AM
To: Nelson, Katherine
Subject: inquiry re. academic paper

Hello Dr. Nelson:

I am a Doctoral student in Child Clinical Psychology at the University of Windsor in Ontario, Canada. My dissertation is in the area of parent-child reminiscing about emotions. I am currently in the data analysis stage of my dissertation (yeah!) and further refining my introduction for defence. My introduction acknowledges your seminal 2004 paper on a social cultural developmental theory of autobiographical memory with Dr. Fivush in Psychological Review, volume 111. I am writing to inquire whether I could have your permission as first author to reproduce in my dissertation your figure 1 on page 490 of that document? The figure illustrates relations in developments from 1 to 5 years leading to the emergence of autobiographical memory. I have received feedback from my committee that a diagram may be helpful to my explanation of the model. As I wish to acknowledge the important connections between parent-child reminiscing and autobiographical memory, your paper is an extremely helpful review. Of course, I would be appropriately referencing the figure via APA guidelines........

Regards, Jacqueline Goodwin, M.Sc.
APPENDIX C
Community Poster

HEY MOM OR DAD!!!!
ARE YOU THE PARENT OF A

SIX TO EIGHT-YEAR-OLD CHILD?

• A researcher from the Department of Psychology at the University of Windsor wishes to meet with parents and their children in order to conduct family research.

• The purpose of this study is to gain a greater understanding of parents' attitudes towards emotions in themselves and their children who are between the ages of six to eight years old. The results of this study will help researchers gain a better understanding of how emotion is expressed in families.

• All individual responses will be kept strictly confidential and a small monetary reimbursement will be provided upon completion of the study.

• If you wish to gain more information, please contact Jackie at XXX-XXXX. Thanks for taking the time to read this notice......
APPENDIX D
Information Sheet – community

RESEARCHER: Jacqueline Goodwin, M.Sc.

SUPERVISOR: Julie Hakim-Larson, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology, University of Windsor

PURPOSE: The purpose of this study is to gain a greater understanding of parents' attitudes towards emotions in themselves and their children who are between the ages of six to eight years old. Results of this study will help researchers gain a better understanding of how emotion is expressed in families.

WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO: You and your child will be asked to come together to the Child Studies Centre in the Department of Psychology, Chrysler Hall South at the University of Windsor. No other family member is to attend the appointment. During this appointment, you and the child will be asked to remember and discuss as naturally as possible five past emotional events that you and the child shared together. This discussion will be audiotaped and videotaped. Following this, the parent will be asked to complete questionnaires which ask for the following: basic demographic information, personality information regarding your child, and information regarding emotional expression and beliefs in your family. While you are completing the questionnaires, your child will be accompanied to a nearby room where they will be asked questions about the emotions from the memories. As well, two short measures of your child's language abilities will be taken. This entire appointment should take between two and two-and-a-half hours. One or two researchers will be working with you and your child during this appointment. A token of appreciation will be offered to families at the completion of their participation (i.e., ten dollars).

At the completion of this first appointment, you will be given the opportunity to decide if you would like to return at another time to participate in a parent interview with a research assistant (i.e., typically 60 to 75 minutes in length). During this interview, you will be asked a series of questions about the expression of emotions in your own life and in your child’s life. This interview will be audiotaped only and will also be conducted at the Child’s Study Centre. This second interview will be scheduled at the parent’s convenience. The child does not attend this second interview.

PARTICIPANTS’ RIGHTS: It is possible that you may be reminded of some uncomfortable feelings during the interview tasks, or questionnaire completion. Thus, participation in this study is entirely voluntary. If for any reason you do not wish to continue participating once the study is underway, you will be free to drop out at any time without penalty. You will still be eligible to receive compensation as described above even if you drop out of the study or refuse to answer some of the questions. The paperwork, audiotaped, and videotaped responses for this project will be kept confidential and will be identified by an assigned numeric code. All materials will be stored in locked cabinets when not in use. Your names will never appear in any reports of this study. By law, an exception to such confidentiality is that researchers must report to authorities any
suspected cases of child abuse and neglect. You may ask questions about the procedure of the study at any time and your questions will be answered.

**FEEDBACK AND COMPENSATION:** Once the entire study has been completed, you may receive a copy of the general group study results if you wish. You will be asked to provide your mailing address on the consent form if you wish to receive a copy of these results. In addition, each parent who participates will be offered ten dollars after completing the study. To ensure financial organization during the research, your printed name and signature will be required to signify that you received the money. Although your individual responses will be kept confidential, if you chose to receive the ten dollars, the fact that you participated will be a matter of public record if the records are required for some accounting purpose.

**FURTHER INFORMATION:** This study has been reviewed by the University of Windsor Ethics Committee. Any further ethical concerns may be addressed to the Chairperson of the University of Windsor Ethics Committee (253-3000, ext. 3916). Any general questions or concerns can be directed to the principal researcher, J. Goodwin, or her supervisor, Dr. J. Hakim-Larson (253-3000, ext. 2241).

**TO PARTICIPATE:** If you wish to participate in this study, please circle yes below and return the bottom part of this information form to Jacqueline (Jackie) Goodwin. If you agree to participate, then you will be later contacted to set an appointment time. A mutually convenient time for the first research appointment will be selected during this initial phone contact.

Do you wish to be contacted to participate in this research (please circle one)?

**yes**

**no**

If yes, please list your name, phone number, and relationship to the child:

If yes, please list the name, age, date of birth, and sex of the child who meets the study requirements (child between 6 to 8 years of age):

Would your child’s other parent be interested in participating in the research as well?

**yes**

**no**

**uncertain – need to check**

If yes, please list their name and phone number:
APPENDIX E
Information Sheet – school system

RESEARCHER: Jacqueline Goodwin, M.Sc.

SUPERVISOR: Julie Hakim-Larson, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology, University of Windsor

PURPOSE: The purpose of this study is to gain a greater understanding of parents’ attitudes towards emotions in themselves and their children who are between the ages of six to eight years old. Results of this study will help researchers gain a better understanding of how emotion is expressed in families.

WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO: You and your child will be asked to come together to the Child Studies Centre in the Department of Psychology, Chrysler Hall South at the University of Windsor. No other family member is to attend the appointment. During this appointment, you and your child will be asked to remember and discuss as naturally as possible five past emotional events that you and the child shared together. This discussion will be audiotaped and videotaped. Following this, the parent will be asked to complete questionnaires which ask for the following: basic demographic information, personality information regarding your child, and information regarding emotional expression and beliefs in your family. While you are completing the questionnaires, your child will be accompanied to a nearby room where they will be asked questions about the emotions from the memories. As well, two short measures of your child’s language abilities will be taken. This entire appointment should take between two and two-and-a-half hours. One or two researchers will be working with you and your child during this appointment. A token of appreciation will be offered to families at the completion of their participation (i.e., ten dollars).

At the completion of this first appointment, you will be given the opportunity to decide if you would like to return at another time to participate in a parent interview with a research assistant (i.e., typically 60 to 75 minutes in length). During this interview, you will be asked a series of questions about the expression of emotions in your own life and in your child’s life. This interview will be audiotaped only and will also be conducted at the Child’s Study Centre. This second interview will be scheduled at the parent’s convenience. The child does not attend this second interview.

PARTICIPANTS’ RIGHTS: It is possible that you may be reminded of some uncomfortable feelings during the interview tasks, or questionnaire completion. Thus, participation in this study is entirely voluntary. If for any reason you do not wish to continue participating once the study is underway, you will be free to drop out at any time without penalty. You will still be eligible to receive compensation as described above even if you drop out of the study or refuse to answer some of the questions. The paperwork, audiotaped, and videotaped responses for this project will be kept confidential and will be identified by an assigned numeric code. All materials will be stored in locked cabinets when not in use. Your names will never appear in any reports of this study. By law, an exception to such confidentiality is that researchers must report to authorities any
suspected cases of child abuse and neglect. You may ask questions about the procedure of the study at any time and your questions will be answered.

