

Mothers' and Fathers' Differential Discussion of Emotion with their School-Age Children

Diana Devine

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

Human Development

Cynthia L. Smith, Chair
Julie C. Dunsmore
Isabel S. Bradburn

December 3, 2018
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: middle childhood, parental emotion socialization, sex differences

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Mothers' and Fathers' Differential Discussion of Emotion with their School-Age Children

Diana Devine

ABSTRACT

Parental socialization of emotions has been a topic of interest in developmental research for decades because of the importance of understanding how children learn about their emotions. The influence of the sex of both parent and child, however, are often not considered, and research on parent emotion socialization has often focused on infants and young children. Not considering these constructs during middle childhood ignores the importance of this developmental period, during which children have a more established gender identity and thus might recognize a shared identity with a parent. Emotion socialization from both parents during this developmental period has the potential to differentially inform children's expectations of gender norms related to emotions. Men and women interpret and express their emotions differently and may differentially socialize their children regarding emotions along these patterns. The current study examined parental emotion coaching and elaboration observed during discussions of positive and negative emotions between 44 children with their mothers and fathers, with specific focus on the sex of the parents and children. I expected that mothers would engage in more emotion coaching and use a more elaborative style than fathers. Additionally, I expected that parents of girls would be more encouraging of positive emotions than parents of boys and that parents of boys would be more discouraging of negative emotions than parents of girls. Children between the ages of 6 and 9 visited the Children's Emotions Lab with their mothers and fathers on separate occasions and participated in an emotion talk task with each parent. Each pair discussed a time when the child was happy and a time when the child was upset; each discussion lasted two and a half minutes each. I found a significant emotion valence

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

by child sex interaction: parents were more elaborative and encouraging when discussing positive emotions with daughters than with sons and that parents were more elaborative and encouraging when discussing negative events with sons than with daughters. There was also specific parent gender by child sex interaction: mothers were less elaborative and encouraging with daughters than sons and that fathers were less elaborative and encouraging with sons than daughters. Findings from this study suggest that parents' experiences with their own emotions influence their emotion socialization practices with their children. Recommended practices for future studies and interventions are suggested.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Mothers' and Fathers' Differential Discussion of Emotion with their School-Age Children

Diana Devine

GENERAL AUDIENCE ABSTRACT

Emotion socialization refers to the ways we come to understand the rules, expectations, and understanding of emotions. Research often looks at the ways that parents socialize, or teach, emotions to their children by examining parent attitudes about children's emotions, parents' reactions to children's emotions, and parent-child discussions of emotions. However, often this research is limited in scope, examining only mothers' parenting, only examining socialization of negative emotions, or using only parent-report data. Research has previously found that boys and girls are socialized differently when it comes to emotions, and I want to build on established research to examine these differences further. For this study, I have observed parent-child conversations about positive and negative emotions, including both mothers and fathers. Forty-four children participated with both their mothers and fathers. I looked at parental elaboration, which is how parents ask for and provide information within a conversation, and parental encouragement of emotions, which relates to how parents validate children's emotions and help children to understand cause and consequences of their emotions. I hypothesized that mothers would be more elaborative, that is ask for and give more information in conversations, and encouraging, that is helping children to accept, understand and respond to their emotions, than fathers. I also hypothesized that parents of daughters would be more elaborative and encouraging when talking about positive emotions and that parents of sons would be less encouraging of negative emotions. Only parts of my hypotheses were supported by the data from my study. Mothers and fathers did have different strategies of emotion socialization, and fathers of daughters were more encouraging of positive emotions. However, parents of sons

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

were more encouraging of negative emotions. Further, parents were less elaborative and encouraging of their same-sex children's emotions. These findings suggest that parents' own experiences, and possibly even the ways their own parents socialized them, is related to the ways they socialize their children.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Acknowledgements

To my advisor, Dr. Cynthia L. Smith, for her constant support and gentle guidance that transformed me from a timid post-bac to a scholar.

To my committee members, Dr. Julie Dunsmore and Dr. Isabel Bradburn, for their patience, suggestions and advice.

To my family, and mostly my sister, for putting up with me while I was writing this thesis and for always being willing to celebrate the small victories along the way.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Table of Contents

List of Tables	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Theoretical Approach	2
Empirical Support	7
Mothering versus Fathering	10
Parenting of Sons Versus Daughters	13
Emotion Talk Task	14
Research Questions and Hypotheses	15
Chapter 2: Methods	17
Participants	17
Procedure	18
Measures	19
Emotion Coaching	19
Elaborative Style	21
Chapter 3: Results	23
Preliminary Analyses	23
Method of Analysis	25
Chapter 4: Discussion	27
Limitations	31
Future Directions	33
Conclusion	34
References	35

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

List of Tables

Table 1 – Descriptive Statistics of Parental Elaboration Scores	42
Table 2 – Descriptive Statistics of Variables of Interest	43
Table 3 – Descriptive Statistics of Variables of Interest by Child Sex.....	44
Table 3 – Correlation Matrix	45
Table 4 – Correlation Matrix by Child Sex	46
Table 5 – MANCOVA Results	47
Table 6 – Means of Parent Encouragement and Elaboration Scores by Paternal Work Hours.....	49
Table 7 – Means of Parent Encouragement and Elaboration Scores by Maternal Work Hours....	50
Table 8 – Differences in Parental Composite Emotion Socialization Scores by Child Sex.....	51

Chapter 1

Introduction

Eisenberg, Cumberland, and Spinrad (1998) proposed that socialization of emotions encompasses parents' reactions to as well as the discussion and expression of emotions. According to Eisenberg et al. (1998), the goals of emotion socialization depend on parental beliefs about appropriate emotion expression and what constitutes social and emotional competency for children; however, men and women express and interpret their emotions differently and thus likely have different goals for sons and daughters. Simon and Nath (2004) found that men were more likely to report positive feelings or feelings of calm, while women were more likely to report negative or anxious feelings. Wong, McElwain, and Halberstadt (2009) also found that mothers of daughters reported more negative self-expressiveness in the family. These sex differences in adults' emotional experiences are likely to relate to the ways that parents socialize emotions to their children. Kuebli and colleagues (1995) suggested that differential parenting may allow girls more opportunities for emotion-related discussions than boys, which could, in turn, allow girls to develop more nuanced understandings of their emotions. Further, if girls have more exposure to and opportunities to discuss their emotions than boys do, girls might develop better emotion regulation skills, which is associated with many positive developmental outcomes (Brownell et al., 2013; Loop & Roskam, 2016). Thus, examining how emotions are socialized to children, especially how mothers versus fathers socialize emotions differently and how parents might socialize boys and girls differently, is important because of the potential long-term implications for how children learn to express and regulate their emotions.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

In the current study, I examined two research questions to address the differential patterns of emotion socialization, looking at differences between male and female parents and differences between male and female children. I hypothesized that mothers will be overall more encouraging of children's emotions and more elaborative in discussions about emotions than fathers will be. Further, I hypothesized that parents of daughters will be more encouraging in discussions of positive emotions than parents of sons and that parents of sons will be more discouraging in discussions of negative emotions than parents of daughters. It is important to note that while this study examined differences between mothers and fathers and sons and daughters, a measure of gender identity was not included. Thus, parent and child sex are used to make these distinctions.

Theoretical Approach

The theoretical basis supporting my research questions and hypotheses includes gender schema theory, social learning theory of identificatory processes, and meta-emotion philosophy. I will briefly describe each theory, explaining how tenants of the theory are related to my proposed study of gender differences in emotion socialization, as well as they ways these three theories complement each other to provide a basis for my research.

In gender schema theory, Bem (1981) posits that children are exposed to society's gender schemas and begin to learn attributes that are associated with their own sex and reject those that are not. These sex-linked attributes comprise their gender schema, a pattern of sex-linked behaviors that help individuals to distinguish sex-appropriate and sex-inappropriate conduct. Children's self-concept begins to be defined by their ability to selectively apply sex-linked attributes, and reject non-sex-linked attributes, to their own personality and behaviors. Their self-concept is then assimilated into their own gender schema.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Although my study did not include a measure of gender identity, participating children were in middle childhood (6-9 years of age) because gender constructs have been found to be developed during that period (Martin & Ruble, 2013). In American culture, gender norms and gender roles dictate appropriate behaviors for boys and girls. Gender-appropriate behavior specifically related to the expression of emotion is still prevalent and thus parent gender and child sex are thought to be important points of potential differential parenting, as emotion socialization occurs within the context of these gender norms. Following Bornstein's (2012) remarks the adaptation of parental behaviors to cultural beliefs and behavior patterns, and specifically, the idea that culture-specific influences can take shape before individuals become parents, the current study used parent reports of child sex as a means of establishing sex differences as a point of differential parenting. Research has found that by about 7 years of age, children are able to use conventional, or stereotypical, reasoning to explain attributes associated with boys and girls (Tenenbaum, Hill, Joseph, & Roche, 2010). For instance, children may observe that boys are always told how strong they are, while girls are told how kind they are, but not vice versa. When children receive these messages, they then associate strength with boys and nurturing with girls, and thus their self-concepts will depend on where how well they are able to adhere to the attribute associated with their gender.

Marin and Fivush (2018) also suggest that everyday interactions in the world unconsciously reflect a gendered existence. These findings suggest that an individual's gender expression, and not necessarily their gender identity, can impact the way they experience the world and specifically the way the world interacts with them. In middle childhood, gender identity is more fully formed and thus children might have more autonomy in how their gender impacts their existence. According to gender schema theory, children assign attributes to a

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

certain sex and consider societal norms and goals to influence their perceptions of these sex-linked attributes; however, the role of direct influences, such as parenting, on children's gender schema is not explicitly stated.

Social learning theory of identificatory processes (Bandura, 1969) echoes some of the same ideas of gender schema theory, specifically an emphasis on identification-based learning is important for socialization. Gender schema theory suggests that children match sex-appropriate and sex-inappropriate behaviors to their own sex, but the theory does not put as much focus on how, where, and by whom children are observing these behaviors. Social learning theory, however, considers parents, specifically, as active socializers and considers responses to children's behavior and not just observed behavior as important to socialization.

The process of sex differentiation, according to social learning theory, begins at birth and continues throughout childhood. For example, parents may buy blue clothing for their male infants and pink clothing for their female infants, keep their male toddlers' hair cut short while female toddlers' hair grows long, and encourage their sons to play contact sports while their girls are encouraged to learn to dance. Parents might make choices about their children's appearance, clothing, toys, and even playmates based on their child's sex. Yee and Brown (1994) found that children as young as three were able to classify people into gender categories but found that gender constancy increased between three and nine years of age, suggesting that sex differentiation is understood at a young age, but sex identity might be still be developing even into middle childhood. Further, parents might respond disapprovingly to children's exhibitions of non-sex-matched behaviors or choices, from which children can learn which behaviors and interests are not appropriate for themselves. Thus, while the social learning theory of identificatory processes acknowledges the specific role of parents in children's socialization, it

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

also considers that sex alone may not be the basis on which young children establish a shared identity with their parents. Previous research (Yee & Brown, 1994) found that three- and five-year old children displayed less gender constancy than nine-year-old children. Younger children who do not have a concrete notion of their own sex may not use that as the primary identity to share with a parent. Thus, it is important to look at more specific ways parents might socialize their children.

The last theory incorporates specific behaviors parents might use to socialize their children specifically related to emotion. In the meta-emotion philosophy, Gottman, Katz, and Hooven (1996) consider that parents' attitudes and beliefs about children's emotion influence their meta-emotion philosophy, which in turn relates to their emotion socialization strategies. Through meta-emotion interviews, two meta-emotion philosophies were identified by Gottman and colleagues (1996). One was an emotion-coaching philosophy, and the other was an emotion-dismissing philosophy. Emotion-coaching philosophies align with emotion encouraging behaviors; parents with an emotion-coaching philosophy validate and label children's emotions, see children's negative emotions as teaching opportunities, and help children problem solve when dealing with their emotions. Parents aligned with the emotion-dismissing philosophy, however, perceive negative emotions to be toxic or harmful to children and presume their responsibility is to make these feelings go away. Parents with an emotion-dismissing philosophy do not necessarily have bad intentions and can be warm and sensitive with their children while still ignoring or denying their children's emotions.

Gottman's theoretical model (1996) associated with these philosophies suggests a direct relation from meta-emotion philosophy to parenting as well as a direct relation from meta-emotion philosophy to child outcome, whereas gender schema and social learning theory

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

consider how children observe the world and other people. Social learning theory considers parents to be active socializers for children in the choices they make, which is similar to the meta-emotion philosophy model that directly links parent beliefs and behavior to child outcomes, but meta-emotion philosophy defines the role of parents' active socialization more clearly. Further, the meta-emotion philosophy model suggests an indirect relation from meta-emotion philosophy to child outcomes through parenting.

