

MATERNAL BELIEFS ASSOCIATED WITH MOTHERS' USE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL
CONTROL

BY

BOBBI WALLING

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology
University of Manitoba
July 6th, 2005.

© Copyright by Bobbi Walling, 2005.

An authorization to reproduce copyright material beyond brief excerpts must be obtained from the copyright owner and submitted with the thesis. Such permission letters should not only allow inclusion of the material in the thesis but should specify the use made of the thesis by the National Library as worded in the "Permission to Microfilm" (form NL-91).



Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

0-494-08987-3

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*

ISBN:

Our file *Notre référence*

ISBN:

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

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

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

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

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION PAGE**

Maternal Beliefs Associated with Mothers' Use of Psychological Control

BY

Bobbi Walling

**A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University
of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree
of**

MASTER OF ARTS

BOBBI WALLING©2005

Permission has been granted to the Library of The University of Manitoba to lend or sell copies of this thesis/practicum, to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to University Microfilm Inc. to publish an abstract of this thesis/practicum.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither this thesis/practicum nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Abstract

The nature and effects of parental control have drawn increasing research and clinical attention. Psychological control is a form of parental control involving behaviours that are intrusive and manipulative of children's thoughts, feelings, and attachment to parents. Although psychological control has been linked to a host of negative developmental consequences for children and adolescents (e.g., depression, anxiety), little is known about the parental determinants of psychological control. The purpose of the present study was to examine maternal beliefs that are likely to contribute to mothers' use of psychological control. Drawing upon the notion that psychological control reflects a relational difficulty that leads to coercion, the study assessed three beliefs conducive to coercion: a sense of powerlessness in parent-child interaction, sensitivity to hurtful messages, and a negative approach to emotions. Two hundred and forty mothers of 3- and 4-year-old children completed self-report measures of perceived control in parent-child interactions, sensitivity to hurtful messages from their children, approach to emotion and psychological control. While both sensitivity to hurtful messages and approach to emotion were positively correlated with psychological control, and perceived power demonstrated a small inverse association, regression analysis revealed that mothers' emotion related beliefs and sensitivity to hurtful messages were significant predictors of mothers' use of psychological control. Mothers' perceived power, on the other hand, did not make an independent contribution to the prediction of psychological control. Implications for understanding factors underlying psychological control are discussed.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my supervisors, Drs. Wendy Freeman and Rosemary Mills, for their support. Their suggestions and continuous feedback were greatly appreciated. I also wish to thank the members of my thesis committee, Drs. Dianne Hiebert-Murphy and Frank Elgar, for their thoughtful contributions.

In addition, I wish to acknowledge my family for their continued support throughout my academic endeavors.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of Tables.....	v
Introduction.....	1
History and Research on Psychological Control.....	1
Psychological Control and Parents' Psychological Status.....	4
The Effects of Parenting Beliefs on Behaviours.....	5
Parental Beliefs That May Contribute to the Use of Psychological Control.....	7
Schemas of Power.....	8
Sensitivity to Rejection.....	10
Approach to Emotion.....	15
Summary.....	17
Hypotheses and Predictions.....	18
Method.....	19
Participants.....	19
Procedure.....	22
Measures.....	22
Results.....	27
Descriptive Statistics.....	27
Associations Between Maternal Beliefs and Psychological Control.....	28
Discussion.....	30

Associations Between Maternal Beliefs and Psychological Control.....	31
Measurement of Psychological Control.....	34
Limitations.....	35
Implications.....	36
References.....	38
Appendices.....	46
Appendix A – Demographic Information.....	46
Appendix B – Psychological Control Scale.....	49
Appendix C – Parent Attribution Test.....	53
Appendix D – Sensitivity to Hurtful Messages.....	58
Appendix E – Approach to Emotion.....	63

List of Tables

1. Demographic Information on Age, Education, Employment, Marital Status, and Income.....	21
2. Descriptive Statistics for Measures of Psychological Control and Maternal Beliefs.....	27
3. Intercorrelations Among Measures of Psychological Control and Maternal Beliefs.....	28
4. Regression Analysis Predicting Mothers' Psychological Control From Maternal Beliefs.....	30

Maternal Beliefs Associated with Mothers' Use of Psychological Control

In the past decade, the nature and effects of parental control have drawn increasing research and clinical attention. One step researchers have taken in understanding the process of parental control is to distinguish between behavioural and psychological control. Behavioural control refers to parental behaviours that attempt to control or manage a child's behaviour through disciplinary strategies such as rewards, punishment, and monitoring. Psychological control, on the other hand, is not concerned with behavioural regulation but instead refers to "parental behaviours that are intrusive and manipulative of children's thoughts, feelings, and attachment to parents" (Barber & Harmon, 2002, p.15). Psychological control is generally manifested through covert strategies, such as inhibition of child self-expression, and manipulation of the parent-child relationship through the use of guilt induction and love withdrawal. Although the construct of psychological control was first introduced in the 1960's (Becker, 1964; Schaefer, 1965), it has received very little research attention until recently. Research has started to link psychological control to poor developmental outcomes, including both internalizing and externalizing problems for children and adolescents (Barber, 1996). Despite the links between psychological control and child adjustment, however, the parental characteristics that may contribute to parents' use of psychological control have yet to be examined. Thus, the purpose of the proposed study is to expand understanding of this construct by examining parental determinants of psychological control.

History and Research on Psychological Control

In a factor analysis of parent and child reports of parenting behaviours, Schaefer (1965) found that parenting could be empirically defined by three dimensions:

Acceptance vs. Rejection, Firm Control vs. Lax Control, and Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control. The latter factor was defined by parental behaviours that were intrusive, directive, and controlling through the use of guilt. This factor was described by Schaefer as involving “covert psychological methods of controlling the child’s activities and behaviours that would not permit the child to develop as an individual apart from the parent” (Schaefer, 1965, p. 555). While Schaefer’s work set the standard for the definition and measurement of psychological control (Barber, 1996), it was not until recently, when Steinberg (1990) reiterated the importance of distinguishing between behavioural and psychological control in order to understand their effects on child development, that psychological control became a focus for researchers interested in studying the parent-child relationship.

To date, much of the work on psychological control has focused on distinguishing it from behavioural control and examining the implications of psychological control for the social and emotional functioning of children and adolescents. As noted by Barber (Barber, 1996), a fundamental difference between behavioural and psychological control appears to be the focus of control or the area of a child’s life that the control is inhibiting. That is, psychological control and behavioural control differ because they focus on different aspects of the child’s development (Barber, 1996). The focus of psychological control appears to be on inhibition of the child’s psychological autonomy, whereas behavioural control is concerned with regulation of the child’s behaviour. Recent research has shown that the domains of the child’s life over which control is exercised differ according to the type of parental control (Smetana & Daddis, 2002). In their research, Smetana and Daddis (2002) examined the effects of parental beliefs and

practices regarding socially regulated (moral and conventional) and personal issues (preferences and choice of friends or activities) on psychological and behavioural control longitudinally in a sample of adolescents and their parents. Endorsing restrictive control over personal but not over socially regulated issues at age 13-years predicted higher maternal psychological control at age 13 and 15 but did not predict behavioural control (Smetana & Daddis, 2002). The results of this study suggest that psychological and behavioural control are differentially associated with beliefs about the appropriateness or acceptability of controlling the personal or private domains of the adolescent's life.

To date, research has also examined the implications of psychological control for social and emotional functioning in children. One important consequence of the difference between the two forms of parental control is that they appear to have different effects on child outcome. In support of this argument, behavioural control has been found to predict externalizing problems, such as delinquency, but not internalizing problems (Barber, Olsen, & Shagle, 1994; Barber, 1996) whereas psychological control has been linked to both internalizing and externalizing problems. Specifically, psychological control has been found to predict a host of adolescent internalizing problems, such as anxiety and depression (Barber, 1996; Barber & Olsen, 1997), and has been linked to associated problems of lower self-esteem and lower academic achievement (Barber, 1999; Barber & Shagle, 1992; Holmbeck, Shapera, & Hommeyer, 2002). To a lesser extent, psychological control has also been found to predict externalizing problems, such as delinquency (Barber, 1996) and antisocial behaviour (Barber & Olsen, 1997). These findings indicate that psychological control is a form of parental control that may have negative consequences for healthy child and adolescent development.

Despite its association with a host of negative outcomes for children, little is known about the determinants of parents' use of psychological control. There has been some research examining contextual factors that may contribute to the use of psychological control, such as stress and child characteristics. For example, psychological control has been predicted by interparental hostility (Stone, Buehler, & Barber, 2002) and early maternal reports of externalizing behaviour in the child (Pettit, Laird, Dodge, Bates, & Criss, 2001). Other research has linked psychological control to specific parent factors. Longitudinal research has found that children's reports of maternal hostile parenting when they were 5 years of age predicted mothers' use of psychological control as reported by the children at age 12 (Pettit & Laird, 2002), suggesting that personal characteristics such as affective negativity may play a role in parents' use of psychological control. While this research represents a beginning in the investigation of parent factors in the use of psychological control, much remains to be learned about why parents use psychological control.

Psychological Control and Parents' Psychological Status

The status of parents' social and emotional functioning may be of particular importance in understanding the determinants of parental psychological control. In a recent review of the literature on psychological control, Barber and Harmon (2002) concluded that the psychological, intrusive, manipulative, and constraining nature of psychological control describe "parental behaviour that fundamentally implicates the parent's psychological status in interactions with the child" (p. 22). More specifically, they suggest that psychologically controlling parents are not acting as objective or neutral socializers for their children so much as they are behaving in ways that protect their own

position in relationship to the child. Thus, it appears that when psychological control occurs, it is the needs, feelings, and well-being of the parent rather than the child that are the parent's primary concerns.

Recent research suggests that one indicator of parents' psychological functioning may be the personal standards to which parents adhere (Soenens, Elliot, Goossens, Vansteenkiste, Luyten, & Duriez, in press). Soenens and colleagues (in press) investigated parental perfectionism as a predictor of parents' use of psychological control. Perfectionists have overly critical self-evaluations and high standards to which they hold themselves and others. Perfectionistic parents are likely to project these high standards onto their children and to be critical of their children when they are not met. Thus, parental perfectionism was expected to predict parents' use of psychological control (Soenens et al., in press). Findings revealed that parents' self reports of perfectionism predicted their use of intrusive, psychologically controlling behaviours with their children. This research provides some initial support for the conception that parents' psychological functioning may play a role in parents' use of psychological control. What is not yet well understood, however, is how aspects of parents' relational functioning might lead to the use of psychological control during parent-child interaction, i.e., what parenting beliefs and cognitions are associated with psychologically control.