FEEDBACK AND COMPENSATION: Once the entire study has been completed, you may receive a copy of the general group study results if you wish. You will be asked to provide your mailing address on the consent form if you wish to receive a copy of these results. In addition, each parent who participates will be offered ten dollars after completing the study. To ensure financial organization during the research, your printed name and signature will be required to signify that you received the money. Although your individual responses will be kept confidential, if you chose to receive the ten dollars, the fact that you participated will be a matter of public record if the records are required for some accounting purpose.

FURTHER INFORMATION: This study has been reviewed by the University of Windsor Ethics Committee and the ethics committee of your school board. Any further ethical concerns may be addressed to the Chairperson of the University of Windsor Ethics Committee (253-3000, ext. 3916). Any general questions or concerns can be directed to the principal researcher, J. Goodwin, or her supervisor, Dr. J. Hakim-Larson (253-3000, ext. 2241).

TO PARTICIPATE: If you wish to participate in this study, please circle yes and return the bottom part of this information form to your child’s teacher. If you agree to participate, Jacqueline (Jackie) Goodwin will contact you to set an appointment time. A mutually convenient time for the first research appointment will be selected during this initial phone contact.

Do you wish to be contacted to participate in this research (please circle one)?

yes  no

If yes, please list your name, phone number, and relationship to the child:

If yes, please list the name, age, date of birth, and sex of the child who meets the study requirements (child between 6 to 8 years of age):

Would your child’s other parent be interested in participating in the research as well?

yes  no  uncertain – need to check

If yes, please list their name and phone number:
APPENDIX F
Information Sheet - acquaintances

RESEARCHER: Jacqueline Goodwin, M.Sc.

SUPERVISOR: Julie Hakim-Larson, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology, University of Windsor

PURPOSE: The purpose of this study is to gain a greater understanding of parents’ attitudes towards emotions in themselves and their children who are between the ages of six to eight years old. Results of this study will help researchers gain a better understanding of how emotion is expressed in families.

WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO: You and your child will be asked to come together to the Child Studies Centre in the Department of Psychology, Chrysler Hall South at the University of Windsor. No other family member is to attend the appointment. During this appointment, you and your child will be asked to remember and discuss as naturally as possible five past emotional events that you and the child shared together. This discussion will be audiotaped and videotaped. Following this, the parent will be asked to complete questionnaires which ask for the following: basic demographic information, personality information regarding your child, and information regarding emotional expression and beliefs in your family. While you are completing the questionnaires, your child will be accompanied to a nearby room where they will be asked questions about the emotions from the memories. As well, two short measures of your child’s language abilities will be taken. This entire appointment should take between two and two-and-a-half hours. One or two researchers will be working with you and your child during this appointment. A token of appreciation will be offered to families at the completion of their participation (i.e., ten dollars).

At the completion of this first appointment, you will be given the opportunity to decide if you would like to return at another time to participate in a parent interview with a research assistant (i.e., typically 60 to 75 minutes in length). During this interview, you will be asked a series of questions about the expression of emotions in your own life and in your child’s life. This interview will be audiotaped only and will also be conducted at the Child’s Study Centre. This second interview will be scheduled at the parent’s convenience. The child does not attend this second interview.

PARTICIPANTS’ RIGHTS: It is possible that you may be reminded of some uncomfortable feelings during the interview tasks, or questionnaire completion. Thus, participation in this study is entirely voluntary. If for any reason you do not wish to continue participating once the study is underway, you will be free to drop out at any time without penalty. You will still be eligible to receive compensation as described above even if you drop out of the study or refuse to answer some of the questions. The paperwork, audiotaped, and videotaped responses for this project will be kept confidential and will be identified by an assigned numeric code. All materials will be stored in locked cabinets when not in use. Your names will never appear in any reports of this study. By law, an exception to such confidentiality is that researchers must report to authorities any
suspected cases of child abuse and neglect. You may ask questions about the procedure of the study at any time and your questions will be answered.

**FEEDBACK AND COMPENSATION:** Once the entire study has been completed, you may receive a copy of the general group study results if you wish. You will be asked to provide your mailing address on the consent form if you wish to receive a copy of these results. In addition, each parent who participates will be given ten dollars after completing the study. To ensure financial organization during the research, your printed name and signature will be required to signify that you received the money. Although your individual responses will be kept confidential, if you chose to receive the ten dollars, the fact that you participated will be a matter of public record if the records are required for some accounting purpose.

**FURTHER INFORMATION:** This study has been reviewed by the University of Windsor Ethics Committee. Any further ethical concerns may be addressed to the Chairperson of the University of Windsor Ethics Committee (253-3000, ext. 3916). Any general questions or concerns can be directed to the principal researcher, J. Goodwin, or her supervisor, Dr. J. Hakim-Larson (253-3000, ext. 2241).

**TO PARTICIPATE:** If you wish to participate in this study, either please inform your acquaintance who can then contact Jacqueline (Jackie) Goodwin or call Jackie directly at 734-7902 in order to schedule an appointment. A mutually convenient time for the research appointment will be selected during this initial phone contact.

Do you wish to be contacted to participate in this research (please circle one) ?

yes  no

If yes, please list your name, phone number, and relationship to the child:

If yes, please list the name, age, date of birth, and sex of the child who meets the study requirements (child between 6 to 8 years of age):

Would your child’s other parent be interested in participating in the research as well?

yes  no  uncertain – need to check

If yes, please list their name and phone number:
### APPENDIX G
Methods of Participant Recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment Method</th>
<th>Number/Percentage of Participants Recruited</th>
<th>Appendix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Windsor undergraduate psychology participant pool</td>
<td>26 (55.3)</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local parenting magazine</td>
<td>13 (27.7)</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted advertisements at the University and in the local community</td>
<td>7 (14.9)</td>
<td>Appendix A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment at University based children’s camp</td>
<td>1 (2.1)</td>
<td>Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School board recruitment</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowball sampling technique</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>Appendix D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment from an additional community family event</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>Appendix B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H
Consent Forms for Participation in Research

RESEARCHER: Jacqueline Goodwin, M.Sc.
SUPERVISOR: Julie Hakim-Larson, Ph.D.
         Department of Psychology, University of Windsor

PURPOSE: The purpose of this study is to gain a greater understanding of parents’ attitudes towards emotions in themselves and their children who are between the ages of six to eight years old. Results of this study will help researchers gain a better understanding of how emotion is expressed in families.

WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO: During this appointment, you and your child will be asked to remember and discuss as naturally as possible five past emotional events that you and the child shared together. This discussion will be audiotaped and videotaped. Following this, the parent will be asked to complete questionnaires which ask for the following: basic demographic information, personality information regarding your child, and information regarding emotional expression and beliefs in your family. While you are completing the questionnaires, your child will be accompanied to a nearby room where they will be asked questions about the emotions from the memories. As well, two short measures of your child’s language abilities will be taken. This entire appointment should take between two and two-and-a-half hours. One or two researchers will be working with you and your child during this appointment. A token of appreciation will be offered to families at the completion of their participation (i.e., ten dollars).

At the completion of this first appointment, you will be given the opportunity to decide if you would like to return at another time to participate in a parent interview with a research assistant (i.e., typically 60 to 75 minutes in length). During this interview, you will be asked a series of questions about the expression of emotions in your own life and in your child’s life. This interview will be audiotaped only and will also be conducted at the Child’s Study Centre. This second interview will be scheduled at the parent’s convenience. The child does not attend this second interview.

