

Running head: PARENTAL META-EMOTION PHILOSOPHY, EMOTION  
REGULATION, AND ACADEMIC MOTIVATION

Examining the Relationships Between Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy, Emotion Regulation,  
and Academic Motivation

by

Molly Chase

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Arts in School Psychology

at

Mount Saint Vincent University  
Halifax, Nova Scotia  
September 2018

© Copyright by Molly Chase, 2018

# PARENTAL META-EMOTION PHILOSOPHY, EMOTION REGULATION, AND ACADEMIC MOTIVATION

## Abstract

The purpose of the current study was to fill a gap in the current literature by examining a theoretical model hypothesizing that parental meta-emotion philosophy is related to emotion regulation abilities in children and that this relationship indirectly and directly predicts children's academic motivation. Researchers suggest that a similar model linking parental meta-emotion philosophy, emotion regulation, and academic achievement exists, providing support for the framework of this novel conceptual model. To test this model, children in grades four to six in schools in New Brunswick and their parents/caregivers were recruited. Children were asked to complete a self-report measure of academic motivation and parents/caregivers were asked to complete a measure of parental meta-emotion philosophy and a measure assessing their child's emotion regulation abilities. Correlational analyses were conducted to assess whether all variables in the model were related to one another and hierarchical regressions were conducted to assess whether parental meta-emotion philosophy and children's emotion regulation abilities predict children's academic motivation. Results suggest that parental meta-emotion philosophy is related to children's emotion regulation abilities and academic motivation, children's emotion regulation abilities are related to their academic motivation, and together, parental meta-emotion philosophy and children's emotion regulation abilities predict academic motivation and amotivation. The results of the study provide implications for future research, contribute to parental meta-emotion philosophy research, and further strengthen the argument that parental meta-emotion philosophy is an important predictor of positive child outcomes. Results also have implications for parents and school psychologists by providing them with information regarding how to help children achieve positive outcomes.

# PARENTAL META-EMOTION PHILOSOPHY, EMOTION REGULATION, AND ACADEMIC MOTIVATION

## Acknowledgements

I have many people to thank for their help and support throughout this journey, and I would like to take this opportunity to officially recognize them. The person I undoubtedly owe the most thanks to is my supervisor, Dr. Daniel Séguin. His support has been unwavering; from helping me develop my study, to taking time out of his vacation to review draft after draft of my thesis, to immediately answering my frantic emails and the multitude of questions I had along the way. It is safe to say that he went above and beyond to help, guide, and encourage me throughout this entire thesis process. I could not have asked for a more positive, kind, supportive, encouraging, and above all, patient supervisor, and for that I am forever grateful. I must also thank Dr. Michelle Eskritt for agreeing to be my committee member and for offering me valuable feedback, insight, and support throughout this process. A huge thank you must also go to my research partner, Cassie Fralic, for sticking by me, keeping me grounded, encouraging me to be confident in my abilities, and offering me endless help, support, and knowledge. Without Cassie, this endeavour would have been far more challenging. It was a pleasure working with all three of these individuals and I cannot thank them enough for continuously helping me improve my thesis to ensure that it is the best that it can be and enabling me to grow.

I would also like to extend my thanks to my internship supervisor, Erin Coates, for her never-ending support, encouragement, and positive attitude and for helping me collect data. Her support enabled me to overcome obstacles that seemed impenetrable, which provided a significant amount of stress relief. I must also thank all of the study participants, who took the time to fill out the measures; without their involvement, there would be no thesis.

