Title	The Effect of Maternal Emotion Socialization on Children's Social Competence
All Authors	Yu Yu Khaing
Publication Type	Local Publication
Publisher (Journal name, issue no., page no etc.)	Myanmar Academy of Arts and Science 2014 Calender Year Award Winning, Doctoral Dissertation, Research Reports, pg-53-90.
Abstract	The goals of the present study were: 1) to describe and provide initial support for the validity of the Future Scenarios Questionnaire (FSQ) based on a translation of the Lundell's (2008) original instrument, a new self-report questionnaire designed to measure parental responding to anticipated children's negative emotions; and 2) to examine how maternal responses on the FSQ related to young children's aggressive, asocial, and prosocial behaviors with peers. Further, this study examined whether the temperamental trait of negative affect moderated the relation between maternal responses on the FSQ and children's social adjustment outcomes. Participants were 107 mothers of preschool-age children. They were requested to provide ratings on the FSQ and child temperament ratings on the Child Behavior Questionnaire. They also completed a range of measures which were designed to assess the construct validity of the FSQ. These included measures of attachment representations, maternal mind-mindedness, perceived control, and alexithymia. Thirty-two teachers provided ratings on the Child Behavior Scale for children's aggressive, asocial, and prosocial behaviors in the peer context. Factor analysis of the FSQ revealed two subscales: Encourage Emotion Expression (EEE) and Discourage Emotion Expression (DEE). Patterns of correlations among these subscales and the criterion mother measures mentioned above suggested that the FSQ demonstrates some construct validity. Further, the results of the moderation analyses showed that maternal response to the FSQ interacts with negative affect in the prediction of child behaviors, but not in the hypothesized ways. In particular, discouraging emotion expression significantly predicted less asocial behavior and more prosocial behavior (approached significance), but only for children rated high in negative affect. None of these relations was significant for children rated low in negative affect. The theoretical and practical implications of these findings are discussed in terms of the importance of child temperament in emotion socialization processes.
Keywords	Emotion socialization, Social competence
Citation	
Issue Date	2016

The Effect of Maternal Emotion Socialization on Children's Social Competence

Yu Yu Khaing*

Abstract

The goals of the present study were: 1) to describe and provide initial support for the validity of the Future Scenarios Questionnaire (FSQ) based on a translation of the Lundell's (2008) original instrument, a new self-report questionnaire designed to measure parental responding to anticipated children's negative emotions; and 2) to examine how maternal responses on the FSQ related to young children's aggressive, asocial, and prosocial behaviors with peers. Further, this study examined whether the temperamental trait of negative affect moderated the relation between maternal responses on the FSQ and children's social adjustment outcomes. Participants were 107 mothers of preschool-age children. They were requested to provide ratings on the FSQ and child temperament ratings on the Child Behavior Questionnaire. They also completed a range of measures which were designed to assess the construct validity of the FSQ. These included measures of attachment representations, maternal mind-mindedness, perceived control, and alexithymia. Thirty-two teachers provided ratings on the Child Behavior Scale for children's aggressive, asocial, and prosocial behaviors in the peer context.

Factor analysis of the FSQ revealed two subscales: Encourage Emotion Expression (EEE) and Discourage Emotion Expression (DEE). Patterns of correlations among these subscales and the criterion mother measures mentioned above suggested that the FSQ demonstrates some construct validity. Further, the results of the moderation analyses showed that maternal response to the FSQ interacts with negative affect in the prediction of child behaviors, but not in the hypothesized ways. In particular, discouraging emotion expression significantly predicted less asocial behavior and more prosocial behavior (approached significance), but only for children rated high in negative affect. None of these relations was significant for children rated low in negative affect. The theoretical and practical implications of these findings are discussed in terms of the importance of child temperament in emotion socialization processes.

Keywords: emotion socialization, social competence

Introduction

One of the most important and challenging socialization tasks is the socialization of emotion. How a child comes to understand his or her own emotional life as well as that of others, in addition to how he or she expresses and regulates emotions, has significant implications for both personality organization and patterns of interrelating (Hubbard & Coie, 1994). Emotion socialization involves the processes by which parents (or other socialization agents) impart to children socially and culturally acceptable ways of expressing emotion, as well as effective ways of responding in situations when they, or others, are emotionally aroused. For a child to respond

*Assistant Lecturer, Dr., Department of Psychology, University of Distance Education, Mandalay

optimally to emotionally-charged events, he or she requires an understanding of emotion as well as ability to regulate and cope with his or her own heightened affect.

It is widely accepted that parents play a primary role in emotion socialization (Chaplin, Cole, & Zahn-Waxler, 2005; Eisenberg, Cumberland, & Spinrad, 1998; Morris, Silk, Steinberg, Myers, & Robinson, 2007). So while acknowledging the impact of siblings, peers, and teachers among others, it is the parental socialization of emotion that is the focus of this research. And although it is recognized that both mothers and fathers are important socializers in related and distinct ways, we focused on maternal socialization of emotion.

As with other socialization outcomes, there are often pronounced individual differences in what mothers deem desirable or appropriate with respect to children's emotional displays and responses. That is, mothers have different ideas and feelings, both explicit and implicit, about children's emotional lives, likely resulting from their own socialization experiences and attachment histories. Not all of these ideas translate into socialization strategies that are adaptive with respect to children's social and emotional outcomes. Further, children themselves influence their own socialization in various ways. A significant and ongoing challenge for developmental researchers is to identify those socialization variables, be they from the mother, the child, or their interaction, that help produce emotionally and socially competent children. The current study was designed to contribute to this research objective.

In particular, we examined one empirically neglected emotion socialization mechanism, that is, the ways in which mothers anticipate and verbally address future-oriented emotional events with their children, and how these ways might be related to children's social adjustment. We focused on emotion socialization in the preschool years because this is a time when emotionally-laden events are quite frequent, and because, during this time, parents are usually the foremost socializers of their children's emotional lives (Denham, 1998). Further, the emergent representational capacities of children during this developmental stage permit greater opportunities for socialization of emotion via language and dialogue (Oppenheim & Waters, 1995; Thompson, Laible, & Ontai, 2003).

Emotion Socialization

In discussing, emotion socialization, it is important to define what it is that is being socialized. One primary outcome of emotion socialization is emotion

competence, typically defined as the interrelated components of: 1) emotional experience and expressiveness, 2) the understanding of emotions and emotion-eliciting events, and 3) emotion regulation abilities (Denham, 1998; Denham, Basset, & Wyatt, 2007; Eisenberg, et al., 1998).

Denham (1998) and others (e.g. Eisenberg, et al., 1998; Halberstadt, 1991) identify and describe three main mechanisms of emotion socialization, derived from social learning theory: 1) parents' own emotional expressions (i.e. modeling of emotions), 2) parents' reactions to their children's emotions (i.e. contingency), and 3) the explicit teaching or coaching children about emotions through discourse.

Social Competence

In addition to children's emotion competence, another related and important outcome of emotion socialization is social competence. Eisenberg et al. (1998) and Morris et al. (2007) concluded that there is strong empirical evidence demonstrating a positive relation between parental emotion socialization and children's outcomes in the domain of emotional experience and expression, which in turn, underlie children's socio-emotional competence. Indeed, there is an impressive empirical literature revealing that emotionally competent children are more socially competent (see for e.g. Denham, 1986; Denham, Renwick, & Holt, 1991; Eisenberg & Fabes, 2006; Spinrad, et al., 2006). It is generally accepted that the ability to express, make sense of, and cope with emotional experiences is intrinsic to adaptive and harmonious relationships with others.

