

PERSONALITY PREDICTORS OF
PRESCHOOL CHILDREN'S STYLES
OF COPING WITH DAILY
HASSLES

by

Kimberly Anne Yolton

Thesis submitted to the Faculty
of the Virginia Polytechnic
Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Child Development

APPROVED:

C. S. Rogers, Chairman

M. J. Benson

V. R. Fu

April, 1989

Blacksburg, Virginia

8-15-69
462

PERSONALITY PREDICTORS OF
PRESCHOOL CHILDREN'S STYLES
OF COPING WITH DAILY
HASSLES

by

Kimberly Anne Yolton

Committee Chairperson: Dr. Cosby S. Rogers
Family and Child Development

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between temperament and styles of coping with daily hassles. Parents of 86 four-year-old children attending preschools and child care centers located in Southwest Virginia completed measures of temperament and coping.

The Behavioral Style Questionnaire (BSQ), designed by Carey and McDevitt, was used to assess each child's temperament. Responses were used to categorize children as having easy, difficult, slow-to-warm-up, or intermediate temperaments. The Coping Styles Inventory for Preschool Children (CSIPC) was developed by the researcher to provide a profile of each child's coping style among the techniques of feeling, thinking, acting, and reacting.

Once the data were collected, numerous statistical procedures were performed. These included Pearson

Product Moment Correlations, Analyses of Variance, and Chi-squares. The findings indicated that children with difficult temperaments employed cognitive, or thinking, styles of coping when confronted with daily hassles.

A better understanding of how children with different temperaments cope with hassles, and stress in general, should enable parents, child care workers, and all those working closely with children to communicate with them more effectively. New and improved methods for instructing children on effective coping techniques can be developed and implemented when professionals have a more accurate perception of the predominant methods currently used by these children.

Acknowledgements

I wish to express sincere thanks to my advisor/committee chairperson, Dr. Cosby S. Rogers, for her support, guidance, and encouragement. Thanks also to the supervising committee members: Dr. Mark J. Benson and Victoria R. Fu, for their time, suggestions, and support.

Thanks to my mother, who instilled in me strong values, and the desire and will to succeed before leaving this life. I know she is proud.

To my grandparents, I wish to express my thanks for them trying to understand why this undertaking needed to be completed, and for their support, concern, attention, and love.

To my roommates, and , I direct a big thanks. I know I wasn't the best roommate during this stressful time, and I appreciate them putting up with me, sympathizing, and offering to help when possible. I also wish to thank my cats, Duchess and Dumpster, for being the best stress releasers I could find, and for offering unconditional love.

Thanks to Piky for all of her support, advice, and counsel. It helps to talk with someone who has been through the experience before. I don't know how I would have made it without you. I wish you and Jorge the best of luck and happy, happy lives together; you were meant for each other.

Thanks to other friends, Kathy, Fran, Troy, Gina, Linda, for being available and listening when I needed to talk.

Thanks to Azra for all of her help during the coding process and in getting this together.

Thanks also to other family members, , whose support has been so important this year. I'd like to thank my nephew/Godchild, , for being such a special child, and I'd like to wish him the happiest and least stressful childhood.

Lastly, I'd like to thank the children of the Child Development Laboratory School at Virginia Tech. Just being able to spend time with them each day has made it all worthwhile. I will miss them all.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
List of Tables.....	viii
Chapter	
I. Introduction.....	1
Statement of Problem.....	1
Research Question.....	2
Hypothesis.....	2
Conceptual Framework.....	2
II. Review of Literature.....	4
Stress and Coping.....	4
Temperament.....	10
Stress, Coping, and Temperament.....	17
Summary.....	19
III. Method.....	21
Description of the Sample.....	21
Description of the Instruments.....	23
Behavioral Style Questionnaire.....	23
Coping Styles Inventory for Preschool Children.....	24
Administration of the Instruments.....	26
Analysis of Data.....	27

IV. Results.....	29
Analysis of Data.....	29
The Behavioral Style Questionnaire.....	30
The Coping Styles Inventory for Preschool Children.....	34
The BSQ and CSIPC.....	36
V. Discussion.....	48
Resulting Questions.....	53
VI. Conclusions and Future Research Considerations.....	58
References.....	60
Appendices.....	66
Appendix A Instrument.....	67
Cover Letter.....	68
Consent Form/Information Sheet....	70
Behavioral Style Questionnaire....	72
Coping Styles Inventory for Preschool Children.....	79
Appendix B Request for Permission Letters.....	93
Vita.....	108

List of Tables

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Scores on Behavioral Style Questionnaire.....	31
---	----

Table 2

Interscale Correlations on Behavioral Style Questionnaire.....	33
---	----

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviation of Scores on Coping Styles Inventory for Preschool Children.....	35
---	----

Table 4

Interscale Correlations on Coping Styles Inventory for Preschool Children.....	37
---	----

Table 5

Intercorrelations Among Coping Styles Inventory for Preschool Children and Behavioral Style Questionnaire Subscale Scores.....	39
---	----

Table 6

Means and F Values of Coping Styles Broken Down by Temperament.....	40
--	----

Table 7

F Values for Behavioral Style Questionnaire Subscale Scores Broken Down by Coping Style.....	43
--	----

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Stress occurs throughout the lifespan. The stresses of childhood are just as important as those which occur during adulthood. They may influence the development and adjustment of a child in many ways. Therefore, the way in which a child copes with stress will affect his/her development throughout life. Many individual characteristics have been identified as influencing an individual's reactions to stress, including age, sex, genetic factors, intelligence, temperament and problem-solving skills (Rutter, 1988). Temperament is the focus of the current literature review and research project. Although the construct of temperament has been identified as influencing a child's coping ability when faced with stress, the literature shows a lack of research implicating how this occurs.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the present research project is to identify the relationships among temperament and styles of coping with the stresses of everyday life.

Research Question

Among preschool children, is temperament significantly related to predominant styles of coping with daily hassles?

Hypotheses

There will be a significant relationship between temperament and predominant styles of coping with daily hassles.

Conceptual Framework

1. Coping refers to efforts, both action-oriented and intrapsychic, to manage environmental and internal demands, which are appraised as stressful (Lazarus & Launier, 1978).
2. Hassles are the ordinary daily complications of life which cause stress for an individual (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).
3. Temperament is a stylistic component of behavior consisting of the how of behavior (Thomas & Chess, 1977).
 - a. The easy child is described as regular in biological functioning, responding with positive approaches to new stimuli, highly adaptable to change, and displaying a mild or

moderately intense mood which is predominantly positive.

- b. The difficult child is characterized by an irregularity of biological functioning, negative withdrawal responses to new stimuli, non-adaptability or slow adaptability to change, and intense mood expressions which are often negative.
 - c. The slow-to-warm-up child is identified by a combination of negative, mildly intensive responses to new stimuli; and slow adaptability. The mildness of the intensity of response is what distinguishes this child from the difficult child.
4. Preschool children include those children who have not yet entered into the formalized school systems by way of Kindergarten, but are engaged in some form of schooling. In this study, the sample was comprised of 4-year-olds.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Stress and Coping

The preschool years are important for the development of a well-adjusted individual. This is a time of rapid learning and growth in all areas of development, including the cognitive, physical, and social-emotional realms. The experiences which occur during all stages of growth and development, including these first five years, often accompany or cause stress in an individual.

An individual's biological or psychological reactions to an event depend upon his/her preparedness, which is often a function of his/her stage of development. The kind of situation which arouses a stress response in an individual is related to the significant events in that person's life (Appley & Trumbull, 1967). There are likely to be varying levels of insulation from the effects of certain kinds of stress-producers compared with others. Individuals have differing thresholds, and are vulnerable to different kinds of stressors.

Rutter (1988) identified one of the most crucial tasks of development as learning how to deal with the inevitable stresses that occur throughout life. He suggested that the long term effects of childhood stress most likely depend on how these stresses are dealt with, at the time they occur, and upon whether or not the outcome is successful adaptation.

Coping is a reaction to a stressor that resolves, reduces, or replaces the affective state classified as stressful (Rutter, 1988). The coping mechanisms that are used when stresses arise are crucial to their successful resolution and affect the overall well-being of the individual. In fact, the way a person copes with stress may be even more important to his/her overall morale, social functioning, and health than the frequency and severity of the episodes of stress themselves (Lazarus & Launier, 1978).

Coping mechanisms involve an individual's attempts to directly alter the threatening conditions of the situation and attempts to change only their appraisal of them so as not to feel threatened. Coping involves the dual functions of problem-solving and regulation of emotional distress. Coping may involve both

manipulation of the environment and intrapsychic processes (Rutter, 1988).

Four basic strategies utilized when coping with stress have been identified by Blom, Cheney, and Snoddy (1986). These include action-, feeling-, thinking-, and body response-oriented styles.

Behavioral, or action-oriented reactions to stress, involve three types of behaviors. Counter behavior is a defensive action taken with the intention of counteracting the stressful condition, such as misbehaving. Dysfunctional behavior is a reaction which demonstrates impaired or abnormal functioning and results in a lower level of performance than the individual is ordinarily capable, such as regressive behavior. Overt behavior is an expressive reaction, such as distorted facial expressions, pacing, or hiding, indicating a need for activity or movement. There is strong support for the notion that overt behavior, in the form of action, is preferable in most situations and can be highly effective in redirecting threats and distress (Blom, Cheney, & Snoddy, 1986; Humphrey & Humphrey, 1981).

Emotional reactions to stress, which constitute

the second basic coping strategy, are either impulsive or inhibited. An impulsive expression of anger, for example, is directed against a person or object. An inhibited expression, however, is kept under control but may be manifested by overt behaviors, such as flushed skin tones (Humphrey & Humphrey, 1981), temper tantrums, and depression (Blom, Cheney, & Snoddy, 1986).

The purpose of physiological reactions to stress is to prepare the body for the fight or flight response. Bodily reactions may include increased heart rate and blood pressure, dilated pupils, and increased production of stomach acid (Humphrey & Humphrey, 1981). These occurrences may lead to such overt responses as nausea and hyperactivity (Blom, Cheney, & Snoddy, 1986).

Cognitive reactions to stress suggest that an individual is thinking about his/her situation, its effects, and any possible methods for preventing greater stress or discomfort. These reactions may include distractability, increased concentration, and an increased frequency of questions (Blom, Cheney, & Snoddy, 1986).

During the coping process, the individual utilizes available resources in managing the demands of the stressful situation. The individual engaged in a coping response is involved in a dynamic, reciprocal relationship with the environment (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Many factors contribute to an individual's coping repertoire, including intelligence, genetic factors, problem-solving skills, age, sex, and temperament (Rutter, 1988). The coping reactions chosen to deal with a specific stressor will vary with the affect generated, as well as with the child's history and temperament. There is an extraordinary variation among children in the selection of a coping response (Rutter, 1988).

Brenner (1984) points out that it is necessary to examine whether a child's coping strategies help him/her to avoid or face a stressor. The techniques which allow him/her to avoid the stressor are often more useful in the short-term; however, adaptations which allow a child to acknowledge and accept a stressor are considered more healthy in the long-term.

Blom, Cheney, and Snoddy (1986) describe the three processes of coping, defending, and fragmenting which

may occur when an individual is faced with stress. During coping, an attitude of challenge, or actively dealing with stressful events and their associated feelings is involved. Common behaviors include the expression of feeling, acceptance of consequences, and assumption of responsibility. A posture of threat, protection, or avoidance of unpleasant events is evident during defending. Common behaviors include withdrawal, blaming others, denying guilt, and refusing responsibility. During fragmenting, an attitude of perceived danger is present. Neither active dealing nor protective mechanisms are used. This often results in disorganized behavior, mistrust in others, and psychosomatic symptoms.