Many thanks must also go to Dr. Melissa McGonnell and Dr. Sara King for their continued encouragement, guidance, reassurance, and understanding, but also for the tough love they provided. I thank them for their wisdom and for answering every silly question I have ever

## PARENTAL META-EMOTION PHILOSOPHY, EMOTION REGULATION, AND ACADEMIC MOTIVATION

asked, providing me with helpful feedback, and believing steadfastly in my abilities. A significant thank you must also go to my incredible School Psychology classmates for being the most supportive and reassuring group of individuals to be surrounded by throughout this entire program. There was never a moment that I felt alone in my struggles, as there were always six others willing to offer their assistance and guidance. Even on my worst days, these six never failed to lift my spirits. Without them, I would have slept less and worried more, but they kept me motivated to keep pushing forward toward my goals. I must also thank all of my friends for providing me with endless encouragement and support and for comforting me in times of need, sometimes even opening their arms and homes to me.

Finally, I must express the greatest thanks to my family for believing in me even when I did not believe in myself and for being proud of me in all that I do. Thank you to my parents who never let me forget my accomplishments and abilities and who supported me every step of the way. A special thanks to my mom and sister for being incredibly patient with me and for handling my anxiety with the utmost compassion, responding with nothing but encouragement. Thank you for always going the extra mile to encourage me to keep my head up in times of struggle and for being the best friends I could ask for. Thank you to my dad for always reminding me of how far I have come and assuring me that my future is nothing but bright. Thank you to my grandparents for their continued support, for keeping me on track, and for their constant assurance that I can accomplish anything I put my mind to. Thank you to every member of my family for never giving up on me and for loving me unconditionally.

Thank you so much to each and every person that has helped me and has made this process much less daunting and challenging. Without you, this would not have been possible.

PARENTAL META-EMOTION PHILOSOPHY, EMOTION REGULATION, AND  
ACADEMIC MOTIVATION

Table of Contents

Title Page .....	i
Abstract .....	ii
Acknowledgements .....	iii
Table of Contents .....	v
List of Tables .....	viii
Introduction .....	1
Parenting .....	1
Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy .....	2
Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Child Outcomes .....	4
Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Academic Achievement .....	4
Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Emotion Regulation .....	5
Emotion Regulation and Academic Achievement .....	6
Existing Evidence-Based Model .....	7
Academic Motivation .....	7
Proposed Theoretical Model .....	10
Rationale for Study .....	10
Hypotheses .....	11
Method .....	13
Participants .....	13
Measures .....	14
Demographics .....	14
Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy .....	15
Emotion Regulation .....	16

PARENTAL META-EMOTION PHILOSOPHY, EMOTION REGULATION, AND  
ACADEMIC MOTIVATION

Academic Motivation.....16

Procedure .....18

Results.....18

    Preliminary Analyses .....19

    Hypothesis Testing.....21

        Relationships Between Variables .....21

            Correlations Between Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Emotion  
Regulation .....21

            Correlations Between Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Academic  
Motivation.....21

            Correlations Between Emotion Regulation and Academic Motivation...  
.....21

        Proposed Model .....25

Discussion.....38

    Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Emotion Regulation .....39

    Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Academic Motivation .....40

    Emotion Regulation and Academic Motivation .....42

    Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy, Emotion Regulation, and Academic Motivation  
.....45

    Limitations and Future Directions .....48

    Implications and Contributions.....50

    Conclusion .....51

References.....53

PARENTAL META-EMOTION PHILOSOPHY, EMOTION REGULATION, AND  
ACADEMIC MOTIVATION

Appendix A.....	59
Demographic Questionnaire .....	59
Appendix B.....	62
The Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire .....	62
Appendix C.....	63
Children’s Behavior Questionnaire.....	63
Appendix D.....	69
The Elementary-School Motivation Scale .....	69
Appendix E .....	72
School Principal Consent Form .....	72
Appendix F.....	74
Parent/Caregiver Consent Form.....	74
Appendix G.....	76
Parent/Caregiver Debriefing Form .....	76

PARENTAL META-EMOTION PHILOSOPHY, EMOTION REGULATION, AND  
ACADEMIC MOTIVATION

List of Tables

Table 1: Correlations Between Measures .....20

Table 2: Correlations Between Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Emotion Regulation  
.....22

Table 3: Correlations Between Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Academic Motivation  
.....23