There is a great deal of evidence that cumulatively suggests that parents who respond to children's negative emotions in supportive ways (for e.g., with acceptance, tolerance, and encouragement) contribute positively to the development of children's social (as well as emotional) competence. And conversely, there is evidence to suggest that parents who respond to children's negative emotions in non-supportive ways (for e.g., with dismissing, minimizing, or punitive reactions) contribute to the development of emotional and behavioral problems in their children.

Thus, in the current study, we looked at the ways in which reported responding to children's expressions of emotions pertaining to future-oriented stressful experiences and the relation of this responding to their children's social competence, as assessed by prosocial behavior, social withdrawal, and aggression.

The Role of Child Temperament in Emotion Socialization

It is not only parents who contribute to children's outcomes, it is well accepted that children themselves, by virtue of their developmental status, their sex, and their personalities, also contribute to some degree to their own socialization (Collins, Maccoby, Steinberg, Hetherington, & Bornstein, 2000). In the present study, the role of child temperament was considered a potentially influential factor in the socialization process. Child temperament, specifically negative emotionality or affect, has been considered as a moderating factor.

In general, high negative affect and poor regulation have been associated with both externalizing and internalizing difficulties in children. Conversely, low levels of negative affect and high regulation have been associated with social competencies such prosocial behavior and peer popularity (Eisenberg & Fabes, 2006).

The Future Scenarios Questionnaire (FSQ)

There are few measures available to measure emotion socialization in Myanmar and even fewer, if any, to measure future-oriented emotion socialization. To date, there is little instrument available that looks at the strategies or behaviors parents employ in response to children's negative emotions (such as anger, fear, or sadness) that they anticipate will be felt or experienced by their children in the near future. Given this, a primary purpose of this study was to develop and to explore validation of a self-report instrument, the Future Scenarios Questionnaire (FSQ).

The FSQ attempts to capture several different approaches in a self-report format, which theoretically fall under two broad categories: strategies that encourage children's expressions of emotion, and strategies that inhibit or restrict children's expressions of emotion.

Validation of the Future Scenarios Questionnaire

In mother-child conversations about the past, maternal styles of reminiscing do not appear to be situation-specific but rather, seem to reflect a consistent attribute of the mother (Reese & Fivush, 1993). Additionally, Kuersten-Hogan and McHale (2000) found a striking level of stability in mothers' use of emotion talk as children progress from the toddler years to the preschool years.

Consistent with these ideas, we predicted there would be other, more stable, maternal characteristics or traits that would relate in meaningful ways to mothers'

response styles on the FSQ. In other words, the extent to which children's emotional expressions are encouraged or discouraged is likely to some extent indicative of more generalized maternal mindsets or internal schemas around emotions and relationships. Examples of some of these mindsets include maternal attachment representations, maternal mind-mindedness, and maternal perceptions of control in relationships. In the present study, each of these was assessed. In addition, a measure of maternal alexithymia, a personality construct, was included in order to assess mothers' potential deficits in the ability to describe, process, and regulate emotions. The Coping with Children's Negative Emotions Scale (CCNES) was also included in the battery of validation measures in order to ascertain the overlap in responding between these two related emotional socialization measures.

The purpose of the present study was twofold. Its primary purpose was to examine the effect of maternal emotion socialization on children's social competence. Second, it was intended to develop a self-report measure of emotion socialization, the FSQ, which assesses how mothers respond to their anticipated children's negative emotions. This measure was validated with additional maternal self-report questionnaires and interviews. Child outcomes were measured with teacher reports of children's social behaviors with their peers. Child temperament was measured by mother report. On the basis of the available literature, the hypotheses of this study were formulated as follows:

H1: Mothers who encourage the expression of their anticipated children's negative emotions would have children who would be rated as less aggressive, less asocial, and more prosocial with peers. Similarly, mothers who discourage the expression of their children's emotions would have children who would be rated as more aggressive, more asocial, and less prosocial with peers.

H2: The relation between the FSQ and children's adjustment would be moderated by children's negative affect. In other words, it was predicted that the hypothesized relations described above would be stronger for children (or significant) rated high in negative affect than for those children rated low in negative affect.

H3: Maternal styles of responding on the FSQ would be significantly correlated with maternal responses on the CCNES, such that mothers with higher scores on the supportive scales of the CCNES would be more likely to encourage the expression of their children's emotions and mothers with higher scores on the

non-supportive scales of the CCNES would be more likely to discourage the expression of their children's emotions.

H4: Maternal styles of responding on the FSQ would be significantly correlated with maternal attachment representations, such that more "secure" mothers would be more likely to encourage the expression of their children's emotions and less "secure" mothers would be more likely to discourage the expression of their children's emotions.

H5: Maternal styles of responding on the FSQ would be correlated with maternal mind-mindedness, such that mothers with higher mind-mindedness scores would be more likely to encourage the expression of their children's emotions and mothers with lower mind-mindedness would be more likely to discourage the expression of their children's emotions.

H6: Maternal styles of responding on the FSQ would be significantly correlated with maternal perceptions of control, such that "high control" mothers would be more likely to encourage the expression of their children's emotions and "low-control" mothers would be more likely to discourage the expression of their children's emotions.

H7: Maternal styles of responding on the FSQ would be significantly correlated with maternal alexithymia, such that mothers with lower levels of alexithymia would be more likely to encourage the expression of their children's emotions and mothers with higher levels of alexithymia would be more likely to discourage the expression of their children's emotions.

Method

Participants

A group of 107 mothers of preschool-age children (57 boys and 50 girls) participated in this research studying in Shwebo Preschool, Meikthilar Preschool and No. 1 Preschool (Mandalay), No. 2 Preschool (Mandalay), Daywin Preschool (Mandalay) and Pyikyeekyattaye Preschool (Mandalay). In addition, child outcomes were determined from teacher (32 teachers) report of children's social behavior with their peers. Ninety-four mothers (91%) reported being married or living in a common-law relationship, and 9 mothers (9%) reported being either divorced, or separated. Fifty-eight mothers (55%) reported having one child, 36 mothers (34%) reported having two children, and 12 mothers (11%) reported having more than two children.

Overall, mothers were well-educated, with a majority of mothers (62%) having completed college/university, and an additional 38% reported having high or middle or primary education. Thirty-one mothers (30%) reported working full-time, twenty-five mothers (24%) reported working part-time and forty-eight mothers (46%) reported do not work. Eighty-three mothers (79%) reported caring herself, one mother (0.95%) reported caring her husband, nineteen mothers (18%) reported caring relatives, parent or sibling and two mothers (1.90%) reported caring caregiver.

Procedures

Recruitment and Mother Package. Potential participants (mothers) were contacted and were given a brief explanation about the study. Upon agreeing to participate, arrangements were made to send a questionnaire package home or school (depending on the mother's preference) that was to be completed by mothers and returned to the researcher. A date for the interview was also scheduled at that time. This package included (i) Children's Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ), (ii) Toronto Alexithymia Scale (TAS-20), (iii) Coping with Children's Negative Emotion Scale (CCNES), and (iv) Parent Attribution Test (PAT) as well as detailed instructions for completing questionnaires.

Interview. There were five interviewers. All of whom were thoroughly trained by the researcher. Mothers were administered the Secure Base Scripts (SBS) task and the Maternal Mind-Mindedness Interview (MMM), both of which were audio-recorded. Finally, mothers were asked to complete an additional questionnaire package, which included the Future Scenarios Questionnaire (FSQ). Following this, mothers were asked for their agreement to have researchers contact their child's teacher for additional information about their child's behavior with peers and a copy of the teacher questionnaire was shown to them.

Mothers were also asked for their permission to be contacted in the future in the event of a follow-up study and were asked if they wished the results of the study to be communicated to them upon completion. At the end of the study, mothers were debriefed and were given the opportunity to ask any questions they might have about the study. They were also given gift baskets (worth Myanmar kyats 850) as a token of appreciation.