Research in the area of adult stress is extensive. The earliest works focus on the major stressful events which occur during adulthood, called "life events" by Holmes and Rahe (1967). Recently, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) have developed a theory of stress related to the everyday complications of life, called "hassles." It has been discovered that although hassles and life events are positively correlated, hassles are better predictors of psychological and somatic symptoms, and

adaptational outcomes as a whole for the individual (Kanner, Coyne, Schaefer, & Lazarus, 1981; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

Research in the area of stress during childhood is minimal. Moreover, the majority of the current research concentrates on the effects of life events and catastrophic stresses. Topics have included separation and bereavement, war (Garmezy, 1988), and divorce (Wallerstein, 1988). There is a great need for research in the area of children's coping with daily stresses and hassles.

Temperament

One of the first personality aspects to appear during infancy is that of temperament. Temperament has been defined as a set of inherited personality traits that appear early in life (Buss & Plomin, 1987), a stylistic component of behavior (Thomas & Chess, 1987), a set of relatively stable, primarily biological differences in reactivity and self-regulation (Rothbart, 1987), and as individual differences in the probability of experiencing and expressing the primary emotions and arousal (Goldsmith, 1987).

Three major orientations have emerged in the

temperament literature. These include the behavioral genetic approach of Buss and Plomin (1975; 1987), the psychophysiological approach of Rothbart and Derryberry (1982), and the clinical psychiatric approach of Thomas and Chess (1977, 1987).

Buss and Plomin (1984, 1987) utilized the parent ratings of twins in deriving their theory of temperament. They focused on the genetic component of individual differences and defined temperament as heritable traits present in early childhood and predictive of adult personality characteristics. These researchers have identified temperament traits by the degree to which they are (a) heritable, (b) stable, (c) predictive of the adult personality, (d) adaptive, and (e) perhaps present in other animals (Buss & Plomin, 1975). Through the use of this technique they have suggested four dimensions of temperament, including emotionality, activity, sociability, and impulsivity. The dimension of impulsivity was later eliminated because it is not likely to occur in infancy (Buss & Plomin, 1984).

Rothbart and Derryberry, taking a physiologically based orientation to temperament, defined it as the

relatively stable, biologically-based individual differences in reactivity of the nervous system and the process of modulation of this reactivity (Rothbart, 1987; Rothbart & Derryberry, 1982). Reactivity is defined as the individual's overall excitability as a function of the cortical, autonomic, motor, and endocrine processes of the nervous system (Rothbart & Derryberry, 1982).

According to Rothbart and Derryberry (1982), individuals vary in their degree and manner of self-regulated reactivity to the changes in the nervous system. The development of temperament traits involves an interaction between heredity, biological development, and life experiences (Rothbart & Derryberry, 1982). These researchers have defined six dimensions of temperament, including (a) activity level, (b) smiling and laughter, (c) fear, (d) distress to limitation, (e) soothability, and (f) duration of orienting (Rothbart, 1981; 1987).

Of the major theories of temperament, the one presented by Thomas & Chess is the most influential (Hubert, 1982). They define temperament as a stylistic component of behavior. They clarify this

definition by stating that temperament may be viewed as a general term referring to the how of behavior, in that it concerns the way in which an individual acts (Thomas & Chess, 1987). Thomas and Chess introduced the concept that infants possess intrinsic personality characteristics that affect their individual styles of interaction. Temperament is therefore important in the development of personality (Thomas & Chess, 1977).

Another concept, introduced by Thomas, Chess, and Birch (1968), is that of goodness-of-fit. Goodness-of-fit describes the interactive process between the child and the caregiver, or environment. The adequacy of the organism's functioning is dependent upon the degree to which the properties of its environment match his/her own characteristics and style of behaving. Optimal development, in a progressive manner, is achieved through the interaction of the child with the environmental opportunities and demands that are consonant with his/her capacities and behavioral style. Disorders in functioning may be seen as deriving from discrepancies between the characteristics of the child and his/her environment (Thomas, Chess, & Birch, 1968). If the parent's caregiving techniques mesh

easily with the child's temperament, a positive goodness-of-fit results. This will have a beneficial effect on the socialization process through which the child will progress. If an inferior goodness-of-fit emerges, the child may be at risk for the development of socialization difficulties, problems in school, or behavior disorders (Thomas & Chess, 1977).

Dissonance, or poorness-of-fit, is the result during those child-environment interactions in which demands are made on the child that he/she is incapable of mastering, and may lead to maladjusted functioning (Thomas, Chess, & Birch, 1968).

Thomas and Chess conducted extensive research in the area of temperament in children, and their theory has generated a great deal of research on the behavioral correlates and predictability of behavioral problems. They stated that temperament is composed of nine categories. Activity level refers to the motor component in an individual child's functioning and the daily occurrence of active and inactive periods. Rhythmicity concerns the predictability or unpredictability of a child's feeding pattern, sleep/wake cycle, and elimination schedule. Approach or

withdrawal indicates the nature of a child's initial response to a new stimulus. Approach would be a positive response, while withdrawal would be negative. Adaptability indicates an individual's responses to new or altered situations, or the ease to which the initial response is altered in the desired direction. Threshold of responsiveness refers to the intensity level of stimulation necessary in order to evoke a discernable response from a child, irrespective of the form the response may take or the sensory modality affected. Intensity of reaction describes the energy level of the response to stimulation, irrespective of the quality or direction of the response. Quality of mood concerns the amount of "pleasant, joyful and friendly" behavior, as compared with the amount of "unpleasant, crying, and unfriendly behavior." Distractibility refers to the ability of outside environmental stimuli to interfere with or alter the direction of a child's ongoing behavior. Attention span and persistence consists of the length of time an activity is pursued by a child, and the continuation of the activity in spite of obstacles which may affect the maintenance of the activity direction.

As a result of their New York Longitudinal Study (NYLS), Thomas and Chess (1977) were able to identify three clusters related to temperament in children. The easy child, comprising 40% of their sample, is described as regular in biological functioning, responding with positive approaches to new stimuli, highly adaptable to change, and with a mild or moderately intense mood which is predominantly positive. The difficult child, making up 10% of their sample, is characterized by an irregularity of biological functions, negative withdrawal responses to new stimuli, non-adaptability or slow adaptability to change, and intense mood expressions which are often negative. The slow-to-warm-up child, constituting 15% of their sample, is identified by a combination of negative, mildly intensive responses to new stimuli, and slow adaptability. The mildness of the intensity of response is what separates these children from difficult children (Thomas & Chess, 1977).

The origin of temperament is not clear. Torgensen and Kringlen (1978) found that there is a strong genetic influence on the disposition. Thomas and Chess (1977) and Goldsmith, Buss, Plomin, Rothbart, Thomas,

Chess, Hinde, and McCall (1987) also stated that the expression and nature of temperament are influenced by environmental factors as well. Although the three major orientations toward the study of temperament are vastly different, there are no contradictions among them. The theories are compatible, and may be used together to strengthen the research on temperament. It seems that temperament is present at birth, and therefore hereditary, but that life experiences and the environment can help to shape its development and influence the resulting adult personality. Even though individual temperamental features change as children grow older, such features may still play an important role in determining individual-environment interactions at any one time (Chess, & Thomas, 1986; Thomas, Chess, & Birch, 1968; Rutter, 1988).

Stress, Coping, and Temperament

Since the effects of stress depend on how an individual copes, and temperament involves reactivity to stimuli, these two constructs should be related. According to Thomas, Chess, and Birch (1968, p. 138),

"stress can be distinguished from an easily accomplished demand by considering it to represent a demand on the child either for an alteration in a habitual pattern of functioning, or for the

mastery of a new activity or task that is difficult for him to achieve" (p. 138).

If the demand is harmonious with the child's capabilities, even if difficult, "expanded environmental mastery and developmental progress will occur and demand will have constituted healthy stimulation for the child" (p. 138). If the demand is so dissonant with the child's behavioral style and ability that mastery is not possible, persistence will not contribute to a healthy outcome. Stress can be excessive and may lead to the development of behavioral disturbances if continued. Thomas, Chess, and Birch go on to say:

"Demands and stresses, when consonant with developmental potentials, however, may be constructive in their consequences and should not be considered as an inevitable cause of behavioral disturbances" (p. 138).

However, there is little research on the contribution of temperament in modifying children's reactions to stressful events (Rutter, 1988). Exceptions include a study by Wertlieb, Weigel, Springer, and Feldstein (1987) who have offered evidence for main effects of stress and temperament on the production of behavioral symptoms in children.

These results give further support to the idea that temperament influences socioemotional functioning and adaptational outcomes of stress reactions in children. Lerner and East (1985) also reported evidence for the hypothesis that temperament may be an important moderator of an individual's reactions to stressors.

Research in the area of childhood stress and coping, as related to temperament, has mainly concerned life events and catastrophic stresses. Dunn, Kendrick, and MacNamee (1981) found that a child's temperament predicted changes in behavior after the birth of a sibling. The implication is that a child's temperamental features mediate the tendency of behavioral changes after a stressful life event such as this. In the Kauai Longitudinal Study, temperamental differences in activity level and social responsiveness were key discriminators of resilient versus problem-plagued children (Werner & Smith, 1982).

Summary

The review of literature indicates that reactions to life events stress and coping mechanisms may be influenced by temperamental characteristics. This researcher found only one previous study (Lookabaugh,

1985) on the relationship between the stress and coping associated with daily hassles and temperament. This is an area which requires further investigation.

Chapter III

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to identify the relationships among the coping styles utilized by preschoolers in dealing with daily hassles and temperament. The researcher examined these relationships through the use of trait ratings and parental reports of behaviors. No control group was utilized; for some analyses, a subsample was selected so as to balance the proportion of children in each temperament group.

The procedure used in conducting this study was as follows: obtained permission to carry out the study, selected participants, located data gathering instruments, administered the instruments, and analyzed the data.

Description of the Sample

The sample consisted of 86 parents of 4-year-old children (M age = 54 months, SD = 3.91 months). The children were enrolled in seven preschools or day care centers in Montgomery and Pulaski Counties in Southwest Virginia. Parents of these children were invited to involve their children in the study by completing the

provided questionnaire packet. A questionnaire packet, accompanied by a brief verbal explanation, was handed to parents as they arrived to pick up their children from school in the afternoon. Approximately 150 packets were distributed; 86 completed packets were collected, yielding a return rate of approximately 57 percent. Of the completed packets, 72 (83.7%) were completed by mothers, and 12 (14%) were completed by fathers. The child sample consisted of 35 (40.7%) males and 51 (59.3%) females.

Since the scores on the BSQ which revealed slow-to-warm-up and intermediate temperaments in children overlapped with those used to determine easy and difficult children, subjects with slow-to-warm-up and intermediate temperaments were disregarded during compilation of a more relevant subsample. The total sample included 13 difficult children and 19 easy children. In order to assure an equal distribution of subjects in the subsample, 6 easy children were randomly selected and removed from the sample set. The resulting easy/difficult subsample (13 easy and 13 difficult children), was composed of 19 females (73.1%) and 7 males (26.9%).

Description of the Instruments

The packet supplied to each parent contained an introductory letter, a consent form/information sheet (containing questions on demographic characteristics), and the instruments to be used.

Behavioral Style Questionnaire

The Behavioral Style Questionnaire (McDevitt & Carey, 1975) was utilized to assess each child's temperament. The scale consists of 100 items, each answered on a Likert-type scale ranging from almost never (assigned score of 1) to almost always (assigned score of 6).

Some sample items are: the child laughs or smiles while playing, the child is willing to try new things, changes in plans bother the child, and the child complains when tired. Through the scoring of the instrument, each child will be placed in one of the four categories (easy, difficult, slow-to-warm-up, intermediate). It is also possible to look at each child's scores in relation to the nine dimensions of temperament.

This researcher selected this scale because it is a reliable and valid measure of the constructs of

interest in this study. Internal consistency for the entire scale is 0.84. Test-retest reliability is 0.89 (McDevitt & Carey, 1978). Further, it is appropriate for the age group under consideration. It is based on a theoretical orientation which is compatible with the variable of interest.

The Coping Styles Inventory for Preschool Children

In conducting the background research and literature review, in preparation for this study, the researcher failed to find a scale which identified the ways in which young children cope with daily hassles. Since this was a crucial component of the proposed project, the Coping Styles Inventory for Preschool Children (CSIPC) was developed by the researcher. This instrument was utilized to identify each child's predominant coping style.