Gottman and colleagues (1996) discussed positive parenting as it related to the emotion coaching philosophy but only considered meta-emotion philosophies and emotion socialization behaviors as they related to negative, but not positive, emotions. The current study will include parent-child discussions of both positive and negative emotions, so meta-emotion philosophies and emotion coaching behaviors can be observed in different emotional contexts.

Whereas meta-emotion philosophy emphasizes the role of parents, it fails to consider that that emotion-related parenting behavior may not truly reflect their underlying beliefs and attitudes toward children's emotions, though Baker, Fenning, and Crnic (2011) did find a relation between fathers' attitudes about emotions and fathers' emotion socialization practices, and Wong, McElwain, and Halberstadt (2009) found that parents with more accepting beliefs about children's negative emotions had fewer nonsupportive reactions to children's expression of negative emotions. Gottman and colleagues (1996) conducted interviews to establish the two meta-emotion philosophies, it is possible that parents' attitudes and beliefs alone do not determine their parenting behaviors. Gender schema and social learning theories both account for that children's understanding of sex-appropriate and sex-inappropriate behaviors, but meta-emotion philosophy does account for the role that sex may change parents' beliefs about

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

emotions and what is appropriate. The current study considers mothers and fathers of sons and daughters to examine whether emotion coaching behaviors may vary by sex.

These three theories are compatible, in that they each provide a basis for the hypotheses of gender differences in emotion socialization. Gender schema theory acknowledges that behaviors can be socially assigned to a certain sex but not that parents play active role in children's understanding of these sex-linked behaviors. Social learning theory of identificatory processes suggests that parents' behavior and responses to children's choices and actions help to teach sex-appropriate behavior and acknowledges that young children do not necessarily understand a shared gender identity with their parents but does not provide another basis for parent influence. Meta-emotion philosophy brings in the specific attention to emotion socialization and parents active training, which is influenced by their underlying attitudes and beliefs, which might include their ideas appropriated sex-linked behaviors that are then transmitted to children.

Empirical Support

The theoretical basis introduces the notion that boys and girls may receive and interpret differences in socialization and empirical research supports these differences. I will first explore general literature on differences in emotion expression for men and women, supporting my first hypothesis that mothers and fathers will differ in their emotion socialization behaviors, specifically that mothers will be more elaborative and encouraging than fathers. Next, I will present research supporting differences in the messages that children receive based on differences between boys and girls. The current study builds on the research that has been previously done in this area in two significant ways. The first is that the children participating in these discussions with their parents are in middle childhood, whereas previous research has not

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

examined these issues in this developmental period. Middle childhood is a time when gender identity begins to be established, when children are more independent and have increased language skills; therefore, they are likely to have more involved conversations about their experiences with their parents. The second way that my project extends previous research is that parents and children discuss both positive and negative experiences at the same time, allowing for emotion socialization to be examined across and between parent gender and child sex as well as emotional valence. The two concepts of interest to my study are emotion coaching, which are parental behaviors that either help children to understand, explain, and respond to their emotions or dismiss, deny, or overlook children's emotions, and elaboration in emotion discussions, which is the degree to which parents are providing and asking for information from their children.

In self-reports of men's and women's emotional experiences and behaviors, Simon and Nath (2004) found that while women's anger lasted longer and was more intense than men's, women were also more likely to consider their anger appropriate. Women were also more likely to seek social support and discuss their emotions. Men, on the other hand, were less likely to view their anger as appropriate, less likely to discuss their feelings, and more likely to use mood-altering substances. These findings might suggest that men are socialized to hide their emotions because it is not appropriate for them to experience or express them, which could lead to more externalizing problems (Simon & Nath, 2004). In light of findings like these, it is important to consider how emotions are socialized to children and how parents can help their children to understand and accept their emotions.

Because less optimal child outcomes have been related to parents' dismissive or unsupportive reactions to children's emotions (Ramsden & Hubbard, 2002; Lunkenheimer, Shields, & Cortana, 2007; Premo & Kiel, 2014), research needs to consider how children learn

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

about emotions in a way that recognizes the complexity of how gender socialization and emotion socialization intersect. It is possible that children whose parents discourage their emotions lack the tools to appropriately recognize and respond to their feelings, which can lead to less optimal developmental outcomes. Parental emotion socialization can also differ based on parent perceptions of children. Baker, Fenning, and Crnic (2011) found that mothers' socialization behaviors were related to their perceptions of children's social skills. It is also likely parental encouragement of emotions is related to children's own awareness of their emotions, which can lead to more optimal outcomes. For example, Ellis and Alisic (2013) suggest that children whose parents engage in emotion coaching may have better emotion regulation skills. This finding suggests that parents' emotion encouraging has positive outcomes for children.

Emotion encouraging includes parents' acknowledgement and labeling of emotions, using emotion experiences as a teaching opportunity, or talking about the cause and effects of emotion (Dunsmore et al., 2013). Parents who encourage emotions can help children to understand not only their positive but also their negative emotions. Children who know how to appropriately respond to their own negative emotions might be able to avoid some less adaptive outcomes of negative emotionality. Lunkenheimer and colleagues (2007) examined emotion coaching within the family context and found that emotion coaching of negative, but not positive, emotions related to lower emotional lability and fewer externalizing problems in children.

Emotion discouraging includes parents' dismissing children's emotions and overriding, or replacing, children's emotions (Dunsmore et al., 2013). Unsupportive reactions to children's positive emotions have been related to higher levels of children's negativity (Shewark & Blandon, 2015). Gottman et al. (1996) included both mothers and fathers in their preliminary

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

data collection on parents' meta-emotion philosophy and found that fathers reported less awareness of emotion and held lower emotion coaching attitudes than did mothers, a finding that was supported by Baker and colleagues (2011), and that mothers' and fathers' parenting behaviors were uncorrelated, suggesting that mothers and fathers parent differently.

Previous research has investigated parenting styles (Maccoby & Martin, 1983) and ways that parenting differs by parent gender (Craig, 2006) and research has also examined the role of emotion coaching behaviors on child outcomes. However, relatively few studies examine the role of both parent gender and child sex in examining how emotion socialization is delivered to children and responded to by children. The current study will address this gap by examining parenting behaviors specifically related to emotion socialization across parent gender and child sex.

McNeal (1999) also conceptualized parent involvement as a form of social capital that might vary by availability of resources and found that parent-child conversations are more effective for children of families with higher socio-economic status. Research has also found that parents who work longer hours spend less time with their children and that the parent-child relationship quality might be lower. In light of these findings, parental education and parent work hours will be controlled for in this study as measures of family socio-economic status.

Mothering versus Fathering. I considered two aspects when examining the role of sex on parent emotion socialization. My first research question examines differences in emotion socialization between mothers and fathers, specifically in their emotion coaching behaviors and their elaborative style, which is the extent to which parents ask for or provide new information in a conversation.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Mothers have been found to be more involved in children's emotional lives and were more supportive, less punitive, and less intrusive than fathers (Hallers-Haalboom et al., 2014; Klimes-Dougan et al., 2007). Women reported feeling more anger and that their emotions were more socially acceptable than men did (Simon & Nath, 2004). If mothers are more accepting of their own emotions, they might also be more accepting of their children's emotions. Thus, it seems likely that mothers may be more encouraging of children's emotions.

Fathers have been found to have unsupportive reactions to children's negative emotions (Klimes-Dougan et al., 2007); thus, fathers may display less supportive emotion coaching or more discouraging emotion coaching. If men are less likely to consider their emotions, especially negative emotions, acceptable (Simon & Nath, 2004), they might have those same beliefs about their children's emotions and be less accepting.

Regarding elaborative style during emotion discussions, Manczak and colleagues (2016) found that fathers used fewer words than mothers, and specifically used fewer words with daughters than sons. Adams and colleagues (1995) found that children used more emotion words in conversations about the past with their fathers than their mothers. Simon and Nath (2004) found that men are less likely than women to seek social support for their emotions. If men have less experience talking about their own emotions, they are likely to be less elaborative in conversations about their children's emotions, and children are then spending more time talking in these conversations and are thus using more words. Manczak and colleagues (2016) also found that children both initiated more emotion words and used more emotion words overall when discussing negative emotions. However, some research (Reese & Fivush, 1993; van der Pol et al., 2016) has also shown that elaborative style does not vary between mothers and fathers when talking to their three-year-old children. Manczak and colleagues (2016) found that

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

mothers initiated more emotion words and explained emotions slightly more than fathers when talking to their five-year-old children. In middle childhood, children have more developed language skills than in preschool and early childhood and may be able to engage in higher level and more elaborate conversations about their experiences with their parents than in previous developmental periods.

Similarly, as children get older and are able to understand and speak at higher levels with their parents, parents may change the ways they initiate and respond to conversations with their children. Research has suggested that parents adapt their emotion socialization practices to match children's level of understanding (van der Pol et al., 2015); thus, nuances in differences between mothers and fathers may not emerge until children are older. Zaman and Fivush (2013) examined parental conversations with four-year-old children and found that mothers were both more elaborative and more engaged than fathers, especially in helping children to understand and work through difficult emotions. The current study will add to this body of literature by examining patterns of emotion coaching and elaborative style in both mothers and fathers and their children in middle childhood. Research has found that children whose parents engaged in more emotion coaching during their preschool years had greater understanding of emotion display rules and emotion regulation in middle childhood (Garner, 1999). Further, Gentzler and colleagues (2005) suggested that emotion-related discussion during middle childhood might be especially important given children's increased experiences apart from their parents, so it is important that they be able to learn and translate emotion skills with parents to these independent situations. Therefore, I predict that mothers will engage in more elaborative conversations with their children than fathers.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Parenting of Sons versus Daughters. The second consideration in examining the role of sex on parent emotion socialization is how child sex might relate to differential socialization of emotions. As discussed in the previous section, patterns of emotion coaching and elaborative style based on parent gender may relate to differences in children's discussion and expression of emotions, but these differences could also be related to parents' differential socialization of daughters and sons. The current study examines these differences in children in middle childhood, a period that has previously been found to exhibit gender constancy (Yee & Brown, 1994) and conventional reasoning about gender (Tenenbaum, Hill, Joseph, & Roche, 2010). Previous research has found that mothers and fathers do differ in socialization practices with younger boys and girls, but that research has not continued through middle childhood when gender might be more relevant to children's perceptions of gender roles and identity.

Girls' emotions may be considered more socially acceptable, and parents of daughters could spend more time talking about and working through negative emotions, while parents of sons engage in less discourse exploring emotions because boys' emotions are less acceptable. To this end, Adams and colleagues (1995) found that both mothers and fathers of daughters were more likely to use emotion-related words than parents of sons, and parents of sons were less likely to discuss negative emotions at all. Kuebli and Fivush (1992) also found that parents talked to daughters about more varied emotion-related experiences than with sons. Parents of daughters are also less likely to respond unsupportively to negative emotions and more likely to elaborate than parents of sons in conversations about the past and fathers of sons are more likely to respond punitively to negative emotions than fathers of daughters (Klimes-Dougan et al., 2007). These findings all support the notion that parents of daughters engage more in conversations about emotions. However, in a 2011 study with children in middle childhood and

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

their parents, Baker, Fenning and Crnic found that fathers' emotion socialization with boys showed slightly more variability than fathers' behavior with daughters. The current study proposes that parents of daughters will be more elaborative than parents of sons when talking to children about emotion-related experiences.

Emotion talk task. Robyn Fivush has studied children's memory, recall, and maternal-child co-construction of memory since the 1980's, and particularly sex differences in the conversations mothers and children have about the past (Fivush, Hudson, & Nelson, 1984; Fivush, 1989). In the early 90's, researchers began examining the emotional valence of conversations and how parents might discuss emotions differently with their children. In these studies (Kuebli & Fivush, 1992; Levy & Fivush, 1993, Fivush & Vasudeva, 2002), researchers did not prompt the emotional valence of mother-child reminiscing topics, just asking parents to select specific events they and their children experienced. The current study prompted parents to choose one happy event and one upset event to discuss to examine differential discussion of positive and negative emotions. This expansion of previous research allows for examination of differential socialization of boys and girls with both positive and negative emotions. Further, participants in the current study were observed in a laboratory setting during the emotion talk task to decrease variability across family conversations. Reese and Fivush (1993) chose to recruit families with 3-year-old children because children of that age are able to actively participate in conversations.