Table 4: Correlations Between Emotion Regulation and Academic Motivation .....24

Table 5: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion  
Philosophy and Attentional Focusing Predicting External Regulation.....26

Table 6: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion  
Philosophy and Attentional Focusing Predicting Introjected Regulation.....27

Table 7: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion  
Philosophy and Attentional Focusing Predicting Identified Regulation.....28

Table 8: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion  
Philosophy and Attentional Focusing Predicting Intrinsic Motivation.....29

Table 9: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion  
Philosophy and Attentional Focusing Predicting Amotivation .....30

Table 10: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion  
Philosophy and Attentional Shifting Predicting External Regulation .....33

Table 11: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion  
Philosophy and Attentional Shifting Predicting Introjected Regulation.....34

Table 12: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion  
Philosophy and Attentional Shifting Predicting Identified Regulation .....35

PARENTAL META-EMOTION PHILOSOPHY, EMOTION REGULATION, AND  
ACADEMIC MOTIVATION

Table 13: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion  
Philosophy and Attentional Shifting Predicting Intrinsic Motivation .....36

Table 14: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion  
Philosophy and Attentional Shifting Predicting Amotivation .....37

Examining the Relationships Between Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy, Emotion Regulation,  
and Academic Motivation

In the field of school psychology, children's wellbeing and outcomes are of the utmost importance. As such, it becomes crucial to determine which factors play a role in shaping children's outcomes, as this may provide insight into how to ensure that children's outcomes are positive. Although there are a variety of factors that contribute to children's outcomes, one of the primary influential factors is the parenting a child receives. In fact, there is a general consensus in social development literature that the quality of parenting is related to children's outcomes (Johnson, Berdahl, Horne, Richter, & Walters, 2014), as different approaches to parenting can be associated with differences in children's behaviour, health, and welfare, among several other outcomes (Smith, 2010). As such, parenting practices and attributes that lead to positive child outcomes deserve considerable attention and should be researched further.

### **Parenting**

Parenting can be defined as acts of rearing, providing for, and supporting the physical, emotional, intellectual, and social development of children from early childhood to adulthood (Johnson et al., 2014). Much research has been done in the field of parenting, which has resulted in a variety of parenting theories and the creation of different parenting styles. Although several parenting styles exist, it is a style characterized by moderate to high levels of control and high levels of warmth referred to as authoritative parenting that has received significant attention (Baumrind, 1971). According to researchers, authoritative parenting and its core components of parental warmth, affection, support, structure, and control reflect the most favourable parental characteristics and practices and it is the parenting style associated with not only the most positive, but the best outcomes for children (Johnson et al., 2014; Smith, 2010).

In addition to this specific style of parenting leading to positive child outcomes, years of research in various fields (e.g., parent education, child development, family systems, child psychology, paediatrics) has identified several other effective, evidence-based parenting practices and characteristics linked to positive developmental, behavioural, emotional, and cognitive outcomes in children (Johnson et al., 2014). These parental practices and attributes include developing a nurturing, supportive parent-child relationship and supporting this relationship by providing children with statements of praise, love, acceptance, and worth, showing physical affection, and encouraging children's development (Johnson et al., 2014). Parenting that leads to positive child outcomes also includes providing children with shelter, nutrition, a supportive environment favourable to health, and structure that contributes to learning and safety (Johnson et al., 2014). Although all of these parenting practices and attributes are important for fostering positive child outcomes, they only scratch the surface of what researchers have found to be effective. Furthermore, research on parenting is continuing to expand, with new concepts related to positive child outcomes being explored.