In developing the CSIPC, the coping styles identified by Blom, Cheney, and Snoddy (1986) were utilized. The four categories of response to stress are feeling, thinking, acting, and reacting (called body response by Blom, Cheney, and Snoddy). The feeling response category includes such emotional reactions as crying and happiness. The thinking

response category includes such reactions as daydreaming and asking questions. The action response category includes such reactions as hiding and complying. The reacting category includes such body responses as thumb sucking and feeling ill.

During the next phase of the scale development, the researcher identified those situations which are common to all preschool children, as everyday occurrences, and are potential hassles for them. These include events such as separating from a parent, receiving minor injuries during play, and making trips to the doctor or dentist.

After numerous revisions, the final instrument consisted of 15 situational items, each with eight response selections to be answered (two from each response category). The frequency of the child's reaction with each of the eight responses is indicated on a Likert-type scale ranging from almost never (a score of 1) to almost always (a score of 6).

The analysis of data obtained through the use of this instrument will reveal a coping styles profile for each child. This profile will consist of a high/low rating in each of the four response categories,

indicating the frequency with which these techniques are used by the child.

As this scale has been developed solely for the purpose of carrying out this proposed research, no reliability or validity information is yet available. The researcher hopes to validate this instrument in the future and obtain this information at that time.

Administration of the Instruments

Parents of participating schools received a letter of invitation to take part in the proposed study. Those choosing to participate were given a packet containing an introductory letter, a consent form/information sheet, and the questionnaires to be utilized. All replies remain anonymous, with the exception of the respondent's relationship to the child subject, characteristics of the child such as gender and age, and various demographic characteristics. Names have been listed separately from data, identifiable only by a code number stored separately and accessible only to the researcher and project director.

Analysis of the Data

The Behavioral Style Questionnaire was scored according to the guidelines provided by the author of the scale. The researcher tabulated the data collected. Analysis of the BSQ identified each child as easy, difficult, slow-to-warm-up, or intermediate.

Analysis of the CSIPC revealed a profile of each child's coping style. The scoring consisted of tallying the number of responses which indicated a frequent utilization of each style of coping. A profile was thus revealed for each subject, displaying his/her use of each coping style, whether high (above the mean) or low (below the mean).

The responses to the demographic items were summarized using frequency counts and percentages. Pearson Correlation Coefficients were calculated for the variable pairs a) BSQ subscale scores with BSQ subscale scores, b) coping styles with coping styles, and c) BSQ subscale scores with coping styles. Analyses of variance were calculated for the variable pairs a) temperament by coping style, and b) BSQ subscale scores by coping style. Chi-square analyses were calculated for the variable pairs a) gender by

temperament, and b) temperament by coping style.

Chapter IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between temperament and styles of coping with the hassles of daily life in the preschool years. It was designed to identify any possible effects that a disposition of temperament may have on a learned response pattern such as coping style.

Questionnaire packets containing demographic surveys, the Behavioral Style Questionnaire, and the Coping Styles Inventory for Preschool Children were used as the instruments for the study.

Analysis of Data

The BSQ and CSIPC were scored according to the guidelines provided by the authors of each scale. Results of the entire sample of 86 children will be discussed, as well as results from the easy/difficult subsample containing 26 children.

In the total sample (N = 86), 19 children (20.9%) were rated as easy, 13 (16.3%) as difficult, 6 (7.0%) as slow-to-warm-up, and 48 (55.8%) as intermediate. On the feelings rating, 40 children (46.5%) were rated as

high, and 46 (53.5%) were rated as low. On the thinking subscale, 41 children (47.7%) were rated as high, and 45 (52.3%) were rated as low. On the acting subscale, 39 children (45.3%) were rated as high, and 47 (54.7%) were rated as low. On the reacting subscale, 31 children (36.0%) were rated as high, and 55 (64.0%) were rated as low.

Within the easy/difficult subsample ($n = 26$), 13 children (50%) were easy and 13 (50%) were difficult. On the feelings subscale, 12 children (46.2%) emerged with a high rating, and 14 (53.8%) emerged with a low rating. On the thinking subscale, 12 children (46.2%) emerged with a high rating, and 14 (53.8%) emerged with a low rating. On the acting subscale, 11 children (42.3%) emerged with a high rating, and 15 (57.7%) emerged with a low rating. On the reacting subscale, 7 children (26.9%) emerged with a high rating, and 19 (73.1%) emerged with a low rating.

The Behavioral Style Questionnaire

Table 1 indicates the means and standard deviations of the subject scores on the BSQ, as well as the norms provided by McDevitt and Carey (1978). Pearson product moment correlations were completed to

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Scores on Behavioral Style Questionnaire

Subscale	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standardized Sample Mean*
Activity			
N=86	3.60	.73	3.56
<u>n</u> =26	3.61	.66	
Rhythm			
N=86	3.15	.70	3.31
<u>n</u> =26	3.12	.86	
Approach/Withdrawal			
N=86	3.26	.79	2.75
<u>n</u> =26	3.28	.88	
Adaptability			
N=86	2.83	.67	2.99
<u>n</u> =26	2.82	.93	
Intensity			
N=86	4.38	.63	2.55
<u>n</u> =26	4.65	.59	
Mood			
N=86	3.49	.63	4.52
<u>n</u> =26	3.53	.81	
Persistence			
N=86	3.04	.70	2.87
<u>n</u> =26	2.98	.88	
Distractability			
N=86	3.86	.68	3.89
<u>n</u> =26	3.90	.64	
Threshold			
N=86	3.89	.60	3.89
<u>n</u> =26	3.96	.71	

Note: N=86 indicates that entire sample was included.

n=26 indicates that only easy and difficult subjects were included.

* means from McDevitt & Carey sample, 1975.

determine relationships among the subscale scores of the BSQ. This revealed numerous significant intercorrelations (Table 2).

A factor analysis of the BSQ extracted three factors. The first of these contains the activity, rhythm, and mood subscales; the second contains the threshold, intensity, and distractibility subscales; and the third contains the activity, persistence, and approach subscales.

A oneway ANOVA on the three extracted factors by easy/difficult temperament revealed significant results. The results from a comparison of the easy ($M = -1.06$, $SD = .47$) and difficult ($M = 1.02$, $SD = 1.15$) children by Factor 1 indicated a significant difference between these groups, $F(1,24) = 36.07$, $p = .00$. A comparison of the easy ($M = -.46$, $SD = .80$) and difficult ($M = .99$, $SD = .78$) children by Factor 2 indicated a significant difference between these two groups, $F(1,24) = 22.15$, $p = .00$. A comparison of the easy ($M = -.56$, $SD = .69$) and difficult ($M = .50$, $SD = 1.20$) children on Factor 3 indicates a significant difference between these two groups, $F(1,24) = 7.68$, $p = .01$.

Table 2

Interscale Correlations on TestBehavioral Style Questionnaire

	Activity	Motivation	Approach/ Withdrawal	Approach Intensity	Mod	Persistence	Distractability	Variable
Activity	---	.32**	-.14	.32**	.16	.10	.00**	
N=66	---	.63	-.13	.30	.42**	.26	.01	.02
n=26	---	---	.30**	.44***	.15	.15	.32**	.03
Approach/ Withdrawal			.59	.70	.00	.82	.80	.22
Approach/ Withdrawal ₁			---	.50***	-.11	.29**	-.01	.03
N=66	---	---	.77***	.56	.75	.15	.26	.03
n=26	---	---	---	---	.45	.32**	.22**	.03
Adaptability					.13	.42	.22**	.16*
N=66	---	---	---	---	.67	.62	.32	.07
n=26	---	---	---	---	.46***	.01	.20**	.44
InEasiness					---	.78	.21	.04
N=66	---	---	---	---	---	.69	.01	.06
n=26	---	---	---	---	---	.63	.01	.01
Persistace					---	---	.09	.27**
N=66	---	---	---	---	---	---	-.01	.41
n=26	---	---	---	---	---	---	-.01	.01
Distractability					---	---	-.29**	.35***
N=66	---	---	---	---	---	---	-.02	.02
n=26	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Note: N=66 indicates that entire sample was included.
 n=26 indicates that only easy and difficult subjects were included.

* P < .05

** P < .01

*** P < .001

These results suggest that difficult children are significantly less adaptable, less rhythmic, and have more negative moods than easy children (Factor 1). They imply that difficult children have lower thresholds, are more intense, and are more distractible than easy children (Factor 2). They also indicate that difficult children are more active, less persistent, and tend to withdraw more often than easy children (Factor 3).

The Coping Styles Inventory for Preschool Children

Table 3 displays the means and standard deviations of the sample scores for each style of coping, as revealed by the CSIPC. Pearson Correlations between the CSIPC subscale scores revealed significant intercorrelations between the subscales of feeling and thinking, $r = .20$ ($p = .03$); feeling and acting, $r = .31$ ($p = .00$); thinking and acting, $r = .27$ ($p = .00$); as well as thinking and reacting, $r = .27$ ($p = .00$) for the sample of 86 subjects. For the subsample of 26 subjects, significant intercorrelations occurred between the subscales of feeling and thinking, $r = .49$ ($p = .01$); feeling and acting, $r = .50$ ($p = .01$); thinking and acting, $r = .53$ ($p = .00$); and thinking

Table 3

**Means and Standard Deviations of Scores on Coping Styles
Inventory for Preschool Children**

Subscale	Mean	Standard Deviation
Feeling		
N=86	9.91	4.25
<u>n</u> =26	9.81	4.79
Thinking		
N=86	12.22	4.48
<u>n</u> =26	11.85	4.90
Acting		
N=86	12.02	3.55
<u>n</u> =26	12.62	3.89
Reacting		
N=86	4.36	4.34
<u>n</u> =26	4.08	3.79

Note: N=86 indicates that entire sample was included.
n=26 indicates that only easy and difficult subjects
were included.

and reacting, $r = .36$ ($p = .03$). (See Table 4).

A oneway analysis of variance, involving subject gender and coping style ($n = 86$), revealed a difference between males ($M = 8.86$) and females ($M = 10.63$) in their usage of a feelings style of coping, which approached significance, $F(1,84) = 3.72$, $p = .06$; and a difference between males ($M = 12.83$) and females ($M = 11.47$) in their usage of an acting style of coping which approached significance, $F(1,84) = 3.12$, $p = .08$.

A oneway analysis of variance involving the CSIPC subscales by gender ($n = 26$) revealed no significant relationship between coping style and gender for the total sample. A significant difference was discovered between the mean scores of the males ($M = 8.29$, $SD = 5.94$) and females ($M = 13.16$, $SD = 3.85$) on the thinking subscale of the CSIPC, $F(1,24) = 6.10$, $p = .02$. Females were rated as using cognitive coping mechanisms more often than males.

The BSQ and CSIPC

Performance of a Pearson correlation procedure revealed significant relationships between scores on several of the BSQ subscales and those of the CSIPC

Table 4

Interscale Correlations on Coping Styles Inventory for Preschool Children

	Feeling	Thinking	Acting	Reacting
Feeling				
N=86	---	.20*	.31**	.14
<u>N=26</u>	---	.49**	.50**	.24
Thinking				
N=86		---	.27**	.27**
<u>N=26</u>		---	.53**	.36*
Acting				
N=86			---	.08
<u>N=26</u>			---	.11

Note: N=86 indicates that entire sample was included.
N=26 indicates that only easy and difficult subjects were included.

* p < .05

** p < .01

(see Table 5).

A 4 X 1 analysis of variance was conducted to examine the relationships among the four temperament types and the four coping styles within the total sample. The means for the easy children ($M = 2.33$, $SD = 2.67$), the difficult children ($M = 4.86$, $SD = 4.38$), the slow-to-warm-up children ($M = 8.00$, $SD = 4.34$), and the intermediate children ($M = 4.52$, $SD = 4.63$) on the reacting subscale indicate a significant difference among the four temperament groups, $F(3,82) = 3.00$, $p = .04$. The means for the easy children ($M = 8.17$), the difficult children ($M = 11.07$), the slow-to-warm-up children ($M = 7.67$), and the intermediate children ($M = 10.50$) on the feelings subscale indicate a difference among the four temperament groups which approaches significance, $F(3,82) = 2.33$, $p = .08$ (see Table 6).