Teacher package. Shortly after the interview, questionnaire packages were sent to the teachers of the children whose mothers had given permission to do so.

This package included the Child Behavior Scale (CBS) and instructions for completing the questionnaire.

Measures

Future Scenarios Questionnaire (FSQ). The Future Scenarios Questionnaire (FSQ) is a self-report questionnaire that was developed by Lundell (2008). It includes nine future-oriented scenarios in which mothers anticipate that their children will experience a negative emotion. Mothers were asked to read each of the scenarios and indicate the likelihood from 1 (not at all likely) to 7 (very likely) that they would say or do each of ten listed suggestions in order to help their child deal with or emotionally prepare for the situation. The listed suggestions included the following: (1) Acceptance: conveying acceptance, understanding, and tolerance of the child's negative emotion (e.g. "tell him/her that it can be really hard when a good friend moves away and he/she might feel sad"); (2) Mastery: invoking child's feelings of mastery or control over the situation by suggesting different ways of handling the situation (e.g. "role play with a toy Doctor's Kit about what will happen and what he/she can expect at the doctor's office"); (3) Abstraction: using creative, abstract ways of talking about the situation or emotion (e.g. drawing a picture of reading a storybook about a similar event); (4) Encourage Expression: encouraging the child to explicitly talk about his or her negative feelings (e.g. "encourage him/her to talk about what he/she feels when he/she thinks about friend moving away"); (5) Shaming: responding in a way that shames, judges, or ridicules the child (e.g. "tell him/her not to act like a baby by crying at the doctor's office") (6) Minimizing: responding in a way that minimizes, dismisses, or downplays the emotion (e.g. "tell him/her that it won't be a big deal"; "tell him/her that there's no reason to be scared and not to overreact"); (7) Distortion: denying or distorting the emotional experience of the child (e.g. "tell him/her that he/she won't be that scared" or "tell him/her that the shot won't hurt"); (8) Contingencies: taking away something from the child or "bribing" the child to conform to maternal expectation of how the child should feel (e.g. "telling him/her that if he/she is really brave at the doctor's, s/he'll get a new toy"); (9) Maternal Distress: responding in a way that is overly intrusive often with an exaggerated focus on mother's upset or concerns (e.g. "let him/her know how upset it makes me for him/her to have to miss the party") and (10) Avoidance: not doing or saying anything

beforehand. Cronbach's alphas for the original subscales were ranging from 0.67 (Maternal Distress) to 0.94 (Encourage Expression).

The original English version of the FSQ was translated into Myanmar by the author and checked by the supervisor against the original version to ensure the conceptual equivalence of the Myanmar version to the original version. Internal consistencies for the different subscales were acceptable with Cronbach's alphas ranging from 0.57 (Contingencies) to 0.84 (Encourage Expression). Additional information regarding the psychometric properties of the FSQ can be found in the Results section.

Coping with Children's Negative Emotions Scale (CCNES). Maternal response to children's negative emotions was measured with the Coping with Children's Negative Emotions Scale (CCNES; Fabes et al., 1990). This is a parent-report questionnaire that outlines 12 scenarios in which children are likely to display distress and negative affect. For each situation, mothers were asked to rate, on 7-point scale, the likelihood that they would respond in each of the following six ways. The reliability coefficient of the Coping with Children's Negative Emotions Scale were found to be 0.75 for Expressive Encouragement; 0.78 for Emotion-Focused Reactions; 0.74 for Problem-Focused Reactions; 0.64 for Distress Reactions; 0.78 for Punitive Reactions and 0.76 for Minimization Responses. The average of the three non-supportive (Distress, Punitive and Minimization Reactions) and supportive (Expressive Encouragement, Emotion- Focused, and Problem-Focused Reaction) subscales were calculated to form a Non-Supportive Score and Supportive Score. Cronbach's alphas for these subscales were found to be 0.71 and 0.73 respectively.

Secure Base Scripts Task. Maternal cognitive representations of attachment were measured with the Secure Base Scripts Task which assesses both the content and quality of a "secure base script" (Waters and Waters, 2006). Mothers were presented with a series of six word-prompt outlines that were designed to elicit a sense of a story. Mothers were asked to read down each column from left to right and to use the prompts to tell a story. They were told that the stories would be audio-taped and should they choose to stop and start the story again, they were permitted to do so. Two coders read each story and rated it for secure base scriptedness using a 7-point scale with higher numbers indicating higher scriptedness. Percent agreement between the two coders for the story was 76% (Baby's Morning).

Maternal Mind-Mindedness Interview (MMM). Maternal mind-mindedness was measured with a single-question interview that was developed by Meins et al. (1998). Mothers were asked "Can you describe [their child's name] for me?" Mothers were told that there were no right or wrong answers and they were free to talk about any of their child's characteristics for as little or as long as they wished. Mothers' responses were audio-taped and transcribed verbatim prior to coding. Mothers' descriptions were coded for mind-related or "mental" attributes which included any reference to children's mental life, such as their mind, imagination, will, intellect, interest, etc. Attributes relating to emotions were also placed in this category. A mind-mindedness score was obtained by calculating the proportion of mental attributes to the total number of attributes mentioned by the mother. Higher scores indicated greater mind-mindedness. All transcripts were coded by one primary coder and a second coder. The percent agreement between the two coders was 77%.

Maternal Perceived Control. To measure maternal perceived control, we developed with Bugental and coworkers' (1989) the Parent Attribution Test (PAT). Respondents were asked to rate the importance she or he attributes to potential causes of caregiving success and failure, in order to ascertain the perceived balance of control between caregiver and child. Mothers were asked to read a hypothetical babysitting scenario in which the interaction did not go well. Mothers were then asked to rate each of 12 factors (on a 7-point scale from "not at all important" to "very important") as possible reasons for such an experience. The factors included six child-attributed reasons and six caregiver-attributed reasons. Adult Control over Failure (ACF) and Child Control over Failure (CCF) scores were obtained by taking the mean of the relevant factors for each subscale. A final Perceived Control over Failure (PCF) score was obtained by subtracting the CCF score from the ACF score for each respondent.

*Maternal Alexithymia***.** To measure mothers' emotional functioning, we also attempted to develop the Toronto Alexithymia Scale (TAS-20) based on the Bagby and coworkers' (1994) original instrument. It is a self-report instrument designed and to measure difficulties in identifying and describing emotions. The TAS-20 is assumed to measure three facets of emotional functioning: (1) difficulty identifying emotions and distinguishing them from bodily sensations; (2) difficulty describing emotions to others; and (3) externally oriented style of thinking. Mothers were presented with 20 statements and were asked to rate on a 5-point scale from 1

(Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) how much they agreed/disagreed with each of them. The alpha of this scale was 0.73.

Child Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ). In order to measure child's dispositional negativity, we developed the Myanmar version of the Child Behavior Questionnaire (Very Short Form) (CBQ) based on the Rothbart and his coworkers (1994, 2001) original instrument. This is a well-established parent-report measure of three aspects of temperament for children aged 3 – 6 years (Negative Affect, Surgency/ Extroversion, and Effortful Control). Mothers were presented with 36 statements that describe children's reactions to different situations and were asked to rate how "true" the statement was of their child's reaction within the past six months. Ratings were made on a 7-point scale from 1 (extremely untrue) to 7 (extremely true). Only the Negative Affect subscale was used in this study. The reliability coefficients of the Children's Behavior Questionnaire were found to be 0.48 for Surgency, 0.49 for Negative Affectivity and 0.60 for Effortful Control.