The current study examined parenting behavior with children in middle childhood, between six and nine years of age, in order to examine the role of gender on parents' differential socialization of emotion. Sanders and colleagues (2015) also examined children's report of parents' emotion socialization as it related to children's negative emotions when children were in

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

middle childhood, which they described as a period of increased independence and regulation and found that high levels of both maternal and paternal unsupportiveness in response to negative emotions related to a negative relation between anger coping and depressive symptoms. Collins and Russell (1991) highlighted the need to consider growth and changes in the parent-child relationship during middle childhood as these relationships change with the transition to adolescence and other developmental changes in this age period.

It is important to identify the ways mothers and fathers differentially socialize their emotions to their children before we can make inferences about what the impacts of those differences may be. The current study aims to address the gap in research on children's emotions by including both fathers and mothers within the same study. As previously stated, it is important to note that the current study did not include a measure of socially constructed gender and thus uses sex as the measure of gender.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

My first research question explores differences in the ways that mothers and fathers talk to their children about both positive and negative emotions. Simon and Nath (2004) reported that women are more likely to talk about their emotional experiences and consider their negative emotions more acceptable than men. The current study examines socialization of both positive and negative emotions, to explore whether mothers and fathers have different approaches in the ways they discuss different emotions with their children. Social learning theory suggests that parents actively socialize their children, so mothers may discuss their own experiences and their children's experiences, more frequently. Considering the meta-emotion philosophy, mothers may also have more positive attitudes toward emotions and thus be more encouraging of their

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

children's emotions. It is hypothesized that mothers will engage in more emotion coaching and use a more elaborative style than fathers.

The second research question explores differences in parents of daughters and parents of sons. It is hypothesized that parents of girls will use more elaborative style when discussing positive and negative emotions than parents of boys. It is also hypothesized that parents of girls will be more encouraging of positive emotions than parents of boys, and parents of boys will be more discouraging of negative emotions than parents of girls.

Parents' emotion encouraging and discouraging behaviors will be observed during a parent-child emotion talk task (Farrant & Reese, 2000; Fivush & Vasudeva, 2002; Dunsmore et al., 2013), using a coding scheme developed by Dunsmore and colleagues (2013) adapted from Gottman and colleagues' (1996) model.

The current study expands on previous research on emotion socialization by examining a parent-child emotion-related conversation during middle childhood, as opposed to early childhood. One reason for this is children's language develops with age and thus parents and children may have more fruitful conversations during this period. Further, children's coping strategies develop and expand during middle childhood (Fields & Prinz, 1977). Parents' emotion socialization could help or interfere with the development of these coping and regulation strategies, thus it is important to understand what strategies parents are using during socialization.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Chapter 2

Methods

Participants

Participants for this study have been part of an ongoing longitudinal study examining children's emotions. The subgroup of participants used for this study were children ($n = 44$, 24 boys, 20 girls) whose parents both participated in a laboratory assessment. Children, between the ages of 6 and 9 years of age, visited the Children's Emotions Laboratory on two separate occasions, once with their mother and once with their father. Of the 44 children, 38 came with their mother first and 6 came with their father first (T1), when children were between 6 and 8 years of age ($M = 88.88$ months, $SD = 7.34$ months). Those same children visited the lab again (T2) between the ages of 7 and 9 years ($M = 104.37$ months, $SD = 7.68$ months). Children who first came with their mother returned with their father and vice versa.

The majority of parents who accompanied their children were married (93.2%) and the mean household income reported by mothers was 6.34 and by fathers was 6.48 (1 = less than \$15,000, 2 = \$15,000-\$30,000, 3 = \$30,000-\$45,000, 4 = \$45,000-\$65,000, 5 = \$60,000-\$75,000, 6 = \$75,000-\$100,000, 7 = over \$100,000). Mothers self-reported their ethnic and racial identities as follows: 90.9% non-Hispanic or Latino, 6.8% Hispanic or Latino, 93.2% white, 4.5% Asian, 2.3% mixed race. Fathers self-reported their ethnic and racial identities as follows: 95.5% non-Hispanic or Latino, 2.3% Hispanic or Latino, 2.3% Native American or Native Alaskan, 95.5% white. Mothers were well educated; 15.9% had some college or a 2-year degree, 29.5% have a 4-year college degree, and 54.5% had an advanced degree. Further, 77.5% of mothers were employed, and of those mothers, 4.5% worked fewer than 10 hours per week, 2.3% worked between 10 and 20 hours per week, 11.4% worked between 20 and 30 hours per

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

week and 59.1% worked more than 30 hours per week. Fathers were also well educated; 11.4% had some college or a 2-year degree, 34.1% have a 4-year college degree, and 54.5% had an advanced degree. Further, 95.5% of fathers were employed, and of those fathers, 2.3% worked between 10 and 20 hours per week, 4.5% worked between 20 and 30 hours per week and 93.2% worked more than 30 hours per week.

Procedure

Participants in this study were recruited from a longitudinal study examining children's emotions. There were 63 boys and 53 girls between the ages of 4.5 and 6 years, $M = 54.03$ months, $SD = 3.60$ months, in the original data set. Of those original participants, 44 children came back to the lab with both their mother and father. Laboratory visits varied in day and time to accommodate families' schedules, and similar procedures were used at T1 and T2. Upon arrival, an undergraduate student greeted families and escorted them to the laboratory. A graduate student in the laboratory introduced the study to the parents and obtained parental consent (see Appendix A) and child assent (see Appendix B). The laboratory tasks were conducted by either the graduate student completing the consent process or by a trained undergraduate student. A second experimenter, typically an undergraduate student, video recorded laboratory sessions. When needed, another student provided childcare to siblings who accompanied families to the laboratory.

Prior to their visit, parents were sent a set of questionnaires, which included a demographic form (see Appendix C), and parents brought the completed questionnaires to the laboratory visit. Parents who did not bring the questionnaires or did not finish completing them were sent home with a reply envelope to return completed questionnaires. All parents completed the same demographic form.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Children and their parents completed a five-minute emotion talk task (Farrant & Reese, 2000; Fivush & Vasudeva, 2002; Dunsmore et al., 2013). When scheduling visits, parents were informed that we would ask them to talk to their children about two events, one when the child was happy and one when the child was upset. At the beginning of the laboratory visit, parents selected the topics for the two events to talk about with their children (happy and upset events). Parents were encouraged to choose events that did not repeat, such as birthdays, or events that happen on a weekly basis, or that have a script within the event itself, such as seeing a movie or play (Farrant & Reese, 2000; Farrar, Fasig, & Welch-Ross, 1997; Haden, Haine, & Fivush, 1997). The experimenter wrote the parent's chosen topics on a card (Appendix D). At both time points, the emotion talk task came approximately mid-way through the visit and was the first task that parents and children completed together. Parents and children sat next to one another on a small sofa in the observation room. The experimenter reminded parents of the instructions and gave the parent the card with the pre-selected events as they sat with the child. Parents were instructed to talk to their children about the events as they normally would at home, spending two and a half minutes on the happy event, and two and a half minutes discussing the upsetting event. The happy and upset event were counterbalanced using a random number generator to assign the order of events, such that 41% of dyads at T1 began with the happy event and 52% of dyads at T2 began with the happy event. The experimenter knocked on the door to let the parent know when it was time to switch to the second event.

Measures

Emotion Coaching. Gottman and colleagues (1996) developed a system to assess parents' own awareness and regulation of negative emotions and their acceptance of and assistance for their children's negative emotions from a meta-emotion interview. However,

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Gottman and colleagues did not specifically observe parents' emotion coaching or dismissing during parent-child interaction. Instead, they observed a parent-child interaction and used coding systems to assess engagement and affect. Future researchers (Dunsmore, Booker, & Ollendick, 2013, as adapted by Day, 2010; Hernandez, Smith, Day, Neal, & Dunsmore, 2018) developed a coding scheme to directly observe parents' emotion encouraging (coaching) and discouraging (dismissing) behaviors.

Emotion coaching (see Appendix E) was coded from DVD recordings of the emotion talk task. A team of two coders completed the emotion coaching coding. Positive and negative event discussions were coded separately (see Appendix F) following from Dunsmore and colleagues (2013).

Both parents received scores for reference to their own emotion and responses to the children's emotions. Parents were scored on their reference to their children's emotions. Parents received separate scores for encouraging responses to positive emotions, encouraging responses to negative emotions, discouraging responses to positive emotion and discouraging responses to negative emotions. Thus, each parent received four separate scores for each of the card events, for a total of eight scores for the task (four for the happy event and four for the upset event). Emotion encouraging scores reflected behaviors consistent with Gottman and colleague's (1996) emotion-coaching philosophy, while emotion discouraging scores were reflective of an emotion-dismissing philosophy. For encouraging and discouraging scores, the highest score for behavior during the discussion was coded.

Scores on the encouraging scale were coded on a scale from 0 to 5, with 0 indicating no encouragement, including not responding. A 1 indicated acknowledgement of the event itself, including facts or details of the event. It was possible for a parent to receive a score of 1 for

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

encouraging, even if the child did not reference their own emotions. For scores of 2 and above, the child had to reference to their own emotion for a parent response to be scored. A score of 2 reflected specific acknowledgment of the other person's emotion one time, through conversation or behavior (e.g., mirroring emotion-related behavior). A score of 3 reflected multiple acknowledgments of the other person's emotions. A score of 4 reflected one instance emotion coaching behavior, such as labeling, discussing causes and effects of the emotion, using the experience as a teaching opportunity, etc. A score of 5 indicated repeated or multiple emotion coaching behaviors.

Discouraging responses were coded on a scale from 0 to 4, with 0 indicating no discouragement, including not responding. A 1 indicated disagreement or dismissing the facts or details of the event. Again, a parent could receive a score of 1, even if the child did not reference their own emotions. A 2 indicated dismissing or discouraging the emotion, by way of invalidating the child's experience, suggesting the emotion is wrong, etc. A score of 3 indicated overriding the child's emotion, through denying the child's emotion, suggesting the child felt another emotion, or suggesting the child felt no emotion. A score of 4 indicated contempt, by which parents devalues the child as a person for the emotion (i.e., a personal attack).

For these scores, 35% of the data were coded by both coders to calculate reliability scores. The reliability for both emotions was acceptable (for Encouraging Positive, $\kappa = .84$; for Encouraging Negative, $\kappa = .80$).

Elaborative style. Transcriptions of dyad conversations were used for elaborative style coding, and parent-child emotion talk tasks were transcribed verbatim (see Appendix G). Each transcript was completed once and checked by a second, independent transcriber for correctness. After transcriptions were completed and checked, transcripts were broken into subject-verb

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

phrases. Subject-verb phrases are phrases that could stand alone, even when part of the same sentence. A team of four coders completed elaborative style. Each subject-verb phrase was categorized based on whether it was elaborative (introducing new information), repetitive (reiteration of previously given information), a request for information, an evaluation (confirmation or negation), associative talk (information not about chosen event, but related in some way), or off topic (information unrelated to chosen event). Each subject-verb phrase was coded as one of the six categories (see Appendix H). For a presentation of descriptive statistics for each code for each parent, see Table 1.

For elaboration scores, sum scores for each of the six categories were calculated for the happy event card and the upset event card. Proportion scores were calculated by dividing the number of subject-verb phrases in a category by the total number of subject-verb phrases in the event card discussion to compare across dyads. Proportions of overall elaboration scores were used for both mother and father in the happy and upsetting events. For these scores, 25% of the data were coded by all four coders to calculate reliability scores. Reliability for elaboration scores were as follows: for maternal elaboration in the happy event, $\kappa = .74$, for paternal elaboration in the happy event, $\kappa = .56$, for maternal elaboration in the upset event, $\kappa = .69$, and for paternal elaboration in the upset event, $\kappa = .64$.

Plan of Analysis

Parent gender, discourse type (elaboration vs. encouraging) and emotion type (happy vs. upset) were within-subjects variables, such that each parent had scores for elaboration and encouraging in both the happy and upset events. Child sex was a between-subjects factor as both mothers and fathers had discussions of happy and upsetting events with the same child. Because of this nested nature and relatively small sample size a 2 X 2 X 2 X 2 MANCOVA was

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

conducted in SAS 9.4 to examine differences in parental emotion discourse. The MANCOVA included three within-subjects factors (parent gender; discourse type; emotion type) and one between-subjects factor (child sex) and considered parental work hours and maternal education as covariates.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Chapter 3

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Means, standard deviations, and values of skewness and kurtosis for variables of interest are reported in Table 2. Means and standard deviations for boys and girls are reported in Table 3. Skewness and kurtosis values did not exceed acceptable ranges for the data presented and thus no data transformations were made. For emotion encouraging and dismissing scores, only parental encouragement of positive emotions in the happy event (Encouraging Positive) and parental encouragement of negative emotions in the upset event (Encouraging Negative) were high-occurring and reliable enough to use for analyses. Though mothers and fathers in the happy and upset events were scored on the same variables, the scales elaboration scores and encouraging scores were not coded on the same scale, so z-scores were used for analyses.