A 4 X 2 analysis of variance was conducted to examine the relationships among the easy and difficult temperament types and the four coping styles within the subsample ($N = 26$). The difference between the means for the children with easy temperaments ($M = 9.92$, $SD = 4.41$) and those with difficult temperaments ($M = 13.77$, $SD = 4.75$) on the thinking subscale indicates that

Table 5

**Intercorrelations Among Coping Styles Inventory for Preschool
Children and Behavioral Style Questionnaire Subscale Scores**

Subscale	Coping Styles			
	Feeling	Thinking	Acting	Reacting
Activity				
N=86	-.03	.03	.11	.08
n=26	.06	.30	.02	.33
Rhythm				
N=86	.03	.02	-.13	.10
n=26	.08	.42	-.14	.20
Approach/ Withdrawal				
N=86	-.01	.08	-.17	.11
n=26	.14	.46	-.18	.32
Adaptability				
N=86	-.10	.14	-.10	.11
n=26	.19	.54	-.09	.09
Intensity				
N=86	.22	.31	.11	.16
n=26	.13	.34	-.16	.40
Mood				
N=86	.10	.32	-.03	.21
n=26	.21	.40	-.26	.16
Persistence				
N=86	.04	.00	.01	.11
n=26	.13	.39	.00	.28
Distractability				
N=86	.03	.18	.16	-.17
n=26	.10	.22	.34	-.12
Threshold				
N=86	.03	.22	-.05	.05
n=26	-.09	.14	.02	.06

Note: N=86 indicates that entire sample was included.
n=26 indicates that only easy and difficult subjects
 were included.

Table 6

Means and F Values of Coping Styles Broken Down by Temperament

Style	Temperament				F value
	Easy	Difficult	Slow to Warm Up	Intermediate	
Feeling					
N=86	8.17	11.07	7.67	10.60	.23
<u>n</u> =26	8.69	10.92	---	---	1.43
Thinking					
N=86	11.67	13.07	12.17	12.19	.26
<u>n</u> =26	9.92	13.77	---	---	4.59*
Acting					
N=86	12.28	11.86	12.50	11.92	.09
<u>n</u> =26	13.54	11.69	---	---	1.49
Reacting					
N=86	2.33	4.86	8.00	4.52	3.00*
<u>n</u> =26	3.00	5.15	---	---	2.20

Note: N=86 indicates that entire sample was included.
n=26 indicates that only easy and difficult subjects were included.

* p < .05

there is a significant difference between these two groups, $F(1,24) = 4.59$, $p = .04$ (see Table 6).

Multiple oneway analyses of variance were conducted to examine the relationships among the ratings on each of the four coping styles and each of the nine temperament subscales within the total sample ($N = 86$). On the intensity subscale, the means for the high-level thinkers ($M = 4.51$, $SD = .66$) and the low-level thinkers ($M = 4.26$, $SD = .58$) indicated a difference between the effects of these styles which approached significance, $F(1,84) = 3.69$, $p = .06$. The means for the high-level thinkers ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .54$) and the low-level thinkers ($M = 3.69$, $SD = .61$) on the mood subscale indicates a significant difference between the effects of these styles, $F(1,84) = 8.36$, $p = .01$. The means for the high-level reactors ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .54$) and the low-level reactors ($M = 3.37$, $SD = .64$) on the mood subscale indicates a significant difference between the effects of these styles, $F(1,84) = 6.01$, $p = .02$. The means for the high-level reactors ($M = 3.66$, $SD = .59$) and the low-level reactors ($M = 3.97$, $SD = .71$) on the distractibility subscale indicates a significant difference between the effects

of these styles, $F(1,84) = 4.04$, $p = .05$ (see Table 7).

Multiple oneway analyses of variance were conducted to examine the relationships among the ratings on each of the four coping styles and each of the nine temperament subscales within the easy/difficult subsample ($n = 26$). The means for the high-level thinkers ($M = 3.83$, $SD = .87$) and the low-level thinkers ($M = 2.81$, $SD = .58$) on the approach/withdrawal subscale indicates a significant difference between the effects of these styles, $F(1,24) = 9.91$, $p = .01$. The means for the high-level thinkers ($M = 3.44$, $SD = .81$) and the low-level thinkers ($M = 2.29$, $SD = .68$) on the adaptability subscale indicates a significant difference between the effects of these styles, $F(1,24) = 10.82$, $p = .01$. The means for the high-level thinkers ($M = 3.94$, $SD = .68$) and the low-level thinkers ($M = 3.18$, $SD = .77$) on the mood subscale indicates a difference between the effects of these styles which approaches significance, $F(1,24) = 4.28$, $p = .06$. The means for the high-level feelers ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .81$) and the low-level thinkers ($M = 4.17$, $SD = .57$) on the threshold subscale indicate a significant difference between the effects

Table 7

p values for Behavioral Style Questionnaire Subscale Scores
Broken Down by Coping Style

Subscale	Coping Style			
	Feeling	Thinking	Acting	Reacting
Activity				
N=86	.88	1.80	.12	.63
<u>n</u> =26	.00	2.95	.38	1.76
Rhythm				
N=86	.44	.17	1.09	1.38
<u>n</u> =26	.10	8.43*	3.56	.01
Approach/ Withdrawal				
N=86	.92	1.08	2.03	.27
<u>n</u> =26	.50	9.91**	1.84	.39
Adaptability				
N=86	1.42	2.27	.20	1.62
<u>n</u> =26	.42	10.82**	1.38	.02
Intensity				
N=86	1.11	3.69	.13	.09
<u>n</u> =26	.17	1.19	.67	.57
Mood				
N=86	.13	5.74*	.00	6.01*
<u>n</u> =26	.00	4.28	2.36	.55
Persistence				
N=86	1.24	.00	.00	.51
<u>n</u> =26	2.98	4.45*	2.04	.00
Distractability				
N=86	.29	1.03	1.13	4.04*
<u>n</u> =26	.19	.14	2.15	.87
Threshold				
N=86	.24	.99	.36	.18
<u>n</u> =26	4.52*	1.78	1.63	.07

Note: N=86 indicates that entire sample was included.
n=26 indicates that only easy and difficult subjects were included.

* p < .05

** p < .01

of these styles, $F(1,24) = 4.52$, $p = .05$. The means for the high-level thinkers ($M = 3.56$, $SD = .90$) and the low-level thinkers ($M = 2.74$, $SD = .63$) on the rhythm subscale indicate a significant difference between the effects of these styles, $F(1,24) = 8.43$, $p = .01$. The means for the high level thinkers ($M = 3.28$, $SD = 1.07$) and the low level thinkers ($M = 2.71$, $SD = .58$) on the persistence subscale indicate a significant difference between the effects of these styles, $F(1,24) = 4.45$, $p = .05$ (see Table 7).

A chi-square analysis was conducted to examine the level of use of each of the four coping styles within each temperament category. Significantly more subjects in the easy temperament category were rated as low on the reactivity subscale of the CSIPC, $\chi^2 = 9.28$, $p = .03$.

A chi-square analysis was conducted to examine the level of use of each of the four coping styles within the easy/difficult temperament categories ($n = 26$). Significantly more subjects in the easy temperament category were rated as using low levels of thinking, and significantly more subjects in the difficult temperament category were rated as using high levels of

thinking when coping with hassles, $\bar{X}_2 = 3.87$, $p = .05$.

Multiple oneway analyses of variance were conducted to examine the relationships among the three factors, extracted from the BSQ, and the four styles of coping utilized within the total sample ($N = 86$). A significant relationship was found between Factor 1, containing the three BSQ subscales of approach/withdrawal, adaptability, and distractibility, and the reacting subscale of the CSIPC, $F(1,84) = 4.65$, $p = .03$, with the subjects who used higher amounts of the reacting style ($M = .30$, $SD = .85$) loading positively on the factor, and those who used lower amounts ($M = -.17$, $SD = 1.05$) loading negatively. A significant relationship was found between Factor 2, containing the three BSQ subscales of intensity, threshold, and mood, and the use of thinking subscale of the CSIPC, $F(1,84) = 3.97$, $p = .05$, with the subjects who used higher amounts of the thinking style ($M = 22$, $SD = 1.01$) loading positively on the factor, and those who used lower amounts ($M = -.20$, $SD = .96$) loading negatively.

Multiple analyses of variance were conducted to examine the relationships among the three factors, extracted from the BSQ, and the four styles of coping

utilized within the subsample ($n = 26$). A significant relationship was found between Factor 1, containing the three BSQ subscales of approach/withdrawal, adaptability, and distractibility, and the thinking subscale of the CSIPC, $F(1,24) = 11.60$, $p = .00$, with the subjects who used higher levels of the thinking style ($M = .81$, $SD = 1.41$) loading positively on the factor, and those who used lower levels ($M = -.73$, $SD = .86$) loading negatively. A relationship which approached significance was found between Factor 2, containing the three BSQ subscales of intensity, threshold, and mood, and the thinking subscale of the CSIPC, $F = 3.48$, $p = .07$, with those subjects who used higher levels of the thinking style ($M = .67$, $SD = .94$) loading positively on the factor, and those who used lower levels ($M = -.08$, $SD = 1.09$) loading negatively. A relationship which approached significance was found between Factor 3, containing the three BSQ subscales of activity, persistence, and rhythm, and the thinking subscale of the CSIPC, $F = 3.64$, $p = .07$, with those subjects who used higher levels of the thinking style ($M = .40$, $SD = 1.34$) loading positively on the factor, and those who used lower levels ($M = -.39$, $SD = .70$)

loading negatively.

Chapter V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore and explain any possible existing relationship between a preschool child's temperament and his/her predominant style of coping with the hassles of daily life. It was designed to identify any possible effects that a disposition of temperament may have on a learned response pattern such as coping style.

Although the literature is wrought with controversy and disagreement, an attempt was made to reveal a clear picture of the true origin, nature, and affects of temperament for the developing preschool child. A lack of published literature on coping styles resulted in scale development and interpretation.

The most significant findings of this study pertain to the children who emerged as thinkers. Children who seemed to use cognitive coping mechanisms tended to be more withdrawn, less adaptive, more intense, less persistent, and have much more negative moods than those children who tended to utilize the alternative coping mechanisms of feeling, acting,

and/or reacting. These five characteristics, taken as a whole, seem to paint a picture of an argumentative child, or one who is typically negative in his/her outlook and dealings with others and life in general. These children were therefore rated as difficult significantly more often than any other children. This seems logical, in that an argumentative or curious child is often annoying and aggravating to adults.

Thinkers seem to be attempting to affect the world around them. They ask questions, make excuses, and generally try to seek control of others and their environment. Feelers and reactors, however, seem to react to the world as it affects them, rather than try to have a deliberate affect on it. Although the statistical results concerning the feelers and reactors were not significant, the differences in mean scores clearly support this hypothesis.

The temperament model discussed by Rothbart (1987) indicates an interactive quality in the personality characteristic of temperament. An individual's expressed temperament directly affects the people he/she comes into contact with, as well as his/her environmental surroundings. Dunn (1980), when

discussing the concept of individual differences in children's temperaments, stated that these variations in personality from one child to another may shape the course of a child's development by influencing the way people behave toward him/her and by affecting the range of his/her life experience. For instance, Rutter (1988) discussed the effect of the birth of a sibling on a child's behavior. He stated that the child's temperament increases the possibility of behavior changes following the birth of a sibling. However, this increased liability of behavior change is due in part to the effect of temperament in modifying a child's responses to altered parental behavior.

Children of differing temperaments elicit different parental behaviors.