Child Behavior Scale (CBS). Teachers completed the Child Behavior Scale (CBS; Ladd & Profilet, 1996) which assesses the behavior of young children in peer contexts. The CBS is comprised of six subscales which represent: Aggressive with Peers, Prosocial with Peers, Excluded by Peers, Asocial with Peers, Hyperactive-Distractible, and Anxious-Fearful. Teachers were asked to rate each listed behavior in terms of how characteristic or applicable it is for the child using a scale ranging from 1 (does not apply to the child) to 3 (certainly applies to the child). These subscales were chosen because behavior patterns which include aggressive, withdrawn, and prosocial behaviors have been the strongest identified predictors of later adaptation. The reliability coefficients of the Child Behavior Scale were found to be 0.74 for Aggressive, 0.72 for Prosoical and 0.76 for Asocial.

Results

Overview of Analysis

Data screening. Ranges, means, and standard deviations for all of the measures included in the study are presented in Table 1. Prior to data analysis, all variables were screened for normality by looking at skew values and normality statistics. All variables conformed to normality except for two child outcome variables: Aggression and asocial behavior were both quite positively skewed. Various transformations were attempted to bring these variables closer to normality,

however these transformations failed to satisfactorily improve their distributions. Thus, these two variables were dichotomized by establishing a cut-point for each variable and coding "0" for those values below this point and "1" for those values above this point. For aggressive behavior, the cut-point was 1.31, scores below which represented a higher likelihood of verbal aggression relative to physical aggression. For asocial behavior, the cut-point was 1.41, scores below which represented a tendency towards a child's preference for being alone compared to more active rejection of peers. For all analyses involving these two variables, the dichotomized variables were used.

Analytic plan. The purpose of this study was to develop the Future Scenarios Questionnaire (FSQ), which was intended to tap mothers' styles of responding to anticipated children's negative emotions. First, the underlying structure of FSQ as well as its psychometric properties was examined. Additionally, the pattern of relations between the FSQ and several maternal characteristics was examined in order to demonstrate concurrent and construct validity. The relations between the FSQ and child temperament and child social competence measures were also examined. Finally, a moderation model of emotion socialization was tested in which maternal response on the FSQ interacts with temperament to predict child social competence outcomes.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics of All Variables in the Study

Measure	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Mother Variables					
FSQ-Encourage Expression (EEE)	107	1.69	6.36	4.89	0.67
FSQ-Discourage Expression (DEE)	107	1.75	5.89	4.58	0.70
CCNES- Supportive Responses	107	3.64	6.72	5.54	0.64
CCNES- Non-supportive Responses	107	1.61	5.19	3.52	0.83
Secure Base Scripts (SBS)	105	1.00	5.00	1.44	0.77
Maternal Mind-Mindedness (MMM)	106	.00	3.00	1.54	0.72
Perceived Control over Failure (PCF)	107	-2.50	5.00	.72	1.19
Maternal Alexithymia (TAS)	107	15.00	51.00	31.50	7.27
Child Variables					
CBQ- Negative Affect (mother report)	107	1.67	6.44	3.90	0.96
CBS- Aggression (teacher report)	107	1.00	2.22	1.31	0.27
CBS- Prosoical (teacher report)	107	1.50	3.00	2.37	0.33
CBS- Asocial (teacher report)	107	1.00	2.83	1.41	0.41

*Note: FSQ-EEE and FSQ-DEE are summary score means that were derived in the way described below.

Psychometric Properties of the Future Scenarios Questionnaire

Factor analysis. The FSQ originally consisted of ten subscales which were previously described in the Method section. The Avoidance subscale (which comprised Item #10 for each of the scenarios – "I would say or do nothing") was not used in the calculation of the final score because of a significantly skewed distribution and restricted range of endorsement. The remaining nine subscales were then subjected to a principal components analysis with Varimax rotation. Eight of the nine subscales clearly loaded on one of two factors, however one subscale, Distortion, cross-loaded positively on both factors. In addition, the Cronbach's alpha for this subscale was 0.58. These two indications suggested that Distortion, as measured in this sample, is likely not a single construct, thus a decision was made to drop this subscale from all further analyses. The remaining eight subscales were then subjected to another principal components analysis with Varimax rotation and the results indicated a clear two-factor solution (i.e. two factors with Eigenvalues greater than 1.0). Cumulatively, these two factors accounted for 63.88% of the variance. The factor loadings for each subscale are shown in Table 2.

The first factor had an Eigenvalue of 2.64 and accounted for 33.05% of the variance. This factor was labeled Discourage Emotion Expression (DEE) and consisted of Minimizing, Shaming, Contingencies, and Maternal Distress. Cronbach's alpha for this subscale was 0.83. The second factor had an Eigenvalue of 2.47 and accounted for 30.83 % of the variance. This factor was labeled Encourage Emotion Expression and consisted of Acceptance, Mastery, Abstraction, and Encourage Expression. Cronbach's alpha for this subscale was 0.79. Cronbach's alphas for each

Table 2 Factor Loadings and Cronbach's Alphas for the Two-Factor Solution to the Future Scenarios Questionnaire

FSQ Subscale	Cronbach's Alpha		Factor Loading
	I	II	A
Discourage Expression of Emotion (DEE)			
Shaming	0.66		0.86
Minimizing	0.64		0.79
Contingencies	0.57		0.77
Maternal Distress	0.65		0.71
Encourage Emotion Expression (EEE)			
Encourage Expression		0.84	0.81
Mastery		0.70	0.78
Acceptance		0.59	0.73
Abstraction		0.65	0.69

of the final eight subscales of the FSQ are also shown in Table 2 and indicate good internal consistency.

Relation of the FSQ to mother and child demographics. To examine whether the two factors of the FSQ (EEE and DEE) related to mother and child demographics, correlations were computed with maternal age, maternal education, child age, child sex, marital status and number of children in the family. These correlations are presented in Table 3.

As shown in Table 3, the only significant (negative) correlation with EEE was marital status. Thus, mothers who were divorced or separated tended to report being more likely to employ strategies that encourage a child's expression of emotion on the FSQ. No other demographic variables were significantly correlated with either EEE or DEE.

Table 3 Correlations between the FSQ and Maternal and Child Demographics

	FSQ Encourage Expression (EEE)	FSQ Discourage Emotion (DEE)
Maternal Age	0.06(107)	0.09(107)
Maternal Education	0.06(104)	-0.09(104)
Child Age	-0.06(107)	-0.13(107)
Child Sex	-0.07(107)	0.12(107)
Marital Status	-0.24*(103)	-0.18(103)
Number of Children	-0.08(106)	0.13(106)

Note: N's vary due to missing data and are in brackets.
*p< .05, **p< .01

Table 4 Intercorrelations among Mother Variables

	FSQ-EEE	FSQ-DEE	CCNES-Support	CCNES-Nonsupport	SBS	MMM	PCF	TAS
FSQ-EEE	-							
FSQ-DEE	.48**	-						
CCNES- Support	.18*	-.02	-					
CCNES- Nonsupport	-.17*	.26**	.09	-				
SBS	.18*	.03	.17*	-.04	-			
MMM	.02	.06	.12	-.24**	.20*	-		
PCF	-.01	-.23**	.12	-.14	.07	.00	-	
TAS	-.01	.25**	.01	.45**	-.09	-.05	-.13	--

*p <.05, **p <.01

Relation of the FSQ to additional maternal characteristics. Additional maternal characteristics that were measured were: CCNES (Supportive and Non-supportive), Secure Base Scripts (SBS), Maternal Mind-Mindedness (MMM), Perceived Control over Failure (PCF), and Maternal Alexithymia (TAS). Intercorrelations among these variables are presented in Table 4. These correlations were expected given the theoretic similarity between these two measures. The EEE subscale was also significantly negatively correlated with the Non-supportive subscale of the CCNES (r = -.17); however, this correlation was small. The DEE subscale was unrelated to the Supportive subscale of the CCNES (r = -.02).