PARTICIPANTS’ RIGHTS: It is possible that you may be reminded of some uncomfortable feelings during the interview tasks, or questionnaire completion. Thus, participation in this study is entirely voluntary. If for any reason you do not wish to continue participating once the study is underway, you will be free to drop out at any time without penalty. You will still be eligible to receive compensation as described above even if you drop out of the study or refuse to answer some of the questions. The paperwork, audiotaped, and videotaped responses for this project will be kept confidential and will be identified by an assigned numeric code. All materials will be stored in locked cabinets when not in use. Your names will never appear in any reports of this study. By law, an exception to such confidentiality is that researchers must report to authorities any suspected cases of child abuse and neglect. You may ask questions about the procedure of the study at any time and your questions will be answered.
FEEDBACK AND COMPENSATION: Once the entire study has been completed, you may receive a copy of the general group study results if you wish. You will be asked to provide your mailing address on the consent form if you wish to receive a copy of these results. In addition, each parent who participates will be offered ten dollars after completing the study. To ensure financial organization during the research, your printed name and signature will be required to signify that you received the money. Although your individual responses will be kept confidential, if you chose to receive the ten dollars, the fact that you participated will be a matter of public record if the records are required for some accounting purpose. If you are a student enrolled in a psychology course at the University and your instructor has agreed, you can also receive three bonus points for your participation.

FURTHER INFORMATION: This study has been reviewed by the University of Windsor Ethics Committee. Any further ethical concerns may be addressed to the Chairperson of the University of Windsor Ethics Committee (253-3000, ext. 3916). Any general questions or concerns can be directed to the principal researcher, J. Goodwin, or her supervisor, Dr. J. Hakim-Larson (253-3000, ext. 2241). To indicate that you have understood and received a copy of this agreement, that you have had the opportunity to ask questions, and that you voluntarily consent to participate, please sign and date the bottom of this form.

I, ________________________________ (please print name) have read this consent form and have received a copy of the information form. I agree to participate in this study and give permission for my child ____________________________ (please print child’s name) to participate.

Signed ____________________________________________________________________

Date ____________________________________________________________________

If you wish to receive written feedback on the results of this study, please write your mailing address on the back of this consent form.
Assent Form for Child Participation in Research

I understand that I will be asked to talk with my parent about five times in the past when I felt a certain kind of feeling (for example, a time that I felt angry). My parent and I will sit and talk about each time for as long as we wish while a videotape recorder takes our picture. I understand that no one but Jackie Goodwin and her helpers will be allowed to see the tape at any time. I also know that I can ask to stop talking at any time that I wish. I also know that the reason Jackie is asking us to talk about what we remember is because she wants to understand how parents and children think about feelings. I also know that I can ask Jackie any questions that I may have at any time.

________________________________________
Name of Child

________________________________________
Age of Child

________________________________________
Date
APPENDIX I
Background Information Form

1. Your age: ____

2. Your sex: a) Male ____   Female: ____

3. What is your marital status? a) Married or living with partner ____
   b) Separated/divorced ____
   c) Widowed ____
   d) Never married ____

4. What is your race or ethnic background?
   a) Caucasian ____
   b) Black ____
   c) Hispanic ____
   d) Aboriginal ____
   e) Asian/Pacific ____
   f) Other (please specify) ____

5. What is the highest grade (or level of education) that you completed?
   a) Less than 8th grade ____
   b) 8th grade to 11th grade ____
   c) High school/GED ____
   d) Post high school (trade/technical school) ____
   e) One to three years of college or university ____
   f) Graduate/professional school ____
   g) Other (please specify) ____

6. Are you currently employed? a) yes ____  b) no ____

7. What is/was your occupation and job title? ________________________________

8. What is the highest grade (or level of education) that your spouse completed?
   a) Less than 8th grade ____
   b) 8th grade to 11th grade ____
   c) High school/GED ____
   d) Post high school (trade/technical school) ____
   e) One to three years of college or university ____
   f) Graduate/professional school ____
   g) Other (please specify) ____
9. Religious background (optional) _______________________

10. Is your spouse employed?  a) yes_____  b) no _____

11. What is/was your spouse’s occupation and job title? ________________________________

12. Which category best describes your total combined household income last year (from all adult sources living in your household?)

   a) Less than $20,000 _______
   b) $20,001 to 40,000 _______
   c) $40,001 to 60,000 _______
   d) $60,001 to 99,999 _______
   e) $100,000 or more _______

13. How many children do you have? _______

14. For each child, please list their age, sex, and relationship (i.e., biological, adoptive, step-child) to you as well as whether the child has any medical or psychiatric disorder(s) or delay(s) in development (e.g., speech or language, physical, intellectual, behavioral, etc.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Disorders/Delays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Have you attended any parenting classes or read any parenting books?

_____ yes  _____ no

16. Please list any parenting classes you have attended and the approximate date(s) of your attendance:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

17. Please list any parenting books you have read and the approximate date(s) you read the books:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

18. In a typical day, how much time do you have to discuss emotional issues with your child?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

19. What particular time or times of the day does this typically occur?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

20. Is there a particular setting or setting(s) where these discussions tend to occur?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX J
Project Coding Manual

DISSERTATION CODING MANUAL

The following data reduction and coding strategies include some aspects of coding systems utilized by the Emotion Competence Research Group led by Drs. Julie Hakim-Larson and Sylvia Voelker at the University of Windsor; Dr. Robyn Fivush and various colleagues (e.g., Buckner & Fivush, 2000; Fivush et al., 2000); Dr. Susanne Denham and various colleagues (PACT system; e.g., Denham et al., 1992); Dr. Susan Harter (Harter & Pike, 1984); and Dr. Rick Snyder (1993).

PART ONE

Rules for Narrative Boundary Setting and Segmentation

Step One: Marking Boundaries of Each Emotion Narrative

The first task is to mark the beginnings and end of all emotion narratives. With this action, we are defining what parts of the transcripts are to be included as codeable content in the ensuing coding steps. Boundaries for coding will be delineated with the use of bold black lines. It is helpful if the emotion narrative is read through once or twice before the marking of boundaries as it helps with the overall understanding of the flow of conversation.

The following are criteria to consider when undertaking this task:

(1) For a narrative to be considered codeable, the partners must engage in three or more conversational turns about an event. If a narrative contains less than three turns, mark it as “NOT CODEABLE” in capital letters at the top of the narrative. The following excerpt is an example of three turns:

M: Were you really sad?
C: Yeah, and so was Sally.
M: Sally too? Yeah, you’re right.

(2) In some transcripts, the parent makes explanatory comments on the nature of the reminiscing task, particularly common at the beginning and end of emotion narratives (e.g., what the experimenter wanted them to do – see beginning of love narrative on transcript of pilot family two noted below).

P: Now remember I told you we are going to talk about how mommies talk about feelings with their kids, right? So, Jackie gave me some things here. Some subjects to talk about. And I already chose which examples we’re going to use ahead of time.
Parents are really talking more about task socialization in such instances. Thus, as described by Fivush in her coding system (personal communication, January 26, 2007), we will not start coding until the parent makes a FIRST attempt to ELICIT AN EVENT OR EMOTION. For example, in the transcript noted above, the next set of communication was:

C: (making funny noises)
P: I want you to listen to me okay? The first one is about love.

Thus, given the above rule, we would begin coding at, “The first one…”

Note the emotion titles near the beginning of each individual emotion narrative (e.g., 1. Anger) do not necessarily indicate where the first segment of a narrative begins – carefully examine the last couple of lines and the beginning lines of each individual narrative to determine the appropriate boundaries. The titles were ONLY used for quick identification of the starting areas of each emotion narrative.