A correlation matrix examining preliminary relations between covariates and variables of interest is presented in Table 4. Overall, more maternal education was related to more paternal education and more paternal encouragement of both positive and negative emotions. The more hours fathers worked per week was associated with less maternal encouragement of positive emotions and less paternal encouragement of negative emotions. More maternal encouragement of positive emotions was associated with more maternal elaboration in the happy event, more maternal encouraging of negative emotions and more paternal elaboration in the happy event but was also related to less paternal elaboration in the upset event. Generally, more maternal elaboration in the happy event was associated with more maternal elaboration in the upset event and more paternal elaboration in the upset event. Maternal encouragement of negative emotions was generally associated with less paternal elaboration in the happy event. Overall, more

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

paternal encouragement of negative emotions was associated with more paternal elaboration in the upset event.

To get a preliminary understanding of relations between variables of interest and child sex, a correlation matrix examining relations between variables of interest and covariates by child sex is presented in Table 5. The relation between maternal education and paternal encouragement of emotions for parents of boys was consistent with the overall pattern; however, there were no relations between maternal education and paternal behaviors for parents of girls. For boys, but not girls, more maternal work hours was related to less paternal elaboration in the happy event. For girls, more maternal work hours was related to less maternal encouraging of positive emotions and less paternal elaboration in the happy event. For boys, paternal work hours was related to less paternal encouragement of negative emotions; however, all fathers of girls in this study worked over 30 hours per week so associations with paternal work hours could not be made. For boys, these relations were consistent, but there was no association between maternal encouragement of positive emotions and maternal or paternal elaboration in the happy event. For girls, relations with maternal encouragement of positive emotions were consistent with the overall patterns but there was no association with paternal elaboration in the upset event. Positive associations between maternal elaboration in the happy event and maternal and paternal elaboration in the upset event were consistent for boys but not for girls. For girls, but not boys, maternal elaboration in the upset event was associated with less paternal encouragement of negative emotions. Positive associations between paternal encouragement of negative emotions and paternal elaboration in the upset event were consistent for boys but not for girls.

In addition to establishing general patterns of relations, these correlation analyses were used to assess which demographic variables would be considered in the MANCOVA analyses.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Parental work hours and maternal education were significantly related to the outcome variables of maternal encouragement of positive emotions, paternal encouraging of both positive and negative emotions, and paternal elaboration in the happy event and thus were included in subsequent analyses.

Method of Analysis

Due to the nested nature of the data (both within family and within event), a 2 X 2 X 2 X 2 MANCOVA examined differences in parental emotion discourse with three within-subjects factors (parent gender; discourse type; emotion type) and one between-subjects factor (child sex), considering parental work hours and maternal education. Parental education and work hours were scored as ordinal variables of different scale and thus were z-scored for the MANCOVA analyses. See Table 6 for presentation of results from the MANCOVA analyses.

The MANCOVA analyses revealed an interaction between parent gender, encouraging and scores, and event valence. There were effects of paternal work hours on this interaction. Scores across parent gender and across encouraging and elaboration varied in the happy event with paternal work hours. Average scores appear to be highest when paternal work hours were moderate (20 to 30 hours per week; see Table).

There was a significant interaction effect between parent gender and encouraging and elaboration scores, which provides partial support for hypothesis one. There were also effects of maternal education and maternal work hours on this interaction. Maternal encouragement was lowest when mothers were most educated and maternal elaboration varied with maternal education level. Paternal encouragement and elaboration across event and emotion valence were higher when mothers were more educated. Similarly, paternal encouragement and elaboration scores were higher when mothers worked, maternal encouragement scores were lower when

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

mothers worked, and maternal elaboration varied with maternal work hours (see Table 8). There were no significant differences in scores across elaboration and encouraging in either the happy or upset event between mothers and fathers; thus, differences in parental emotion socialization behaviors by event valence were not supported. Because parental discouraging scores were low for both emotions in both events, analyses could not examine differences in discouraging behaviors by parent gender.

There was an effect of child sex on the interaction between parent gender, emotion valence and encouraging and elaboration scores, which provides partial support for hypothesis two. Fathers engaged in more elaboration and encouragement with daughters than sons and on positive events, both parents engaged in more encouragement and elaboration with daughters than sons. Table 9 presents the composite scores across parent gender, emotion encouraging and elaboration for both the happy and upset events, as well as composite scores across emotion valence, emotion encouraging and elaboration for both mothers and fathers. The scores presented in Table 9 are composited z-scores, not raw scores, and thus cannot be directly interpreted; however, these composited scores show patterns in differences between mothers and fathers and by emotion valence. However, mothers engaged in less elaboration and encouragement with daughters than sons and for negative events, both parents engaged in more encouragement and elaboration with sons than daughters.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Chapter 4

Discussion

My study examined the relations between parent gender, child sex, and parental emotion socialization behaviors while children were in middle childhood. Both parental encouragement and parental elaboration in discussions of both positive and negative emotions were considered. My first hypothesis was that mothers would be more elaborative and encouraging than fathers. My second hypothesis was related to child sex and emotion valence, expecting that parents of girls would be more encouraging of positive emotions than parents of boys and that parents of boys would be more discouraging of negative emotions than parents of girls.

It is important to note that scores for parental discouragement of emotions were too low-occurring to be validated for use in analyses. A possible explanation integrates McNeal's (1999) consideration of parental involvement as social capital with Gottman and colleagues' (1996) meta-emotion philosophy, in that more highly educated and higher income parents have better understanding of children's emotions within their parent-child relationships. In this way, the highly educated sample in this study would not engage in emotion discouragement, as it is a less adaptive strategy to children's well-being and could also negatively affect the parent-child relationship. Additionally, children in this study were in middle childhood, which expands upon previous research on emotion socialization in toddlerhood (Zaman & Fivush, 2013). Children in middle childhood are more independent and also have more languages skills as they get older. They could be more selective in the ways they choose to talk to their parents about their experiences, and may not present opportunities for parents to discourage emotion expression.

Partial support was found for my first hypothesis in that there was a significant interaction between parent gender and encouraging and elaboration scores. Mothers were more

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

elaborative and encouraging with sons than fathers were; however, fathers were more elaborative and encouraging with daughters than mothers. In conducting post hoc analyses, more paternal encouragement and elaboration in families with more highly educated mothers was found and less maternal encouragement occurred with more highly educated mothers. These findings, coupled with generally positive associations between maternal education and paternal encouragement of emotions, might suggest that in families where mothers were more highly educated, parental responsibilities were shared more equally by mothers and fathers, such that fathers were spending more time and were more comfortable having conversations with their children. Returning to McNeal's (1999) conception of parental involvement as social capital, more affluent families, might have more opportunities for both mothers and fathers to interact with their children than in families with less educated parents who had to work more hours to make ends meet. In fact, Marks, Bun, and McHale (2009) found that parents with higher levels of education reported more egalitarian views of gender roles within the family. Boehnke (2011) also found that higher education and maternal employment were related to men's attitudes on gender roles and that dual earner families, that is families where both parents work are more likely to have egalitarian gender role attitudes. As such, families in this sample with two working parents may not only have more egalitarian ideas about parenting but also might have more shared responsibilities when it comes to time spent with children (i.e., fathers in families with two working parents may spend more time with their children than fathers who are the sole earners in their families).

There was also partial support for my second hypothesis. Overall, parents were more elaborative and encouraging with daughters than sons. Fathers of daughters were more elaborative and encouraging than fathers of sons in discussions of positive events. However,

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

mothers were less elaborative and encouraging with daughters than sons across both positive and negative emotions, which was surprising given previous research (Klimes-Dougan et al., 2007; Zaman & Fivush, 2013; Manczak et al., 2016). My findings might suggest that mothers who have experienced the reactions to their own expression of emotion might want to shield their daughters from negative experiences or stereotypes and thus discourage their daughters' expression of emotion. Though Wong, McElwain, and Halberstadt (2009) found that mothers displayed more negative expressiveness with their daughters when they had more accepting beliefs about children's negative emotions, the authors suggested that mothers may socialize their daughters in the ways they were taught to be acceptable, which could apply to the findings here. Garside and Klimes-Dougan (2002) consider Chodorow's 1978 theory of gender differences in the attachment process, specifically that mothers consider daughters as extensions of themselves and will parent accordingly. Women who experienced negative reactions to their negative expressions might be less likely to encourage their daughters' negative emotions.

Similarly, fathers were less elaborative and encouraging with their sons than daughters. Parents, both mothers and fathers, were more elaborative and encouraging in discussions of negative emotions with sons than daughters. This finding was unexpected and in contrast to my second hypothesis and previous research. Adams and colleagues (1995) found that parents encouraged daughters more frequently and elaboratively in conversations about sadness. As such, this finding could suggest that certain negative emotions are more socially acceptable for boys, and not girls, to express; thus, parents might encourage their sons' negative emotions, like anger, more than their daughters' negative emotions. Wong, McElwain, and Halberstadt (2009) also found that mothers and fathers with more accepting views of children's negative attitudes had fewer unsupportive responses to sons.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Overall, results from this study confirm that further analyses relating to sex and gender differences of both parents and children regarding emotion socialization ought to be continued. The post hoc analyses relating to parental work status and education suggest that in homes where both parents work, there may be more equal sharing of parental responsibilities such that both fathers and mothers develop relationships and have richer conversations with their children. In contrast, when mothers do not work, they may spend more time with children, and fathers who are the sole earners for the family may spend less time with their children and have less elaborative conversations with their children.

The differences related to parent gender suggest that the way parents were socialized with emotions may have influence on the way they parent their own children. As such, the intergenerational transmission of emotion socialization should to be analyzed, as attitudes about gender roles are likely to be more egalitarian than traditional in families where both parents work (Boehnke, 2011). Parents behavior within the home models gender roles for children and thus it's important to consider how parents were raised in their family of origin and the relation to their own parenting behaviors. Parents were less elaborative and encouraging when discussing negative emotions. Girls are more likely to have comorbid depression and anxiety than boys and are more likely to have internalizing problems related to these conditions (Rescorla et al., 2007). Perhaps if girls were socialized that their negative emotions were acceptable and they were able to talk about their negative feelings, internalizing problems within girls will be less prominent. Boys are more likely than girls to have externalizing problems (Rescorla et al., 2011), often related to physical aggression, and differences in social buffers have been theorized to explain some of these differences (Keenan, Shaw, Walsh, Delliquadri, & Giovannelli, 1997). Parents were more elaborative and encouraging in discussions of negative emotions with their sons than

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

daughters; however, these findings still allow for a number of possibilities. First, the increased discussions regarding negative emotions may allow for boys to feel that their expressions of negative emotions are appropriate, even when they may not be. Alternatively, even if boys receive appropriate support from their parents regarding their negative emotions, they may not receive the same levels of support from their peers and also teachers in different contexts. If boys do not feel that their peers will accept and support their negative emotions, they may express them in inappropriate ways, such as physical aggression.

Continuing to examine sex and gender differences related to emotion socialization with regard to parent-child relationships is important in that it allows us to understand how parents might help children build foundations of emotion understanding and regulation, specifically related to the ways boys and girls may be getting different support from their parents. In addition, it is important to consider the role that sex and gender may play in peer relations regarding emotion socialization. If children have different levels of support in different contexts (at home versus at school, for instance) they may have context-dependent differences in emotion expression and associated problems.

Limitations

All research studies come with limitations and it important to note those limitations and how they may impact generalizability of findings. In this study, our sample was very homogenous. That, in itself, is not necessarily a limitation, as it allows researchers to understand patterns of socialization in a specific subgroup of the population (Bornstein, 2012). However, it is important to note that this sample was largely European American, with a high family income and well-educated parents. This sample was recruited from a town surrounding a large research university, where many families are associated with the university in some capacity—parents

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

may be faculty members or students. Thus, while the sample was recruited from the Southwest Virginia region, the findings related to this sample are not representative of rural Appalachia and parenting behaviors from that population may be different than the behaviors found in the current study. Another limitation of this study was the small sample size. The area from which these families were recruited is somewhat transient, parents who are students or faculty may move away after receiving their degree or finding a tenured position at another university. Further, for the second follow-up for this study, the parent asked to accompany the child was not the parent originally recruited to the study. Thus, because parents asked to come for the second follow-up did not agree to the study at its onset, they may have been less willing to participate at the follow-up time point.

Importantly, while this study considered both parent gender and child sex, a child-reported measure of sex was not included. As such, there is a chance that children's identities and experiences were not accurately reflected by parent-reported child sex. Additionally, this study included only male and female parents and children; other gender identities were not represented. This study was also based in a laboratory, which helped to decrease variability in experience across families; however, the laboratory setting may be such a derivation from a family norm that parents and children might interact in ways different than they normally would.