Significant correlations with additional mother variables hypothesized to be related to modes of responding on the FSQ also provided some validity evidence. For the Secure Base Scripts (SBS), and consistent with predictions, there was a small significant positive correlation with the EEE subscale (r = .18). Thus, mothers who had greater access to a "secure base script" were more likely to report encouraging their children's expression of emotion on the FSQ. There was no significant correlation with the DEE subscale.

Also consistent with predictions, maternal perceptions of control, as indexed by the PCF score, was significantly negatively related to the DEE subscale (r = -.23). Thus, mothers who perceived themselves as having more control relative to the child in a challenging situation were less likely to discourage or suppress children's expression of emotion with strategies such as shaming and minimizing. The EEE subscale was unrelated to the PCF scale. In addition, maternal alexithymia, as measured by the TAS, was significantly positively related to the DEE subscale of the FSQ (r= .25). Thus mothers who report difficulties understanding, processing, or describing emotions were more likely to report employing strategies that discourage children's expression of emotions. The correlation between EEE and TAS was not significant. Finally, and unexpectedly, maternal mind-mindedness was completely unrelated to both components of the FSQ (r = .02 for EEE and .06 for DEE).

Relation of negative affect and child adjustment variables to maternal and child demographics. Correlations were computed to examine whether any of the maternal or child demographic variables was related to the measures of negative affect, aggression, prosocial behavior, and asocial behavior. These correlations can be seen in Table 5.

As can be seen in Table 5, child age was significant positively correlated with aggression and prosocial behavior and negatively correlated with asocial behavior. However, child age was not significantly correlated with negative affect. Child sex was significant positively correlated with child aggression, with boys being rated by teachers as more aggressive with peers. Additionally, the negative correlation between child sex and prosocial behavior almost reached significance (r= -.15, p= .06) suggesting that boys were rated by teachers as slightly more prosocial with peers. With respect to maternal variables, maternal age was significantly negatively correlated with child negative affect. Maternal education was negatively related with child aggression, which approached significance (p= .06), with mothers who reported more years of education having children who were rated by teachers as less aggressive with peers. Maternal education and maternal age were unrelated to all other child variables.

Table 5 Correlations between CBQ, CBS and Maternal and Child Demographics

	CBQ - Negative Affect	CBS - Aggression	CBS- Prosocial Behavior	CBS - Asocial Behavior
Child Age	0.03	0.20*	0.22*	-0.22*
Child Sex	0.14	0.20*	-0.15†	0.05
Maternal Age	-0.17*	0.12	0.10	0.09
Maternal Education	-0.03	-0.16†	0.02	0.13

† p <.10, * p <.05, N=107

Table 6 Correlations between the FSQ and Child Variables for Boys, Girls, and Total Sample

	FSQ- Encourage Emotion Expression			FSQ- Discourage Emotion Expression		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
CBQ- Negative Affect	0.01	-0.15	-0.07	0.10	0.14	0.13
	(57)	(50)	(107)	(57)	(50)	(107)
CBS- Aggression Behavior	0.03	0.10	0.03	0.07	0.03	0.07
	(57)	(50)	(107)	(57)	(50)	(107)
CBS- Prosocial Behavior	0.06	-0.10	-0.00	0.06	0.12	0.08
	(57)	(50)	(107)	(57)	(50)	(107)
CBS- Asocial Behavior	0.05	-0.16	-0.05	0.02	-0.24*	-0.11
	(57)	(50)	(107)	(57)	(50)	(107)

* p <.05

Note: Figure within the parentheses refers to the number of observation i.e. N

Relation of the FSQ to Child Temperament and Child Adjustment Variables. Correlations between the EEE and DEE subscales of the FSQ, and child negative affect, aggression, prosocial behavior, and asocial behavior are shown in Table 6. Correlations are presented separately for boys and girls, and also for the total sample.

As can be seen in this table, the FSQ subscales were unrelated to the Negative Affect component of temperament. This was the case for both boys and girls, and for the entire sample. With respect to child adjustment indices (as measured by the CBS), surprisingly only one significant relation was found. For girls (but not for boys), DEE was significantly negatively correlated with asocial behavior (r= - .44). Thus, contrary to expectation, mothers with higher DEE scores had girls who were rated by teachers as being less asocial with peers.

Moderation Model of Emotion Socialization. The aim of this study was to test a model of emotion socialization in which maternal responding to anticipated negative emotions in children interacted with child temperament (in this case, negative affect) in the prediction of child social competence. To test this hypothesized model, a series of hierarchical regression analyses was conducted (see Aiken & West, 1991). Separate equations were computed to predict each of the various indices of social competence (e.g. aggression, prosocial behavior, and asocial behavior) from each of the two predictor variables, Encourage Emotion Expression (EEE) and Discourage Emotion Expression (DEE). Thus, six regressions were computed in total. For the two dichotomized variables, aggression and asocial behavior, logistic regression was employed, whereas for prosocial behavior, linear regression was employed.

In all cases, the predictor, moderator, and outcome variables were standardized before entering them into the regression equations. The control variables were entered first and consisted of child sex, child age, maternal education, maternal age and number of children. The predictor variable (either EEE or DEE) was entered in the second step and the moderator variable, Negative Affect (NA), was entered in the third step. In the final step, the two-way interaction terms were entered which were represented by the products of EEE × NA and DEE × NA. The results of each of the regressions can be seen in Tables 7, 8, and 9. The β's presented are from the final step (step 4) of each of the regressions.

As can be seen in Table 7, a significant interaction was not found between DEE and negative affect in the prediction of aggressive behavior. With respect to

Table 7 Results of Logistic Regression Analyses Predicting Aggression Behavior

Variables	β	Std. Error	Wald	Exp(B)
Control Variables				
Child Sex	1.07	0.50	4.57*	2.91
Child age	1.45	0.47	9.45**	4.28
Mother age	0.04	0.06	0.49	1.04
Mother education	-0.50	0.25	4.12*	0.61
Number of children	0.30	0.40	0.56	1.35
Predictor				
Discourage Expression of Emotion	1.72	1.12	2.37	5.56
Moderator				
Negative Affect	4.34	3.60	1.45	76.29
Interaction				
DEE × NA	-0.98	0.78	1.61	0.37
$\chi^2(8) = 6.21$				
Nagelkerke$R^2 = 0.27$				
-2 log likelihood = 118.66				
Variables	**β**	**Std. Error**	**Wald**	**Exp (B)**
Control Variables				
Child Sex	1.06	0.50	4.47*	2.89
Child age	1.33	0.45	8.65**	3.78
Mother age	0.03	0.06	0.27	1.03
Mother education	-0.48	0.24	3.92*	0.62
Number of children	0.50	0.39	1.69	1.65
Predictor				
Encourage Emotion Expression	0.11	1.01	.01	1.11
Moderator				
Negative Affect	-0.23	3.46	0.00	0.80
Interaction				
EEE × NA	0.02	0.71	0.00	1.02
$\chi^2(8) = 12.22$				
Nagelkerke$R^2 = 0.24$				
-2 log likelihood = 121.59				

*p <.05 **p <.01

EEE, there was also no significant interaction with negative affect in the prediction of aggressive behavior.

However, as seen in Table 8, DEE significantly interacted with negative affect in the prediction of asocial behavior. This can be seen in Table 8. For children rated high in negative affect, high maternal DEE scores significantly predicted less asocial behavior (p = .01). With respect to EEE, there was no significant interaction with negative affect in the prediction of asocial behavior.