There is an intimate association between some individual differences in children, and differences in the way their parents behave toward them...Parents will vary in their reaction to children of different temperaments. Just as similar patterns of lively and demanding behavior may be found to be intolerably wearing by some parents and enjoyable by others, so too similar parental styles will be experienced very differently by children with different temperamental makeups (Dunn, 1980, p. 106).

Temperamental influences on an individual's social strategies indirectly affect others also (Rutter,

1988). Temperament will influence the circumstances under which a child feels comfortable or uncomfortable and distressed. It will influence the situations his/her chooses to enter or avoid (Rothbart, 1987).

Children who are active, curious and investigate may enjoy the experience of new situations, and gain from a range of experiences far wider than that experienced by a more withdrawn and passive child (Dunn, 1980, p. 106).

This concept then may be involved in the process of "niche picking" (Rothbart, 1987).

Differences in children's adaptabilities will affect the degree of unhappiness or stress experienced when faced with a change in circumstances or the environment. Changes of this nature are recurrent in the lives of young children (Dunn, 1980). Individual differences between children may be important in explaining the differences between children's responses to such stressful experiences (Dunn, 1980). The way children are treated by others may indicate a protective effect as a result of temperament. Campbell (1974) discovered that more active babies were given more attention in a hospital nursery. Carey (1970) found that children with difficult temperamental characteristics tended to be more accident prone. This

could be due to either a greater frequency of reckless, exploring behavior, or less close supervision.

Rothbart (1988) suggested that easy children are less neurophysiologically reactive. The functioning of the neurochemical system is of great importance in an individual's response to stress. Rutter (1988) stated that differences in the endocrine responses are linked to variations in how individuals perceive events and respond to situations. How the stimulus is discerned is critical in determining the neuroendocrine response of the body (Ciaranello, 1988; Mandel, 1967). When the stimulus is perceived as a challenge to the individual's control, the fight-flight mechanism is activated, and an increased secretion of norepinephrine and epinephrine results. When the stimulus is perceived as a loss of control by the individual, a sense of helplessness and anxiety occurs, and adrenaline is released. According to Ciaranello (1988), "not only do specific circumstances cause preferential release of one or the other of the catecholamines, but personality type seems to be an important determinant as well" (p. 97).

From the present study, it may be hypothesized

that children who choose thinking styles of coping, and are trying to gain control of themselves and their surroundings, will perceive a stressful stimulus as a challenge. The fight-flight mechanism will therefore be activated, accompanied by an increased secretion of epinephrine and norepinephrine. Those children who choose the feeling and reacting styles of coping, in responding to their surroundings, may perceive a stressful stimulus as a loss of control. A sense of helplessness and anxiety may result, along with an increased release of adrenaline.

At all levels, differential response capability exists to modulate, amplify, or attenuate responses to the stress. "The function of this system is basic: it serves to keep the animal alive" (Ciaranello, 1988, p. 100).

Resulting Questions

Several questions arise as a result of this study:

1. Since the difficult children were revealed as using more cognitive coping techniques, the question arises as to whether these children are coping more or less effectively than those children who are using different coping techniques, and may therefore be rated

as easy. If the difficult/thinkers are not coping as effectively as the others, then do they need to learn to use the other types of coping techniques (ie. emotions, actions, physiological responses)? In other words, are they difficult because they are thinkers, or are they thinkers because they are difficult, and are these characteristics maladaptive? If they are difficult because they are thinkers, it may be helpful to assist these children in learning to use some coping mechanisms from the other styles. If they are thinkers because they are difficult, it may be helpful to encourage and support the development of more adequate cognitive coping skills in these children.

2. Questions as to the effectiveness of easy children's coping abilities arise. Do easy children cope more adequately than others, or do they just have higher thresholds for perceiving stress and therefore have less stress to contend with? It cannot be determined from these results whether the feelers, actors, and reactors are coping more or less effectively than the thinkers. In fact, as Rutter (1988) stated, "there can be no one (or even several) most successful coping strategy - the mode which is

most effective is likely to vary with the type of stress and the circumstances" (p. 29). It may be that some methods are more appropriate for one person, while others are better suited to another person. All that we know is that they are utilizing different coping techniques.

3. Since these preschool children have not yet developed the skills necessary for verbalizing the ways in which they are feeling, thinking, acting, and reacting, their parents were asked to rate these characteristics for them in order to determine their temperaments and coping styles. Questions arise concerning what constructs are actually being measured in such an instance. Is the child's true temperament and coping style being measured, or the parental perception of the child's temperament and coping style? Most likely the latter. If so, the parent's personality characteristics, including temperament and coping style, will also affect the rating process.

The numerous intercorrelations which were discovered among the scores on the BSQ may indicate that parents who rated their children as high or low on one subscale, tended to rate them similarly on most

other subscales. Similar results were obtained with respect to the CSIPC.

A factor analysis of the CSIPC revealed only one factor. Intercorrelations may indicate a tendency for the parents, in completing the questionnaires, to score children as either high or low on most items. These considerations may indicate a problem in utilizing parents as raters on these instrument. They may be unable to supply purely objective information about their children. It may be argued, however, that only the parents of the child would actually be familiar with his/her responses to such daily complications as those appearing on the BSQ and CSIPC. Thomas and Chess (1982), in referring to temperament, stated that rating a child on this construct requires information on the child's behavior in many situations and sequences of behavioral responses over hours and days. "Only an observer living with the child has sufficient information to adequately rate the child's behavior" (Thomas & Chess, 1982, p. 8).

One consideration in evaluating the accuracy of the CSIPC is that each question contains feeling, thinking, acting, and reacting selections in the

positive and negative direction. Therefore, these directional effects may cancel out the overall trend during scoring. It may be beneficial to devise a procedure to weight the items according to their positive and negative direction.

Chapter VI

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS

In conclusion, this study on the temperamental personality predictors of preschool children's coping styles produced potential contributions and implications for parents, educators, counselors, and all those who work closely with and come into contact with young children. This study attempts to clarify the role of temperament in the coping process. The indication that difficult children utilize cognitive styles of coping with hassles suggests that new approaches for working with these children need to be formulated.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. The study should be replicated with a larger sample in order to increase the accuracy and confidence of the conclusions made.
2. Replication of the study involving subjects of various ages should be performed in order to test for age-related effects.
3. Further investigations of the reliability and

validity of the CSIPC should be performed.

4. Investigations of the benefits and/or drawbacks of difficult temperaments should be conducted, including such issues as coping effectiveness, and resilience to stress.

5. Investigations into the neurochemical composure of children under stress; the relationship between neurochemistry and coping style, and temperament.

6. Investigations of the styles of coping utilized by children experiencing life events and/or catastrophic stressors, and the influence of temperament on these styles.

7. Replication utilizing different, more objective raters, such as teachers.

8. Replication, employing both mothers and fathers as raters of the children, in order to determine whether their different perspectives of the children have an effect on the scores.

References

- Appley, M. H., & Trumbull, R. (1967). Psychological stress. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Blom, G. E.; Cheney, B. D.; & Snoddy, J. E. (1986). Stress in childhood. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Brenner, A. (1984). Helping children cope with stress. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.
- Buss, A. H., & Plomin, R. (1987). In Goldsmith et al. Roundtable: What is temperament? Four approaches. Child Development, 58, 505-529.
- Buss, A. H., & Plomin, R. (1975). A temperament theory of personality development. New York: Wiley Interscience.
- Buss, A. H., & Plomin, R. (1984). Temperament: Early developing personality traits. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Campbell, D. (1977). Individual differences. In M. Rutter and L. A. Hersov (Eds.). Child psychiatry: Modern approaches. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Carey, W. B. (1970). A simplified method for measuring

- temperament. Journal of Pediatrics, 77, 188-194.
- Chess, S. & Thomas, S. (1986). Temperament in clinical practice. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Ciaranello, R. D. (1988). Neurochemical aspects of stress. In N. Garmezy and M. Rutter (Eds.). Stress, coping, and development in children. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dunn, J., Kendrick, C., & MacNamee, R. (1981). The reaction of first-born children to the birth of a sibling: Mothers' reports. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 22, 1-18.
- Dunn, J. (1980). Individual differences in temperament. In M. Rutter (Ed.). Scientific foundations of developmental psychiatry. London: William Heineman Medical Books Limited.
- Garmezy, N. (1988) Stressors of childhood. In N. Garmezy and M. Rutter (Eds.), Stress, coping and development in children (pp.43-84). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Goldsmith, H. H., Buss, A. H., Plomin, R., Rothbart, M. K., Thomas, A., Chess, S., Hinde, R. A., & McCall, R. B. (1987). Roundtable: What is Temperament? Four approaches. Child Development, 58, 505-529.

- Holmes, T. H., & Rahe, R. H. (1967). The social readjustment rating scale. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 11, 213-218.
- Hubert, N. C., Wachs, T. D., Peters-Martin, P., & Gandour, M. (1982). The study of early temperament: Measurement and conceptual issues. Child Development, 53, 571-800.
- Humphrey, J. H. & Humphrey, J. N. (1981). Reducing stress through creative relaxation. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Kanner, A. D., Coyne, J. C., Schaefer, C., & Lazarus, R. S. (1981). Comparison of two modes of stress management: Daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 4, 1-38.
- Lazarus, R., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. New York: Springer.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Launier, R. (1978). Stress-related transactions between person and environment. In L. A. Pervin & M. Lewis (Eds.), Perspectives in interactional psychology. New York: Plenum Press.
- Lerner, R. M., & East, P. L. (1984). The role of temperament in stress, coping and socioemotional

- functioning in early development. Infant Mental Health Journal, 5, 148-159.
- Lookabaugh, S. L. (1986). The role of inanimate transitional objects in helping children cope with daily hassles. Unpublished master's thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.
- Mandler, G. (1980). The conditions for emotional behavior. In D. C. Glass (Ed.), Neurophysiology and emotion. New York: Rockefeller University Press.
- McDevitt, S. C., & Carey, W. B. (1978). The measurement of temperament in 3 - 7 year old children. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 19, 245-253.
- McDevitt, S. C., & Carey, W. B. (1975). Behavioral Style Questionnaire. Scottsdale, AZ.
- Rothbart, M. K. (1987). In H. H. Goldsmith et al. Roundtable: What is temperament? Four approaches. Child Development, 58, 505-529.
- Rothbart, M. K. (1981). Measurement of temperament in infancy. Child Development, 52, 578-583.
- Rothbart, M. K., & Derryberry, D. (1982). Theoretical

issues in temperament. In M. Lewis & L. T. Taft (Eds.). Developmental disabilities, theory, assessment and intervention. Jamaica, NY: Spectrum.

Rutter, M. (1988). Stress, coping and development: Some issues and some questions. In N. Garmezy and M. Rutter (Eds.), Stress, coping, and development in children. (pp. 1-41). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Thomas, A. & Chess, S. (1982). The reality of difficult temperaments. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 28, 1-20.

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

Thomas, A., & Chess, S. (1987). In H. H. Goldsmith et al. Roundtable: What is temperament? Four approaches. Child Development, 58, 505-529.

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

Torgensen, A. M., & Kringlen, E. (1978). Genetic aspects of temperamental differences in infants. Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 17, 433-444.

Wallerstein, J. S. (1988) Children of divorce: Stress and developmental tasks. In N. Garmezy and M. Rutter (Eds.), Stress, coping, and development in children. (pp 265-302). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Werner, E. E., & Smith, R. S. (1982). Vulnerable but invincible: A study of resilient children. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wertlieb, D., Weigel, C., Springer, T., & Feldstein, M. (1987). Temperament as a moderator of children's stressful experiences. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 57, 234-245.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COLLEGE OF HUMAN RESOURCES



VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061-0416

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT (703) 961-4794 or 4795

January 30, 1989

Dear Parent:

In partial fulfillment of the requirements of my Master's degree in Child Development at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, I am conducting a study to determine the relationships between preschool children's personality traits and their techniques used to cope with stress. A better understanding of how these behavioral characteristics affect children's current coping mechanisms will enable teachers and parents to assist in the coping process.