### **Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy**

Relatively new research in the field of parenting has introduced a novel parenting concept referred to as parental meta-emotion philosophy. Parental meta-emotion philosophy was created as the majority of research on the effects of parenting focused on parents' affect, discipline, and variables such as warmth and control, but little research had focused on parents' thoughts and feelings about their own affect or the affect of their child (Gottman, Katz, & Hooven, 1996). Within this concept, the term meta-emotion is used broadly, incorporating both feelings and thoughts about emotions, rather than just referring to one's feelings about feelings or emotions about emotions (e.g., feeling embarrassed about becoming angry) (Gottman et al., 1996). With

this in mind, parental meta-emotion philosophy refers to the feelings and thoughts parents have about their own emotions and their children's emotions, how they respond to their children's emotions, and the reason they give for how they responded (i.e., what they are attempting to teach children when responding to their emotions). Parental meta-emotion philosophy focuses on how parents' understanding of their own emotions enables them to teach their children about emotions and how this translates into certain outcomes for their children.

Initial research on this concept of parenting identified two different typologies of parental meta-emotion philosophy: emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy and emotion dismissing meta-emotion philosophy. Parents who have an emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy are those who are aware of emotions in themselves and in their children, can talk about and differentiate between those emotions, and provide assistance to their children with emotions by acting as an emotion coach of sorts (Gottman et al., 1996). Additionally, parents with an emotion coaching philosophy validate their child's emotions and help them label emotions, view their child's negative emotions as a teaching opportunity or a chance to become closer with their child, and help the child problem solve by creating goals and strategies for approaching situations that lead to negative emotions (Gottman et al., 1996). Parents who have an emotion dismissing meta-emotion philosophy often deny or ignore negative emotions (e.g., anger, sadness) as they view them as potentially harmful to their child and, as such, believe their role is to change negative emotions or quickly eliminate them while also communicating to their child that negative emotions do not last and are not important (Gottman et al., 1996). These parents do not view negative emotions as beneficial or as a teaching opportunity or chance to become closer to their child, and often distract their child when negative emotions are experienced rather than help their child problem solve (Gottman et al., 1996).

### **Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Child Outcomes**

Parental meta-emotion philosophy and both emotion coaching and emotion dismissing types have been directly linked to a variety of different child outcomes in research (e.g., Gottman et al., 1996). For example, parental meta-emotion philosophy has been shown to predict lower levels of behaviour problems, greater inhibitory control, and better physical health in children in middle childhood (Gottman et al., 1996; Lagacé-Séguin & Coplan, 2005). Emotion dismissing parental meta-emotion philosophy has been shown to contribute to a higher level of behaviour problems and poorer emotion regulation abilities among children in middle childhood (Lunkenheimer, Shields, & Cortina, 2007). Conversely, evidence suggests that parents who have an emotion coaching parental meta-emotion philosophy have children with fewer externalizing problems, higher self-esteem, and better social skills, peer relationships, and social and emotional competence than children of parents with an emotion dismissing philosophy (Daga, Raval, & Raj, 2015; Denham, Mitchell-Copeland, Strandberg, Auerbach, & Blair, 1997; Gottman & Declaire, 1997; Gottman et al., 1996; Shortt, Stoolmiller, Smith-Shine, Mark Eddy, & Sheeber, 2010).

### **Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Academic Achievement**

Although parental meta-emotion philosophy has been linked to a variety of positive child outcomes, some appear more frequently in the literature, as they are important outcomes that warrant attention and research. One child outcome variable that frequently appears in parental meta-emotion philosophy literature is academic achievement, which refers to a student's success in school in terms of meeting short- and long-term education goals (e.g., obtaining good grades). Researchers examining the relationship between these variables have found that parental meta-emotion philosophy predicts academic achievement in children (e.g., Gottman et al., 1996). More

specifically, longitudinal research has resulted in the finding that children in preschool whose parents have an emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy show higher academic achievement years later in elementary school (Hooven, Gottman, & Katz, 1995). It was suggested that inherent in an emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy is a greater ability to regulate emotions in order to manage stress and parents having a greater ability to regulate emotions relates to similar abilities in their children (Hooven et al., 1995). As such, it was posited that an emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy is related to more positive and less negative interactions between parents and children, which is reflected in lower levels of stress in children (Hooven et al., 1995). Further, it was suggested that with lower levels of stress, children will be better at focusing their attention and self-soothing and through these mechanisms, children will have higher levels of academic achievement (Hooven et al., 1995). Thus, researchers believe that emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy predicts higher academic achievement in children and that academic achievement is mediated by parents' meta-emotion philosophy (Hooven et al., 1995).