Finally, the method of analysis was appropriate due to sample size and presents of both within- and between-groups variables. However, due to the nature of the analyses conducted, the directionality of that relationship is not determined and more specific conclusions and interpretations of findings cannot be made.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Future Directions

This research contributes to the existing literature on emotion socialization by examining both mothers and fathers within families during middle childhood. Future studies might examine emotion socialization longitudinally, looking at change over time related to children's development of a gender identity, from toddlerhood through adolescence. Further, it could be useful to include a child reported sex or gender variable, as well as consideration and inclusion of gender identities outside the cisgender binary. Future studies should also attend to racial, ethnic and socioeconomic variability in their samples and might consider a more naturalistic observation of parent-child interactions.

Based on findings related to parental work and education and emotion socialization practices, I recommend future researchers measure parental attitudes about parenting and parent-reported attitudes about children's emotions. While correlational research cannot establish directionality, it would add to the field of literature to consider associations between gender role attitudes, education and employment status and emotion socialization behaviors. I also recommend future researchers assess time spent and parental involvement with children, including division of parental responsibilities, to see how these variables relate to emotion socialization. It could be that it is not only quantity of time spent, but quality of time or activities during which time is shared that relate to parents' elaboration in conversations with their children. For example, a parent who drives a child to and from school each day may have a unique opportunity to engage their child in conversation in a way that is different from time at home. Considering different parental activities and the opportunities they provide for conversation and reminiscing with children as they relate to emotion socialization behaviors will be beneficial for research in this area. Studies that consider an experimental or naturalistic

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

design could examine parent-child conversations in these different situations to assess whether there are qualitative differences in conversation depending on time, location and context.

I would also recommend that future researchers consider, either qualitatively or quantitatively, assessing parents' experiences with sharing their own emotions as children and adults. These assessments could serve to not only establish a framework from which parents may be building their beliefs about emotions, but also begin to understand intergenerational transmission of emotion socialization behaviors across multiple generations.

To further understand distinctions in differential emotion socialization, future researchers could look at more nuanced emotional valence, considering specific emotions, such as happiness, sadness, anger and fear, to determine emotion socialization behaviors as they relate to specific feelings and experiences. Future studies could also allow children to select topics of discussion to establish investment in the conversation.

Conclusion

This study expanded the literature by looking at a relatively understudied age group, middle childhood, for differences in emotion socialization. Further, though previous studies have included discussions of positive emotions, it was not an explicit design of the study (Kuebli & Fivush, 1992; Fivush & Levy, 1993, Fivush & Vasudeva, 2002). My study included discussions of both positive and negative emotions for all children and their parents, and adds significant findings about the interaction between parent gender and emotion valence. Thus, despite the limitations, the findings of my study make an important contribution to the literature on parental emotion socialization.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

References

- Adams, S., Kuebli, J., Boyle, P. A., & Fivush, R. (1995). Gender differences in parent-child conversations about past emotions: A longitudinal investigation. *Sex Roles, 33*, 309-323.
- Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., & Spinrad, T. L. (1998). Parental socialization of emotion. *Psychological Inquiry, 9*(4), 241-273.
- Baker, J. K., Fenning, R. M., & Crnic, K. A. (2011). Emotion socialization by mothers and fathers: Coherence among behaviors and associations with parent attitudes and children's social competence. *Social Development, 20*, 412-430.
- Bandura, A. (1969). Social-learning theory of identificatory processes. *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research, 213-262*.
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88*, 354-364.
- Boehnke, M. (2011). Gender role attitudes around the globe: Egalitarian vs. traditional views. *Asian Journal of Science, 39*, 57-74.
- Bornstein, M. H. (2012). Cultural approaches to parenting. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 12*, 212-221.
- Brownell, C. A., Svetlova, M., Anderson, R., Nichols, S. R., & Drummond, J. (2013). Socialization of early prosocial behavior: Parents' talk about emotions is associated with sharing and helping in toddlers. *Infancy, 18*, 91-119.
- Collins, W. A. & Russell, G. (1991). Mother-child and father-child relationships in middle childhood and adolescence: A developmental analysis. *Developmental Review, 11*, 99-136.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

- Craig, L. (2006). Does father care mean fathers share? A comparison of how mothers and fathers in intact families spend time with children. *Gender and Society, 20*, 259-281.
- Day, K. L. (2010). *Children's Private Speech During an Emotion-Eliciting Task* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA.
- Dunsmore, J. C., Booker, J. A., & Ollendick, T. H. (2013). Parental emotion coaching and child emotion regulation as protective factors for children with oppositional defiant disorder. *Social Development, 22*, 444-466.
- Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., & Spinrad, T. L. (1998) Parental socialization of emotion. *Psychology Inquiry, 9*, 241-273.
- Ellis, B. H., & Alisic, E. (2013). Maternal Emotion Coaching: A Protective Factor for Traumatized Children's Emotion Regulation? *Journal of Child & Adolescent Trauma, 6*, 118-125.
- Farrant, K., & Reese, E. (2000). Maternal style and children's participation in reminiscing: Stepping stones in children's autobiographical memory development. *Journal of Cognition and Development, 1*, 193-225.
- Farrar, M. J., Fasig, L. G., & Welch-Ross, M. K. (1997) Attachment and emotion in autobiographical memory development. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 67*, 389-408.
- Fields, L., & Prinz, R. J. (1997). Coping and adjustment during childhood and adolescence. *Clinical Psychology Review, 17*, 937-976.
- Fivush, R. (1989). Exploring sex differences in the emotional content of mother-child conversations about the past. *Sex Roles, 20*, 675-691.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

- Fivush, R., Hudson, J., & Nelson, K. (1984). Children's long-term memory for a novel event; An exploratory study. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *30*(3), 303-316.
- Fivush, R., & Marin, K. (2018). Development of a gendered narrative identity. In APA Handbook of the Psychology of Women: Vol I. History, Theory, and Battlegrounds Cook, S. L., Rutherford, A., Travis, C. B., White, J. W., Williams, W. S., & Wyche, K W. (Eds).
- Fivush, R., & Vasudeva, A. (2002). Remembering to relate: Socioemotional correlates of mother-child reminiscing. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, *3*, 73-90.
- Garner, P. W. (1999). Continuity in emotion knowledge from preschool to middle-childhood and relation to emotion socialization. *Motivation and emotion*, *23*, 247-266.
- Garside, R. B., & Klimes-Dougan, B. (2002). Socialization of discrete negative emotions: Gender differences and links with psychological distress. *Sex Roles*, *47*, 115-128.
- Gentzler, A. L., Contreras-Grau, J. M., Kerns, K. A., & Weimer, B. L. (2005). Parent-child emotional communication and children's coping in middle childhood. *Social Development*, *14*, 591-612.
- Gottman, J. M., Katz, L. F., & Hooven, C. (1996). Parental meta-emotion philosophy and the emotional life of families: Theoretical models and preliminary data. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *10*, 243-268.
- Haden, C. A., Haine, R. A., & Fivush, R. (1997). Developing narrative structure in parent-child reminiscing across the preschool years. *Developmental Psychology*, *33*, 295-307.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

- Hallers-Haalboom, E. T., Mesman, J., Groeneveld, M. G., Endendijk, J. J., van Berkel, S. R., van der Pol, L. D., & Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J. (2014). Mothers, fathers, sons and daughters: Parental sensitivity in families with two children. *Journal of Family Psychology, 28*, 138.
- Hernandez, E., Smith, C. L., Day, K. L., Neal, A., & Dunsmore, J. C. (2018). Patterns of parental emotion-related discourse and links with children's problem behaviors: A person-centered approach. *Developmental Psychology, 54*, 2077-2089.
- Keenan, K., Saw, D. S., Walsh, B., Delliquadri, E., & Giovannelli, J. (1997). *DSM-III-R* disorders in preschool children from low-income families. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 36*, 620-627.
- Klimes-Dougan, B., Brand, A. E., Zahn-Waxler, C., Usher, B., Hastings, P. D., Kendziora, K., & Garside, R. B. (2007). Parental emotion socialization in adolescence: Differences in sex, age and problem status. *Social Development, 16*(2), 326-342.
- Kuebli, J., & Fivush, R. (1992). Gender differences in parent-child conversations about past emotions. *Sex Roles, 27*, 683-698.
- Kuebli, J., Butler, S., & Fivush, R. (1995). Mother-child talk about past emotions: Relations of maternal language and child gender over time. *Cognition & Emotion, 9*, 265-283.
- Levy, G., & Fivush, R. (1993). Scripts and gender: A new approach for examining gender-role development. *Developmental Review, 13*(2), 126-146.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

- Loop, L., & Roskam, I. (2016). Do children behave better when parents' emotion coaching practices are stimulated? A micro-trial study. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 25*, 2223-2235.
- Lunkenheimer, E. S., Shields, A. M., & Cortina, K. S. (2007). Parental emotion coaching and dismissing in family interaction. *Social Development, 16*, 232-248.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.) & E. M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Socialization, Personality, and Social Development, 4*(4), 1-101. New York: Wiley.
- Manczak, E. M., Mangelsdorf, S. C., McAdams, D. P., Wong, M. S., Schoppe-Sullivan, S., & Brown, G. L. (2016). "How did that make you feel?": Influences of gender and parental personality on family emotion talk. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 62*, 388-414.
- Marks, J., Bun, L. C., & McHale, S. M. (2009). Family patterns of gender role attitudes. *Sex Roles, 61*, 221-234).
- Martin, C. L., & Ruble, D. N. (2010). Patterns of gender development. *Annual review of psychology, 61*, 353-81.
- McNeal, R. B. (1999). Parental involvement as social capital: Differential effectiveness on science achievement, truancy, and dropping out. *Social Forces, 78*, 117-144.
- Premo, J. E., & Kiel, E. J. (2014). The effect of toddler emotion regulation on maternal emotion socialization: Moderation by toddler gender. *Emotion, 14*, 782-793.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

- Ramsden, S. R., & Hubbard, J. A. (2002). Family expressiveness and parental emotion coaching: Their role in children's emotion regulation and aggression. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 30*, 657-667.
- Reese, E., & Fivush, R. (1993). Parental styles of talking about the past. *Developmental Psychology, 29*(3), 596-606.
- Rescorla, L. A., Achenbach, T. M., Ivanova, M. Y., Harder, V. S., Otten, L., Bilenberg, N. ... Verhulst, F. C. (2011). International comparisons of behavioral and emotional problems in preschool children: parents' reports from 24 societies. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 40*, 456-67.
- Sanders, W., Zeman, J., Poon, J., & Miller, R. (2015). Child regulation of negative emotions and depressive symptoms: The moderating role of parental emotion socialization. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 24*, 402-415.
- Shewark, E. A., & Bandon, A. Y. (2015). Mothers' and fathers' emotion socialization and children's emotion regulation: A within-family model. *Social Development, 24*, 266-284.
- Simon, R. W., & Nath, L. E. (2004). Gender and emotion in the United States: Do men and women differ in self-reports of feelings and expressive behavior? *American Journal of Sociology, 109*, 1137-1176.
- Tenenbaum, H. R., Hill, D. B., Joseph, N., & Roche, E. (2010). 'It's a boy because he's painting a picture': Age differences in children's conventional and unconventional gender schemas. *British Journal of Psychology, 101*(1), 137-154.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

van der Pol, L. D., Groeneveld, M. G., van Berkel, S. R., Endendijk, J. J., Hallers-Haalboom, E.

T., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & Mesman, J. (2015). Fathers' and mothers' emotion talk with their girls and boys from toddlerhood to preschool age. *Emotion, 15*, 854.

van der Pol, L. D., Groeneveld, M. G., Endendijk, J. J., van Berkel, S. R., Hallers-Haalboom, E.

T., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & Mesman, J. (2016). Associations between fathers' and mothers' psychopathology symptoms, parental emotion socialization, and preschoolers' social-emotional development. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 25*, 3367-3380.

Wong, M. S., McElwain N. L., & Halberstadt, A. G. (2009). Parent, family, and child

characteristics: Associations with mother- and father-reported emotion socialization practices. *Journal of Family Psychology, 23*, 452-463.

Yee, M., & Brown, R. (1994). The development of gender differentiation in young children.

British Journal of Social Psychology, 33(2), 183-196.

Zaman, W., & Fivush, R. (2013). Gender differences in elaborative parent-child emotion and

play narratives. *Sex Roles, 68*, 591-604.