I am requesting your assistance, as the parent of a four-year-old child, in completing this endeavor. Enclosed in this packet are various items. The first item is a consent form/information sheet. Please sign this form and fill out the requested information prior to completing any subsequent material. Please remember that all information will be kept confidential and is used solely for demographic statistics. However, if you feel unable to answer any of the information items are offensive to you, feel free to skip them. If you are not able to participate in the study, please return the packet to your daycare center director.

Following the consent form/information sheet, are three questionnaires. The first, the Coping Styles Inventory for Preschool Children (CSIPC) will assess your child's style of response to common, daily complications. The next two items, the Behavioral Style Questionnaire (BSQ) and the Child Behaviors Inventory (CBI), will help describe your child's characteristic behavioral style. The results of the CBI will not be used in the current study but may contribute to a future research project.

Please follow the directions on each instrument very carefully, and answer all questions honestly. The CSIPC will take approximately 15 minutes to complete, the BSQ approximately 30 minutes, and the CBI approximately 10 minutes. Please return the completed packet to your daycare center office. I would like begin collecting completed materials on February 6, 1989, and to have all data collected by February 3, 1989. I encourage you to return the material as soon as you have completed it.

COLLEGE OF HUMAN RESOURCES



VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061-0416

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT (703) 961-4794 or 4795

The study should be completed by April, 1989. I will be glad to share a report including the findings of this research if you are interested. If you are interested in this information, please indicate this on the consent form. Should you have any questions or need further information about the study, I would be glad to discuss the matter with you. I can be reached at 703-961-6148, during business hours, and at 703-961-2467, after five o'clock. You may also reach Dr. Cosby S. Rogers, my research advisor, at 703-961-4793.

In exchange for your much-valued time and cooperation, and that of your center director, I have offered to provide a showing of the highly acclaimed video "Self-Esteem in School Age Children," by Dr. Cosby S. Rogers of Virginia Tech. This is contingent upon an eighty percent return of materials. Although your child is not yet of school age, he/she will soon be entering into the public school system. This video can be very useful in helping you to understand the dynamics and importance of self-esteem for your child. It offers suggestions and guidelines for building your child's self-esteem and helping him/her to feel more confident. The usual rental fee, of fifty dollars, will be waived so that you and the other parents involved in your center can enjoy this fine production at a future parent meeting.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Kimberly A. Yolton

CONSENT FORM

I am willing to complete a set of questionnaires describing my preschool child's behavior. Within the requested time, I will return the packet of materials to the office of my child's daycare center. I understand that there are no known risks and all information will be treated as confidential.

Signature of Parent

Background Information

1. What is your relationship to the preschool child?
 - a. mother _____
 - b. father _____
 - c. guardian _____
 - d. other (specify) _____
2. Age of the child _____
3. Was this child acquired through...
 - a. natural birth _____
 - b. adoption _____
 - c. other _____
4. Ages of other siblings, if any.
_____ _____ _____ _____
5. Preschool child's birth order _____
6. Your marital status
 - a. single, never married _____
 - b. married _____
 - c. divorced or separated _____
 - d. widowed _____
7. What is your age?
 - a. less than 19 years _____
 - b. 19 to 23 years _____
 - c. 24 to 28 years _____
 - d. 29 to 33 years _____
 - e. 34 to 38 years _____
 - f. 39 to 43 years _____
 - g. 44 to 48 years _____
 - h. 49 to 53 years _____
 - i. more than 53 years _____

8. What race do you consider yourself?
Are you...

White _____
Black _____
Asian _____
Other (specify) _____

9. What is your religion, if any?

Protestant _____
(if protestant, specify denomination)

Catholic _____
Jewish _____
None _____
Other (specify) _____

10. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Grade School _____
High School _____
Trade or Business School _____
Four-Year College _____
Graduate School (specify degree earned)

11. What is your family income per year?

- a. less than \$8,000 _____
- b. \$8,000 to \$13,999 _____
- c. \$14,000 to \$19,999 _____
- d. \$20,000 to \$25,999 _____
- e. \$26,000 to \$31,999 _____
- f. \$32,000 to \$37,999 _____
- g. \$38,000 to \$43,999 _____
- h. \$44,000 to \$49,999 _____
- i. \$50,000 and over _____

Yes, I would be interested in receiving an
abstract from the completed study.

BEHAVIORAL STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE

by
Sean C. McDevitt, Ph.D. and William B. Carey, M.D.

DATA SHEET

Child's Name _____ Sex _____

Date of Child's Birth _____ Present Age _____
month day year

Rater's Name _____

Relationship to Child _____

Date of Rating _____
month day year

RATING INFORMATION

1. Please base your rating on the child's recent and current behavior (the last four to six weeks).
2. Consider only your own impressions and observations of the child.
3. Rate each question independently. Do not purposely attempt to present a consistent picture of the child.
4. Use extreme ratings where appropriate. Avoid rating only near the middle of the scale.
5. Rate each item quickly. If you cannot decide, skip the item and come back to it later.
6. Rate every item. Circle the number of any item you are unable to answer due to lack of information or any item that does not apply to your child.

Copyright by Sean C. Mc Devitt, Ph.D. and William B. Carey, M.D.,
1975. All right reserved.

USING THE SCALE SHOWN BELOW, PLEASE MARK AN "X" IN THE SPACE THAT TELLS HOW OFTEN THE CHILD'S RECENT AND CURRENT BEHAVIOR HAS BEEN LIKE THE BEHAVIOR DESCRIBED BY EACH ITEM.

Almost never 1	Rarely 2	Usually does not 3	Usually does 4	Frequently 5	Almost always 6
1.	The child is moody for more than a few minutes when corrected or disciplined.		almost : : : : : : never	almost : : : : : : always	
2.	The child seems not to hear when involved in a favorite activity.		almost : : : : : : never	almost : : : : : : always	
3.	The child can be coaxed out of a forbidden activity.		almost : : : : : : never	almost : : : : : : always	
4.	The child runs ahead when walking with the parent.		almost : : : : : : never	almost : : : : : : always	
5.	The child laughs or smiles while playing.		almost : : : : : : never	almost : : : : : : always	
6.	The child moves slowly when working on a project or activity.		almost : : : : : : never	almost : : : : : : always	
7.	The child responds intensely to disapproval.		almost : : : : : : never	almost : : : : : : always	
8.	The child needs a period of adjustment to get used to changes in school or at home.		almost : : : : : : never	almost : : : : : : always	
9.	The child enjoys games that involve running or jumping.		almost : : : : : : never	almost : : : : : : always	
10.	The child is slow to adjust to changes in household rules.		almost : : : : : : never	almost : : : : : : always	
11.	The child has bowel movements at about the same time each day.		almost : : : : : : never	almost : : : : : : always	
12.	The child is willing to try new things.		almost : : : : : : never	almost : : : : : : always	
13.	The child sits calmly while watching TV or listening to music.		almost : : : : : : never	almost : : : : : : always	
14.	The child leaves or wants to leave the table during meals.		almost : : : : : : never	almost : : : : : : always	

Almost never 1	Rarely 2	Usually does not 3	Usually does 4	Frequently 5	Almost always 6
15. Changes in plans bother the child.			almost : : : : : almost never	never	almost always
16. The child notices minor changes in mother's dress or appearance (clothing, hairstyle, etc.).			almost : : : : : almost never	never	almost always
17. The child does not acknowledge a call to come in if involved in something.			almost : : : : : almost never	never	almost always
18. The child responds to mild disapproval by the parent (a frown or shake of the head).			almost : : : : : almost never	never	almost always
19. The child settles arguments with playmates within a few minutes.			almost : : : : : almost never	never	almost always
20. The child shows strong reaction to things, both positive and negative.			almost : : : : : almost never	never	almost always
21. The child had trouble leaving the mother the first three days when he/she entered school.			almost : : : : : almost never	never	almost always
22. The child picks up the nuances or subtleties of parental explanations (example: implied meanings).			almost : : : : : almost never	never	almost always
23. The child falls asleep as soon as he/she is put to bed.			almost : : : : : almost never	never	almost always
24. The child moves about actively when he/she explores new places.			almost : : : : : almost never	never	almost always
25. The child likes to go to new places rather than familiar ones.			almost : : : : : almost never	never	almost always
26. The child sits quietly while waiting.			almost : : : : : almost never	never	almost always
27. The child spends over an hour reading a book or looking at the pictures.			almost : : : : : almost never	never	almost always
28. The child learns new things at his/her level quickly and easily.			almost : : : : : almost never	never	almost always

Almost never 1	Rarely 2	Usually does not 3	Usually does 4	Frequently 5	Almost always 6
29. The child smiles or laughs when he/she meets new visitors at home.			almost never	_____	almost always
30. The child is easily excited by praise.			almost never	_____	almost always
31. The child outgoing with strangers.			almost never	_____	almost always
32. The child fidgets when he/she has to stay still.			almost never	_____	almost always
33. The child says that he/she is "bored" with his/her toys and games.			almost never	_____	almost always
34. The child is annoyed at interrupting play to comply with a parental request.			almost never	_____	almost always
35. The child practices an activity until he/she masters it.			almost never	_____	almost always
36. The child eats about the same amount at supper from day to day.			almost never	_____	almost always
37. Unusual noises (sirens, thunder, etc.) interrupt the child's behavior.			almost never	_____	almost always
38. The child complains when tired.			almost never	_____	almost always
39. The child loses interest in a new toy or game the same day.			almost never	_____	almost always
40. The child becomes engrossed in an interesting activity for one half hour or more.			almost never	_____	almost always
41. The child cries intensely when hurt.			almost never	_____	almost always
42. The child reacts strongly to kidding or light-hearted comments.			almost never	_____	almost always
43. The child approaches children his/her age that he/she doesn't know.			almost never	_____	almost always
44. The child plays quietly with his/her toys and games.			almost never	_____	almost always

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
1	2	3	4	5	6
45. The child is outwardly expressive of his/her emotions.			almost never	almost always	almost always
46. The child is enthusiastic when he/she masters an activity and wants to show everyone.			almost never	almost always	almost always
47. The child is sleepy at his/her bedtime.			almost never	almost always	almost always
48. The child stops an activity because something else catches his/her attention.			almost never	almost always	almost always
49. The child is hungry at dinner time.			almost never	almost always	almost always
50. The child holds back until sure of himself/herself.			almost never	almost always	almost always
51. The child looks up when someone walks past the door-way.			almost never	almost always	almost always
52. The child becomes upset if he/she misses a regular television program.			almost never	almost always	almost always
53. The child reacts strongly (cries or complains) to a disappointment or failure.			almost never	almost always	almost always
54. The child accepts new foods within one or two tries.			almost never	almost always	almost always
55. The child has difficulty getting used to new situations.			almost never	almost always	almost always
56. The child will avoid misbehavior if punished firmly once or twice.			almost never	almost always	almost always
57. The child is sensitive to noises (Telephone, doorbell) and looks up right away.			almost never	almost always	almost always
58. The child prefers active outdoor play to quiet play inside.			almost never	almost always	almost always
59. The child dislikes milk or other drinks if not ice-cold.			almost never	almost always	almost always

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
1	2	3	4	5	6

75. The child requests "something to eat" between meals and regular snacks. almost ____:____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
76. The child rushes to greet the parent or greets loudly after absence during the day. almost ____:____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
77. The child looks up when he/she hears voices in the next room. almost ____:____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
78. The child protests when denied a request by the parent. almost ____:____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
79. The child ignores loud noises when reading or looking at pictures in a book. almost ____:____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
80. The child dislikes food that he/she had previously seemed to accept. almost ____:____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
81. The child stops what he/she is doing and looks up when the parent enters the room. almost ____:____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
82. The child cries for more than a few minutes when hurt. almost ____:____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
83. The child watches a long (1 hour or more) TV program without getting up to do something else. almost ____:____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
84. The child spontaneously wakes up at the usual time on weekends and holidays. almost ____:____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
85. The child responds to sounds or noises unrelated to his/her activity. almost ____:____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
86. The child avoids new guests or visitors. almost ____:____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
87. The child fidgets when a story is being read to him/her. almost ____:____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
88. The child becomes upset or cries over minor falls or bumps. almost ____:____:____:____:____:____ almost never always

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
1	2	3	4	5	6

89. The child interrupts an activity to listen to conversation around him/her. almost ____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
90. The child is unwilling to leave a play activity that he/she has not completed. almost ____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
91. The child is able to fall asleep when there is conversation in a nearby room. almost ____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
92. The child becomes highly excited when presented with a new toy or game. almost ____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
93. The child pays attention from start to finish when the parent tries to explain something to him/her. almost ____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
94. The child speaks so quickly that it is sometimes difficult to understand him/her. almost ____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
95. The child wants to leave the table during meals to answer the doorbell or phone. almost ____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
96. The child complains of events in school or with playmates that day. almost ____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
97. The child frowns when asked to do a chore by the parent. almost ____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
98. The child tends to hold back in new situations. almost ____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
99. The child laughs hard while watching television cartoons or comedy. almost ____:____:____:____:____ almost never always
100. The child has "off" days when he/she is moody or cranky. almost ____:____:____:____:____ almost never always

subject no. _____

COPING STYLES INVENTORY FOR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

In answering the following questions, recall your child's behaviors during the past two weeks. Under each question you will find a variety of behaviors, labeled "a" through "h". Please mark an "X" in the space that tells how often your child behaved in each of the manners described. An extra space, labeled "i," has been provided for you to write in any other frequent behaviors your child has displayed under each specific situation.

	Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
1. When it is your child's bedtime does he/she:						
a. cry					almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____	almost never always
b. ask why					almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____	almost never always
c. hide					almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____	almost never always
d. suck thumb					almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____	almost never always
e. seem happy					almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____	almost never always
f. make excuses					almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____	almost never always
g. go willingly					almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____	almost never always
h. complain of feeling ill					almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____	almost never always
i. other <u>(please specify)</u>					almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____	almost never always

do not write below this line

F T A R

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always	
<hr/>						
2. When separating from you (parent), does your child..						
a. cry			almost	__:_:_:_:_:_	almost never	always
b. ask to go with you			almost	__:_:_:_:_:_	never	almost always
c. cling to you			almost	__:_:_:_:_:_	never	almost always
d. suck thumb			almost	__:_:_:_:_:_	never	almost always
e. seem happy			almost	__:_:_:_:_:_	never	almost always
f. ask you to stay			almost	__:_:_:_:_:_	never	almost always
g. separate without a fuss			almost	__:_:_:_:_:_	never	almost always
h. complain of feeling ill			almost	__:_:_:_:_:_	never	almost always
i. other	(please specify)		almost	__:_:_:_:_:_	never	almost always

do not write below this line

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
<hr/>					
3. When your child is served something he/she dislikes at mealtime, does he/she...					
a. cry				almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ almost never	always
b. ask why				almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ almost never	always
c. misbehave				almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ almost never	always
d. say he/she is not hungry				almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ almost never	always
e. seem happy				almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ almost never	always
f. daydream				almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ almost never	always
g. eat without complaining				almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ almost never	always
h. complain of feeling ill				almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ almost never	always
i. other _____ (please specify)				almost ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ almost never	always.

do not write below this line
F T A R

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
<hr/>					
4. When told that it is bathtime, does your child...					
a. cry			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always
b. ask why			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always
c. misbehave			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always
d. suck thumb			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always
e. seem happy			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always
f. make excuses			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always
g. bathe without a fuss			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always
h. complain of feeling ill			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always
i. other _____ (please specify)			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always

do not write below this line

F T A R

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
<hr/>					
5. When told to clean-up his/her toys or room, does your child...					
a. cry			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
b. ask for help			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
c. misbehave			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
d. suck thumb			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
e. seem happy			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
f. make excuses			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
g. clean-up without a fuss			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
h. complain of feeling ill			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
i. other <u>(please specify)</u>			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always

do not write below this line
F T A R

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always	
<hr/>						
6. When your child is required to change activities, does he/she...						
a. cry			almost	__ : __ : __ : __ : __	almost never	always
b. ask why			almost	__ : __ : __ : __ : __	never	almost always
c. misbehave			almost	__ : __ : __ : __ : __	never	almost always
d. suck thumb			almost	__ : __ : __ : __ : __	never	almost always
e. seem happy			almost	__ : __ : __ : __ : __	never	almost always
f. become distractable			almost	__ : __ : __ : __ : __	never	almost always
g. change activities easily			almost	__ : __ : __ : __ : __	never	almost always
h. display hyperactive behavior			almost	__ : __ : __ : __ : __	never	almost always
i. other _____	(please specify)		almost	__ : __ : __ : __ : __	never	almost always

do not write below this line

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
<hr/>					
7. When your child does not receive something he/she requests, does he/she...					
a. cry			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always
b. ask why			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always
c. misbehave			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always
d. suck thumb			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always
e. seem happy			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always
f. become distractable			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always
g. accept your decision			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always
h. complain of feeling ill			almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always
i. other _____	(please specify)		almost : : : : : : almost never		almost always

do not write below this line

F T A R

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
<hr/>					
e. When frustrated by a difficult task, does your child...					
a. cry			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
b. ask for help			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
c. misbehave			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
d. suck thumb			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
e. seem happy			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
f. become distractable			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
g. find something else to do			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
h. complain of feeling ill			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
i. other _____ <u>(please specify)</u>			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always

do not write below this line

F T A R

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
9. When getting ready to leave the house for school in the morning, does your child...					
a. cry			almost __:__:_:__:_:__	almost never	almost always
b. ask questions			almost __:__:_:__:_:__	almost never	almost always
c. misbehave			almost __:__:_:__:_:__	almost never	almost always
d. suck thumb			almost __:__:_:__:_:__	almost never	almost always
e. seem happy			almost __:__:_:__:_:__	almost never	almost always
f. have trouble following directions			almost __:__:_:__:_:__	almost never	almost always
g. get ready without a fuss			almost __:__:_:__:_:__	almost never	almost always
h. complain of feeling ill			almost __:__:_:__:_:__	almost never	almost always
i. other <u>(please specify)</u>			almost __:__:_:__:_:__	almost never	almost always

do not write below this line

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
10. When going to the doctor or dentist for a routine check-up, does your child... (If your child has not had a visit in the past two weeks, recall his/her most recent visit when answering this item.)					
a. cry			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
b. daydream			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
c. misbehave			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
d. suck thumb			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
e. seem happy			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
f. have trouble following directions			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
g. go to appointment without a fuss			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
h. complain of feeling ill			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always
i. other <u>(please specify)</u>			almost never	____:____:____:____:____	almost always

do not write below this line

F T A R

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
<hr/>					
11. When your child receives minor injuries during play, does he/she...					
a. cry			almost ____	____:____:____:____:____	almost never always
b. ask questions			almost ____	____:____:____:____:____	almost never always
c. become clingy			almost ____	____:____:____:____:____	almost never always
d. suck thumb			almost ____	____:____:____:____:____	almost never always
e. become quiet			almost ____	____:____:____:____:____	almost never always
f. daydream			almost ____	____:____:____:____:____	almost never always
g. continue playing			almost ____	____:____:____:____:____	almost never always
h. complain of feeling ill			almost ____	____:____:____:____:____	almost never always
i. other _____	(please specify)		almost ____	____:____:____:____:____	almost never always

do not write below this line

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
<hr/>					
12. When your child is running a fever, does he/she...					
a. cry			almost : : : : : : almost		always
b. ask questions			almost : : : : : : almost		always
c. become clingy			almost : : : : : : almost		always
d. suck thumb			almost : : : : : : almost		always
e. seem happy			almost : : : : : : almost		always
f. become distractable			almost : : : : : : almost		always
g. behave as usual			almost : : : : : : almost		always
h. complain of feeling ill			almost : : : : : : almost		always
i. other _____	(please specify)		almost : : : : : : almost		always

do not write below this line
F T A R

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
13. When having difficulty with clothing, buttons, zippers, or tying shoes, does your child...					
a. cry			almost never	__:__:__:__:__	almost always
b. ask for help			almost never	__:__:__:__:__	almost always
c. misbehave			almost never	__:__:__:__:__	almost always
d. suck thumb			almost never	__:__:__:__:__	almost always
e. seem happy			almost never	__:__:__:__:__	almost always
f. become distractable			almost never	__:__:__:__:__	almost always
g. continue working at the task			almost never	__:__:__:__:__	almost always
h. complain of feeling tired			almost never	__:__:__:__:__	almost always
i. other <u>(please specify)</u>			almost never	__:__:__:__:__	almost always

do not write below this line

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
<hr/>					
14. When frightened, does your child...					
a. cry			almost : : : : : almost never		always
b. ask for help			almost : : : : : almost never		always
c. hide			almost : : : : : almost never		always
d. suck thumb			almost : : : : : almost never		always
e. laugh			almost : : : : : almost never		always
f. become distractable			almost : : : : : almost never		always
g. behave as usual			almost : : : : : almost never		always
h. wet or soil clothing			almost : : : : : almost never		always
i. other _____	(please specify)		almost : : : : : almost never		always

do not write below this line
F T A R

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always	
15. When your child is required to wait, does he/she...						
a. cry			almost	____:____:____:____:____	almost never	always
b. ask questions			almost	____:____:____:____:____	never	almost always
c. misbehave			almost	____:____:____:____:____	never	almost always
d. suck thumb			almost	____:____:____:____:____	never	almost always
e. seem happy			almost	____:____:____:____:____	never	almost always
f. become distractable			almost	____:____:____:____:____	never	almost always
g. wait patiently			almost	____:____:____:____:____	never	almost always
h. complain of feeling ill			almost	____:____:____:____:____	never	almost always
i. other _____	(please specify)		almost	____:____:____:____:____	never	almost always

do not write below this line

APPENDIX B

Kimberly A. Yolton

Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Janet K. Sawyers, Ph.D.
Director
Jean Vogler
Acting Director
Virginia Tech Child Development
Laboratory School
140 Wallace Hall
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Dear Dr. Sawyers and Mrs. Vogler:

In partial fulfillment of the requirements of my Master's degree in Child Development at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, I am conducting a study to determine the relationship between temperament and preschool children's styles of coping with daily hassles. A better understanding of how this personality characteristic affects children's current coping mechanisms and the development of more advanced coping response repertoires will enable day care professionals, teachers, counsellors, and parents to assist children in the coping process.

I am requesting permission to conduct this research using the four-year-old children in your laboratory school facility. Should permission be granted, I will be distributing a packet of information and questionnaires to the mothers caretakers of these children during the week of January 30, 1989. I would like to begin collection of the packets one week after the dispersion date, or the week of February 8, 1989. Enclosed, you will find a sample of the packets that I would like to issue to the mothers and a permission slip. Please sign this if you agree to the use of your laboratory school children in this study.

My study should be completed by April, 1989. I will be glad to share a report including the findings of this research if you are interested. Should you need further details about the study, I will be happy to discuss the project with you. I can be reached at 961-6148, during business hours, and at 961-2467, after five o'clock.

Thank you for your cooperation and prompt response.

Sincerely,

Kimberly A. Yolton

Enclosures

I, Jean Vogler, acting director of the Virginia Tech Child Development Laboratory School, in Blacksburg, Virginia, agree to allow Kimberly A. Yolton to conduct her study, concerning the relationship between temperament and preschool children's coping styles, utilizing the four-year-old children in the Laboratory School.

Signed,

Kimberly A. Yolton

Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Mr. Ken Williams
Director
Rainbow Riders Child Care Center
2470 Ramble Rd
Blacksburg, VA 24060

Dear Mr. Williams:

In partial fulfillment of the requirements of my Master's degree in Child Development at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, I am conducting a study to determine the relationships between temperament and preschool children's styles of coping with daily hassles. A better understanding of how this personality characteristic affects children's current coping mechanisms and the development of more advanced coping response repertoires will enable day care professionals, teachers, counsellors, and parents to assist children in the coping process.