The Effects of Parental Beliefs On Parenting Behaviours

Parents' psychological status may affect how they relate to their child and, more specifically, how they think and feel about their children and themselves as parents. In turn, these thoughts and feelings are likely to have important implications for parenting behaviours. In the past two decades, parental beliefs - the attributions, expectations,

goals, and schemas held by parents - have drawn increasing attention from researchers interested in understanding parenting behaviours. The beliefs held by parents are thought to contribute, both consciously and unconsciously, to parenting behaviour by affecting parents' perceptions and interpretations of their children's behaviour. Indeed, research has shown that the way parents think and feel about parenting and child behaviour affects the way they behave toward their children (Goodnow, 1988; Rubin & Mills, 1992).

Among the parental beliefs that have been studied as determinants of parenting behaviour are attributions, or the ways parents explain why certain behaviours occur. Several studies have found that mothers' attributions for children's behaviour predict the quality of their discipline. For example, mothers who attributed responsibility for misbehaviour to their children (Slep & O'Leary, 1998) and formed negative appraisals of neutral and positive child behaviour (Lorber, O'Leary, & Kendziora, 2003) were more likely to be overreactive in their discipline. Parents' attributions about themselves are also likely to have implications for their parenting behaviour. For example, the expectations parents have about their own ability to influence their children's behaviour have been found to affect parents' cognitive, affective, and behavioural responses to caregiving interactions (Grusec, Hastings, & Mammone, 1994; Bugental, Lewis, Lin, Lyon, & Kopeikin, 1999). Specifically, when parents have little faith in their ability to effectively influence their children's behaviour, parenting tends to become negative and hostile (Bugental, et al., 1999). Taken together, these findings suggest that the attributions parents' make about themselves and their children in caregiving interactions may affect the quality of parenting and may be relevant to the study of psychological control.

Parenting goals, the outcomes that parents strive for in interactions with their children, have also been examined in relation to parenting behaviour. Hastings and Grusec (1998) found that parenting goals were predictive of parenting behaviour and affect during parent-child conflict. Specifically, parents who were primarily concerned with relationship goals exhibited the most responsive and least dominating behaviour. In contrast, parents whose primary concern was themselves showed greater negative affect, less sympathy and responsivity, and more dominating behaviour than parents with either relationship or child-centered goals (Hastings & Grusec, 1998). To the extent that parenting goals reflect the parent's psychological status, these findings suggest that when the needs of the parent are the primary concern, parents may have greater negative affect during parent-child interactions and may be more likely to use coercive and punitive parenting behaviours. Taken together, the research on parental beliefs indicates that the way parents think and feel has important implications for their behaviour. A primary aim of the present research is to examine the parental beliefs that may influence parents' use of psychological control.

Parental Beliefs That May Contribute to the Use of Psychological Control

If the status of parents' psychological functioning is indeed an impetus for psychological control, it is necessary to examine the relational and emotional beliefs held by parents that might contribute to their use of psychological control. Several lines of research that provide evidence for the notion that parental beliefs may be involved in the use of psychological control will be examined. Specifically, the association between mothers' use of psychological control and their schemas of power, sensitivity to hurtful messages from their children, and approach to emotions will be examined.

Schemas of Power

To the extent that psychological control reflects the psychological status of the parent, it may be associated with beliefs about one's power in interpersonal interactions. Relational schemas are cognitive patterns of thoughts, feelings, and goals that affect how information about interpersonal experiences is perceived (Baldwin, 1992). They are comprised of an interpersonal script, representing a sequence of events, and schemas of both the self and the other that organize information about participants in the interaction and guide interpersonal interactions. It has been argued that parents' relational schemas, including their attributions of interpersonal control, have important implications for parenting behaviours (Bugental, Lewis, Lin, Lyon, & Kopeikin, 1999). The majority of work on how attributions of control function in parent-child interactions has been done by Bugental and colleagues. In a series of studies, Bugental has examined the attributions parents make about the potential causes of success and failure in caregiving situations. Parents who hold high-power schemas believe that there is an appropriate balance of power or control within the caregiving relationship while those with low-power schemas perceive a power disadvantage. That is, they believe that their child has relatively more control over shared outcomes than they do themselves (Bugental, 1992).

Parental schemas of power and their influence on parenting behaviour. Perceived power has been shown to have important implications for the management of conflict in parent-child interactions. Bugental and colleagues (1999) argue that parents with perceptions of a perceived power disadvantage are chronically vigilant to the possibility of threat to their power and may react with an exaggerated use of control in response to child behaviour. Indeed, research has shown that mothers with schemas of low power

show a distinct pattern of affective and cognitive responses in caregiving interactions when compared with mothers who hold schemas of higher power (Bugental, Blue, Cruzcosa, 1989; Bugental et al., 1993). In one study, the autonomic and affective responses of mothers identified as having either high or low perceived control were recorded as they attempted to teach a computer game to a child who gave the impression of responsiveness or unresponsiveness. Mothers with low perceived power showed a defensive pattern of arousal indicated by elevated levels of autonomic arousal (increased heart rate and skin response) and an increased report of negative thoughts about the interaction, particularly when interacting with an unresponsive child (Bugental et al., 1993).

In addition to triggering negative thoughts and emotions towards their children, this defensive response in parents with low power schemas has also been associated with parental behaviours that attempt to restore a sense of power. Mothers with schemas of low power have been found to use high levels of force in their interactions with children (Bugental et al., 1989; Bugental et al., 1999). For example, when given ambiguous control in a teaching interaction, low power women were more likely than women with higher levels of perceived power to use greater punitive force when providing negative feedback to child trainees (Bugental et al., 1999). In addition, mothers with low perceived power were found to experience more irritation and annoyance with children and to be more likely to use coercive or abusive force (Bugental et al., 1989). This research suggests that schemas of low power contribute to a defensive response in mothers comprised of greater autonomic reactivity, affective negativity, and greater power assertive discipline. While a link with psychological control has not been directly

established, it is reasonable to expect that this defensive response in mothers with low perceived power in relation to their child may contribute to greater use of psychological control. Thus, it is hypothesized that mothers with lower perceived power will use more psychological control than mothers with higher perceived power.

Sensitivity to Rejection

Perceived acceptance by others is another parental belief that may contribute to the use of psychological control by influencing the way parents feel about themselves and their relationship with their children. The experience of emotion has been conceptualized as a fundamental component of effective parenting and is thought to reflect the quality of the parent-child relationship (Dix, 1991). In his model of the affective organization of parenting, Dix (1991) argues that emotions serve to organize parental behaviour. When parents are focused on the interests of their child, their emotions tend to be more positive, and their behaviours tend to be more sensitive and responsive. When parents' goals are self-oriented, however, their emotions will reflect the extent to which their own goals are achieved. Given that the child's and parents' goals are often incompatible, the extent to which parents' goals are self- rather than child-oriented is likely to have important implications for parenting behaviours. When parents are focused on their own needs and desires, they are likely to be more irritated and emotionally reactive when these needs are not met. Once aroused, negative emotions may lead to cognitive interference which undermines sensitivity to children's needs, leading to parenting that is punitive, overly controlling, and self-focused. Thus according to this model, for parents with preoccupying personal concerns, negative affectivity may be particularly salient and the quality of parenting is likely to suffer.

Research supports the idea that parents' emotions during childrearing interactions may be linked to parenting behaviour. Indeed, research has found that parental affect is associated with outcome in parent-child interactions (Kochanska, Clark & Goldman, 1997; Dix et al., 1990) and in children's social and emotional functioning (Cumberland-Li, Eisenberg, Champion, Gershoff, & Fabes, 2003; Eisenberg, Fabes, & Murphy, 1996). For example, mothers high on negative emotionality, as indicated by their proneness to negative emotions and their reactivity to stress, were found to display more negative affect in interactions with their children and to report more power assertive discipline (Kochanska, Clark & Goldman, 1997). By contrast, low negative emotionality was associated with positive parental behaviours and positive developmental outcomes for children (Cumberland-Li et al., 2003). The implication of these findings is that proneness to negative emotions in parents may undermine sensitive parenting.

Parental sensitivity to hurtful child messages and parental behaviour. Hurt feelings in particular may have important implications for parenting behaviours. Sensitivity to these rejection-related feelings has been conceptualized as an important component of interpersonal functioning and is thought to have implications for how people think, feel, and behave in their relationships. Downey and Feldman (1994) argue that people who are sensitive to rejection tend to anxiously expect, readily perceive, and overreact to instances of perceived rejection. That is, individuals who expect rejection tend to perceive intentional rejection in the ambiguous or insensitive behaviour of others and respond with hostile, unsupportive, and controlling behaviours (Downey & Feldman, 1994). In parents, sensitivity to rejection may have implications for psychological control by contributing to negative emotions and feelings of hostility.

It has been suggested that hurt feelings occur when interactions connote “relational devaluation,” a perception that one is not as important, close, or valuable to another person as desired (Leary, Springer, Negel, Ansell, & Evans, 1998). Supporting an association between hurt feelings and relational devaluation, research with adults has shown that the intensity of hurt feelings was positively related to feelings of rejection (Leary, et al., 1998). In addition, when asked to describe situations in which their feelings were hurt, participants characterized hurtful episodes in terms of criticism, betrayal, rejection, feeling unappreciated, and being ignored or excluded, and reported that they were most often hurt by close friends, romantic partners, acquaintances, and family members. Hurt feelings were significantly associated with negative self-perceptions and were accompanied by negative affect and emotions such as anxiety and hostility. Participants were also asked to indicate how they had reacted after their feelings were hurt. Responses indicated that the most common reaction to hurtful episodes was to express anger and to argue or defend oneself (Leary et al., 1998). Taken together, these findings suggest that hurt feelings can lead to anger and hostility in relationships by influencing how people think and feel about themselves, significant others, and the relationship itself.

It is not surprising that when an individual has been hurt, they may lash out or express anger towards the individual who hurt them. It has been proposed that hostility may be a specific reaction to perceived rejection (Ayduk, Downey, Testa, Yen, & Shoda, 1999). In support of a link between hostility and rejection, Ayduk et al. (1999) found that thoughts of rejection facilitated hostile thoughts to a greater extent in women with high expectations of rejection when compared to women with lower rejection-related

expectations. Furthermore, in a daily diary study examining the link between perceived rejection and acts of hostility, women with high expectations of rejection reported more conflicts with their romantic partners when they had felt rejected on the previous day (Ayduk et al., 1999). These results suggest that perceived rejection may contribute to the expression of hostility in interpersonal relationships.

Other researchers have demonstrated a relationship between rejection and aggression. One study examined the effects of rejection on emotion and behaviour by randomly assigning undergraduates to varying levels of rejection and acceptance conditions (Buckley, Winkel, & Leary, 2004). Findings revealed that rejected individuals were more likely to feel angry, sad, and have hurt feelings and were significantly more tempted to behave antisocially than individuals who were accepted. More specifically, subjects who were told that another participant definitely did not want to work with them reported that they would be more likely to engage in aggressive behaviours, such as ignoring or humiliating the participant who rejected them, and less tempted to engage in prosocial acts such as complimenting the other participant (Buckley et al., 2004).