Zeman, J., Shipman, K., & Suveg, C. (2002). Anger and sadness regulation: Predictions to

internalizing and externalizing symptoms in children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 31*, 393-398.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Parental Elaboration Scores

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
Happy Event				
Maternal				
Elaboration	.53	.19	.16	.84
Repetition	.03	.03	.00	.16
Remember Prompt	.01	.03	.00	.11
Evaluation	.03	.03	.00	.11
Associative	.16	.13	.00	.50
Off Topic	.23	.14	.03	.58
Paternal				
Elaboration	.50	.16	.08	.83
Repetition	.02	.04	.00	.22
Remember Prompt	.02	.03	.00	.13
Evaluation	.04	.04	.00	.17
Associative	.15	.13	.00	.59
Off Topic	.27	.15	.05	.76
Upset Event				
Maternal				
Elaboration	.49	.18	.13	.80
Repetition	.03	.04	.00	.22
Remember Prompt	.03	.10	.00	.67
Evaluation	.03	.04	.00	.15
Associative	.20	.14	.00	.57
Off Topic	.23	.14	.00	.53
Paternal				
Elaboration	.44	.20	.07	.85
Repetition	.02	.03	.00	.09
Remember Prompt	.02	.02	.00	.09
Evaluation	.04	.05	.00	.18
Associative	.22	.19	.00	.87
Off Topic	.27	.16	.06	.69

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Variables of Interest

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Skewness</i>	<i>Kurtosis</i>
Child age T2 in months	88.88	7.34	72.30	101.83	-.54	-.32
Child age T3 in months	104.37	7.68	87.43	116.00	-.29	-.91
Maternal Encouraging Positive	2.59	1.60	1	6	.57	-.91
Paternal Encouraging Positive	1.91	1.41	0	6	1.42	1.78
Maternal Encouraging Negative	4.50	1.32	1	6	-.83	.53
Paternal Encouraging Negative	3.57	1.87	1	6	-.22	-1.38
Maternal Happy Phrases	39.61	10.54	14	63	.12	-.06
Maternal Happy Elaboration	.53	.19	.16	.84	-.05	-1.00
Paternal Happy Phrases	41.64	10.75	14	61	-.21	-.30
Paternal Happy Elaboration	.50	.16	.08	.83	-.26	-.40
Maternal Upset Phrases	37.34	9.07	23	69	1.22	2.34
Maternal Upset Elaboration	.49	.18	.13	.80	-.05	-.92
Paternal Upset Phrases	39.05	12.95	15	72	.35	.10
Paternal Upset Elaboration	.44	.20	.07	.84	-.07	-.41

Note. Phrases refers to the number total number of subject-verb phrases uttered by the parent during the conversation.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of Variables of Interest by Child Sex

	Girls				Boys			
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min.</i>	<i>Max.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min.</i>	<i>Max.</i>
Maternal Encouraging Positive	2.60	1.73	1	6	2.58	1.53	1	5
Paternal Encouraging Positive	2.05	1.32	1	6	1.79	1.50	0	6
Maternal Encouraging Negative	3.95	1.32	1	6	4.96	1.16	1	6
Paternal Encouraging Negative	3.55	1.99	1	6	3.58	1.82	1	6
Maternal Happy Phrases	41.75	8.73	28	57	37.83	11.69	14	63
Maternal Happy Elaboration	.54	.18	.16	.83	.53	.19	.22	.84
Paternal Happy Phrases	44.10	9.93	28	61	39.58	9.34	15	59
Paternal Happy Elaboration	.54	.13	.33	.83	.47	.17	.08	.79
Maternal Upset Phrases	37.90	8.40	23	54	36.88	14.58	25	69
Maternal Upset Elaboration	.43	.17	.16	.79	.54	.17	.13	.80
Paternal Upset Phrases	42.45	9.98	23	63	36.21	14.58	15	72
Paternal Upset Elaboration	.44	.16	.07	.70	.44	.23	.07	.85

Note. Phrases refers to the number total number of subject-verb phrases uttered by the parent during the conversation.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Table 4

Correlation Matrix

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.
1. Maternal Education															
2. Maternal Work Hours	.07														
3. Paternal Education	.51**	-.10													
4. Paternal Work Hours	-.12	-.15	.09												
5. Maternal Encouraging Positive	-.02	-.19	-.13	-.31*											
6. Maternal Happy Phrases	-.09	-.01	.22	-.08	-.05										
7. Maternal Happy Elaboration	-.04	.07	.04	.15	.32*	.05									
8. Maternal Encouraging Negative	.02	.00	-.01	-.20	.37*	-.17	.08								
9. Maternal Upset Phrases	-.19	.09	.04	-.17	-.12	.63**	.10	.02							
10. Maternal Upset Elaboration	.16	.08	.12	.13	-.14	.06	.45**	.22	.13						
11. Paternal Encouraging Positive	.33*	.11	.10	.07	-.01	.01	-.25	.04	-.05	-.05					
12. Paternal Happy Phrases	-.18	-.04	.24	-.09	-.01	.41**	-.13	-.17	.30*	.02	-.26				

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

13. Paternal Happy Elaboration	-.12	-.04	.13	.05	.34*	.19	.17	-.31*	.07	-.06	-.06	.09			
14. Paternal Encouraging Negative	.36*	-.09	-.07	-.26 [†]	-.11	-.22	.03	-.13	-.24	-.22	.26 [†]	-.13	.06		
15. Paternal Upset Phrase	-.31*	-.01	.13	.10	-.11	.44**	-.08	-.41**	.34*	.00	-.13	.70**	.32*	-.17	
16. Paternal Upset Elaboration	.08	-.13	.15	.18	-.30*	.04	.39**	-.06	-.10	.16	.03	-.21	.24	.26 [†]	-.21

Note. ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, [†] $p < .10$

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Table 5

Correlation Matrix by Child Sex

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Maternal Education		.10	.66*	-.15	-.06	-.07	-.04	-.02	-.26	.22	.42*	-.12	-.02	.54**	-.31	.13
2. Maternal Work Hours	.00		.21	-.16	.14	.12	.13	-.11	-.11	.04	.10	.09	-.43 [†]	-.20	-.10	-.28
3. Paternal Education	.40 [†]	-.31		.06	-.28	.22	-.09	-.03	-.04	.10	.45*	.17	.16	.25	.05	.21
4. Paternal Work Hours	--	--	--		-.45*	-.15	.19	-.17	-.24	.29	.07	-.18	.00	-.38	.06	.23
5. Maternal Encouraging Positive	.03	-.48 [†]	.01	--		-.11	-.25	.41*	-.04	-.12	-.17	.10	-.26	-.16	-.04	-.55**
6. Maternal Happy Phrases	-.11	-.14	.13	--	.02		.01	-.17	.67**	-.07	-.13	.61**	.22	-.12	.58**	-.02
7. Maternal Happy Elaboration	-.05	.03	.18	--	-.39 [†]	.12		.13	.14	.69**	-.22	-.22	.19	.06	-.11	.44*
8. Maternal Encouraging Negative	.02	-.06	.21	--	.41 [†]	-.02	.06		-.08	.36 [†]	.14	-.05	-.23	.01	-.31	-.07
9. Maternal Upset Phrases	-.07	.34	.12	--	-.22	.58**	.04	.21		.04	-.31	.48*	.10	-.16	.51*	-.18
10. Maternal Upset Elaboration	.07	.02	.34	--	-.17	.44 [†]	.22	-.13	.31		-.06	-.05	-.21	-.01	-.17	.28
11. Paternal Encouraging Positive	.20	.14	-.39 [†]	--	.19	.22	-.29	.00	.36	.03		-.21	-.03	.25	-.14	-.02
12. Paternal Happy Phrases	-.26	-.10	.25	--	-.14	-.03	-.04	-.14	.00	.28	-.41		-.09	-.20	.69**	-.11

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

13. Paternal Happy Elaboration	-.28	.58*	-.02	--	-.50*	.03	.15	-.29	-.02	.35	-.18	.28	□	.16	.22	.34
14. Paternal Encouraging Negative	.13	.02	-.41 [†]	--	-.06	-.38	.01	.29	-.36	-.49*	.27	-.05	-.08		-.23	.35 [†]
15. Paternal Upset Phrase	-.30	.18	.11	--	-.25	.01	-.04	-.44	.01	.51*	-.19	.68**	.41 [†]	-.10		-.16
16. Paternal Upset Elaboration	-.02	-.01	.07	--	.07	.20	.32	-.08	.07	-.03	.14	-.43 [†]	.04	.13	-.34	

Note. Correlations for boys presented above the diagonal. ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, [†] $p < .10$

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Table 6

MANCOVA Results

Effect	Within-subjects (interaction with Type)		Between-subjects
	Wilks' lambda	F	F
Parent Gender	.88	2.77	n/a
Maternal Education	.68	3.16*	6.98**
Maternal Work Hours	.88	.92	0.00
Paternal Work Hours	.99	.00	34.07***
Child Sex	.79	5.36*	15.36***
Elaboration vs. Encouraging (Elab/Enc)	.95	.98	
Maternal Education	.88	.90	
Maternal Work Hours	.82	1.45	
Paternal Work Hours	.78	5.60*	
Child Sex	.99	.00	
Emotion Valence	.88	2.78	
Maternal Education	.83	1.34	
Maternal Work Hours	.98	.11	
Paternal Work Hours	.98	.40	
Child Sex	.46	23.50***	
Parent Gender x Elab/Enc	.82	4.41*	
Maternal Education	.62	4.06*	
Maternal Work Hours	.68	3.14*	
Paternal Work Hours	.97	.65	
Child Sex	.99	.07	
Parent Gender x Valence	.94	1.31	
Maternal Education	.92	.55	
Maternal Work Hours	.92	.60	
Paternal Work Hours	.99	.00	
Child Sex	.97	.61	
Elab/Enc x Valence	.88	2.70	
Maternal Education	.78	1.93	
Maternal Work Hours	.87	.98	
Paternal Work Hours	.92	1.67	
Child Sex	.96	.86	

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Parent Gender x Elab/Enc x Valence	.72	7.94*
Maternal Education	.91	.66
Maternal Work Hours	.87	1.01
Paternal Work Hours	.84	3.75†
Child Sex	.80	5.01*

Notes. For all covariates, numerator degrees of freedom = 3; for main effects, numerator degrees of freedom = 1; for all effects, denominator degrees of freedom = 20; *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Table 7

Description of Parent Encouragement and Elaboration Scores by Paternal Work Hours

	Paternal Work Hours		
	Low	Moderate	High
Parental Scores in Happy Event	-.97	1.19	-.03
Parental Scores in Upset Event	.04	1.10	-.05
Maternal Scores across both Events	.11	1.62	.08
Paternal Scores across both Events	-1.04	.67	-.01

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Table 8

Means of Parent Encouragement and Elaboration Scores by Maternal Work Hours

	Maternal Work Hours			
	None	Low	Moderate	High
Maternal Encouragement Scores	.97	.01	.91	-.63
Maternal Elaboration Scores	.25	-2.51	-.93	.16
Paternal Encouragement Scores	-.83	.83	.94	.17
Paternal Elaboration Scores	-.49	1.01	.20	.15

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Table 9

Differences in Parental Composite Emotion Socialization Scores by Child Sex

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Happy event		
Boys	-.32	1.67
Girls	.38	1.33
Upset event		
Boys	.64	2.43
Girls	-.76	1.35
Maternal Discourse		
Boys	.59	2.42
Girls	-.70	2.00
Paternal Discourse		
Boys	-.27	2.65
Girls	.32	1.97

Note. Means reported have been z-scored. Reported scores for emotion valence have been composited across emotion encouraging and elaboration. Reported scores for parents have been composited across emotion valence, emotion encouraging and elaboration.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Appendix A

Parent Consent Form

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Parental Permission Form

Title of Research Project: Emotion Understanding and Regulation

Investigator: Cynthia L. Smith, Ph.D.

I. Purpose of this Research/Project

The purpose of our study is to look at how parents and children interact and how children respond to different situations and handle their emotions.

II. Procedures

You and your child will spend approximately an hour in our laboratory playroom. For some of the situations, you will be asked to interact with your child as you might at home. For other activities, the research assistant will interact with your child, while you sit in an adjoining room.

To begin, the experimenter will bring in a toy that is locked in a clear container. Your child will be given a set of keys and allowed to work on opening the lock; however, the key to open the container will not be on the ring and will be brought in by the experimenter after four minutes. After opening the container, the experimenter and your child will play with the toy for three minutes. Next, we will ask you and your child to talk about two events; one that made your child happy, and one that made your child upset. During the next activity, you and your child will be given a set of toys to play with as you normally would at home. After playing with the toys, we will ask you and your child to clean up the toys as you normally would at home. At the end of the visit, the experimenter will bring in a prize for your child to take home with him/her.