Table 8 Results of Logistic Regression Analyses Predicting Asocial Behavior

Variables	β	Std. Error	Wald	Exp (B)
Control Variables				
Child Sex	-0.25	0.49	0.26	0.78
Child age	-1.29	0.45	8.43**	0.28
Mother age	0.14	0.06	5.33*	1.15
Mother education	0.31	0.25	1.61	1.37
Number of children	-1.09	0.45	5.93*	0.34
Predictor				
Discourage Expression of Emotion	1.58	1.12	2.02	4.87
Moderator				
Negative Affect	9.06	3.77	5.79*	0.19
Interaction				
DEE × NA	-1.71	0.81	4.48*	0.18
$\chi^2(8) = 12.94$				
Nagelkerke$R^2 = 0.29$				
-2 log likelihood = 115.96				
Variables	**β**	**Std. Error**	**Wald**	**Exp (B)**
Control Variables				
Child Sex	-0.38	0.47	0.64	0.69
Child age	-1.12	0.42	6.96**	0.33
Mother age	0.11	0.06	3.87*	1.12
Mother education	0.38	0.24	2.50	1.46
Number of children	-0.81	0.39	4.27*	0.44
Predictor				
Encourage Emotion Expression	0.60	1.12	0.28	1.81
Moderator				
Negative Affect	3.30	3.70	0.80	27.14
Interaction				
EEE × NA	-0.46	0.75	0.38	0.63
$\chi^2(8) = 5.60$				
Nagelkerke$R^2 = 0.20$				
-2 log likelihood = 124.32				

*p <.05 **p <.01

Finally, as seen in Table 9, the interaction between DEE and negative affect in the prediction of prosocial behavior approached significance (p=.05). This interaction suggests that for children rated high in negative affect, high maternal DEE scores predicted more prosocial behavior. Again, with respect to EEE, there was no significant interaction with negative affect in the prediction of prosocial behavior. In sum, the results of the moderation analyses provided some support for the hypothesis that maternal responding on the FSQ interacts with negative affect in the prediction of children's aggressive, asocial, and prosocial behaviors.

Table 9 Results of Regression Analyses Predicting Prosocial Behavior

Variables	*B*	Std. Error	Beta	T	ΔR^2
Control Variables					
Child Sex	-0.10	0.07	-0.14	-1.40	.05
Child age	0.12	0.06	0.20	1.96†	
Mother age	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.56	
Mother education	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.09	
Number of children	0.07	0.06	0.14	1.16	
Predictor					
Discourage Expression of Emotion	-0.23	0.15	-.47	-1.53	
Moderator					
Negative Affect	-1.01	.49	-1.52	-2.04*	
Interaction					
DEE × NA	0.21	0.11	1.64	1.99†	
Control Variables					
Child Sex	-0.08	0.07	-0.13	-1.19	.01
Child age	0.11	0.06	0.19	1.80†	
Mother age	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.32	
Mother education	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.32	
Number of children	0.04	0.06	0.09	0.75	
Predictor					
Encourage Emotion Expression	-0.10	0.15	-0.20	-0.66	
Moderator					
Negative Affect	-0.40	0.53	-0.61	-0.76	
Interaction					
EEE × NA	0.08	0.11	0.60	0.71	

† p <.10 * p <.05 ** p <.01

Discussion

A primary purpose of the present study was to examine the possible effects of one kind of maternal emotion socialization, namely how mothers respond to anticipated children's negative emotions, on children's social competence. In doing so, we developed and provided initial support for the validity of a Myanmar version of self-report measure, the Future Scenarios Questionnaire. We will discuss the construct validity of the FSQ, as well as review the patterns of association with child

outcome measures of aggressive, asocial, and prosocial behavior. Contrary to our expectations, we found that the FSQ did not directly relate to child outcomes, however, when a model that included child negative affect as a moderator was tested, relations between the FSQ and child outcomes were revealed. The theoretical and practical implications of the main findings are discussed below.

Validation of the Future Scenarios Questionnaire

The results of this study provided some preliminary support for the FSQ as a valid, Myanmar version of the instrument for assessing the ways by which mothers respond to their children's negative emotions when faced with upcoming stressful situations. In particular, the pattern of correlations among the two factors of the FSQ - Encourage Emotion Expression (EEE) and Discourage Emotion Expression (DEE) - and several additional mother measures demonstrated some evidence of construct validity. For the most part, this pattern was consistent and in accordance with our predictions.

In responding to the items on the FSQ, mothers were required to draw upon conscious appraisal processes, which lend towards self-presentation or response style bias in a way that instruments that assess more implicit, or even unconscious schemas (for example, Secure Base Scripts, PAT) likely do not. Thus, we choose to correlate the two subscales of the FSQ questionnaire with measures of more generalized maternal schemas in order to attenuate the effects of shared method variance. Indeed, the pattern of correlations among the FSQ subscales and these measures largely supported our hypotheses that maternal schemas (for e.g., pertaining to security/ attachment and control) would relate to how a mother might address or prepare her child for an upcoming stressful situation.

With respect to attachment representations, mothers who were rated as more "secure" were more likely to report encouraging their children's expression of negative emotions on the FSQ. This is consistent with prior attachment-related research that has shown that secure or autonomous mothers are more open and willing to approach and discuss negative emotions than mothers who are more "insecure" (see Laible & Panfile, in press). Unexpectedly however, mothers' security (as assessed by the SBS measure) was unrelated to the Discourage Emotion Expression subscale of the FSQ. This suggests that perhaps the relation between a mother's security and the extent to which she might either encourage or discourage emotion expression is not so straightforward, and that additional factors, such as individual differences in children,

might need to be considered. This suggestion is also somewhat in accordance with Berlin and Cassidy's (2003) conclusion that mothers of secure children neither heighten nor suppress children's negativity, but rather accept and are moderately controlling of it.

Additionally, and consistent with predictions, mothers who perceived themselves as having more control relative to a child in difficult caregiving situations were less likely to discourage children's expression of negative emotions in anticipation of stressful events. This is likely due to these mothers being more confident and efficacious in their ability to tolerate and deal with negative emotions in their children, and perhaps being less likely to become dysregulated themselves in the face of a perceived power imbalance.

There was one maternal mindset we assessed, maternal mind-mindedness, that contrary to prediction, did not correlate with either factor of the FSQ. One possible explanation for this finding is that the mind-mindedness interview involved asking a mother to produce a narrative about her child as opposed to endorsing how she would respond directly to her child in a particular circumstance (i.e. what the FSQ requires). One difference between the mind-mindedness measure and the other two measures included to assess maternal schemas (i.e. the SBS and the PAT) is that the mind-mindedness measure requires that a mother still keep her particular child in mind, rather than generating fictional stories based on word-prompts (e.g. SBS) or giving likely reasons for a difficult encounter with an imaginary or hypothetical child (e.g. PAT). For these latter two tasks, a mother's responses might be more removed from her actual past experiences and relationship with her own child, so thus might be more "projective" or more representative of qualities within herself, independent of qualities in her particular child. And indeed it was found that these maternal qualities did relate to the subscales of the FSQ in anticipated and meaningful ways.

The mind-mindedness construct, on the other hand, although functioning at a level of mind states (e.g. the degree to which a mother considers her child as having a "mind"), might be quite distinct from the actual maternal behaviors or strategies which are accessed by the FSQ. In other words, there might be a difference between what a mother carries in her head about her child, assessed through an analysis of maternal language (i.e. MMM interview), versus how she interacts with her child, as assessed by the FSQ (Meins, et al., 2001).