Other research suggests that feeling rejected can cause rejection of the other person. Bourgeois and Leary (2001) found that rejected participants (those selected last for a team) derogated the leadership ability of the team captains who chose them last and formed negative impressions of them as being unlikable, incompetent, and an undesirable friend (Bourgeois & Leary, 2001). The implications of this research are that the personal impact of rejection can be minimized by lowering one's desire to be accepted by the other person (Bourgeois & Leary, 2001; Leary, Tambor, Terdal & Downs, 1995). In the parent-child relationship, psychological control may serve this same self-protective

function by derogating the child and thereby minimizing the degree to which rejection hurts the parent.

While the effects of rejection have not yet been explicitly examined among children and their parents, research suggests that relationships within families may be a particularly important environment in which to study hurtful messages. In a study of hurtful messages in several types of relationships, hurtful messages received from family members elicited greater feelings of hurt than those received from non-family members (Vangelisti & Crumley, 1998). In addition, recent findings suggest that hurt feelings associated with relational devaluation in adult relationships may also extend to relationships between parents and their children. Mills, Nazar, and Farrell (2002) examined hurt feelings in parent-child relationships by asking mothers and their children to recall an instance when their feelings had been hurt by the other, and to rate emotions, self- and interpersonal perceptions, and attributions about the event. Results indicated that, for both children and mothers, hurt feelings were typically elicited by messages of disparagement or disregard, such as distancing/rebuff or criticism and, for children, disciplinary encounters such as yelling and punishment. The feelings brought about by these messages were comprised of pain and distress, and included negative emotional reactions to the self, the other, and the relationship. In addition, the stronger the emotional reactions to instances of hurtful messages, the more likely both children and mothers were to report that they would respond by expressing anger (Mills et al., 2002). These findings suggest that parents are affected by hurtful messages from their children. In parents who are sensitive to rejection, such messages may elicit feelings of hostility that could motivate the use of psychological control. Thus, it is hypothesized that

mothers who show a greater sensitivity to hurtful messages from their children will report greater use of psychological control.

Approach to Emotion

Another belief system that may contribute to the use of psychological control is the parent's philosophy about emotions and their expression. Healthy emotional expression has long been recognized as an important component of positive family functioning (Ginott, 1965; Ramsden & Hubbard, 2002). For example, Ginott (1965) argued that emotional education, or helping children to *know* what they feel through understanding and validating the child's emotions, serves to reduce family negativity, including criticism, sarcasm, derisive comments, and parental frustration. Moreover, he argued that parents must accept negative emotion within themselves and recognize that they are entitled to express how they feel as long as the child's personality or character does not come under attack (Ginott, 1965). What Ginott's argument implies is that parental negativity and derogation may be minimized by an accepting approach to emotion (Hooven, Gottman & Katz, 1995). Psychological control appears to represent the lack of such a positive approach to emotional experience and expression. As previously noted, psychological control includes derogatory parent behaviours that are intrusive and manipulative of children's thoughts and feelings and constraining of children's expression of opinions and emotions (Barber & Harmon, 2002). Thus, psychological control may result from a negative and unaccepting approach to the expression of emotion.

Gottman and colleagues (Hooven, Gottman, & Katz, 1995) refer to parents' approach to emotion as a "meta-emotion philosophy," which they define as an organized

set of feelings and thoughts about one's own emotions and one's children's emotions. Meta-emotion philosophy encompasses parents' awareness and acceptance of emotion in themselves and in their child, and their encouragement of and willingness to explore their child's emotions. Parents who are high in awareness of emotion and in their ability to talk to their children about emotions, eliciting conditions, and strategies for coping with emotion are described as having an "emotion coaching" meta-emotion philosophy. These parents accept their children's emotions unconditionally and guide the regulation of difficult emotions (Gottman, 1997). In contrast, parents with a "dismissing" meta-emotion philosophy are those who believe that emotions such as sadness or anger are potentially harmful and should not be dwelled on. These parents tend to ignore, deny, or trivialize their children's emotions (Gottman, 1997). Parents with a "disapproving" meta-emotion philosophy not only dismiss negative emotion in their children, but are also judging and critical of their children's feelings.

Hooven, Gottman, and Katz (1995) have proposed that parents with an emotion coaching philosophy have greater social skills in emotion regulation and that these skills are apparent in their management of affect in interpersonal relationships. Consistent with this hypothesis, emotion-coaching parents were found to have greater skills at parent-child interaction and were less hostile, defensive, and contemptuous in their marital interactions. In addition, these parents were physically healthier and had children who were less stressed physiologically (Hooven et al., 1995). In other research, Gottman, Katz, and Hooven (1996) studied the relationship between parents' meta-emotion philosophy and parental negativity. They found that meta-emotion was related to both the inhibition of parental derogation of the child and to the facilitation of praising.

Specifically, parents who “coached” their children in how to handle emotions were less intrusive, critical, and derisive in their parenting and were more affectionate, responsive, and enthusiastic (Gottman et al., 1996). While the link with psychological control has not been directly established, these findings suggest that parents who engage in less emotion coaching with their children may be less accepting of emotion in general, and more likely to disregard or invalidate the feelings of their children. Thus, it is hypothesized that a dismissing/disapproving approach to emotion is related to greater use of psychological control.

Summary

Psychological control is an intrusive and manipulative form of parenting that appears to reflect the psychological status of the parent. To date, much of the research on psychological control has examined the contextual factors related to the use of psychological control and the developmental consequences for children. Little research has examined the parental determinants, and none has addressed the parental beliefs that may be involved in the use of psychological control. The theory and research reviewed suggest that several belief systems may contribute to parents’ use of psychological control. Specifically, parents with low perceived power, high sensitivity to hurtful messages, and/or a dismissing/disapproving approach to emotions may be more likely to engage in psychological control. The purpose of the present study was to examine the extent to which these beliefs are associated with the use of psychological control. It was predicted that maternal schemas of low power, high sensitivity to hurtful child messages, and a dismissing/disapproving approach to emotions would be associated with the use of psychological control by mothers. The extent to which these belief systems may comprise

an interrelated set of beliefs is not known. It is possible that parents arrive at the use of psychological control by different means. Alternatively, it is possible that these beliefs are related components of some underlying relational schema or personality trait that contributes to the use of psychologically controlling parenting practices. Thus, the relative strength of the determinants and whether they are independent or overlap in predicting psychological control was also examined.

Hypotheses and Predictions

Primary Research Question: Are mothers' schemas of power, sensitivity to hurtful messages, and approach to emotion related to their use of psychological control with their preschool children?

Hypothesis 1: On the basis of theory and research suggesting that schemas of low power in mothers contribute to increased cognitive and affective negativity and greater use of power assertive and authoritarian control, it is expected that schemas of low power will be associated with greater use of psychological control. It is predicted that mothers reporting lower levels of perceived power over caregiving situations will report greater use of psychological control than mothers reporting higher levels of perceived power.

Hypothesis 2: In view of the evidence suggesting that perceived rejection is associated with feelings of hostility and the tendency to derogate or express anger in response to such emotions, it is expected that mothers' sensitivity to rejection will be associated with the use of psychological control. It is predicted that mothers reporting greater sensitivity to hurtful child messages will report greater use of psychological control than mothers reporting less sensitivity to hurtful messages.

Hypothesis 3: Based on research suggesting that an accepting and open approach to emotion is associated with less parental derogation, it is expected that beliefs about the appropriate experience and expression of emotion will be related to mothers' use of psychological control. It is predicted that greater endorsement of a disapproving/dismissing approach to emotion will be related to greater use of psychological control than mothers reporting less of a disapproving/dismissing approach to emotion.

Exploratory Research Questions: Do the individual determinants differ in their relative predictive power? That is, are any of the determinants stronger than others in their prediction of psychological control? Do any of the determinants overlap in their prediction of psychological control or do they have independent predictive power?

Method

Participants

The participants were 240 mothers with preschool-age children (109 girls, 131 boys) ranging in age from 3.6 to 4.5 years of age ($M = 4.08$, $SD = 3.14$). The data for the present study were collected as part of a larger project in which children are being followed longitudinally from age 3 to age 7 to examine the antecedents and developmental implications of proneness to shame in childhood. The sample was recruited from a cohort of 3,500 children and their families drawn randomly from a population of 6,358 children living in Winnipeg, born between June 1st, 1999 and May 31 2000, and registered with Manitoba Health. Manitoba Health mailed to these 3,500 families, on the researcher's behalf, a letter inviting families with healthy children to participate in a study examining the influence of children's emotions on health. Parents

who were interested in participating were invited to contact the University by calling or by mailing an enclosed response card containing their name and phone number. Parents from 364 families inquired about the study. Of these 364 families, 257 participated in at least one component of the study, 33 inquired too late, and 74 declined to participate or were not able to participate for various reasons (did not speak English, schedule conflicts). In total, 240 mothers completed the measures of parenting beliefs and psychological control analyzed in the present study.

Mothers completed a demographic questionnaire to provide information about their education, employment, marital status, and family income (see Appendix A). Mothers were predominantly in their 30's or 40's, were well-educated, had some college or university), worked part or full-time, were cohabiting or married, and reported family incomes at or above the national median. Information on mothers' education and occupation was coded using the Hollingshead (1975) index of socioeconomic status. Further information regarding this descriptive information is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic Information on Age, Education, Employment, Marital Status, and Income.

Variable	n	%
Mother's Age		
20-29	44	18.6
30-49	191	81
Education		
12 th grade or less	37	15.7
Community college/some university	92	39
University Graduate	64	27.1
Graduate or Professional school	43	18.2
Employment		
Working at least part-time	172	72
None reported	68	28
Marital Status		
Married or Cohabiting	210	88.9
Single or Divorced	26	11
Family Income		
Under 20,000	22	9.5
21-30,000	17	7.3
31-40,000	24	10.3
41-60,000	61	26.3
Over 61,000	108	46.5

Procedure

The larger project from which the present data were drawn was conducted in three phases. The data for the present study were collected in the first phase of data collection. In this phase of data collection, families completed questionnaires assessing child temperament, parental beliefs, and parenting practices and participated in a 1½-hour laboratory visit to assess shame responding in children. Questionnaires that made up the source of data for the present study were mailed to families and returned at the time of the laboratory visit. When questionnaires were incomplete at the time of the laboratory visit, parents completed them during the visit or were given a stamped return envelope and asked to return them by mail. Families were given an honorarium of \$75 for their participation.