As the transcripts progress, some of the following types of comments will become apparent:

- disciplinary in nature (Parent says, “Please sit straight in your chair” or “Listen to me please”),
- specific instructions to the child about the task (Parent says, “You have to speak up so they can hear you on the tape”)
- comments about equipment or surroundings (Child says, “That’s a cool tape recorder” or “Why is there a hook on the back of that door?”)
- comments addressed to the experimenter (Parent says, “Is that enough, Jackie?” or “Are we doing this correctly?”)
- talking by the experimenter (particularly common at the beginning and ending of the task).

These types of comments SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED in the codeable narrative content.

When speakers clearly stop discussing the emotional event, start talking about a completely new story unrelated to the current emotion story, or engage in off-topic or fantasy talk, code the narrative as ending. If they clearly resume or pick back up the initial identified emotion story later in the transcript, then these lines can be marked as codeable. Included in these codeable sections will be narrative content wherein the parent may have included some broad based concluding comments pertinent to the codeable emotion story at the end of the narrative that may even have been located after noncodeable content (e.g., a second noncoded story).

Sometimes a parent may ask a child about their opinion regarding the appropriateness of the story as an example of a particular emotion. We WILL CODE this type of content
as the parent is asking their child to reflect further on emotional aspects of the story. As seen at the bottom of page three for pilot family two:

P: Is there anything else you want to talk about for the emotion of love?
C: Nope.
P: That’s it? Do you think it was a good example or a choice?
C: I don’t know. (laughs)
P: Can you think of a better one?
C: No.

However, if this discussion initiates a different story or off topic conversation, then we will NOT CODE that content.

(6) We will code all intelligible content even if a line contains a small amount of unintelligible content that does not significantly interfere with the understanding of the passage.

**Step Two: Segmentation of Propositions**

(1) Following the demarcation of the narrative boundaries, the next step is to identify the codeable individual narrative units throughout the transcripts. These units are referred to as propositions in the literature (Wang & Fivush, 2005).

A **proposition** will be defined as a subject-verb construction (e.g., from Fivush et al. (2000) – “You cried.” or “There was an owl in the tree.”). Also from Fivush et al. (2000) and Wang & Fivush (2005), each unique or implied verb in an independent clause forms a new propositional unit.

**Important definitions:**

An **independent clause** is defined as a group of words that contains a subject and verb and expresses a complete thought.

A **dependent clause** is a group of words that contains a subject and a verb but does not express a complete thought.

Please review and refer to the provided reference materials on grammatical definitions of independent clauses.

For example:

“*We ran and ran*” = one proposition

“*We ran and stopped*” = two propositions
Peterson & McCabe (1994) and Hamond & Fivush (1991) also noted that in coding a subject and predicate, the predicate may be implied rather than directly stated:

Some examples:
Q/ "What did you see at Disneyworld?"
A/ "I saw Mickey mouse" - explicit verb
or
A/ "Mickey Mouse" - implicit verb
Both above coded as one proposition.

Q/ "What did you see at Disneyworld?"
A/ "Mickey Mouse and Goofy" – implicit verb
Above coded as two propositions.

(2) Each proposition will be segmented by small brackets marked directly onto the transcript in black ink in the following fashion:

P: [Okay.] [Um H, Mommy, do you remember the day for the race that your shoelace open and you become the last person to run?] [That was sad, right?]
C: [Mmm hmm.]

(3) ALL TEXT IN THE TRANSCRIPTS WILL BE SEGMENTED. This includes those pieces of text that may have been marked as NOT CODEABLE for the purposes of this study as outlined in section (4) above. This thorough segmentation will allow the current segmentation work to be utilized in any future research which may include coding a larger amount of text than is coded in the current study.

(4) Based upon my experience with the pilot data, it may be more efficient to segment first all the parent’s communication (in blue ink) and then all the child’s communication (in red ink). It is helpful to code each person systematically and thoroughly before you move onto the next person as you get a better sense of their particular grammatical style which may make for more accurate segmentation.

(5) Following segmentation, each individual emotion transcript will have each segment numbered in black ink. Numbering will start anew at the beginning of each new emotion content, but will be numbered consecutively across both parent and child turns. The numbers will be placed above and towards the left side of each segment.

Note the emotion titles near the beginning of each individual emotion narrative (e.g., 1. Anger) do not necessarily indicate where the first segment of a narrative begins – carefully examine the last couple of lines and the beginning lines of each individual narrative to determine the appropriate segment.
(6) There are particular nuances in the way people actually converse that can cause issues for segmentation. The following are some examples with the associated coding rules:

- For some of our families in this project, English was a second language and sometimes their English usage was poor but the meaning was interpretable. If a section of communication is not proper English but can be interpreted clearly (e.g., you can tell what the person is saying), segment based upon the meaning. For example:

  FRAG  FRAG  22
  P: [Okay.] [Um.] [Let’s go now happiness]

Here the context of the lines around this communication, tells us that the parent is trying to actually say something like, “Let’s do the next emotion, happiness”. So, we will code accordingly.

- Count repetitions of clauses separately each time as it does indicate greater narrative production. Thus, both instances of “yes” produced by the parent below would be marked and counted as separate segments.

  C: After I was being nice, after and he was, both those boys weren’t.
  P: Yes?
  C: So I got my name off the list.
  P: Yes?

- If a person produces a “false start” (i.e., a false start is when someone begins to say something and then changes it) at the beginning of a communication and then corrects themselves with another independent clause, then we will code the independent clause as a separate clause from the false start clause. As noted in the transcribing rules (see additional handout), “false starts” are indicated by the presence of a comma after an obvious false start. For example:

  FRAG
  C: [ I didn’t tell you.] [I think you are talking about the one I just told you.]

- If the false start is comprised of an independent clause (i.e., subject, verb and a complete thought like the example above), then it will be segmented and numbered as a proposition. However, if the false start is a fragment (not a clause of any type) or a dependent clause with no clear thought, then it will be segmented and a code of “FRAG” (for fragment) will be marked above and to the left of the segment. The FRAG segment will not be counted in the proposition counts.

- If a false start appears to happen in the middle of a communication and doesn’t significantly change the meaning of the communication, and the words around it
still appear to form an independent clause, we will simply include the false start within the independent clause segment and count it as one proposition. See example below.

P: [Do you agree?]
C: [Yeah. ] [I think that, I want, she should find another toy.]

- If one person responds to the other, and then continues to say something else, count this as two segments. For example:

P: [Do you agree?]
C: [Yeah. ] [I think that she should find another toy.]

- If two people talk at the same time and one person’s speech is broken up on the transcript, then include the continued information as part of the same segment. In the sample below, lines one and three are counted as one segment. Thus, place the same number over both pieces of communication

P: [And I think...]
C: [Yeah?]
22
P: that they should go.]

- If two people simultaneously talk (indicated by underlining in these transcripts), the same rule applies as in the previous example if the speech is intelligible. Again, in the sample below, lines one and three are counted as one segment.

P: [And I think...]
C: [Yeah?]
22
P: that they should go.]

- If a section in a segment is unintelligible but can be interpreted by the surrounding words, continue to segment as usual. Unintelligible content is indicated by ???????

C: [Should she come with us?]
P: [Yes, (?????) come in the car.]

- However, if an unintelligible communication is not part of the sentences around it and therefore the content of it cannot be truly known, that unintelligible content will be segmented and marked above with a FRAG code as well. See example below:
FRAG

P: [The last number?] [Yeah.] [??????] [That’s great!]

• When considering nonverbal contents, all head nods or shakes by the child that can be inferred from the parent’s subsequent comments should be segmented and coded. For example:

P: [Is it important for me to say I love you] [or do you wanna know?] [Do you think it is important I say that every night?]
C: [(nods?)]
P: [Why?]
PART TWO

Coding for Parent-Child Narrative Descriptors, Emotion Words, Parental Elaboration/Repetitions, and Sociorelational Frames

As much as is possible during your coding work on this project, it is important that you stay away from in-depth reading on parental discussion of child emotion or “reminiscing about emotions” as it is theoretically possible that such reading could render you no longer “blind” during this coding process.