We also examined the relation between the FSQ and the personality trait of alexithymia, and found that as predicted, mothers who rated themselves as more alexithymia were more likely to report strategies that disavowed or discouraged their children's expressions of negative emotions. This is consistent with the idea that these mothers have inherent difficulties understanding, processing, and in particular, communicating about emotions in general.

Finally, the correlations between the EEE and the DEE subscales of the FSQ and the supportive and non-supportive subscales of CCNES respectively were not surprising given the similarity in the development and intent of the two measures. These correlations provide some indication that the FSQ is in fact measuring the ways by which mothers do respond to children's negative emotions. On the other hand, these correlations might also suggest that these scales are both measuring the same construct, that is, the ways in which mothers respond to negative emotions in general, regardless of their past, present, or anticipated orientation. This of course, needs to be clarified in future studies. Further, with respect to the principal components analysis of the FSQ, it is recognized that the sample size is small, and the subject to variable ratio is minimal, limiting firm conclusions about the scale's validity.

The above findings cumulatively point to the FSQ as a potentially valid instrument. However, additional and more extensive examination of the psychometric properties is certainly needed in order to establish stability, reliability, and discriminant validity, with larger samples and over time. Also, relating mothers' responses on the FSQ to observations of their actual parenting behaviors and to additional child outcomes is an important next step in extending and establishing the validity of the Myanmar version of FSQ.

Discussion of Findings with Child Outcomes

Surprisingly, almost no direct associations were found between the two FSQ subscales and child outcome measures of aggressive, asocial, and prosocial behavior. In fact, and contrary to prediction, DEE was negatively correlated with asocial behavior, and this finding was significant for girls only. It seems that girls in this sample were less withdrawn when mothers were more discouraging of emotion expression. One possibility is that in this study, when girls' expressions of negative emotions, including sadness or fear, were more controlled or restricted by their mothers, these girls might be less inclined to express these kinds of emotions at school, leading to teacher perceptions of more outgoing behaviors. It is difficult to

disentangle the precise relations in this study because of the aggregated way in which the FSQ groups responses across different emotions (i.e. anger, fear, sadness).

The paucity of direct effects with children's social competence was unexpected and somewhat surprising. However, one central hypothesis of this study was that the temperamental trait of negative affect would moderate the link between maternal responses on the FSQ and child adjustment. In particular, in keeping with prior suggestions in the literature that "negative" parenting would have a greater impact on children with temperamental vulnerabilities and less of an effect on those children who are more temperamentally resilient (see Bates & Pettit, 2007; Belsky, 2005), we predicted there would be positive relations between DEE and children's social maladjustment indices (e.g. aggression) and this relation would be stronger among children high in negative affect. Conversely, we predicted that the relation between EEE and children's social adjustment indices (e.g. prosocial behavior) would be stronger for children rated high in negative affect. In other words, more supportive or empathic parenting would matter more for these children.

Instead, we found that only DEE predicted more positive child adjustment, a relation that was moderated by child negative affect. Specifically, for high negative affect children, DEE predicted less asocial behavior and a trend towards more prosocial behavior.

One way of interpreting this result might be in terms of "goodness of fit". In other words, DEE, although being often associated with negative outcomes, may not necessarily be a form of "negative" parenting in all circumstances and for all children. Thus, it might not be that useful to consider that the same parenting intervention will necessarily work for all children; rather, different children might be differentially impacted by, or might even require, different kinds of parenting. What might matter more is how well a certain intervention works for a particular child, in a certain context.

The child outcomes that were the focus in this study- aggressive, asocial, and prosocial behavior- depend to a large extent on children's ability to control their expressions of emotion. Thus it appears that discouraging further expression of negative emotion in an already highly emotional child might serve that child well in environments that require a high level of regulation and control. For example, in a school context, children need to demonstrate high levels of cooperation and self-control with peers, perhaps much more so than in the context of the parent-child

relation at home. Children lacking a certain degree of self-control, both emotionally and behaviorally, will undoubtedly be challenged, both academically and socially (Stright, et al, 2008).

Conclusion

This study highlights the need to examine individual differences in children in the relations between maternal socialization and the development of social competence. It seems there is no optimum style for all children under all circumstances and that the route to social competence might take different forms depending on a child's level of negative affect. For example, children who are temperamentally negative may benefit from greater emphasis on parenting strategies that emphasize emotional control versus expression. More generally, this study also emphasizes the importance of knowing one's child and tailoring socialization approaches accordingly. Additional research, especially of a longitudinal nature, will help to clarity and expand upon these interesting findings.

Limitations of the Study and Future Research

The present study does have several limitations. First, the small sample of this study precludes examination of important characteristics of both mothers and children that have been shown to be related to emotion socialization behaviors in important ways. Second, the sample was relatively homogeneous, being primarily middle class. It is likely that findings might differ for other ethnic and socioeconomic groups. However, given that one purpose of this study was the development of a new self-report measure, the homogeneity of the sample might have been necessary to avoid introducing confounding demographic variables. In validation studies in the future, it would be useful to assess the similarities and differences in parental responding among different cultural groups. Also, the findings were limited to mothers, so it remains unclear as to the role of paternal socialization of children's emotions pertaining to future-oriented stressful events or to the role of joint mother and father socialization.

Perhaps the most serious drawback is that the study was correlational and examined concurrent associations between variables, limiting inferences about causality and age-related change. Thus, there is a need for longitudinal research to clarify the direction of effects, but also to assess longer term outcomes or

consequences of certain types of emotion socialization. There is some suggestion that emotional suppression increases emotional arousal and anxiety over time and that the maladaptive effects of suppressive strategies intensify over time (Buck 1984; Roberts & Strayer, 1987). For example, Krause, Mendelson, and Lynch (2002), in a retrospective study with adults, found that chronic emotional inhibition fully mediated the relation between childhood history of emotional invalidation (e.g. parental punishment, minimization, and distress in response to negative emotion) and adult psychological distress (e.g. depression and anxiety). They concluded that childhood emotional inhibition might be functional in the shorter term and for the parent in that it reduces parental distress but might have longer term negative consequences for the child (Krause, et al, 2002).

Nevertheless children do also need to learn how to manage or control emotional expression to meet short-term goals in situations that demand it or in which expression might be inappropriate (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1992; Kopp, 1989). More research is needed to understand the complex interplay among more immediate and longer term consequences with respect to both emotional and social adjustment.

Contributions of the Present Study

This study contributes to the advancement of knowledge in the parenting and socialization field in several ways. With respect to new directions, it examines future-oriented emotion socialization which to date, has not been investigated. It also introduces a method for assessing this construct, the Future Scenarios Questionnaire, which offers the potential to be a valid and reliable self-report measure. Finally, the results of the regression analyses add to the increasing body of literature asserting that child temperament is an important moderator of the links between parenting and child adjustment.

This study also has some methodological strength. For example, when studying temperament and emotion regulation, there is often the inherent difficulty in methodologically separating emotional reactivity (temperament) from emotion regulation (outcome). For this reason, we used children's social behaviors with peers (i.e. the CBS) as the child outcome measure (versus a measure of children's emotion regulation, which is more likely to have overlapping features with measures of temperament). In addition, the use of teacher reports of child outcomes is advantageous. First, teachers are perhaps more likely to see the child's behaviors with

peers than are the parents and have a larger comparison base of children. Thus, teachers are important source of "real life" information. Additionally, Winsler and Wallace (2002), in comparing mother and teacher reports of children's behavior, found that in general teacher reports, but not parent reports, were significantly associated with observations of children's behavior in the classroom (e.g. inappropriate behavior, peer affiliation, expressed negative affect).