### **Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Emotion Regulation**

Another child outcome that has been extensively studied in relation to parental meta-emotion philosophy is emotion regulation. Emotion regulation refers to the ability to inhibit and control emotional arousal (i.e., emotions) (Eisenberg et al., 1997). Researchers examining the relationship between emotion regulation and parental meta-emotion philosophy have found that a link exists between these variables, such that parents' meta-emotion philosophy influences the way children are socialized to experience and express emotions and impacts their ability to regulate emotions (Gottman et al., 1996). The specific relationship that researchers have found is that emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy is related to better emotion regulation abilities

in children (e.g., Dunsmore, Booker, & Ollendick, 2013; Gottman, Fainsilber-Katz, & Hooven, 1997; Gottman et al., 1996; Shortt et al., 2010). In fact, researchers have found evidence that children of parents with an emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy have a better understanding of emotions and tend to have a heightened sense of awareness of their own emotions and better emotion regulation abilities than children of parents with an emotion dismissing meta-emotion philosophy (Denham et al., 1997; Gottman et al., 1997; Gottman et al., 1996). Further extending these results, researchers have suggested that children of parents with an emotion dismissing meta-emotion philosophy have poor emotion regulation abilities and emotion coaching protects children from having difficulty with emotion regulation (Lunkenheimer et al., 2007).

The finding that parental meta-emotion philosophy is related to emotion regulation abilities in children has been evidenced in several studies involving children of various ages (i.e., ages seven to 15) and ethnicities (e.g., Cunningham, Kliewer, & Garner, 2009), and with various clinical conditions (e.g., Hurrell, Houwing, & Hudson, 2017). Thus, the notion that children of parents with an emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy have good emotion regulation abilities and children of parents with an emotion dismissing meta-emotion philosophy have more difficulty regulating emotions is well supported in research.

### **Emotion Regulation and Academic Achievement**

While parental meta-emotion philosophy has been linked to both emotion regulation and academic achievement, links have also been found between emotion regulation and academic achievement in children (e.g., Singh & Singh, 2013). More specifically, researchers have found that good emotion regulation abilities in children are related to them having higher levels of academic achievement (Graziano, Reavis, Keane, & Calkins, 2007; Gumora & Arsenio, 2002;

Kwon, Hanrahan, & Kupzyk, 2016).

### **Existing Evidence-Based Model**

Through the research that has been conducted regarding parental meta-emotion philosophy and its relationship with emotion regulation and academic achievement and the relationship between emotion regulation and academic achievement, researchers have determined that a link exists between all three of these variables. When researchers examined the relationship between parental meta-emotion philosophy and academic achievement, they determined that it was not a direct relationship, but that parental meta-emotion philosophy was operating through the emotion regulation abilities of children, such that greater emotion regulation abilities were reflected in higher academic achievement in school (Hooven et al., 1995). In other words, researchers found evidence that parental meta-emotion philosophy affects academic achievement through emotion regulation abilities (Hooven et al., 1995). Thus, researchers have identified a model that exists in which emotion coaching parental meta-emotion philosophy leads to better emotion regulation abilities in children and this predicts higher academic achievement in these children.

### **Academic Motivation**

Despite there being plenty of evidence of a relationship existing between parental meta-emotion philosophy and academic achievement in children, the relationship between parental meta-emotion philosophy and academic motivation is one that has not yet been examined in the literature (DiPerna & Elliott, 1999). Therefore, the gap in parental meta-emotion philosophy research is that academic motivation has not been explored as a potential positive child outcome.