Based upon my experience working with the pilot data, it is suggested that all coding tasks discussed below be completed on an individual emotion narrative before moving onto the next emotion narrative. Thus, in a family transcript, one would code all narrative descriptors, emotion words, elaborations/repetitions, and sociorelational frames in the family’s first emotion (e.g., if Anger was the first emotion narrative) before moving onto the second emotion narrative (e.g., if Love was the second emotion narrative). The reason for this is that it is important for accurate coding that a coder stay embedded thoroughly in one story while making coding decisions.

Step One: Coding for Parent-Child Narrative Descriptors

The first task of this round of coding is to get an overall sense of the narrative content. As it is important to have a good sense of what the family members are communicating, it is helpful to read through the narrative at least twice before trying to undertake specific coding.

My title of “Parent-Child Narrative Descriptors” refers to global indicators of the nature of and agreement about emotion that occurs during discussions of past shared emotions between parents and children. We will be coding for several of these dynamics as outlined below.

IT WILL BE IMPORTANT FOR YOU TO READ THROUGH THE EMOTION CUE CARDS FOR EACH FAMILY EMOTION NARRATIVE JUST PRIOR TO CODING EACH EMOTION NARRATIVE AS IT WILL MORE CLEARLY HELP YOU TO RECOGNIZE THE FOLLOWING DESCRIPTORS IN THE STORIES.

(1) Potential for secondary or mixed emotions to arise in response to the specific emotional prompt during parent-child discussion (e.g., discussion of Anger arises in relation to shared story about Sadness).

During data collection, various parents ask about the possibility of mixed child emotion states in relation to their nominated events (stories about past shared experiences where their child experienced anger, sadness, love, hope, or happiness). I instructed parents to try to identify a story that from their perspective was as “pure” an example of one of the identified emotions as possible. However, I also additionally told parents that if the child
had a difference in perspective on the nature of the emotion, to just process that as they typically would at home.

**“MIXED” CODING DECISION** - If a mixed emotional state in the child is discussed in a narrative, a code of MIXED will be entered on the coding sheet in order to track this phenomenon. For example, if upon reading an Anger narrative, it becomes clear that the child acknowledges having more than one emotion in relation to the memory the parent has chosen (e.g., remembers also feeling Sadness), then that narrative will be given the MIXED code. The narrative will continue to be coded despite a mixed emotional state.

(2) Parent-child disagreement about the emotional attribution of the narrative.

Upon reading a narrative, if there is an obvious disagreement between the parent and child about (1) the child’s primary emotion or emotions within the shared emotional event (i.e., anger, sadness, happiness, hope, or love) or (2) about the reality that the child may have had a mixed state about that emotion, then the narrative is clearly a “nonshared” event meaning a shared consensus was not successfully reached about the understanding of that emotional event.

**“DISAGREE” CODING DECISION** - Narratives with no clear emotional consensus will be coded as DISAGREE on the coding sheet. Ultimately, these narratives will be dropped from analyses at this stage of the project. However, as there is a possibility that I may wish to further explore these narratives in future research, we will continue to code these narratives for emotion words in the following rounds of coding detailed below.

In this situation, you should scan to see if there happens to be a second story available under that the first (sometimes parents spontaneously discussed two stories) to code in place of the “nonshared” story. If there is a second story, please code it as well even if it has been originally marked as not codeable by the first team of coders. So, with regards to the coding to follow below, we would code both stories in the example above.

(3) Parent-child discussion about “nonshared” past emotion narratives.

It is possible that despite my best efforts to dissuade them, some parents may have identified experiences that they were not actively involved with, thus it was nonshared (e.g., child has fight at school, comes home, and tells parent that they are or were angry, but parent was not there to actually witness event).

This is an important distinction because there is evidence to suggest that conversation about nonshared events are very different than shared events, and it is important that I compare the same types of experience across all the dyads (R. Fivush, personal communication, June 27th, 2002; McCabe & Peterson, 1991).

**“NONSHARED” CODING DECISION** - If this nonshared emotion becomes obvious in the coding of an emotional narrative, then that particular narrative will be coded as NONSHARED on the coding sheet and will be dropped from the current analyses. As
suggested above, in this situation, you should scan to see if there happens to be a second story available under that the first (sometimes parents spontaneously discussed two stories) to code in place of the "nonshared" story. If there is a second story, please code it as well even if it has been originally marked as not codeable by the first team of coders. So, with regards to the further coding below, we would code both stories in the example above.

Step Two: Coding for Emotion Content in Parent-Child Narratives

Following completion of the coding entailed in step one, we will begin to look more specifically within the narratives for instances of codeable (1) discrete emotion words and (2) words describing the behavioral expressions of emotions. We will also be counting the number of unique emotion words used for each emotional state.

DISCRETE EMOTION WORDS AND BEHAVIORAL EXPRESSIONS OF EMOTIONS

This coding will involve examining both the child and parental communications for words which reflect the following emotional states and behavioral expressions. FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS SECTION, WE WILL BE CODING ANY OF THE CODES NOTED BELOW THAT MAY SHOW UP IN EITHER THE SEGMENTED PROPOSITIONS OR THE MARKED "FRAG" CLAUSES.

These emotions are divided into two categories: positive emotion words and negative emotion words. PLEASE REFER TO THE ENCLOSED "LIST OF EMOTION WORDS” FOR POTENTIAL WORDS FOR INCLUSION UNDER EACH EMOTION STATE BELOW:

NEGATIVE EMOTION WORDS

(1) Discrete negative emotion words

AN- Anger
SA- Sadness
FE- Fear
NEGOT - Other negative emotions (e.g., feel bad, upset, etc).

NLO - negation of love (like) (e.g., I don’t love her)
NHA - negation of happiness (e.g., I was not happy)
NSU - negation of surprise (e.g., I wasn’t surprised)
NHO - negation of hope (e.g., I don’t feel hope)
NPOSOT- negation of other positive emotions (e.g., It was not good)
(2) Behavioral expressions of negative emotions

NEGBEH: Negative behavior (e.g., scolding, screaming, swearing, hitting, biting, yelling, crying, etc.)
NPOSBEH: Negation of positive behavior (e.g., not laughing)

Additional coding rules for negative emotion words

• Some of the above codes will involve single words whereas others will involve multiple words grouped together. Thus, when you code a single word or a group of words, underline the word(s) so that it will be clear what word(s) are being considered for that code. PLEASE USE CAPITAL LETTERS FOR CODES. For example:

NPOSBEH
C: She was not laughing at what J. said to her.

AN
P: She was mad at what he said?

• Please record all code tallies for each narrative on the provided coding sheets following coding.

• CODE ALL separate occurrences of pertinent words or phrases even when a word is repeated continually. Such repetition is important for an accurate frequency count. For example,

NEGBEH NEGBEH SA
C: She cried and cried because she was so sad.

• Words describing judgments of performance (e.g., “bad throw”) will not be coded as emotion words.

• Words describing morality judgments of others (e.g., “bad” or “mean” or “nasty” girl) will not be coded as emotion words.

• References to “hunger or hungry” or similar biological processes will not be coded as emotion words.
POSITIVE EMOTION WORDS

(1) Discrete positive emotion words

LO - Love (like)
HA- Happiness
SU- Surprise
HO - Hope
POSOT- Other positive emotions (e.g., feel good, feel great etc).