Measures

Psychological control. Maternal use of psychological control was assessed using the self-report form of the Psychological Control Scale (PCS; Olsen et al., 2002, see Appendix B). The PCS is a 33-item parent-report measure that includes items drawn from an 8-item youth self-report measure of parental psychological control (Barber, 1996), which was an adaptation of the first known measure of psychological control developed by Schaefer (1965), and several new items generated by early childhood experts to improve the suitability of the scale for parents of preschoolers. Items in the PCS tap six conceptually defined dimensions of psychological control: constraining verbal expressions (3 items; e.g., I interrupt our child when he/she is speaking), invalidating feelings (3 items; e.g., I try to change how our child feels or thinks about things),

personal attack (3 items; e.g., I bring up our child's past mistakes when criticizing him/her), erratic emotional behaviour (5 items; e.g., I show impatience with our child), love withdrawal (5 items; e.g., I will avoid looking at our child when our child has disappointed me), and guilt induction (13 items; e.g., I act disappointed when our child misbehaves). To date, the PCS has been used either by employing subscales (grouping items conceptually; Hart, Nelson, Robinson, Olsen, & McNeilly-Choque, 1998; Olsen et al., 2002) or by defining one general factor (Mills, 2004). In a study of preschoolers, Olsen et al. (2002) grouped items into four subscales (Personal Attack, Erratic Emotional Behaviour, Guilt Induction, Love Withdrawal) and found comparable factor loadings for items on these subscales across three cultures (USA, China, Russia). The scores on these subscales were correlated with internalizing and externalizing behaviours in children, providing evidence for criterion validity. In a study of school-age children and their mothers (Mills, 2004), a total psychological control score was employed, with an internal consistency of .81 for mothers' self-reports. Mothers' self-reported psychological control was associated with stronger emotional reactions to hurtful messages as reported by children and by mothers, providing evidence for the criterion validity of the total psychological control score.

The 33 items of the PCS were embedded in a larger questionnaire assessing parenting styles. Mothers responded by indicating how frequently their spouse, and then they themselves, engaged in the behaviour described, using a 5-point Likert scale. In the present study, mothers' self-reports were analyzed. A total psychological control score was created by averaging responses to the 33 items. The resulting score ranged from 1 to

5, with higher scores indicating greater use of psychological control. Cronbach's alpha for the PCS in this sample was .78.

Schemas of power. Mothers' schemas of power were assessed using the Parent Attribution Test (PAT; Bugental et al., 1989; see Appendix C). The PAT has demonstrated some convergent validity and test-retest reliability ($r = .63$; Bugental, 1995). Low power scores on the PAT have been found to predict greater parental coercive force (Bugental et al., 1989) and high physiological reactivity to an unresponsive child (Bugental et al., 1993). PAT scores, however, were not related to other measures of parenting self-efficacy (Lovejoy, Verda, & Hays, 1997). In support of the discriminant validity of the PAT, relations between PAT scores and measures of negative affect and social desirability were not significant (Lovejoy, Verda, & Hays, 1997). Mothers were presented with descriptions of two hypothetical caregiving situations, one with a successful outcome (e.g., "you took care of a neighbour's child one afternoon and had a really good time together") and one with an unsuccessful outcome (e.g., "you did not get along well"), and were asked to rate the potential causes of success and failure in the situations. Mothers were asked to indicate how important they believed each cause of failure would be as possible reasons for the unsuccessful outcome, using a 7-point Likert scale. Some causes reflect child power (13 items; e.g., "the extent to which the child was stubborn and resisted your efforts") and some parental power (13 items; e.g., "what kind of mood you were in that day"). In previous research, only the failure scales have been found to predict caregiver responses (Bugental & Happaney, 2000). Consequently, only mothers' responses to the failure situation were used to score perceived power in this study. A composite score indicating the perceived balance of

power within the caregiving relationship was calculated by subtracting mothers' attributions of child control over failure (MCCF) from their attributions of adult control over failure (MACF).

Sensitivity to hurtful messages. Mothers' emotional reactions to hurtful messages from their child were measured using four hypothetical vignettes in which a child says or does something that is potentially hurtful to the parent. The vignettes were drawn from a descriptive study of parents' experiences of hurtful messages from their children (Mills, Nazar, & Farrell, 2002; see Appendix D). The vignettes describe a child showing disregard toward the parent, noncompliance with a parent's directive, rejecting a parental overture, and criticizing the parent. Mothers were asked to imagine that the situation depicted in each vignette involved them and their child and to rate their emotional reactions and self-perceptions using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("very mild") to 5 ("very strong"). One emotion score was created for each of the four vignettes by averaging mothers' ratings on items reflecting negative emotional reactions to each vignette. Cronbach's alpha for four emotion scores was .96. These emotion scores were then averaged across the vignettes to create an overall score assessing sensitivity to hurtful messages. Scores can range from 1 to 5 with higher scores indicating greater sensitivity to hurtful messages.

Beliefs about emotion. Mothers' approach to emotion was assessed using a Likert-scaled questionnaire version of Hooven, Gottman, and Katz's (1995) Meta-Emotion Interview, a measure of beliefs about emotions (Duff, Harkin-Larson, Lee, & Voelker, 2001; see Appendix E). Parents' responses to the interview measure have demonstrated consistent associations with parenting quality, physiological reactivity, and child outcome

(Gottman, 1997; Hooven, Gottman, & Katz, 1995; Gottman, Katz, & Hooven, 1996). The Likert-scaled questionnaire version of the measure (Duff et al., 2001) has demonstrated convergent validity as indicated by its relations with other family expressiveness variables. Specifically, a coaching approach was associated with positive emotional expressiveness, while a disapproving approach was associated with negative emotional expressiveness. Mothers were given the questionnaire version and asked to indicate how much they agreed with each of 81 items describing beliefs and attitudes about their own and their child's experience of anger and sadness, using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("not at all") to 7 ("extremely"). The measure yields subscales assessing three approaches to emotion: Coaching (23 items; e.g., "anger is an emotion worth exploring;" "when my child is sad, it's a chance to get close") Dismissing (25 items; e.g., "I try to change my child's angry moods into cheerful ones;" "children really have very little to be sad about"), and Disapproving (23 items; e.g., "when my child is acting sad, he turns into a real brat;" "I don't think it's right for a child to show anger"). Mothers dismissing and disapproving approach to emotion showed a moderate correlation, $r(240) = .61, p < .01$. For the purposes of the present study, an overall index of negative approach to emotion was created by combining mothers' responses to the 48 items from the dismissing and disapproving subscales into one mean score. The resulting scores ranged from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating a stronger negative approach to emotion. Cronbach's alpha for the negative approach to emotion scale was .89.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Preliminary analyses revealed several extreme values on two variables, psychological control and perceived power. Following the recommendation of Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), these four values were lowered to the next largest score to reduce their influence. The variables were normally distributed, as indicated by low skewness and kurtosis indices. Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 2. On average, mothers attributed more control over caregiving interactions to themselves than to their children (positive balance score), reported they would be mildly hurt by messages from their children, were in slight disagreement with statements describing a negative approach to emotion (3 on 7-point scale), and engaged in psychologically controlling behaviours almost “once in a while” (2 on a 5-point scale). The sample size of 240 mothers was sufficient to detect medium effects at $p < .05$ (Cohen, 1992). There was no association between mothers’ socioeconomic status (Hollingshead, 1975) and their reported use of psychological control, $r(223) = .05$, $p = .50$. Therefore, socioeconomic status was not included in the regression analysis.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Measures of Psychological Control and Maternal Beliefs

Measure	M	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
Psychological Control	1.81	.26	1.19	2.70	.64	.93
Perceived Power	.89	1.44	-2.67	6.67	.32	.04
Sensitivity to Hurt	1.87	.50	1.03	3.95	.95	1.1
Approach to Emotion	2.96	.61	1.58	4.67	.11	-.49

Associations Between Maternal Beliefs and Psychological Control

The purpose of this study was to examine maternal beliefs associated with mothers' use of psychological control. To test the hypothesis that lower perceived power, greater sensitivity to hurtful messages, and a more negative approach to emotions would be related to greater maternal use of psychological control, correlation and regression analysis were conducted.

To provide a complete picture of the associations, preliminary analyses were done examining zero-order correlations between the three maternal belief variables assessed in this study and psychological control. Intercorrelations among the measures are presented in Table 3. Each of the three maternal beliefs was associated with psychological control. Specifically, higher self-reported psychological control was significantly related to lower perceived power, greater sensitivity to hurtful messages, and a more negative approach to emotion.

Table 3

Intercorrelations Among Measures of Psychological Control and Maternal Beliefs

Measure	1	2	3	4
1. Psychological Control	...			
2. Perceived Power	-.19**	...		
3. Sensitivity to Hurt	.45**	-.22**	...	
4. Approach to Emotion	.38**	-.12	.30**	...

To test the hypothesis that perceived power, sensitivity to hurtful messages, and a negative approach to emotion predict maternal use of psychological control, a multiple regression was performed. The assumptions of multiple regression are that the variables

are normally distributed, linearly related to the criterion variable, and are similarly variable around the criterion variable (homoscedasticity). To determine whether the data met these assumptions, residual scatterplots were analyzed. Results of this analysis revealed that the data were normally distributed, linear, and homoscedastic.

In order to ascertain the relative contributions of the individual predictors and the total variance accounted for, the regression was computed using a simultaneous method of entry, in which all predictor variables are entered into the regression equation at once. Indices of perceived power, sensitivity to hurtful messages, and negative approach to emotions served as predictor variables and mother's score on psychological control was the concurrent criterion variable. Table 4 displays the regression coefficients (B); standardized regression coefficients (β) showing the relative importance of each predictor; and the squared semi-partial correlations, which indicates the unique contribution of the predictor to the total variance of the criterion variable. Only mothers' sensitivity to hurt and negative approach to emotion contributed significantly to the prediction of psychological control. For the two significant regression coefficients, 95% confidence limits were calculated. The confidence limits for sensitivity to hurtful messages were .083 to .205, and those for negative approach to emotion were .10 to .20. The sum of the squared semi-partial correlations for the two significant predictors indicates that the amount of R^2 uniquely attributable to sensitivity to hurt and negative approach to emotion is .17. The predictor variables in combination contributed .10 in shared variability to R^2 . In all, 27% of the variability in psychological control was predicted from the three maternal belief variables together. The effect size index,

calculated using Cohen's (1992) formula for calculating effect size for multiple regression, corresponded with his criteria for a large effect size ($f^2 = .37$).

Table 4

Regression Analysis Predicting Mothers' Psychological Control From Maternal Beliefs

Variable	B	β	si^2	p
Perceived Power	-.02	-.08	.01	.16
Sensitivity to Hurt	.14	.27	.07	.00
Approach to Emotion	.15	.34	.10	.00

Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to examine maternal beliefs associated with mothers' use of psychological control. It was hypothesized that mothers who report schemas of low power, greater sensitivity to hurtful messages, and a more negative approach to emotion would report greater use of psychological control. In support of this hypothesis, all maternal beliefs were associated with mothers' use of psychological control. The extent to which these maternal beliefs predicted mothers' use of psychological control was also examined. Regression analysis revealed that mothers' sensitivity to hurtful messages and emotion-related beliefs were significant predictors of mothers' use of psychological control. Mothers' perceived power, on the other hand, did not make an independent contribution to the prediction of psychological control. Examination of the unique and shared variance indicated that the maternal belief variables overlap to some extent in their prediction of psychological control.