Academic motivation can be defined as one's approach, perseverance, and interest level concerning academic subjects. In research, children's academic motivation has been defined as

encompassing the reason(s) why children engage in school endeavours as well as how they experience themselves with respect to school activities, behaviours, and emotions (Grolnick, Friendly, & Bellas, 2009). It has also been suggested that academic motivation includes children's school-related goals, perceptions regarding control over school outcomes, and beliefs concerning their abilities and the value of school endeavours (Grolnick et al., 2009).

While it has been suggested that some researchers conceptualize motivation as being a unitary construct (Burgueño, Sicilia, Medina-Casabón, Alcaraz-Ibáñez, & Lirola, 2017), others propose that there are different facets of motivation (e.g., Deci & Ryan, 2000). Specifically, certain researchers propose that motivation can be split into three distinct facets: amotivation, intrinsic motivation, and extrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Amotivation is simply defined as non-motivation or the absence of motivation to engage in an activity (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Karsenti & Thibert, 1996; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Intrinsic motivation is described as engaging in an activity simply for its inherent satisfaction, or for the enjoyment of the activity itself, rather than for a distinct consequence (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Karsenti & Thibert, 1996; Ryan & Deci, 2000). In contrast, extrinsic motivation can be described as engaging in an activity in order to obtain a distinct consequence or attain a distinct outcome (Karsenti & Thibert, 1996; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Although research on academic motivation is sparse, researchers have found evidence that a relationship exists between children's emotion regulation abilities and academic motivation (e.g., Kwon et al., 2016). More specifically, researchers have found that children with better emotion regulation abilities have higher levels of academic motivation, similar to the finding that children with better emotion regulation abilities have higher levels of academic achievement (Kwon et al., 2016). Researchers have also found a link between academic

motivation and academic achievement, as academic motivation has been identified as being an important component of academic functioning that contributes to and is positively related to academic achievement (Broussard & Garrison, 2004; Kwon et al., 2016; Lloyd & Barenblatt, 1984). It has been found that children's academic motivation predicts their academic achievement, such that higher levels of academic motivation predict higher levels of academic achievement (Spinath, Spinath, Harlaar, & Plomin, 2006; Steinmayr & Spinath, 2009). Several other studies have also provided evidence that motivation, as measured by different motivational constructs, is positively related to and explains variance in academic achievement (e.g., Gose, Wooden, & Muller, 1980; Gottfried, 1990).

Research has also resulted in the finding that the development and maintenance of children's academic motivation is the outcome of interactions between many different factors and, according to a review of the literature, one important factor that influences child academic motivation is parenting (Grolnick et al., 2009). For example, it has been found that children's motivation is most likely to prosper when parents have high expectations for and believe in the abilities of their children and when they support children's problem solving in an effort to help them develop independence (Grolnick et al., 2009). As such, it is reasonable to expect that other aspects of parenting, such as parents' meta-emotion philosophy, might also be related to children's academic motivation. Specifically, given that parents helping their children problem solve is linked to children's academic motivation, it is reasonable to expect that when parents help their children problem solve with a specific focus on emotions (i.e., emotion coaching) it may also be related to children's academic motivation. Further, given that emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy has been linked to better emotion regulation abilities in children and good emotion regulation abilities have been linked to higher levels of academic motivation in

children, it is possible that emotion coaching could be indirectly related to children's academic motivation. Said differently, it is likely that when parents teach children about emotions and help them problem solve with regard to emotions, children will develop good emotion regulation abilities, which have been linked to higher levels of academic motivation in children.

### **Proposed Theoretical Model**

Given that a model exists linking parental meta-emotion philosophy, emotion regulation, and academic achievement and both emotion regulation and academic achievement have been linked to academic motivation, I theorized that academic motivation could replace academic achievement in the existing model to create a novel model. Simply put, I theorized that children's academic motivation would be linked to parental meta-emotion philosophy via emotion regulation, just as children's academic achievement has been shown to be. More specifically, I theorized that emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy would be linked to good emotion regulation abilities in children and this would predict higher levels of academic motivation.