NSA – negation of sadness (e.g., I was not sad)
NAN – negation of anger (e.g., I was not angry)
NFE - negation of fear (e.g., I don't feel afraid)
NNEGOT – Negation of other negative emotions (e.g., not crabby; not frustrated)

(2) Behavioral expressions of positive emotions

POSBEH: Positive behavior – e.g., hug, kiss, smile, etc.
NNEGBEH: Negation of negative behavior – e.g., not crying

Additional coding rules for positive emotion words

• References to “like or love” that refer to food or colours will not be coded as emotion words.

• References to “like or love” that is about thing or activity that they feel special about in the context of a relationship will be coded as emotion words. (e.g., I love your smile; I love playing with you.)

• References to “care” when it means “I care about you” will be coded as emotion words.

• The word “fun” will be coded under the emotion of Happiness.

• In all narratives, but particularly HOPE, terms related to “volition and desire” (e.g., wants, wishes, or needs) will be coded as due to their possible relatedness to the experience of “hope” or “hoping” in that particular narrative.

IMPORTANT - In all of the narratives, particularly in Hope, it may be possible that new emotion words will come forward that are not currently listed in the coding manual or sheets. These words should be coded under the appropriate emotion and recorded on the coding sheet as outlined in the section below. These words should be discussed between the coders until an agreement is reached about whether these words are to be included in all remaining coding.
NUMBER OF UNIQUE WORDS FOR EACH EMOTIONAL STATE

Parents use a wide variety of emotion words to explain or describe an emotion state. For example, talking about being "sad", "down", and "miserable" rather than simply "sad". In the current research, I am putting focus on emotion words which capture both the behavioral expressions of emotions (e.g., crying, bawling, wailing) in addition to more discrete emotion words (e.g., sad, mad, happy). Thus, we will count the numbers of examples of unique word(s) USED BY PARENTS ONLY under each discrete emotion category outlined above and each unique example of a behavioral expression. If an emotion code actually involves multiple words, then just count each unique set of emotion words as one example. For example:

**NPOSBEH**
P: She was not laughing at what J. said to her.

**AN**
P: She was mad at what he said?

Thus, "not laughing" would be recorded as one unique example of usage under the NPOSBEH code. The word "mad" would also be recorded as one unique example under the AN code. Please record the nature and frequency of each example under each coding category on the coding sheets.

It is possible that multiple usages of the same root word will be found where additional words or the addition of suffixes will suggest a level of intensity for that word (e.g., sad, sadder, saddest, more sad, the saddest ever, etc.). If the root word remains the same and there is no difference implied about the general feeling of the word (i.e., all of the sad variants above are still referring to the emotional experience of sadness), then just record the variants as an example of the root feeling (e.g., sadness).

**Step Three: Coding for Parental Elaboration**

The third step in this round of data coding is examining the data with regard to a measure of parental elaboration utilized previously by Fivush and her colleagues (Fivush & Vasudeva, 2002; Reese et al., 1993; Wang & Fivush, 2005). Thus, we are only going to be specifically coding for parents’ use of this strategy in this round of coding. However, successful coding of this variable will require careful examination of children’s verbal content in each of the emotion narratives as well. This coding involves looking at each proposition as opposed to focus on words as undertaken in step two above.

Elaborations express how much new information parents are bringing into their conversations with their children and how richly detailed the conversations are. In contrast, Repetitions capture the extent to which parents are simply asking the same questions over and over.
Coding definitions for the current study

- An **Elaboration** is defined as the provision of any new information. Thus, an elaboration is coded when parents’ propositions either:

(1) introduce an event for discussion,
For example: "Do you remember when we went to Florida?" or "Do you remember some of the places that we went swimming this summer?"

(2) move the conversation to a new aspect of the codeable event,
For example: “What did we do after you got a shot?”

(3) add information about a particular aspect of the codeable event.
For example:

C: I ate ice cream.

M: Ice cream. *It was an ice cream cake.* And what was on the ice cream cake?

The two underlined propositions above are coded as two elaborations. Regarding “Ice cream” above, a parent’s repetition of a child’s previous response is **not** considered an elaboration.

**Additional examples of propositions that will be coded as elaborations:**

a) Memory questions Any questions that asked the child to provide new information regarding the codeable event under discussion, including who, what, where, and when questions (e.g., What did we do after you got a shot at the basket?).

b) “Do you remember X?” questions
(e.g., Do you remember going to Myer’s Park?).

c) Yes–no questions
Questions that only required the child to confirm or deny new information provided by the parent (e.g., Did you swim in the lake?).

d) Memory statements
The parent’s utterances that provided new information regarding the memory event without calling for a response (e.g., Uncle Tang brought you a nice present.).

- A Repetition is when (1) the parent repeats the exact content or the gist of his or her own previous utterance (check the word lists if in doubt about the similarity of various emotion words)
For example:

M: Who was there?

C: I don't know. It was raining.

M: Do you remember who was there?

- or (2) the parent tries to elicit memory information from the child but provides no new information.

P: Do you remember anything about going horseback riding? What do you remember? Tell me about it?

C: I don't know.

Last two parental propositions would be coded as two repetitions.

The following are examples of propositions which WOULD NOT BE CODED as Elaborations or Repetitions:

1) **Evaluations.** The parent provides feedback to the child by confirming, negating, or questioning the child's previous statement (e.g., P: You're right, there's a lot of sand there; C: Um-hum.). A parent's repetition of a child's previous response is considered an evaluation. (e.g., C: Shamu was black and white; P: Black and white? Very good! The parent's response was coded as two evaluations, one a repetition of the child's correct response, and the other an affirmation/confirmation).

2) **Associative talk.** Parents' statements or questions not specifically about the particular past event under discussion, but related to the event. For instance, associative talk includes: (1) talk concerning another past event related to the event under discussion (e.g., "What other train have we gone on besides the one at the zoo?"); (2) facts about the world which arose in conjunction with the event in question; (3) talk concerning the event in question couched in fantasy rather than factual terms (e.g., when asking child about crabs at the beach, "Did any crabs play the guitar?"); (4) comments on a future occurrence of the particular event in question (e.g., "Do you want to go to the baseball game again?").

3) **Metamemory comments.** Parents remarked on the process of remembering or about their own or their children's memory performance (e.g., "I'd forgotten about that.").

4) **Off-topic talk.** Within a conversation about a past event, parents talk about topics which, in contrast to associative talk, were not related to the event being discussed.
“ELAB and REP” CODING DECISION Thus, each proposition uttered by the parent will need to be examined in the context of conversation with the child for the above criteria. When an elaboration is discovered, the proposition will be double underlined and coded underneath the line with the letters ELAB in capital letters. Similarly, when a repetition is discovered, the proposition will be double underlined and coded underneath the line with the letters REP in capital letters.

Elaboration example:

P: **What did we see at the aquarium?**

ELAB

C: Ummmm....

P: **Did we see those little penguins?**

ELAB

C: Yeah!

P: **Those little black and white penguins?**

ELAB

C: Yep. They were funny looking.

Repetition example:

P: **What did we see at the aquarium?**

ELAB

C: Ummmm....

P: **What did we see there?**

REP

C: I don’t know.

The number of parental repetitions and elaborations for each emotion narrative will be tallied and recorded on the coding sheet.

**Step Four: Coding the Emotions of Love and Hope for Sociorelational Frame**

I wish to explore the sociorelational frames that parents utilize when discussing the emotions of **Love and Hope** with their children. I will be utilizing a coding system taken
directly from Buckner and Fivush (2000) to operationalize these concepts. Thus, the following code definitions are taken directly from that study.