Associations Between Maternal Beliefs and Psychological Control

These findings provide some initial support for the notion that mothers' own social and emotional functioning may be related to their use of psychological control (Barber & Harmon, 2002). Mothers who were more sensitive to hurtful messages from their children also reported greater use of psychologically controlling parenting practices. These findings are consistent with previous research that has found associations between feelings of hurt and the expression of anger and derogation towards the individual who hurt them (Bourgeois & Leary, 2001; Buckley et al., 2004; Mills et al., 2002). One possible interpretation of these findings is that, when mothers are hurt by their children, feelings of hostility are elicited that motivate the use of psychological control. That is, psychological control may serve a self-protective function by derogating the child and minimizing the extent to which the parent feels hurt.

Mothers who were more negative in their approach to emotions were also more likely to be psychologically controlling of their preschool-age children. Mothers' with a negative approach to emotion are less aware and accepting of emotion in general (Gottman, 1997) and may not have the skills necessary to express their own feelings and needs or to assist their children in effectively managing their own emotions. It is possible that in caregiving interactions, such a negative approach to emotion may elicit insensitivity and contribute to parents' use of psychological control. Taken together, the results of these findings suggest that when psychological control occurs, it may be the feelings and well-being of the parent rather than the child that are the parent's primary concerns. Future research examining other indicators of mothers' psychosocial functioning, such as levels of anxiety and depression, may provide further insight into

how parents own social and emotional functioning affects their use of psychological control.

Together, mothers' sensitivity to hurtful messages and negative approach to emotion accounted for approximately one third of the total variance accounted for in the model. It may be that these emotions and emotion related beliefs in mothers reflect an affective negativity or underlying personality structure that undermines sensitive parenting and contributes to their use of psychological control. For instance, research has found that parents high on neuroticism, a personality trait characterized by emotional instability and distress, were characterized by poor psychosocial functioning, poor parenting, more avoidant coping, and had children with greater internalizing and externalizing problems than parents with low neuroticism scores (Ellenbogen & Hodgins, 2004). Further research examining the extent to which the maternal beliefs examined in the present study comprise an underlying emotional vulnerability or personality structure is needed. Also, because a substantial amount of variance in psychological control was not explained by sensitivity to hurtful messages and approach to emotion, further research is needed to look at other factors that may contribute to mothers' use of psychological control.

As expected, mothers' perceived power showed a small inverse relationship with psychological control, indicating that lower perceived power in mothers was associated with greater maternal use of psychological control. Perceived power did not, however, offer any unique prediction when simultaneously examined with sensitivity to hurtful messages and negative approach to emotion. These findings are somewhat inconsistent with previous research showing a relationship between perceptions of low control and

parental overcontrol (Bugental & Happaney, 2000; Mills, 1998; Mills, 1999). Research suggests, however, that the relationship between perceived control and parental overcontrol may be evident only under certain conditions. In a study examining child derogation as a means of power assertion, Bugental and Happaney (2000) found that only when primed to think in terms of competition with their children (social threat condition) did parents with low perceived control derogate the performance of their children. Characteristics of the child have also been found to moderate the relationship between perceived control and psychological control (Mills, 1998). Specifically, mothers with schemas of low control were more authoritarian and protective (Mills, 1998) and used more love withdrawal and guilt induction (Mills, 1999) when they had a temperamentally fearful child.

The implications of these findings are that low power schemas alone may not be sufficient to contribute to psychologically controlling parenting practices. That is, parents with low perceived control may be more likely to use psychological control only under conditions in which an imbalance of power is cued. A measure assessing the frequency of psychological control may not be sensitive to the situational nature of the coercion exerted by mothers with low perceived power. Contexts in which parents perceive threat or challenge from their children or, alternatively, perceive a power advantage may be moderators of the relationship between perceived control and psychological control. Future research examining these variables in the context of difficult parent-child interactions that involve potential threat to parents or experimental manipulation (i.e., priming parents to feelings of threat) are needed to further elucidate the relationship between perceived control and psychological control.

Measurement of Psychological Control

To date, there is no well-established measure of psychological control. Researchers have used a variety of methodologies and conceptualizations in their examination of parents' use of psychological control. For instance, psychological control has been operationalized in terms of various subscales and as an overall construct (Hart, Nelson, Robinson, Olsen, & McNeilly-Choque, 1998; Mills, 2004; Olsen et al., 2002). In interpreting the present findings, it is important to consider the multifaceted nature of the 33-item measure of psychological control used. Viewing psychological control as an overall construct may be too simplistic as different parents may be likely to express their psychologically controlling behaviours in different ways.

Indeed, researchers have begun to distinguish between different forms of psychological control. Two defining features of psychological control are overprotectiveness and rejection (Rubin, Burgess, & Hastings, 2002). Both overprotection and rejection fall under the umbrella of psychological control in that they are intrusive and discourage the independence and autonomy of the child (Barber, Olsen, & Shagle, 1994; Rubin et al., 2002). Although the intrusive nature by which these forms of psychological control exert their negative effect on children are conceptually similar, their expression is functionally different, and they may be motivated by different characteristics or emotions in parents. For instance, it is possible that rejection is elicited by feelings of hostility whereas overprotection may be driven by parents' own anxiety and worry about the child. An important direction for future research is to examine the parental belief systems and emotions that may be differentially associated with these components of psychological control.

Limitations

Several limitations of the present study should be noted. First, reliance entirely on mother's self-report of both her parenting beliefs and behaviors raises concern about the validity of the findings. It is possible that the association found between mothers' schemas of power, sensitivity to hurtful messages, approach to emotion and their use of psychological control, based entirely on mothers' self-report, are due in part to method variance. As well, mothers may be apprehensive about endorsing items reflecting negative or socially unacceptable beliefs and behaviours related to parenting or have poor insight into their own parenting behaviours. Further research using methods such as spouse report or observation of psychological control is needed.

Second, because the data are correlational and concurrent in nature, it is not possible to draw any conclusions about whether the maternal beliefs examined are causally related to mothers' use of psychological control. It is possible that parental belief systems directly contribute to mothers' use of psychological control, or conversely, that the use of psychological control as a parenting tool contributes to more negative belief systems and emotions in mothers. Child characteristics may also elicit psychologically controlling reactions in parents. The extent to which other parent and child factors moderate the relation between parental beliefs and psychological control is not known. Researchers have, however, begun to recognize the importance of examining the transactional processes that occur between parents and children and the importance of examining the role child temperament plays in parental behaviours (Hastings & Rubin, 1999; Rubin, Burgess, & Hastings, 2002). Longitudinal data are needed to examine the

impact of other variables, such as child temperament and the interaction between child and parent variables, on parents' use of psychological control.

Third, as previously noted, the literature is mixed in terms of how psychological control is conceptualized and, to date, there is no well-established measure of psychological control. The findings of the present study are limited by the tools available for measuring psychological control. Future research is needed to examine the psychometric properties of existing psychological control scales and to develop stronger measures to assess specific aspects of psychological control.

Finally, only mothers were included in the sample. In view of gender differences in emotion socialization and expression between men and women, the determinants of psychological control, particularly those related to emotion, may differ for mothers and fathers. For instance, the tendency for men to externalize their emotion and for women to internalize emotions suggests that hostility may be a stronger predictor of psychological control for fathers and anxiety for mothers. An important direction for future research is to examine how the determinants of psychological control may differ and mothers and fathers.

Implications

Despite the limitations noted above, the findings of the present study suggest that two characteristics reflecting mothers' psychological status, sensitivity to hurtful messages and approach to emotion, are associated with their use of psychological control. These findings may have important practical implications for clinical and applied areas of family functioning. In view of the deleterious effects of psychological control on children, understanding why some parents are psychologically controlling is an important

contribution to the literature. By understanding the maternal emotions and beliefs associated with psychological control, we may be in a better position to develop interventions to decrease parental use of psychological control. Interventions that target mothers' approach to emotion or psychoeducation about healthy emotional expression in the family may serve to enhance other treatment modalities. For example, child anxiety has been linked to overprotective parenting (Hudson & Rapee, 2002). Interventions and treatment for child anxiety have shifted from solely working with the child to involving parents in treatment and addressing parents' own anxiety. Understanding the parental emotions and beliefs that promote psychological control may contribute to the identification of parental characteristics that warrant attention in parent focused approaches to treatment of child internalizing problems.

References

- Ayduk, O., Downey, G., Testa, A., Yen, Y., & Shoda, Y. (1999). Does rejection elicit hostility in rejection sensitive women? *Social Cognition, 17*, 245-271.
- Baldwin, M. W., (1992). Relational schemas and the processing of social information. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 461-484.
- Barber, B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development, 67*, 3296-3319.
- Barber, B.K., & Harmon, E. L. (2002). Violating the self: Parental psychological control of children and adolescents. In B. K. Barber (Ed), *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents*. (pp. 15-52). Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Barber, B. K. & Olsen, J. A. (1997). Socialization in context: Connection, regulation, and autonomy in the family, school, and neighborhood, and with peers. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 12*, 287-315.
- Barber, B.K., Olsen, J. E. & Shagle, S. (1994). Associations between parental psychological and behavioural and youth internalized and externalized behaviours. *Child Development, 65*, 1120-1136.
- Barber, B. K. & Shagle, S. C. (1992). Adolescent problem behaviours: A social ecological analysis. *Family Perspective, 26*, 493-514.
- Becker, W. C. (1964). Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In M. L. Hoffman & W. W. Hoffman (Eds.), *Review of child development research* (Vol.1, pp. 169-208). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bourgeois, K. S., & Leary, M. R. (2001). Coping with rejection: Derogating those who

- choose us last. *Motivation and Emotions*, 25, 101-111.
- Buckley, K. E., Winkel, R. E., & Leary, M. R. (2004). Reactions to acceptance and rejection: Effects of level and sequence of relational evaluation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 14-28.
- Bugental, D. B. (1992). Affective and cognitive processes within threat-oriented family systems. In I. E. Irving, A. McGillicuddey-Delisi, & J. (Eds.), *Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children* (pp. 219-248). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bugental, D. B. (1995). Parent Attribution Test. Unpublished manuscript.
- Bugental, D. B., Blue, J., Cortez, V., Fleck, K., Kopeikin, H., Lewis, J., & Lyon, J. (1993). Social cognitions as organizers of autonomic and affective responses to social challenge. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 94-103.
- Bugental, D. B., Blue, J. & Cruzcosa, M. (1989). Perceived control over caregiving outcomes: Implications for child abuse. *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 532-539.
- Bugental, D. B. & Happaney, K. (2000). Parent-child interaction as a power contest. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 21, 267-282.
- Bugental, D. B., Johnston, C., New, M., & Silvester, J. (1998). Measuring parental attributions: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 12, 459-480.
- Bugental, D. B., Lewis, J. C., Lin, E., Lyon, J., & Kepeikin, H. (1999). In charge but not in control: The management of teaching relationships by adults with low perceived power. *Developmental Psychology*, 35, 1367-1378
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155-159.