With respect to reports of child temperament, mothers were the only source in this study. Although there is some debate in the literature about the validity of mother reports, Rothbart and Bates (1998) point out that mothers often see children in greater range of contexts and thus have a wider base of knowledge about their children's reactions, and are thus "experts" on their children. Also there is substantial evidence that parents' reports of child temperament converge moderately with other kinds of measures, such as observer's ratings (Bates & Pettit, 2007). Finally, because the outcome measure is based on teacher reports (and not on mother reports), there is less likely common source bias.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to thank Dr. Tin Maung Hla, Rector of Mandalay University of Distance Education, for his encouragement to do research. I would also like to give my gratitude to my Professor and Head, Dr. Ni Ni Lwin, Head of Psychology Department, Mandalay University of Distance Education, for her help, encouragement, and support. I would especially like to extend my heartfelt thanks to my Supervisor, Dr. Nilar Kyu, Professor, Head of Psychology Department, University of Yangon, for her ongoing support, availability, and commitment to seeing this paper through, and for always believing that it could be done even when I wavered in this belief. And then, thank for her wise guidance, persistent encouragement, and her kind mentorship over many years. I am very grateful to have had the opportunity to work with and learn from her.

References

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bagby, R.M., Taylor, G. J., & Parker, J.D.A (1994). The twenty-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale: II. Convergent, discriminant, and concurrent validity. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 38,* 33-40.

Bates, J. E. & Pettit, G. S. (2007). Temperament, parenting, and socialization. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research* (pp. 153-177). New York: Guilford.

Belsky, J. (2005). Differential susceptibility to rearing influence: An evolutionary hypothesis and some evidence. In B. J. Ellis & D.F. Bjorklund (Eds.), *Origins of the social mind: Evolutionary psychology and child development* (pp. 139-163). New York: Guilford.

Berlin, L. J., & Cassidy, J. (2003). Mothers' self-reported control of their preschool children's emotional expressiveness: A longitudinal study of associations with infant-mother attachment and children's emotion regulation. *Social Development, 12,* 477-495.

Bugental, D. B., Blue, J., & Cruzcosa, M. (1989). Perceived control over caregiving outcomes: Implications for child abuse. *Developmental Psychology, 25,* 532-539.

Buck, R. (1984). *The communication of emotion*. New York: Guilford Press.

Chaplin, T. M., Cole, P. M., & Zahn-Waxler, C. (2005). Parental socialization of emotion expression: Gender differences and relations to child adjustment. *Emotion, 5,* 80-88.

Collins, W.A., Maccoby, E. E., Steinberg, L., Hetherington, E. M., & Bornstein, M. H. (2000). Contemporary research on parenting: The case for nature and nurture. *American Psychologist, 55,* 218-232.

Denham, S. A. (1986). Social cognition, prosocial behavior, and emotion in preschoolers: Contextual validation. *Social Development, 57,* 194-201.

Denham, S. A. (1998). *Emotional development in young children.* New York: Guilford.

Denham, S. A., Bassett, H. H., & Wyatt, T. (2007). The socialization of emotional competence. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization*: *Theory and research* (pp. 614-637). New York: Guilford.

Denham, S. A., Renwick-DeBardi, S., & Holt, R. (1991). Working and playing together: Prediction of preschool social-emotional competence from mother-child interaction. *Child Development, 62,* 242-249.

Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., & Spinrad, T. L. (1998). Parental socialization of emotion. *Psychological Inquiry, 9,* 241-273.

Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1992). Emotion and its regulation in early development. *New directions for child development, No. 55: The Jossey-Bass education series.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (2006). Emotion regulation and children's socioemotional competence. In L. Balter & C. S. Tamis-LeMonda (Eds.), *Child psychology: A handbook of contemporary issues (2nd ed.)* (pp. 357-381). New York: Psychology Press.

Fabes, R. A., Eisenberg, N., & Bernzweing, J. (1990). The Coping with Childrens' Negative Emotions Scale: Description and Scoring. *Unpublished Scale, Department of Family Resources and Human Development,* Arizona State University.

Halberstadt, A. G. (1991). Toward an ecology of expressiveness: Family socialization in particular and a model in general. In R. S. Feldman & B. Rimé (Eds.), *Fundamentals of nonverbal behavior: Studies in emotion & social interaction* (pp. 106-160). New York, Cambridge University Press.

Hubbard, J. A., & Coie, J. D. (1994). Emotional correlates of social competence in children's peer relationships. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 40,* 1-20.

Kopp, C. B. (1989). Regulation of distress and negative emotions: A developmental view. *Developmental Psychology, 25,* 343-354.

Krause, E. D., Mendelson, T., & Lynch, T. R. (2002). Childhood emotional invalidation and adult psychological distress: The mediating role of emotional inhibition. *Child Abuse& Neglect, 27,* 199-213.

Kuersten-Hogan, R., & McHale, J. P. (2000). Stability of emotion talk in families from the toddler to the preschool years. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 161,* 115-121.

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

Laible, D., & Panfile, T. (in press). Mother-child reminiscing in the context of secure attachment relationships: Lessons in understanding and coping with negative emotions. In J. Quas & R. Fivush (Eds.) *Emotion and memory in development: Biological, cognitive, and social considerations*. Oxford Series in Affective *Science.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Lundell, L. J. (2008). The Future Scenarios Questionnaire (FSQ): Maternal responses to anticipated children's negative emotions and social adjustment in early childhood.

Meins, E., Fernyhough, C., Fradley, E., & Tuckey, M. (2001). Rethinking maternal sensitivity: Mothers' comments on infants' mental processes predict security of attachment at 12 months. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 42,* 637-648.

Meins, E., Fernyhough, C., Russell, J., & Clark-Carter, D. (1998). Security of attachment as a predictor of symbolic and mentalising abilities: A longitudinal study. *Social Development, 7,* 1-24.

Morris, A. S., Silk, J. S., Steinberg, L., Myers, S. S., & Robinson, L. R. (2007). The role of the family context in the development of emotion regulation. *Social Development, 16,* 361-388.

Oppenheim, D., & Waters, H. S. (1995). Narrative processes and attachment representations: Issues of development and assessment. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 60,* 197-215.

Reese, E., & Fivush, R. (1993). Parental styles of talking about the past. *Developmental Psychology, 29,* 596-606.

Roberts, W., & Strayer, J. (1987). Parents' responses to the emotional distress of their children: Relations with children's competence. *Developmental Psychology, 23,* 415-432.

Rothbart, M. K., Ahadi, S. A., & Hershey, K. L. (1994). Temperament and social behavior in childhood. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 40,* 21-39.

Rothbart, M.K., Ahadi, S. A., Hersey, K.L., & Fisher, P. (2001). Investigations of temperament at three to seven years: The Children's Behavior Questionnaire. *Child Development, 72,* 1394-1408.

Rothbart, M. K., & Bates, J. E. (1998). Temperament. In W. Damon & N. Eisenberg (Eds.) *Handbook of child psychology, 5th ed.: Vol 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 105-176). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Stright, A. D., Gallagher, K. C., & Kelley, K. (2008). Infant temperament moderates relations between maternal parenting in early childhood and children's adjustment in first grade. *Child Development, 79,* 186-200.

Thompson, R. A., Laible, D. J., & Ontai, L.L. (2003). Early understandings of emotion, morality, and self: Developing a working model. In R. V. Kail (Ed.), *Advances in child development and behavior, Vol. 31,* (pp. 137-171). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Waters, H. S., & Waters, E. (2006). The attachment working models concept*:* Among other things, we build script-like representations of secure base experiences. *Attachment & Human Development, 8,* 185-197.

Winsler, A., & Wallace, G. L. (2002). Behavior problems and social skills in preschool children: Parent-teacher agreement and relations with classroom observations. *Early Education and Development, 13,* 41-58.