We will examine each proposition in each parent narrative of Love and Hope to determine whether it included the following information:

(1) References to the child (RCH) – Any instance where the child’s name is included in the parent’s talk about the past, or when the child is referred to as “you”, “your” or “you’re”. References to the child indicate the degree to which parents are highlighting the role of the child in his or her own experiences. Remember that in our transcripts, proper names have been shortened to one initial (e.g., J. for Jackie), so you will have to pay attention to the context to help understand who the initial is indicating. For example:

```
RCH RCH RCH
P: John (or J.), you went to the pool yesterday, didn’t you?
```

We would underline and code three references to child (“John”, “you”, and a second “you”).

2) References to parent (RPA) – Instances where the parents included him or her self as part of the event being remembered. This would include use of “I”, “me”, “mine” or calling the self “Mom/Mommy” or “Dad/Daddy”. For example,

```
RPA
P: Daddy was there too, eh?
```

We would underline and code one reference to parent.

3) References to others (ROT) – As another indicator of the social contexts of events, each reference made to another person, including proper names and relationship terms (mother, brother, friend) will be tabulated. For example:

```
RCH ROT RCH ROT ROT
P: Was your brother and your friend, Paul (P.), at the party?
```

Here, we would underline and code two references to child and three references to others.

4) Affiliation (PAF or NAF) – This thematic category captures both positive and negative statements about the state of relationships, thus it is more than just a simple reference to a person. This category reflects the kinds of social relationships that play a role in personal experiences.

Positive affiliation (PAF): Sentiments of good feeling towards another or the marking of relational beginnings (e.g., “We loved playing together in the snow”). Any explicit mention of “togetherness”, or concepts of aiding or helping (e.g., “We sat together at the table”, “I’m part of the Angels team”, “She helped me to it”). Again, we would underline and code these as PAF.
Negative affiliation (NAF): Talk reflecting a disturbance in unity, a dislike of another, or acts that do not promote cohesion in relationships such as ignoring someone (e.g., "He just didn’t like me", "We played a mean trick on her", "He hit me"). Again, we would underline and code these as NAF.

IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT THESE CODES MAY NOT BE MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE MEANING IT IS THEORETICALLY POSSIBLE THAT A PROPOSITION MAY RECEIVE TWO CODES AT ONCE.
PART THREE

Broader Thematic Analyses Of Hope And Love

Several of the codes below stem from the theoretical work of Harter (Harter & Pike, 1984) and Snyder (1993).

HOPE NARRATIVES

A) WHAT IS THE PRIMARY GOAL OF THE HOPEFUL EPISODE THAT THE PARENT AND CHILD DISCUSSED?

1) Cognitive and/or scholastic competence

Achieving a goal in relation to an intellectual task and/or related to school performance. For example, performance in puzzles, spelling, counting, improving grades, improving knowledge in school, etc. References specifically to possible future careers will be coded under “other”.

2) Physical and/or athletic competence

Achieving a goal in relation to a physical or athletic achievement, or with regards to making or building something. For example, performing well at running, hopping, playing outside games, making a team, winning a race, achieving a particular athletic standard in her/his sport, etc.

3) Extracurricular competence

Achieving a goal in relation to a nonathletic extracurricular activity. For example, meeting a certain standard in music, cadets, drama, etc.

4) Peer Acceptance

Achieving a goal in relation to connecting, being with, or relating positively in some way with peers. For example, stay overnight at a friend’s, making a new friend, getting asked to play with others, etc.

5) Maternal acceptance

Achieving a goal in relation to connecting, being with, or relating positively in some way with his/her mother. For example, hoping to do a particular activity with mom, hoping to go somewhere with mom, hoping for the mom to come back from somewhere, etc.
6) Paternal acceptance

Achieving a goal in relation to connecting, being with, or relating positively in some way with his/her father. For example, hoping to do a particular activity with dad, hoping to go somewhere with the dad, hoping for the dad to come back from somewhere, etc.

7) Family acceptance

Achieving a goal in relation to connecting, being with, or relating positively in some way with other family members. For example, sibling, aunt, cousin, step-family relations, family as a whole, etc. PLEASE STATE WHO THE FAMILY MEMBER(S) IS/ARE THAT HAVE BEEN INCLUDED UNDER THIS CODE.

8) Teacher acceptance

Achieving a goal in relation to connecting, being with, or relating positively in some way with his/her teacher. For example, hoping to please a teacher via some activity, hoping to be well liked by a teacher, etc.

9) Conduct/behavior

Achieving a goal in relation to her/his own behavior or conduct. For example, not losing their temper, being more patient or kind with others, etc.

10) Appearance

Achieving a goal in relation to her or his appearance. For example, wanting to improve their appearance somehow, buy clothes to improve their appearance, etc.

11) Obtainment of a valued possession

Achieving a goal in relation to obtaining a valued possession. For example, wanting or wishing to obtain a valued possession such as a toy, gift, money, pet, etc.

12) Other PLEASE DESCRIBE

B) IN THE STORY, DOES THE PARENT DISCUSS OR ACKNOWLEDGE ANY PARTICULAR STRATEGY OR STRATEGIES TO ENCOURAGE OR SUPPORT HOPE IN THE CHILD? (CAN SCORE MORE THAN ONE STRATEGY)

* In these stories, the strategies below may have been discussed as past strategies that were utilized or used during the past event or they may be in the form of suggestions for the future that the parent discussed.
Potential strategies to consider:

1) Clarifying or discussing further the nature of the child’s goal (e.g., asking questions about the goal, asking the child to tell them more about the goal).

2) Reminding the child about any aspect of a possible past success the child achieved in relation to their current goal or some other goal.

3) Telling or providing the child with stories (e.g., movies, storybooks, family stories) of other children or adults pursuing similar goals.

4) Encouraging the child to imagine him or herself in a particular situation and being successful at pursuing or attaining some part of the goal (i.e., use of imagery).

5) Any type of parental teaching related to how to intellectually attack, work towards, or achieve goals. Examples of such strategies include teaching the child to attack or problem solve a situation; teaching or discussing ways to break the larger goal down into smaller “doable chunks”; providing treats or rewards for good work towards a goal; encouraging child to step back and “re-goal” (i.e., temporarily or permanently disengage from a problematic goal and re-think or commit to another goal or subgoal, etc.)

6) Fostering humour about the self and/or one’s circumstances.

7) No strategy discussed

8) Other strategy discussed (PLEASE DESCRIBE OTHER STRATEGY)

LOVE NARRATIVES

A) WITH WHOM IS THE CHILD ENGAGED IN A LOVING MOMENT WITHIN THE STORY?

1) Mother
2) Father
3) Sibling
4) Other family member – one person (e.g., step-family, grandparent, aunt, cousin, etc.) (PLEASE STATE WHO IS INVOLVED)
5) Multiple family members at once (PLEASE STATE WHO ARE INVOLVED)
6) Peer or peers
7) Romantic love
8) Pet(s)
9) Combination of family and pet (PLEASE STATE WHO IS INVOLVED)
10) Teacher
11) Others (PLEASE DESCRIBE)
B) ARE AMBIVALENT FEELINGS ABOUT THE OBJECT OF THEIR AFFECTIONS ACKNOWLEDGED IN THE LOVE NARRATIVE?

“Ambivalent” here refers to simultaneous, contradictory attitudes or feelings towards a person or thing. Typically refers to the combination of a positive (e.g., love) and negative emotions (anger, hurt, jealousy, etc.).

For example, during the love story, a child may explain he/she loves their sibling but also acknowledges anger towards the sibling or a child states he/she loves the mom, but also make reference to a discipline episode where they were angry with the parent.