- Cumberland-Li, A., Eisenberg, N., Champion, C., Gershoff, E., & Fabes, R. (2003). The relation of parental emotionality and related dispositional traits to parental expression of emotion and children's social functioning. *Motivation and Emotion, 27*, 27-56.
- Dix, T. (1991). The affective organization of parenting: Adaptive and maladaptive processes. *Psychological Bulletin, 110*, 3-25.
- Dix, T., Ruble, D., Grusec, J., & Nixon, S. (1989). Social cognition in parents: Inferential and affective reactions to children of three age levels. *Child Development, 57*, 879-894.
- Downey, G., & Feldman, S. (1996). Implications of rejection sensitivity for intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 1327-1343.
- Duff, A., Harkin-Larson, J., Lee, C., & Voelker, S. (Unpublished manuscript). Self-Expressiveness and parenting emotion styles in parents of preschoolers.
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R., & Murphy, B. (1996). Parents' reactions to children's negative emotions: Relations to children's social competence and comforting behaviour. *Child Development, 67*, 2227-2247.
- Ellenbogen, M. & Hodgins, S. (2004). The impact of high neuroticism in parents on children's psychosocial functioning in a population at high risk for major affective disorder. A family-environmental pathway of intergenerational risk. *Development and Psychopathology, 16*, 113-136.
- Ginott, H. G. (1965). *Between parent and child: New solutions to old problems*. Toronto, Ontario: The MacMillan Company.
- Goodnow, J. J. (1998). Parents' ideas, actions, and feelings: Models and methods from

- developmental and social psychology. *Child Development*, 59, 286-320.
- Gottman, J. M. (1997). *The heart of parenting: Raising an emotionally intelligent child*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Gottman, J., Katz, L., & 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.
- Grusec, J. E., Hastings, P., & Mammone, N. (1994). Parenting cognitions and relational schemas. In J. G. Smetana (Ed.), *Beliefs about parenting: Origins and developmental implications*. New directions for child development. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hart, C., Nelson, D., Robinson, C., Olsen, S., McNeilly-Choque, M. (1998). Overt and relational aggression in Russian nursery school-age children: Parenting style and marital linkages. *Developmental Psychology*, 34, 687-697.
- Hastings, P. D., & Grusec, J. E. (1998). Parenting goals as organizers of responses to parent-child disagreement. *Developmental Psychology*, 34, 465-479.
- Hastings, P. & Rubin, K. (1999). Predicting mothers' beliefs about preschool-aged children's social behavior: Evidence for maternal attitudes moderating child effects. *Child Development*, 70, 722-741.
- Hollingshead, A. B. (1975). Four factor index of social status. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Sociology, Yale University, New Haven, CT.
- Holmbeck, G., Shapera, W., & Hommeyer, J. (2002). Observed and perceived parenting behaviours and psychosocial adjustment in preadolescents with spina bifida. In B. K. Barber (Ed), *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children*

- and adolescents.* (pp.191-234). Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Hooven, C., Gottman, J., & Katz, L. (1995). Parental meta-emotion structure predicts family and child outcomes. *Cognition and Emotion, 9*, 229-264.
- Hudson, J. & Rapee, R. (2002). Parent-child interactions in clinically anxious children and their siblings. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 31*, 548-555.
- Katz, L., & Windecker-Nelson, B. (2004). Parental meta-emotion philosophy in families with conduct-problem children: Links with peer relations. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 32*, 385-398.
- Kochanska, G., Clark, L. & Goldman, M. (1997). Implications of mothers' personality for their parenting and their young children's developmental outcomes. *Journal of Personality, 65*, 387-420.
- Leary, M. R., Springer, C., Negel, L, Ansell, E., & Evans, K. (1998). The causes, phenomenology, and consequences of hurt feelings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1225-1237.
- Leary, M. R., Tambor, E. S., Terdal, S. K., & Downs, D. L. (1995). Self-esteem as an interpersonal monitor: The sociometer hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 518-530.
- Lorber, M. F., O'Leary, S. G., & Kendziora, K. T. (2003). Mothers' overreactive discipline and their encoding and appraisals of toddler behaviour. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 31*, 485-494.
- Lovejoy, M., Verda, M., & Hays, C. (1997). Convergent and discriminant validity of

- measures of parenting efficacy and control. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 26, 366-376.
- Mills, R. S. L. (2004). Psychological control and mothers' emotional awareness. Manuscript submitted for review.
- Mills, R. S. L., Nazar, J., & Farrell, H. M. (2002). Child and parent perceptions of hurtful messages. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 19, 731-754.
- Olsen, S., Yang, C., Hart, C., Robinson, C., Wu, P., Nelson, D., Nelson, L., Jin, S., & Wo, J. (2002). Maternal psychological control and preschool children's behavioural outcomes in China, Russia, and the United States. In B. K. Barber (Ed), *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents*. (pp. 235-262). Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Pettit, G. S., & Laird, R. D. (2002). Psychological control and monitoring in early adolescence: The role of parental involvement and earlier child adjustment. In B. K. Barber (Ed), *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents*. (pp. 97-124). Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Pettit, G. S., Laird, R. D., Dodge, K.A., Bates, J.E., & Criss, M.M. (2001). Antecedents and behaviour problem outcomes of parental monitoring and psychological control in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 72, 583-598.
- Ramsden, S., & Hubbard, J. (2002). Family expressiveness and parental emotion coaching; Their role in children's emotion regulation and aggression. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 30, 657-667.
- Rubin, K., Burgess, K., & Hastings, K. (2002). Stability and social-behavioral

- consequences of toddlers' inhibited temperament and parenting behaviours. *Child Development*, 73, 483-495.
- Rubin, K. & Hastings, P. (1999). Predicting mothers' beliefs about preschool-aged children's social behavior: Evidence for maternal attitudes moderating child effects. *Child Development*, 70, 722-741.
- Rubin, K. J., & Mills, R. S. L. (1992). Parents' thoughts about children's socially adaptive and maladaptive behaviours: Stability, change, and individual differences. In I. E. Sigel, A. V. McGillicuddy-DeLisi, & J. J. Goodnow (Eds.), *Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children* (pp. 41-69). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schaefer, E. S. (1965). A configurational analysis of children's reports of parent behaviour. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 29, 552-557.
- Slep, A.M., & O'Leary, S. (1998). The effects of maternal attributions on parenting: An experimental analysis. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 12, 234-243.
- Smetana, J. G., & Daddis, C. (2002). Domain-specific antecedents of parental psychological control and monitoring: The role of parenting beliefs and practices. *Child Development*, 73, 563-580.
- Soenens, B., Elliot, A., Goossens, L., Vansteenkiste, M., Luyten, P., & Duriez, B. (Unpublished manuscript). The intergenerational transmission of perfectionism: Parents' psychological control as an intervening variable.
- Steinberg, L. (1990). Autonomy, conflict, and harmony in the family relationship. In S. S. Feldman & G. R. Elliot (Eds.), *At the threshold: The developing adolescent* (pp. 255-276). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Stone, G., Buegler, C., & Barber, B. (2002). Interparental conflict, psychological control, and youth problem behaviour. In B. K. Barber (Ed), *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents*. (pp. 53-96). Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L.S. (1996). *Using Multivariate Statistics*, (3rd ed). New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Vangilisti, A. L., & Crumley, L. P. (1998). Reactions to messages that hurt: The influence of relational contexts. *Communication Monographs*, 65, 173-196.

Appendix A

General Information

This questionnaire will take you about 5 minutes. Your answers to these questions will permit us to describe, as a group, the families participating in this study.

1. What is the birthdate of **the child** who is participating in this study with you?

____/____/____
d m y

Check one: Girl? []1 or Boy? []2

2. Is this child: Your biological child? []1 Your spouse's biological child? []1
Your adopted child? []2 Your spouse's adopted child? []2
Your stepchild? []3 Your spouse's stepchild? []3

3. Please state the age and sex of any other children you have:

<u>Age (in years)</u>	<u>Sex</u>
—	—
—	—

4. What is the highest level in school or university you have completed (check one)? What is the highest level your spouse has completed?
- | | |
|--|--|
| 1st to 8th grade []1 | 1st to 8th grade []1 |
| 9th to 12th grade []2 | 9th to 12th grade []2 |
| community college or some university . []3 | community college or some univ. []3 |
| university graduate []4 | university graduate []4 |
| graduate or professional school []5 | graduate or professional school . []5 |

5. Approximately how many hours do you work each week for pay (include home-based work, work outside of the home, hours self-employed)? Your spouse?:
- | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Not working for pay []1 | Not working for pay []1 |
| 1 to 14 hours a week []2 | 1 to 14 hours a week []2 |
| 15 to 24 hours a week . . . []3 | 15 to 24 hours a week . . . []3 |
| 25 to 39 hours a week . . . []4 | 25 to 39 hours a week . . . []4 |
| 40 hours a week or more . []5 | 40 hours a week or more . []5 |

6. If employed, are you (check one): part-time? []1 full-time? []2
If employed, is your spouse (check one): part-time? []1 full-time? []2

7. If employed, are you (check one): temporary/term []1 permanent? []2
If employed, is your spouse (check one): temporary/term []1 permanent? []2

8. What is your present or most recent past occupation(s)? (Please be specific, e.g., "homemaker," "auto mechanic," "high school teacher"):

What is your spouse's present or most recent past occupation(s)? (Please be specific, e.g., "homemaker," "auto mechanic," "high school teacher"):

9. Are you Canadian? If yes, check one: 1st generation: ___ 2nd: ___ 3rd or more: ___
 How much do you feel you are a Canadian? (Please rate your feelings on a 10-point scale in which 1 = not at all and 10 = very much a Canadian): _____

Is your spouse Canadian? If yes: 1st generation: ___ 2nd: ___ 3rd or more: ___

10. To which ethnic or cultural group(s) did your ancestors belong? (check all that apply):

- | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> French | <input type="checkbox"/> English | <input type="checkbox"/> German | <input type="checkbox"/> Scottish | <input type="checkbox"/> Irish |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Italian | <input type="checkbox"/> Ukrainian | <input type="checkbox"/> Metis | <input type="checkbox"/> Jewish | <input type="checkbox"/> Black |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese | <input type="checkbox"/> Portuguese | <input type="checkbox"/> South Asian | <input type="checkbox"/> Polish | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> North American Indian | <input type="checkbox"/> Inuit/Eskimo | <input type="checkbox"/> Dutch (Netherlands) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify: _____) | | | | |