During the activities when the experimenter is with your child, you will be asked to fill out questionnaires. We will also ask you to complete some forms at home before your child's visit to our research lab. If you do not finish the questionnaires, we will ask you to take them home and mail them back to us in the envelope provided. Again, we anticipate that the entire procedure will take approximately an hour, although if your child needs breaks, the visit may go longer. The activities will be video recorded.

III. Risks to Participation

Risks to the children in the study are minimal to none. There are no extraordinary physical risks to either you or your child in participating, although your child may become frustrated during some of the tasks.

IV. Benefits to Participation

There is no guarantee that there will be benefits, and no promise or guarantee of benefits has been made to encourage you and your child to participate. We are aware that you are giving up your personal time devoted to your family. An important benefit of this study is that the data we collect will help us to understand the way that children manage emotional responses and behaviors that affect the development of their social skills. Benefits may include the opportunity for you to think about behaviors and emotions and how they may influence social relationships. Another benefit may be the opportunity for you to interact with your child. If you like, we will send you a letter describing the results of this study at the conclusion of the project.

V. Extent of Anonymity and Confidentiality

The information in the study records will be kept strictly confidential. Each child will be assigned a number to protect his/her identity. Videotapes and questionnaire information from the study will be kept in locked cabinets in the laboratory and destroyed when no longer needed for publication purposes. All materials will be made available only to persons conducting the study. No reference will be made in oral or written reports that could link you to the study. In any study involving children, direct evidence of abuse must be reported.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

VI. Compensation

You will be given a \$10 gift card for participation in the laboratory visit. Your child will receive an age-appropriate prize.

VII. Freedom to Withdraw

You are free to withdraw from this study at any time and will still receive the compensation.

VIII. Approval of Research

This research project has been approved, as required, by the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and by the Department of Human Development.

IX. Parent's Responsibilities

You will be asked to complete some questionnaires about your life and your child's behavior and to interact with your child during part of the laboratory visit.

X. Parent's Permission

I have read and understand the above information. I have had all my questions answered and am aware that I will receive a copy of this form. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent for myself and my child named below to participate in this study.

Parent Participant name _____

Child Participant name _____

Parent Participant's signature _____ Date _____

Should I have any questions about this research or its conduct, I may contact:

Cynthia L. Smith, Ph.D.
Investigator

smithcl@vt.edu or 231-4793
Email/telephone

Anisa Zvonkovic, Ph.D.
Departmental Reviewer/Department Head

anisaz@vt.edu or 231-4794
Email/telephone

David M. Moore, IRB Chair
Office of Research Compliance
Research and Graduate Studies

moored@vt.edu or 231-4991
Email/telephone

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Appendix B

Child Assent Form

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Child Assent Form

Title of Research Project: Emotion Understanding and Regulation

Investigator: Cynthia L. Smith

I. Explanation of Research to Child

Today, we're going to play some fun games with you. Some of the games you'll play with us and some of the games you'll play with your mom or dad. Do you have any questions?

II. Asking for Child's Verbal Assent

Are you ready to get started?

III. Child Assent (optional)

Do you want to write your name here?

Child's signature

IV. Witness Affirmation

The child verbally agreed to participate in this research study. I understand that the parent will receive a copy of this assent form.

Child's name

Signature of witness

Date

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Appendix C

Demographic Information

You are:

- Biological mother
- Biological father
- Step-mother
- Step-father
- Other (describe) _____

Your age: _____

Describe your ethnicity:

- Hispanic or Latino
- Not Hispanic or Latino

Describe your race:

- American Indian/Alaska Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Black or African American
- White
- Other (describe) _____

What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

- Grade school (What grade?) ____
- Some high school (What grade?) ____
- High school graduate
- Some college or 2-year college
- College graduate (4-year college)
- Master's degree
- Ph.D., M.D. or other doctoral degree

Are you currently a student?

- Yes, full time
- Yes, part time
- No

Are you currently employed?

- Yes
- No

Your child's other parent is:

- Biological mother
- Biological father
- Step-mother
- Step-father
- Other (describe) _____

Other parent's age: _____

Describe your child's other parent's ethnicity:

- Hispanic or Latino
- Not Hispanic or Latino

Describe your child's other parent's race:

- American Indian/Alaska Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Black or African American
- White
- Other (describe) _____

What is the highest level of education that your child's other parent has completed?

- Grade school (What grade?) ____
- Some high school (What grade?) ____
- High school graduate
- Some college or 2-year college
- College graduate (4-year college)
- Master's degree
- Ph.D., M.D. or other doctoral degree

Is your child's other parent currently a student?

- Yes, full time
- Yes, part time
- No

Is your child's other parent currently employed?

- Yes
- No

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

If yes, how many hours do you work?

- Less than 10
- Between 10 and 20
- Between 20 and 30
- Over 30

Please describe your current occupation or job title:

Describe your position and main duties

If yes, how many hours do they work?

- Less than 10
- Between 10 and 20
- Between 20 and 30
- Over 30

Please describe your child's other parent's current occupation or job title:

Describe their position and main duties

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

What is your annual **combined** family income (before taxes)? This does not include any welfare or food stamps.

- less than \$15,000
- \$15,000-\$30,000
- \$30,000-\$45,000
- \$45,000-\$60,000
- \$60,000-\$75,000
- \$75,000-100,000
- Over 100,000

What is your current marital status?

- Married
- Single and living with partner
- Single
- Divorced
- Separated
- Widowed
- Other (Please describe) _____

Describe your **child's** ethnicity:

- Hispanic or Latino
- Not Hispanic or Latino

Describe your **child's** race:

- American Indian/Alaska Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Black or African American
- White
- Other (describe) _____

Is your child currently a member of a:

- Single parent household
- Two parent household

Do any other adults (besides you and your child's other parent) live in your household?

- Yes
- No

If yes, how many adults live in your household? Please describe the relationship of these adults to your child and their role in your child's life.

Please describe your child's **siblings**:

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

First Name	Age	Gender	Relationship to Child	Does this sibling live with your child?
1. _____	1. _____	<input type="radio"/> Male <input type="radio"/> Female	<input type="radio"/> Full <input type="radio"/> Half <input type="radio"/> Step	<input type="radio"/> Yes, full time <input type="radio"/> Yes, part time <input type="radio"/> No
2. _____	2. _____	<input type="radio"/> Male <input type="radio"/> Female	<input type="radio"/> Full <input type="radio"/> Half <input type="radio"/> Step	<input type="radio"/> Yes, full time <input type="radio"/> Yes, part time <input type="radio"/> No
3. _____	3. _____	<input type="radio"/> Male <input type="radio"/> Female	<input type="radio"/> Full <input type="radio"/> Half <input type="radio"/> Step	<input type="radio"/> Yes, full time <input type="radio"/> Yes, part time <input type="radio"/> No
4. _____	4. _____	<input type="radio"/> Male <input type="radio"/> Female	<input type="radio"/> Full <input type="radio"/> Half <input type="radio"/> Step	<input type="radio"/> Yes, full time <input type="radio"/> Yes, part time <input type="radio"/> No
5. _____	5. _____	<input type="radio"/> Male <input type="radio"/> Female	<input type="radio"/> Full <input type="radio"/> Half <input type="radio"/> Step	<input type="radio"/> Yes, full time <input type="radio"/> Yes, part time <input type="radio"/> No

Appendix D

Emotion Talk Task Card

Discussing Family Events

Please talk about this event first:

When you hear the knock on the door, please switch and start talking about:

Please remember to discuss the events with your child just as you would at home.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Appendix E

Emotion Coaching Coding

EUR Emotion Coaching Coding Manual

- Watch ENTIRE tape first!
 - Code only the first two and a half minutes
- Record Start Time for first card
- Note Emotion of First Card
- Code for overall Quality of Interaction
- Code Time Discussing Event Emotions

CARD EMOTION

1 = Upset event

2 = Happy event

GLOBAL RATING: QUALITY OF INTERACTION

After watching the entire tape, rate the overall quality of interaction between the child and parent.

- -1 = disengagement, lack of reciprocity, arguing
- 0 = engaged, reciprocity, civil cooperation, conversation etiquette
- +1 = engaged AND warmth, affection, attunement

This rating should be based on overall interaction: multiple instances of a behavior in any given category. Should look at the overall interaction (body language/posture, tone, etc.) In addition, if there are multiple instances of multiple behaviors from different categories (ie. -1 and +1) average them out (ie. code as a 0). This is ONE code for the whole task, not per 30 second interval.

Note: The global rating helps coders determine the family's "baseline" for certain behaviors (e.g. does the parent frequently praise the child, does the child often exclaim when speaking, make a buzzing noise, etc.). Both content and tone of voice should be considered. By determining a baseline, coders can better determine meaningful fluctuations from how they typically behave that could be considered reference to emotion, encouraging, or discouraging.

REFERENCE TO EMOTION? (*This is specific to the parent/child's OWN emotion, not emotions of a 3rd person*)

- This is specific to the participant's response, his or her emotion (not of a 3rd person!), related to the question on the card-*can be related to anything on topic*. This is more than just the event on the card. You code this once for positive emotion and once for negative emotion during both tasks.
 - 0 = no emotion
 - 1 = consistent or mild. This will be coded if the player makes one reference to emotion (e.g., uses an emotion term, dramatizes emotion, shows nonverbal expression of emotion).
 - 2 = multiple or strong. This will be coded if the player makes more than one reference to emotion or shows very strong emotional intensity (e.g., uses an emotion term + dramatizes emotion, uses an emotion term + shows nonverbal expression of emotion, shows strong verbal or nonverbal indicators of emotion).
- Notes:
 - If parent is coaching, i.e., asking questions about emotions, and the child responds to questions, consider these as references to emotions
 - Remember to always code for both positive and negative emotions.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

- Emotion terms: angry, afraid, anxious, guilty, ashamed, sad, envious, jealous, disgusted, happy, joyful, proud, relieved, love (if about “desiring or participating in affection”, as with a person or other animal) (from Lazarus, 1991); synonyms count, too (e.g., “pissed off” for “angry”)
- Remember: “*I had fun with (as a result of thinking/being around) you*” counts, but “*I/we (generally) had fun*” does not
- Physical states do not count such as tired, bored, hungry, etc.
- Do not code as a Reference to Emotion if the emotion was expressed *in response to the other person's emotion* (e.g. child smiles and parent smiles back). This should be coded as Encouraging (below).

ENCOURAGING

- 0 = parent/child shows no encouragement of the child/parent; for example, does not respond or is discouraging
- 1 = parent/child affirms the facts or discusses the event.
Notes: A ‘1’ can be coded even if the other person does not express emotion, since it is about the facts of the event itself. This code should be applied in reference to something the parent or child says about behavior that has already occurred.
 - More than answering a yes/no question
 - Can be coded for asking questions/eliciting more information about the event
 - Must indicate that the person speaking is acknowledge or inquiring about the other person’s perspective!
 - “What else was there?”
- 2 = parent/child acknowledges the *emotion* (can be nonverbal)
 - This should be a clear acknowledgement of the *emotion* and not of the event.
 - Must be in response to a reference to emotion.
 - Nonverbal: mirroring/sharing of emotion; pat on back; sharing eye contact; shows awareness of the emotion
 - In order to be considered mirroring, parent and child must be looking at each other before emotion expression
 - Child talks about being sad and parent says ‘I understand why you were sad.’ The parent pauses for a couple seconds and then explains why she did what she did. This acknowledges the child’s emotions before the parent moves on to explain her actions. *Without the pause*, this is discouragement.
- 3 = Labeling/validating emotions once.
 - Parent helps the child to verbally label his/her emotions OR verbally empathizes with or validates the child’s emotion.
 - Examples: ‘How did you feel when that happened?’, ‘Was that a happy event?’, ‘Are you excited to play soccer?’ ‘Yeah, I can see how you feel...’, ‘I’m sorry you felt sad’, ‘That would have made me feel sad too.’, ‘You were very sad about that’.
- 4 = Labeling/validating emotions multiple times.
 - Same description as above, with more than one occurrence of parental labeling/validating.
- 5 = Coaching/explaining causes and consequences once.
 - Questions/comments that go beyond labeling and validating emotions to address causes and consequences of emotions and/or strategies to deal with emotions.
 - Parent seeks intimacy or teaching opportunity about the child’s emotion.
 - Parent helps the child to problem solve about emotions, not just about the event.
 - Examples: ‘Can you think of anything that would have made it easier?’, ‘What did you do when you felt sad?’, ‘What could you do next time you feel sad?’, ‘Why did the spider make you scared?’, ‘Why were you angry?’, ‘When you felt happy, what did you do next?’, ‘What

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

did Aaron do that made you angry?', 'What made you sad?', 'What was so exciting when we were in Paris?'

- 6 = Coaching/explaining causes and consequences multiple times.
 - Same description as above, with more than one occurrence of parental coaching/explaining.