1) yes
2) no

C) IN WHAT WAYS WERE THE SHARED AFFECTIONS IN THIS STORY PRIMARILY EXPRESSED? (CAN SCORE MORE THAN ONE STRATEGY)

1) Having fun during a shared active activity (e.g., playing together, going somewhere together, sharing an activity)

2) Having a conversation or discussion where they shared positive emotions

3) Hugging, kissing, or cuddling (i.e., some form of physical affection)

4) Doing “something” for someone else to make them feel good (e.g., making or giving someone a gift, allowing someone to do an activity they wished to do)

5) Other (PLEASE DESCRIBE)
APPENDIX K
Parent Emotion Likert Scales

Emotional experience (circle): love hope happiness anger sadness

1. How would you describe your child’s level of emotional intensity (i.e., how strongly they felt that particular emotion) when they originally experienced this episode?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>a little</td>
<td>somewhat intense</td>
<td>quite a bit</td>
<td>a lot of intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intense</td>
<td>intense</td>
<td></td>
<td>of intensity</td>
<td>intensity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Approximately how long did your child’s expression of this emotion last during or after the original episode?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>briefly-a few seconds</td>
<td>more than a few minutes, but not all day</td>
<td>more than an hour but not all day</td>
<td>more than one day but less than a week</td>
<td>a week or longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How long ago did the original episode occur?

4. How many total number of times have you talked about and/or looked at pictures and videos of the original event?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never</td>
<td>infrequently</td>
<td>somewhat frequently</td>
<td>very frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1-3 times)</td>
<td>(4-9 times)</td>
<td>(10 or more times)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L
Likert Scale Teaching Script for Child

Sometimes adults like to know how a young person like yourself feels about important things that have happened. We can find out how other people feel in two ways – we can ask them and they can show us.....

For example, if another person asked me how happy I was the first day I went to school, I could say "quite a bit happy" and I could show them with these circles. You see each circle means a different answer. This tiny circle means I was not at all happy, the next bigger one means a little happy, the next bigger one means somewhat happy (in the middle happy), the next bigger one means quite a bit happy, and the biggest one means a lot or very happy. So, because I was quite a bit happy, I would point to this circle.

Now, if someone asked me how angry I was the day my sister broke my bicycle, I could say "a little angry" and I could show them with these circles. This tiny circle means I was not at all angry, the next bigger one means a little angry, the next bigger one means somewhat angry (in the middle angry), the next bigger one means quite a bit angry, and the biggest one means a lot or very angry. So, because I was a little bit angry because I liked my bike, but I knew my sister didn’t mean to hurt my bike – it was an accident, I would point to this circle.

Now, if a friend of yours broke your favorite toy, how would you feel? How much (insert feeling) would you feel? Would you feel not at all (insert feeling), a little (insert feeling), somewhat in the middle (insert feeling), quite a bit (insert feeling), or a lot or very (insert feeling)? Can you point out how much you felt? (Ensure child understands procedure)

Now, remember the story that you and your mom/dad just talked about – the time that you felt (love, hope, happiness, anger, and sadness). I want to know how much (love, hope, happiness, anger, and sadness) you felt when (describe event briefly). Did you feel not at all (insert feeling), a little (insert feeling), somewhat in the middle (insert feeling), quite a bit (insert feeling), or a lot or very (insert feeling)? Can you point how much you felt? Repeat for the five emotional experiences:

Story One:
Feeling: __________ Rating: __________________

Story Two:
Feeling: __________ Rating: __________________

Story Three:
Feeling: __________ Rating: __________________

Story Four:
Feeling: __________ Rating: __________________

Story Five:
Feeling: __________ Rating: __________________
APPENDIX M
Parent-Child Reminiscing About Emotions: Debriefing Information

Researchers: Jacqueline Goodwin, M.Sc.
Research Supervisor: Julie Hakim-Larson, Ph.D.
University of Windsor
Department of Psychology
(519) 253-3000, Ext. 2241

The study you have just completed concerns how children learn about emotions from their parents. First, we were interested in how parents and child talk about past shared experiences when children felt various types of emotions. Second, we were also interested in exploring how parents and children discuss past experienced negative emotions (i.e., anger and sadness) versus positive emotions (i.e., hope, love, and happiness). Our final purpose of this study was to examine the relations between parenting emotion style (based upon the questionnaires and interview) and parents and children’s approaches to talking about past shared emotional events. Although researchers now believe that children learn about emotions and how to control and express them in many everyday activities such as talking about past experiences, specifically what children are learning and how this is related to parenting behaviors is still not completely understood. Thank you very much for your participation and your help in advancing our understanding!

If you would like to learn more about emotions and parenting, you might enjoy the book “The Heart of Parenting: Raising an Emotionally Intelligent Child” by John Gottman, Ph.D., published by Simon & Schuster in 1997.

If you feel that you may need psychological services to help in coping with your role as a parent, some community resources are provided below.

Psychological Services Centre
(University of Windsor students only)
519-973-7012

Regional Children’s Centre
Western Campus
Windsor Regional Hospital
1453 Prince Road
Windsor, Ontario N9C 3Z4
519-257-5211

Children’s Achievement Centre
1015 Highland Avenue
Windsor, Ontario N9A 1R6
519-252-3473
Study name: Parent-Child Reminiscing About Emotions
Researcher: Jacqueline Goodwin, M.Sc.
Research Supervisor: Julie Hakim-Larson, Ph.D.

I have participated in the study on children’s emotions and received $10.00 in cash as compensation.

Date: _________________

Signed: __________________________________________
### APPENDIX O
Regression Analyses for Hypothesis IIa, IIb, III

Summary of Regression Analyses for Hypothesis IIa Prediction of Total Child Emotion Words in Anger, Sadness, Happiness, Hope, and Love Narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Child gender/PPVT</th>
<th>PACES/SEFQ Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step one</td>
<td>Step two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. All frequencies of total child emotion words within each narrative above were log($X_i + 1$) transformed due to skewness prior to the completion of the regression analyses. PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – III; PACES = Parent Attitude Toward Children’s Expressiveness Scale; SEFQ = Self Expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire.*
Summary of Regression Analyses for Prediction of Hypothesis IIIb Total Maternal Emotion Words in Anger, Sadness, Happiness, Hope, and Love Narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Child gender/EVT</th>
<th>PACES/SEFQ Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Step one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. With the exception of the sadness narrative, all frequencies of total maternal emotion words within each narrative above were log(Xi + 1) transformed due to skewness prior to the completion of the regression analyses. EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test; PACES = Parent Attitude Toward Children's Expressiveness Scale; SEFQ = Self Expressiveness in the Family Questionnaire.
Summary of Regression Analyses for Prediction of Hypothesis III Family Conversation Length in Anger, Sadness, Happiness, Hope, and Love Narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Child gender/EVT</th>
<th>ERPSST/CBQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All frequencies of family conversation length within each narrative above were log$(X_i + 1)$ transformed due to skewness prior to the completion of the regression analyses. EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test; ERPSST = Emotion-Related Parenting Styles Self-Test; CBQ = Children's Behavior Questionnaire.
Summary of Regression Analyses for Prediction of Hypothesis III Maternal Elaborations in Anger, Sadness, Happiness, Hope, and Love Narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Child gender/EVT</th>
<th>ERPSST/CBQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All frequencies of maternal elaborations within each narrative above were log($X_i + 1$) transformed due to skewness prior to the completion of the regression analyses. EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test; ERPSST = Emotion-Related Parenting Styles Self-Test; CBQ = Children’s Behavior Questionnaire.
Summary of Regression Analyses for Prediction of Hypothesis III Total Maternal Emotion Words in Anger, Sadness, Happiness, Hope, and Love Narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Child gender/EVT</th>
<th>ERPSST/CBQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step one</td>
<td>Step two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* With the exception of sadness, all frequencies of total maternal emotion words within each narrative above were log$(X_i + 1)$ transformed due to skewness prior to the completion of the regression analyses.

EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test; ERPSST = Emotion-Related Parenting Styles Self-Test; CBQ = Children's Behavior Questionnaire.
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