To which ethnic or cultural group(s) did your spouse's ancestors belong? (all that apply):

- | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> French | <input type="checkbox"/> English | <input type="checkbox"/> German | <input type="checkbox"/> Scottish | <input type="checkbox"/> Irish |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Italian | <input type="checkbox"/> Ukrainian | <input type="checkbox"/> Metis | <input type="checkbox"/> Jewish | <input type="checkbox"/> Black |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese | <input type="checkbox"/> Portuguese | <input type="checkbox"/> South Asian | <input type="checkbox"/> Polish | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> North American Indian | <input type="checkbox"/> Inuit/Eskimo | <input type="checkbox"/> Dutch (Netherlands) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify: _____) | | | | |

11. What is your marital status? (check one):

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Cohabiting []1 | For how long? _____ yrs. |
| Married []2 | For how long? _____ yrs. |
| Separated/divorced []3 | For how long? _____ yrs. |
| Single []4 | |

12. How old are you? (check one):

How old is your spouse? (check one):

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Less than 20 years of age . . []1 | Less than 20 years of age . . []1 |
| 20 to 29 years of age []2 | 20 to 29 years of age []2 |
| 30 to 39 years of age []3 | 30 to 39 years of age []3 |

- | | |
|---|---|
| 40 to 49 years of age []4 | 40 to 49 years of age []4 |
| 50 to 59 years of age []5 | 50 to 59 years of age []5 |
| 59 years of age or above []6 | 59 years of age or above []6 |

13. So that we can describe the group of families participating in this study, please indicate your **FAMILY** income for the past year (that is, total income before taxes of **ALL** members of the family residing in your household), by checking one of these income categories:

- Under \$10,000 []1
- \$10,001 to \$20,000 []2
- \$20,001 to \$30,000 []3
- \$30,001 to \$40,000 []4
- \$40,001 to \$60,000 []5
- \$60,001 to \$75,000 []6
- Over \$75,000 []7

Appendix B

This section will take you about 45 minutes.

The following pages contain a list of behaviours that parents exhibit when interacting with their children. Answer each question comparing yourself with parents that you know, thinking in terms of parenting interactions with your child. Please respond to the items **independent of your spouse**.

This questionnaire is designed to measure *how often your spouse* exhibits certain behaviours towards this child, and *how often you* exhibit certain behaviours towards this child.

Example:

First, please read each item on the questionnaire and think about *how often your spouse* exhibits this behaviour and place your answer on the **first** line to the left of the item, under [He].

[He] [I]

— — 1. [**He allows**] [I allow] our child to choose what to wear to school.

SPOUSE EXHIBITS BEHAVIOUR:

1 = Never

2 = Once in a While

3 = About Half of the Time

4 = Very Often

5 = Always

Then, rate *how often you* exhibit this behaviour and place your answer on the **second** line to the left of the item, under [I].

[He] [I]

— — 1. [He allows] [**I allow**] our child to choose what to wear to school.

I EXHIBIT THIS BEHAVIOUR:

1 = Never

2 = Once in a While

3 = About Half of the Time

4 = Very Often

5 = Always

COMPARED WITH PARENTS THAT YOU KNOW: Make two ratings for each item: (1) rate how often your spouse exhibits this behaviour and (2) how often you exhibit this behaviour with your child.

SPOUSE EXHIBITS BEHAVIOUR:
BEHAVIOUR:

- 1 = Never
- 2 = Once in a While
- 3 = About Half of the Time
- 4 = Very Often
- 5 = Always

I EXHIBIT THIS

- 1 = Never
- 2 = Once in a While
- 3 = About Half of the Time
- 4 = Very Often
- 5 = Always

[He] [I]

- | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|---|
| ___ | ___ | 1. | [He changes][I change] the subject whenever our child has something to say. |
| ___ | ___ | 2. | [He shows][I show] impatience with our child. |
| ___ | ___ | 3. | [He shows][I show] erratic emotional behaviour around our child. |
| ___ | ___ | 4. | [He lets][I let] our child know when he/she has disappointed [him][me]. |
| ___ | ___ | 5. | [He tries][I try] to change how our child feels or thinks about things. |
| ___ | ___ | 6. | [He tells][I tell] our child he/she is not as good as we were growing up. |
| ___ | ___ | 7. | [He lets][I let] our child know when we are angry with him/her. |
| ___ | ___ | 8. | [He brings up][I bring up] our child's past mistakes when criticizing him/her. |
| ___ | ___ | 9. | [He makes][I make] our child aware of how much we sacrifice or do for him/her. |
| ___ | ___ | 10. | [He ignores][I ignore] our child when he/she tries to get attention. |
| ___ | ___ | 11. | If our child has [hurt his feelings, he stops talking to our child][hurt my feelings, I stop talking to our child] until our child pleases [him][me]. |

- ___ ___ 12. [He acts like he knows][I act like I know] what our child is thinking or feeling.
- ___ ___ 13. [He says][I say], "if you really care for me, you would not do things that cause me to worry."
- ___ ___ 14. [He tells][I tell] our child that their behaviour was dumb or stupid.
- ___ ___ 15. [He is][I am] less friendly with our child if our child does not see things [his][my] way.
- ___ ___ 16. [He goes][I go] back and forth between being warm and critical towards our child.
- ___ ___ 17. [He tells][I tell] our child of all the things [he has][I have] done for him/her.
- ___ ___ 18. [He acts][I act] disappointed when our child misbehaves.
- ___ ___ 19. [He interrupts][I interrupt] our child when he/she is speaking.
- ___ ___ 20. [He tells][I tell] our child that he/she should be ashamed when he/she misbehaves.
- ___ ___ 21. [He tells][I tell] our child that we get embarrassed when he/she does not meet our expectations.
- ___ ___ 22. [He makes][I make] our child feel guilty when our child does not meet our expectations.
- ___ ___ 23. [He informs][I inform] our child that punishment will always find him/her when misbehaviour occurs.
- ___ ___ 24. [He doesn't][I don't] like to be bothered by our child.
- ___ ___ 25. [He finishes][I finish] our child's sentence whenever he/she talks.
- ___ ___ 26. [He doesn't][I don't] pay attention when our child is speaking to us.
- ___ ___ 27. [He would][I would] like to tell our child how to feel or think about things.
- ___ ___ 28. [He blames][I blame] our child for other family members' problems.
- ___ ___ 29. [He changes his moods][I change my moods] when with our child.

- ___ ___ 30. [He lets][I let] our child know how disappointed we are when he/she misbehaves.
- ___ ___ 31. [He loses his][I lose my] temper easily with our child.
- ___ ___ 32. [He tells][I tell] our child he/she is not as good as other children.
- ___ ___ 33. [He will][I will] avoid looking at our child when our child has disappointed [him][me].

Appendix C

This section will take you about 15 minutes.

In the next sections, we want to know what you think. First, we want to know how important you believe different factors might be as potential causes of successful and unsuccessful interaction with children. We are interested in discovering the way people think about children -- there are no right or wrong answers.

Example: If you were teaching a child an outdoor game and he or she caught on very quickly, how important do you believe these possible causes would be?

- | | not at all
important | very
important |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| a. how good he or she is in sports in general | ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- ----- | |
| | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| | (Circle one of the numbers) | |
| b. how good a teacher you are | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| | (Circle one of the numbers) | |
| c. how easy the game is | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| | (Circle one of the numbers) | |

Answer the following questions by making ratings in the same way as shown above.

1. Suppose you took care of a neighbour's child one afternoon, and the two of you had a really good time together. How important do you believe the following factors would be as possible reasons for such an experience?

- | | not at all
important | very
important |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a. whether or not this was a "good day" for the child, e.g., whether there was a TV show s/he particularly wanted to see (or some other special thing to do) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| b. how interested you were in being with the child that day | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| c. how well you get along with children in general | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| d. how lucky you were in just having everything work out well | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |

e.	how much the child enjoys being with adults	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
f.	how pleasant a disposition the child had	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
g.	how well the neighbour had set things up for you in advance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
h.	whether the child was rested	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
i.	how much you enjoy being with children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
j.	how good a mood you were in that day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
k.	whether the child's surroundings contained interesting things for the child to see or do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
l.	the extent to which the child was alert and responsive to you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
m.	how much special effort you made to get along with the child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
n.	how accepting you were of the child's behaviour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
o.	how generally understanding you are of children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
p.	how imaginative you are as a person	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
q.	how well-behaved the child was	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
r.	the extent to which you treated the child with respect	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
s.	how well-organized you are as a person	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
t.	how much the child enjoyed the activities that were available	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
u.	how much you encouraged the child in things they were trying to do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
v.	how self-confident you were	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

w.	how much affection you demonstrated for the child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
x.	how much the child liked you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
y.	how compatible your interests were with those of the child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
z.	how responsive you were to the child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
aa.	how well you understood this particular child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
bb.	how good a mood the child was in on that day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
cc.	how pleasant or friendly the child was	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

The next question asks about bad experiences with children. Reasons for good interactions are not necessarily the same as those for unsuccessful ones. So please think about this situation without regard for the way you answered the first question.

2. Suppose you took care of a neighbour's child one afternoon, and the two of you did not get along well. How important do you believe the following factors would be as possible reasons for such an experience?

		not at all important			very important			
a.	how unlucky you were in having everything just work out wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b.	how unpleasant a disposition the child had	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c.	whether the child was tired or not feeling too well	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d.	whether or not you really enjoy children that much	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
e.	whether the child doesn't like other people taking care of him/her	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
f.	whether or not this was a bad day for							

	the child, e.g., whether there was nothing good on TV, whether it was raining and s/he couldn't go outside	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
g.	the extent to which your neighbour failed to set things up for you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
h.	how much your mind was preoccupied with other things that day and you didn't give your full attention	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
i.	whether you used the wrong approach for this child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
j.	the extent to which the child was stubborn and resisted your efforts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
k.	how you get along with children in general	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
l.	how unsuited the physical environment was for a child, e.g., not enough to do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
m.	what kind of mood you were in that day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
n.	insufficient experience with children of this age	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
o.	whether you were tired on that particular day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
p.	the extent to which the child failed to pay attention to you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
q.	how hungry the child was	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
r.	your lack of understanding about what can be expected of children at this particular age	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
s.	the kind of child he or she was	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
t.	how little effort the child made to take interest in what you said or did	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
u.	the extent to which you were not feeling well on that day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

v.	not having enough time with the child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
w.	the extent to which the child acted upset (e.g., threw a tantrum) because the parents left	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
x.	how bad a mood the child was in on that day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
y.	the extent to which you expected too much from the child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
z.	whether or not this was a bad day for you in general	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
aa.	how much you disliked this particular child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
bb.	your way of doing things (e.g., how strict you are) didn't suit this particular child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
cc.	how unpleasant or unfriendly the child was	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix D

This section will take you about 15 minutes.