DISCOURAGING

- 0 = parent/child shows no discouragement of the child/parent; for example, does not respond or is encouraging
 - 1 = parent/child argues the facts or dismisses the event
- Notes:* A '1' can be coded even if the other person does not express emotion, since it is about facts of the event.
- 2 = parent/child is dismissive of the *emotion*
 - Convey the notion that the given emotion is wrong or unimportant
 - Ignoring the emotion, distracting the person from the emotion, or minimizes the emotion.
 - Example 1: Child laughs during task and the parent abruptly changes the topic ("Ok, let's do this")
 - Example 2: Child shows negative emotion during the task and the parent laughs afterwards at how they both are doing the task
 - 3 = parent/child overrides the emotion
 - Parent/child corrects the child/parent about his/her *emotion*. Tells the child/parent that in fact it is a different emotion that he or she is feeling, actively attempts to remove the emotion, or indicates that he or she really is feeling nothing. This can often happen if the parent is comforting the child, but that response is functioning to *remove* the emotions
 - Examples: 'No, you weren't upset about that, you really liked it', 'you did not even notice that at the time, you're just making it up now'
 - 4 = parent/child shows contempt for the other person because of an emotion
 - Parent/child devalues or dismisses the child/parent *as a person* because of his/her emotions
 - Can occur without a reference to emotion, as long as the one showing contempt makes it clear they are responding to the other's emotional experience (related to card topic)

Notes:

- Higher scores trump lower ones: if you see evidence for both acknowledging of the event AND of the emotion, you should code that as *Encouraging 3*. In other words, when separate pieces of evidence support a lower and higher score, go with the higher score
- When one piece of evidence is in between two scores, go with the lower one. For instance, if you are undecided between a '2' and a '3' for encouraging emotion, go with a '2' – be conservative
- Both encouragement and discouragement are always coded – responses may show both encouragement and discouragement, one or the other, or neither
- Code encouragement/discouragement separately for positive emotions and negative emotions
- Can have encouragement/discouragement without any reference to emotion originally being brought up by the responding player
- When players share a response, you can code the same based on events but not for emotions. Code emotions separately based on how each player responded
- Dramatization of event can be seen as mirroring the expressed emotion
- When conversation is off topic, don't code

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

- Codes of 1 for Response to OTHER'S Emotions are coded for the card type (for happy event, encouraging 1 is coded for positive)
- Both encouragement and discouragement are always coded – responses may show both encouragement and discouragement, one or the other, or neither
- Parents cannot encourage children's emotions by talking about their own emotions. When parents' respond to a child's communication of emotion by talking about their own feelings, that's coded as parents' reference to emotion AND may also be coded as discouraging if it dismisses the child's emotion ("You were upset? Well, how do you think I felt?"), overrides the child's emotion ("You shouldn't have been upset, I'm the one who was upset."), or expresses contempt for the child as a person ("You're so selfish, you should be thinking about how upset you made me.").
- Dramatization of the event can be seen as mirroring the expressed emotion (encouraging) or as mocking it (discouraging) depending on the nonverbals.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Appendix F

Emotion Coaching Coding Sheet

	-1	0	+1		Happy → Upset 1	Upset → Happy 2
Quality of Interaction (Global Rating):	0	0	0	Order of Cards:	0	0

Start time for Happy Event: _____

	Parent			Child		
Positive	0	1	2	0	1	2
	0	0	0	0	0	0
Negative	0	1	2	0	1	2
	0	0	0	0	0	0

	None 0	Acknow. Event 1	Acknow. Emotion 2	Label Once 3	Label Multiple 4	Explain once 5	Explain multiple 6
Parent Encouraging of <u>positive</u> emotion:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parent Encouraging of <u>negative</u> emotion:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Child Encouraging of <u>positive</u> emotion:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Child Encouraging of <u>negative</u> emotion:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	None 0	Questions child 1	Dismisses event, emotion 2	Overrides emotion 3	Contempt 4
Parent Discouraging of <u>positive</u> emotion:	0	0	0	0	0
Parent Discouraging of <u>negative</u> emotion:	0	0	0	0	0

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Child Discouraging of positive emotion: 0 0 0 0 0

Child Discouraging of negative emotion: 0 0 0 0 0

Start time for Upset Event: _____

	Parent			Child		
Positive	0	1	2	0	1	2
	O	O	O	O	O	O
Negative	0	1	2	0	1	2
	O	O	O	O	O	O

	None 0	Acknow. Event 1	Acknow. Emotion 2	Label Once 3	Label Multiple 4	Explain once 5	Explain multiple 6
Parent Encouraging of <u>positive</u> emotion:	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Parent Encouraging of <u>negative</u> emotion:	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Child Encouraging of <u>positive</u> emotion:	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Child Encouraging of <u>negative</u> emotion:	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

	None 0	Questions child 1	Dismisses event, emotion 2	Overrides emotion 3	Contempt 4
Parent Discouraging of <u>positive</u> emotion:	O	O	O	O	O
Parent Discouraging of <u>negative</u> emotion:	O	O	O	O	O
Child Discouraging of <u>positive</u> emotion:	O	O	O	O	O
Child Discouraging of <u>negative</u> emotion:	O	O	O	O	O

Appendix G

Transcription Instructions

1. In a new word document, go to **File → Page Setup → Margins**. Change margins to 1". Next, under **File → Page Setup**, go to the **Layout** tab and click **Line Numbers**. Choose **Add line numbering**.
2. Go to **View** and choose **Header and Footer**. In the header, put the subject number in the top right corner. In the footer, insert page number in the bottom center.
3. At the top of the page, in bold type, insert the subject number, date of study, interviewer, and the transcribed by and double-checked by information for each file. Please include the dates the transcribing and double-checking were completed. Follow the below format:

ID ##

Date: MM/DD/YYYY

Interviewer: Name

Transcribed by: Name, MM/DD/YYYY

Double Checked by: Name, MM/DD/YYYY

4. Dialogue should be typed in plain text and double spaced in between each speaker. Anything that is not dialogue (for example, a nod or laughing) that must be included in the transcript should be italicized and in parenthesis. **Remember to never use the child's name in the transcription**, even if the speaker says it. Use "*c's name*" if the parent says the child's name during the conversation.
5. Use P to indicate parents' speech and CH to indicate child's speech.

P: So let's take for example, what's your favorite thing, what's your favorite food that you like to eat?

CH: Chicken nuggets.

P: Chicken nuggets? So if I said, um, "Eating chicken nuggets makes me happy," would you say yes or no?

6. Type out the conversation as you hear it. Use commas when the speaker pauses during a sentence and use periods when they finish a sentence. Do not use ellipses (...), dashes (-), colons (:), or semicolons (;). **If the speaker cuts off in the middle of a sentence, use a period.** Use quotes if the speaker is quoting or another person or hypothetically quoting themselves, as in the example above.

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

- 7. If there is a two-second or more pause between phrases, separate them with a period. If the pause is less than two seconds, separate with a comma. If a sentence/phrase starts with “yeah” but there is no pause at all before continuing, do not add a comma between “yeah” and the rest of the phrase.**

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

Appendix H

Elaborative Style Coding

Subject Verb-SV: Unit of coding is a subject-verb clause “We went to the store” and “we bought ice cream”

Instructions:

Read through the entire transcript.

Fill out the header on the coding sheet.

For each conversation turn, break the speech into subject-verb phrases.

For each row, fill in the transcript line number and the subject-verb phrase.

Write in “P” if the parent is speaking, and “C” if the child is speaking.

When breaking conversation turns into subject-verb phrases:

Read through the entire conversation turn and look for verbs.

Go to each verb and identify the subject-verb phrases.

Remember that subject-verb phrases can stand alone. For example, “You go into Name’s room” would stand alone, whereas “When you go into Name’s room” would not.

Trust the punctuation. Periods and question marks should be treated differently than commas.

Any phrases that don’t stand alone are grouped with the subject-verb phrase that follows them.

Use grammatical rules when breaking up subject-verb phrases, not the meaning of the phrase.

Special rules:

If the same word or sound is repeated, keep together as one phrase (i.e., “no no no” would be one phrase, as would “hmm, hmmm”)

If a word or sound seems to be qualifying a phrase, keep together as one phrase (i.e., “Well, we saw you” would be one phrase, whereas “Yeah, that’s pretty funny” would be two phrases – “yeah” and “that’s pretty funny”)

If a word or sound occurs at the end of a phrase, and the speaker continues right away into another phrase, keep the first phrase together (i.e., “I took away your nail polish, right? Do you know why?” – “I took away your nail polish, right” would be one phrase. Likewise, “He got mad, didn’t he?” would be one phrase, as would “He was sad, yeah.”)

If the speaker uses the other person’s name to start a phrase, consider that an attention-getter and separate from the rest of the phrase (i.e., “Name, put the pen down” would be two phrases – “Name” and “put the pen down”)

If the speaker uses the other person’s name to end a phrase, the name is not being used to get attention and therefore should be kept with the rest of the phrase (i.e., “I agree, Name” would be one phrase)

If in doubt, err on the side of breaking up speech into more phrases

Categorize each phrase into the categories below.

Repeat steps 3 and 4 until you reach the end of the transcript section you’re coding.

Elaboration: Comments which introduces a new topic or event for discussion, moved the conversation to a new aspect of the event, or add information about a particular aspect of the

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

event. Elaboration is an index of how much new information parents are bringing into the conversation.

3 subtypes of elaboration (*Farrant and Reese, 2000*)

Memory question elaboration: Any question that asks the child to provide new information about the event or a particular aspect of the event. (e.g. What did you give to your friend?)

Yes-No elaboration: Any question simply requiring the child to confirm or deny a piece of information provided by the mother (e.g. Do you remember when we went to the rugby match?) Hanging “yes-no” questions immediately following statement elaborations count as yes-no elaborations (i.e., “You called us once (statement elab). Right? (yes-no elab)”)

Statement elaborations: A statement that provide the child with information about the event under discussion but does not require a response.

P1: Do you remember when I asked you to help me the other night? (Yes/No elaboration)

C1: Yes, we had to clean up.

P2: Yes, I asked you to clean up the dishes. (Statement elaboration) And what did we have to do to the dishes? (Memory question elaboration)

C2: We had to throw out all the leftovers and take out the trash.

P2: That’s right; it was very nice when you helped me. (Statement elab) Why do you think I asked you to help? (Memory question elab)

Repetitions: Parents who repeated the exact content about the event or very similar content to their own previous utterance, regardless of whether the previous utterance was a statement or question. Repetitions do not have to immediately follow the similar content; they can take place at any point in the conversation, as long as the content is very similar to something the parent said previously. Repetitions can be in the form of memory-questions, yes-no questions, or statements.

P1: What did we do at the zoo?

C1: I dunno?

P2: Do you remember what we did at the zoo?

Remember Prompts: Request that the child says more but does not contain content (e.g. What else? Do you remember anything else? Tell me about it.)

Evaluations: Comments that in some way confirm or deny information about the event provided by the other person. There are two types:

(1) CON-Confirmations: Yes, yeah, right, etc.

(2) NEG-Negations: NO, nope, etc.

Associative Talk: Statements or questions that are not about the particular event under discussion*, but are related in one of the following ways:

MOTHERS' AND FATHERS' DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION

(1) event: talk concerning another past event that is in some way comparable to the event under discussion

(2) general knowledge: comments about facts about the world related to the event under discussion

(3) fantasy: Talk about the discussion, but is fantasy

(4) future: comments concerning the future occurrence of the particular event

*When events follow each other in temporal sequence, they can be considered one large event as long as there is some continuity with the people involved. For example, if the family starts out talking about going to the dentist, and the parent says "After the dentist, where did we go?" that would be elaboration rather than associative talk.

*When information is causally connected, it's considered as part of the same event. For example, "We watched Toy Story because you got the Buzz Lightyear toy" would be elaboration, whereas if the event is watching Toy Story, and it's not clear when the Buzz Lightyear toy was acquired, "When did you get Buzz Lightyear?" would be associative talk.

Off Topic: Statements or questions that are completely unrelated to the discussion (i.e., "do you need to go to the bathroom?"). Please code placeholders (e.g. I don't know, don't remember, hmm, etc.), clarifications (i.e., "did you say no?"), and metamemory (comments or questions about memory itself; i.e., "sometimes it's hard to remember") as OFF Topic

Helpful Questions to Ask Yourself When Categorizing Phrases

Is this phrase about the event?

Yes

Possible categories:

Elaboration

Repetition

Related, but not directly:

Associative Talk

No

Possible categories:

Evaluation (Confirmation or Negation)

Remember Prompt

Off Topic (default)

Does the phrase provide new information?

Yes

Elaboration

No

Repetition