I am requesting permission to conduct this research using the four-year-old children in your day care facility. Should permission be granted, I will be distributing a packet of information and questionnaires to the primary caretakers of these children during the week of January 30, 1989. I would like to begin collection of the packets one week after the dispersion date, or on February 6, 1989. Enclosed, you will find a sample of the packets that I would like to issue to the caretakers.

In exchange for your cooperation and an eighty percent return of questionnaires by participating parents in your center, I would like to offer you the opportunity to show the highly acclaimed video "Self-Esteem in School-Age Children," by Dr. Cosby S. Rogers, of Virginia Tech, at one of your future parent meetings. The regular price for rental of this video will be waived for this showing.

My study should be completed by April, 1989. I will be glad to share a report including the findings of this research if you are interested. Should you need further details about the study, I will be happy to discuss the project with you. I can be reached at 961-6148, during business hours, and at 961-2467, after five o'clock.

Please sign the form on the this page, and return it to me, at the address above, if you agree to these terms. I am looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you for your cooperation and prompt response.

Sincerely,

Kimberly A. Yolton

Enclosures

I, Ken Williams, director of Rainbow Riders Child Care Center in Blacksburg, Virginia, agree to allow Kimberly A. Yolton to conduct her study, concerning the relationship between temperament and preschool children's coping styles, utilizing the four-year-old children in the Rainbow Riders Child Care Center. I understand that if an eighty percent return rate of the questionnaires is achieved, I will be offered a free showing of Dr. Cosby S. Rogers video "Self-Esteem in School Age Children" for use at one of our future parent meetings.

Signed,

Kimberly A. Yolton

Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Ms. Katherine Chadwick
Director
Shawvalley Tots Child Care Center
Route 460
Shawsville, VA

Dear Ms. Chadwick:

In partial fulfillment of the requirements of my Master's degree in Child Development at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, I am conducting a study to determine the relationships between temperament and preschool children's styles of coping with daily hassles. A better understanding of how this personality characteristic affects children's current coping mechanisms and the development of more advanced coping response repertoires will enable day care professionals, teachers, counsellors, and parents to assist children in the coping process.

I am requesting permission to conduct this research using the four-year-old children in your day care facility. Should permission be granted, I will be distributing a packet of information and questionnaires to the primary caretakers of these children during the week of January 30, 1989. I would like to begin collection of the packets one week after the dispersion date, or on February 6, 1989. Enclosed, you will find a sample of the packets that I would like to issue to the caretakers.

In exchange for your cooperation and an eighty percent return of questionnaires by participating parents in your center, I would like to offer you the opportunity to show the highly acclaimed video "Self-Esteem in School-Age Children," by Dr. Cosby S. Rogers, of Virginia Tech, at one of your future parent meetings. The regular price for rental of this video will be waived for this showing.

My study should be completed by April, 1989. I will be glad to share a report including the findings of this research if you are interested. Should you need further details about the study, I will be happy to discuss the project with you. I can be reached at 961-6148, during business hours, and at 961-2467, after five o'clock.

Please sign the form on the this page, and return it to me, at the address above, if you agree to these terms. I am looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you for your cooperation and prompt response.

Sincerely,

Kimberly A. Yolton

Enclosures

I, Katherine Chadwick, director of Shawvalley Tots Child Care Center in Shawsville, Virginia, agree to allow Kimberly A. Yolton to conduct her study, concerning the relationship between temperament and preschool children's coping styles, utilizing the four-year-old children in the Shawvalley Tots Child Care Center. I understand that if an eighty percent return rate of the questionnaires is achieved, I will be offered a free showing of Dr. Cosby S. Rogers video "Self-Esteem in School Age Children" for use at one of our future parent meetings.

Signed,

Kimberly A. Yolton
140 Wallace Hall
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Ms. Mary Blevins
Director
Old McDonald's Farm
Nursery School Inc.
Dublin, VA

Dear Ms. Blevins:

In partial fulfillment of the requirements of my Master's degree in Child Development at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, I am conducting a study to determine the relationships between temperament and preschool children's styles of coping with daily hassles. A better understanding of how this personality characteristic affects children's current coping mechanisms and the development of more advanced coping response repertoires will enable day care professionals, teachers, counsellors, and parents to assist children in the coping process.

I am requesting permission to conduct this research using the four-year-old children in your day care facility. Should permission be granted, I will be distributing a packet of information and questionnaires to the primary caretakers of these children during the week of January 30, 1989. I would like to begin collection of the packets one week after the dispersion date, or on February 6, 1989. Enclosed, you will find a sample of the packets that I would like to issue to the caretakers.

In exchange for your cooperation and an eighty percent return of questionnaires by participating parents in your center, I would like to offer you the opportunity to show the highly acclaimed video "Self-Esteem in School-Age Children," by Dr. Cosby S. Rogers, of Virginia Tech, at one of your future parent meetings. The regular price for rental of this video will be waived for this showing.

My study should be completed by April, 1989. I will be glad to share a report including the findings of this research if you are interested. Should you need further details about the study, I will be happy to discuss the project with you. I can be reached at 961-6148, during business hours, and at 961-2467, after five o'clock.

Please sign the form on the this page, and return it to me, at the address above, if you agree to these terms. I am looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you for your cooperation and prompt response.

Sincerely,

Kimberly A. Yolton

Enclosures

I, Mary Blevins, director of Old McDonald's Farm Nursery School Inc. in Dublin, Virginia, agree to allow Kimberly A. Yolton to conduct her study, concerning the relationship between temperament and preschool children's coping styles, utilizing the four-year-old children in the Old McDonald's Farm Nursery School Inc. I understand that if an eighty percent return rate of the questionnaires is achieved, I will be offered a free showing of Dr. Cosby S. Rogers video "Self-Esteem in School Age Children" for use at one of our future parent meetings.

Signed,

Kimberly A. Yolton

Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Ms. Elizabeth Dodson
Director
Tiny Tots Day Care Center
420 Starlight Dr
Christiansburg, VA

Dear Ms. Dodson:

In partial fulfillment of the requirements of my Master's degree in Child Development at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, I am conducting a study to determine the relationships between temperament and preschool children's styles of coping with daily hassles. A better understanding of how this personality characteristic affects children's current coping mechanisms and the development of more advanced coping response repertoires will enable day care professionals, teachers, counsellors, and parents to assist children in the coping process.

I am requesting permission to conduct this research using the four-year-old children in your day care facility. Should permission be granted, I will be distributing a packet of information and questionnaires to the primary caretakers of these children during the week of January 30, 1989. I would like to begin collection of the packets one week after the dispersion date, or on February 6, 1989. Enclosed, you will find a sample of the packets that I would like to issue to the caretakers.

In exchange for your cooperation and an eighty percent return of questionnaires by participating parents in your center, I would like to offer you the opportunity to show the highly acclaimed video "Self-Esteem in School-Age Children," by Dr. Cosby S. Rogers, of Virginia Tech, at one of your future parent meetings. The regular price for rental of this video will be waived for this showing.

My study should be completed by April, 1989. I will be glad to share a report including the findings of this research if you are interested. Should you need further details about the study, I will be happy to discuss the project with you. I can be reached at 961-6148, during business hours, and at 961-2467, after five o'clock.

Please sign the form on the this page, and return it to me, at the address above, if you agree to these terms. I am looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you for your cooperation and prompt response.

Sincerely,

Kimberly A. Yolton

Enclosures

I, Elizabeth Dodson, director of Tiny Tots Day Care Center in Christiansburg, Virginia, agree to allow Kimberly A. Yolton to conduct her study, concerning the relationship between temperament and preschool children's coping styles, utilizing the four-year-old children in the Tiny Tots Day Care Center. I understand that if an eighty percent return rate of the questionnaires is achieved, I will be offered a free showing of Dr. Cosby S. Rogers video "Self-Esteem in School Age Children" for use at one of our future parent meetings.

Signed,

Kimberly A. Yolton
140 Wallace Hall
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Ms. Doris Phillips
Director
St. Albans Hospital Nursery School
Radford, VA 24143

Dear Ms. Phillips:

In partial fulfillment of the requirements of my Master's degree in Child Development at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, I am conducting a study to determine the relationships between temperament and preschool children's styles of coping with daily hassles. A better understanding of how this personality characteristic affects children's current coping mechanisms and the development of more advanced coping response repertoires will enable day care professionals, teachers, counsellors, and parents to assist children in the coping process.

I am requesting permission to conduct this research using the four-year-old children in your day care facility. Should permission be granted, I will be distributing a packet of information and questionnaires to the primary caretakers of these children during the week of January 30, 1989. I would like to begin collection of the packets one week after the dispersion date, or on February 6, 1989. Enclosed, you will find a sample of the packets that I would like to issue to the caretakers.

In exchange for your cooperation and an eighty percent return of questionnaires by participating parents in your center, I would like to offer you the opportunity to show the highly acclaimed video "Self-Esteem in School-Age Children," by Dr. Cosby S. Rogers, of Virginia Tech, at one of your future parent meetings. The regular price for rental of this video will be waived for this showing.

My study should be completed by April, 1989. I will be glad to share a report including the findings of this research if you are interested. Should you need further details about the study, I will be happy to discuss the project with you. I can be reached at 961-6148, during business hours, and at 961-2467, after five o'clock.

Please sign the form on this page, and return it to me, at the address above, if you agree to these terms. I am looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you for your cooperation and prompt response.

Sincerely,

Kimberly A. Yolton

Enclosures

I, Doris Phillips, director of St. Albans Hospital Nursery School, in Radford, Virginia, agree to allow Kimberly A. Yolton to conduct her study, concerning the relationship between temperament and preschool children's coping styles, utilizing the four-year-old children in the Nursery School. I understand that if an eighty percent return rate of the questionnaires is achieved, I will be offered a free showing of Dr. Cosby S. Rogers video "Self-Esteem in School Age Children" for use at one of our future parent meetings.

Signed,

Kimberly A. Yolton

Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Ms. Peggy Hammond
Director
Radford Child Care Center
Radford, VA

Dear Ms. Hammond:

In partial fulfillment of the requirements of my Master's degree in Child Development at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, I am conducting a study to determine the relationships between temperament and preschool children's styles of coping with daily hassles. A better understanding of how this personality characteristic affects children's current coping mechanisms and the development of more advanced coping response repertoires will enable day care professionals, teachers, counsellors, and parents to assist children in the coping process.

I am requesting permission to conduct this research using the four-year-old children in your day care facility. Should permission be granted, I will be distributing a packet of information and questionnaires to the primary caretakers of these children during the week of January 30, 1989. I would like to begin collection of the packets one week after the dispersion date, or on February 6, 1989. Enclosed, you will find a sample of the packets that I would like to issue to the caretakers.

In exchange for your cooperation and an eighty percent return of questionnaires by participating parents in your center, I would like to offer you the opportunity to show the highly acclaimed video "Self-Esteem in School-Age Children," by Dr. Cosby S. Rogers, of Virginia Tech, at one of your future parent meetings. The regular price for rental of this video will be waived for this showing.

My study should be completed by April, 1989. I will be glad to share a report including the findings of this research if you are interested. Should you need further details about the study, I will be happy to discuss the project with you. I can be reached at 961-6148, during business hours, and at 961-2467, after five o'clock.

Please sign the form on this page, and return it to me, at the address above, if you agree to these terms. I am looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you for your cooperation and prompt response.

Sincerely,

Kimberly A. Yolton

Enclosures

I, Peggy Hammond, director of Radford Child Care Center in Radford, Virginia, agree to allow Kimberly A. Yolton to conduct her study, concerning the relationship between temperament and preschool children's coping styles, utilizing the four-year-old children in the Radford Child Care Center. I understand that if an eighty percent return rate of the questionnaires is achieved, I will be offered a free showing of Dr. Cosby S. Rogers video "Self-Esteem in School Age Children" for use at one of our future parent meetings.

Signed,

VITA

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 2**

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 2 of 2**