In this section, we would like to know how you would feel in difficult situations. As you read the following stories, please imagine that it is you and your child in the situation and that your child has said or done what is described. Even if your child has never said or done anything like this or it is completely out of character, imagine how you **would feel** if it happened. For each feeling listed, please rate how strong that emotion would be for you, by checking the appropriate box in the row.

1. Your child asks for a special meal for dinner, which you make. However, when it is ready your child changes his/her mind and refuses to eat it.

How would you feel after your child did that? Would your feelings be (see list below):

	Very strong	Strong	Moderate	Mild	Very mild or not at all
hurt	<input type="checkbox"/>				
pain	<input type="checkbox"/>				
worried	<input type="checkbox"/>				
upset	<input type="checkbox"/>				
angry	<input type="checkbox"/>				
afraid	<input type="checkbox"/>				
irritated	<input type="checkbox"/>				
revengeful	<input type="checkbox"/>				
disappointed	<input type="checkbox"/>				
sad	<input type="checkbox"/>				
nervous	<input type="checkbox"/>				
frustrated	<input type="checkbox"/>				

How would you feel about yourself after your child did that? Would your feelings be (see list below):

	Very strong	Strong	Moderate	Mild	Very mild or not at all
good	<input type="checkbox"/>				
helpless	<input type="checkbox"/>				
not as good about self	<input type="checkbox"/>				
not as sure of self	<input type="checkbox"/>				
lonely	<input type="checkbox"/>				
unlikeable	<input type="checkbox"/>				
ashamed (bad as a <u>person</u>)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
rejected	<input type="checkbox"/>				
guilty (bad about his/her <u>behaviour</u>) .	<input type="checkbox"/>				

2. One morning, your child doesn't want to go to nursery school and, when you say it's time to go, runs into his/her room and refuses to budge.

How would you feel after your child did that? Would your feelings be (see list below):

	Very strong	Strong	Moderate	Mild	Very mild or not at all
hurt	<input type="checkbox"/>				
pain	<input type="checkbox"/>				
worried	<input type="checkbox"/>				
upset	<input type="checkbox"/>				
angry	<input type="checkbox"/>				
afraid	<input type="checkbox"/>				
irritated	<input type="checkbox"/>				
revengeful	<input type="checkbox"/>				
disappointed	<input type="checkbox"/>				
sad	<input type="checkbox"/>				
nervous	<input type="checkbox"/>				
frustrated	<input type="checkbox"/>				

How would you feel about yourself after your child did that? Would your feelings be (see list below):

	Very strong	Strong	Moderate	Mild	Very mild or not at all
good	<input type="checkbox"/>				
helpless	<input type="checkbox"/>				
not as good about self	<input type="checkbox"/>				
not as sure of self	<input type="checkbox"/>				
lonely	<input type="checkbox"/>				
unlikeable	<input type="checkbox"/>				
ashamed (bad as a <u>person</u>)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
rejected	<input type="checkbox"/>				
guilty (bad about his/her behaviour) .	<input type="checkbox"/>				

3. You can see that your child is disturbed about something, and you'd like to help, but your child shuts you out and won't tell you what's wrong.

How would you feel after your child did that? Would your feelings be (see list below):

	Very strong	Strong	Moderate	Mild	Very mild or not at all
hurt	<input type="checkbox"/>				
pain	<input type="checkbox"/>				
worried	<input type="checkbox"/>				
upset	<input type="checkbox"/>				
angry	<input type="checkbox"/>				
afraid	<input type="checkbox"/>				
irritated	<input type="checkbox"/>				
revengeful	<input type="checkbox"/>				
disappointed	<input type="checkbox"/>				
sad	<input type="checkbox"/>				
nervous	<input type="checkbox"/>				
frustrated	<input type="checkbox"/>				

How would you feel about yourself after your child did that? Would your feelings be (see list below):

	Very strong	Strong	Moderate	Mild	Very mild or not at all
good	<input type="checkbox"/>				
helpless	<input type="checkbox"/>				
not as good about self	<input type="checkbox"/>				
not as sure of self	<input type="checkbox"/>				
lonely	<input type="checkbox"/>				
unlikeable	<input type="checkbox"/>				
ashamed (bad as a <u>person</u>)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
rejected	<input type="checkbox"/>				
guilty (bad about his/her behaviour) .	<input type="checkbox"/>				

4. Your child asks you to take him/her to the zoo. You explain why it's not a good day to go, but your child says, "You're never any fun."

How would you feel after your child did that? Would your feelings be (see list below):

	Very strong	Strong	Moderate	Mild	Very mild or not at all
hurt	<input type="checkbox"/>				
pain	<input type="checkbox"/>				
worried	<input type="checkbox"/>				
upset	<input type="checkbox"/>				
angry	<input type="checkbox"/>				
afraid	<input type="checkbox"/>				
irritated	<input type="checkbox"/>				
revengeful	<input type="checkbox"/>				
disappointed	<input type="checkbox"/>				
sad	<input type="checkbox"/>				
nervous	<input type="checkbox"/>				
frustrated	<input type="checkbox"/>				

How would you feel about yourself after your child did that? Would your feelings be (see list below):

	Very strong	Strong	Moderate	Mild	Very mild or not at all
good	<input type="checkbox"/>				
helpless	<input type="checkbox"/>				
not as good about self	<input type="checkbox"/>				
not as sure of self	<input type="checkbox"/>				
lonely	<input type="checkbox"/>				
unlikeable	<input type="checkbox"/>				
ashamed (bad as a <u>person</u>)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
rejected	<input type="checkbox"/>				
guilty (bad about his/her <u>behaviour</u>) .	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Appendix E

This section will take you about 30 minutes.

In this section, we want to know about your feelings regarding sadness, fear, and anger – both in yourself and in your child. For each item, please circle the number that best indicates how much you agree with each statement. If you are not sure, choose the number that seems the closest. While this section requires you to answer lots of questions, try to stick with it. Its length ensures that we cover most aspects of parents' beliefs.

	Not at all						Extremely
1. Children really have very little to be sad about.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I think that anger is okay as long as it's under control.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Children acting sad are usually just trying to get adults to feel sorry for them.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. A child's anger deserves a time-out.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. When my child is acting sad, s/he turns into a real brat.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. When my child is sad, I am expected to fix the world and make it perfect.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I really have no time for sadness in my own life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Anger is a dangerous state.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. If you ignore a child's sadness it tends to go away and take care of itself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Anger usually means aggression.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Children often act sad to get their way.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I think sadness is okay as long as it's under control.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

- | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13. | Sadness is something one has to get over, to ride out, not to dwell on. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. | I don't mind dealing with a child's sadness, as long as it doesn't last too long. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. | I prefer a happy child to a child who is overly emotional. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16. | When my child is sad, it's a time to problem-solve. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 17. | I help my children get over sadness quickly so they can move on to better things. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 18. | I don't see a child's being sad as any kind of opportunity to teach the child much. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 19. | I think when kids are sad they have overemphasized the negative in life. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 20. | When my child is acting angry, s/he turns into a real brat. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 21. | I set limits on my child's anger. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 22. | When my child acts sad, it's to get attention. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 23. | Anger is an emotion worth exploring. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 24. | A lot of a child's anger comes from the child's lack of understanding and immaturity. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 25. | I try to change my child's angry moods into into cheerful ones. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 26. | You should express the anger you feel. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 27. | When my child is sad, it's a chance to get close. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 28. | Children really have very little to be angry about. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 29. | When my child is sad, I try to help the child explore what is making him/her sad. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

- | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30. | When my child is sad, I show my child that I understand. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 31. | I want my child to experience sadness. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 32. | The important thing is to find out why a child is feeling sad. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 33. | Childhood is a happy-go-lucky time, not a time for feeling sad or angry. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 34. | When my child is sad, we sit down to talk over the sadness. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 35. | When my child is sad, I try to help him/her figure out why the feeling is there. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 36. | When my child is angry, it's an opportunity for getting close. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 37. | When my child is angry, I take some time to try to experience this feeling with my child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 38. | I want my child to experience anger. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 39. | I think it's good for kids to feel angry sometimes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 40. | The important thing is to find out why the child is feeling angry. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 41. | When my child gets sad, I warn him/her about not developing a bad character. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 42. | When my child is sad I'm worried s/he will develop a negative personality. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 43. | I'm not really trying to teach my child anything in particular about sadness. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 44. | If there's a lesson I have about sadness it's that it's okay to express it. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 45. | I'm not sure there's anything that can be done to change sadness. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

- | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 46. | There's not much you can do for a sad child beyond offering him/her comfort. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 47. | When my child is sad, I try to let him/her know that I love him/her no matter what. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 48. | When my child is sad, I'm not quite sure what s/he wants me to do. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 49. | I'm not really trying to teach my child anything in particular about anger. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 50. | If there's a lesson I have about anger it's that it's okay to express it. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 51. | When my child is angry, I try to be understanding of his/her mood. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 52. | When my child is angry, I try to let him/her know that I love him/her no matter what. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 53. | When my child is angry, I'm not quite sure what s/he wants me to do. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 54. | My child has a bad temper and I worry about it. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 55. | I don't think it is right for a child to show anger. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 56. | Angry people are out of control. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 57. | A child's expressing anger amounts to a temper tantrum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 58. | Kids get angry to get their own way. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 59. | When my child gets angry, I worry about his/her destructive tendencies. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 60. | If you let kids get angry, they will think they can get their way all the time. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 61. | Angry children are being disrespectful. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 62. | Kids are pretty funny when they're angry. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

- | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 63. | Anger tends to cloud my judgement and I do things I regret. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 64. | When my child is angry, it's time to solve a problem. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 65. | When my child gets angry, I think it's time for a spanking. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 66. | When my child gets angry, my goal is to get him/her to stop. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 67. | I don't make a big deal of a child's anger. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 68. | When my child is angry, I usually don't take it all that seriously. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 69. | When I'm angry, I feel like I'm going to explode. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 70. | Anger accomplishes nothing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 71. | Anger is exciting for a child to express. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 72. | A child's anger is important. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 73. | Children have a right to feel angry. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 74. | When my child is mad, I just find out what is making him/her mad. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 75. | It's important to help the child find out what caused the child's anger. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 76. | When my child gets angry with me, I think, "I don't want to hear this." | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 77. | When my child is angry I think, "If only s/he could just learn to roll with the punches." | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 78. | When my child is angry I think, "Why can't s/he accept things as they are?" | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 79. | I want my child to get angry, to stand up for himself/herself. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

80. I don't make a big deal out of my child's
sadness. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
81. When my child is angry I want to know what
s/he is thinking. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7