### **Rationale for Study**

With this proposed theoretical model in mind, my rationale for conducting this study was to fill the gap in the parental meta-emotion philosophy literature by examining academic motivation as an outcome of parental meta-emotion philosophy and emotion regulation abilities in children. More specifically, I tested the novel model I proposed in which parental meta-emotion philosophy is related to emotion regulation abilities in children and this predicts academic motivation in order to determine if these relationships do exist. I chose to examine academic motivation because it had not yet been examined as being a potential outcome of parental meta-emotion philosophy and deserved consideration, as it is an important predictor of

academic achievement in children, which is a positive child outcome. Thus, my study aimed to test this novel model and add to the literature on parental meta-emotion philosophy and its relationship with child outcomes, which are top priority in the field of school psychology.

### **Hypotheses**

Given that researchers have found evidence of a relationship between parental meta-emotion philosophy and emotion regulation, I hypothesized that emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy would be related to better emotion regulation abilities in children. I also hypothesized that emotion regulation would be related to academic motivation, such that better emotion regulation abilities in children would be related to higher levels of academic motivation in these children, as researchers have also found evidence of this relationship. Additionally, I hypothesized that parental meta-emotion philosophy would be related to academic motivation, such that emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy would be related to higher levels of academic motivation in children. Although researchers have not found evidence of this relationship, they have found evidence of a relationship between parental meta-emotion philosophy and academic achievement as well as a relationship between academic motivation and academic achievement. With this information, I extended these relationships and suggested that because academic motivation and academic achievement are linked, parental meta-emotion philosophy may be related to academic motivation in the same way it is related to academic achievement.

The final hypothesis was related to the overall model and suggested that parental meta-emotion philosophy would be related to children's emotion regulation abilities and this would predict children's academic motivation. In other words, I predicted that a model including both parental meta-emotion philosophy and emotion regulation abilities would predict academic

motivation better than parental meta-emotion philosophy or emotion regulation alone. More specifically, I hypothesized that emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy would be related to good emotion regulation abilities in children and this would predict higher levels of academic motivation in these children.

Although I expected these relationships, I examined the relations between the variables in my model using a goodness of fit framework (Thomas & Chess, 1977). Goodness of fit simply refers to the extent to which a child's characteristics match environmental demands (Thomas & Chess, 1977). There is said to be goodness of fit if child characteristics and environmental characteristics are well matched, such that the child's characteristics are sufficient enough to meet environmental demands and expectations, but if there is a mismatch between the two and the child is not able to cope with the demands of the environment, the fit is considered poor (Chess & Thomas, 1991). It has been suggested that children's developmental outcomes are related to goodness of fit, such that when there is a good fit between child characteristics and the environment, child development progresses in a favourable manner, but when the fit is poor, development progresses less favourably (Chess & Thomas, 1991).

When considering parent-child relationships, goodness of fit refers to the degree to which child and parent characteristics are well matched (Lagacé-Séguin & Coplan, 2005). In the current study, the child characteristic of interest was emotion regulation and the parent characteristic was the type of parental meta-emotion philosophy. The specific interaction I was expecting to find was that the combination of emotion coaching and children's good emotion regulation abilities would predict higher levels of academic motivation in children. Thus, I expected to find relations between parental meta-emotion philosophy and children's emotion regulation abilities and I predicted that children's academic motivation would depend on the goodness of fit between

parents' meta-emotion philosophy and children's emotion regulation abilities.

Although emotion coaching parental meta-emotion philosophy has been related to many positive child outcomes, researchers have also found evidence that it has been positively associated with anxiety in children with good emotion regulation abilities (Lagacé-Séguin & Coplan, 2005). In interpreting these results, the researchers suggested that perhaps for children with good emotion regulation abilities, emotion coaching might be the equivalent of "emotionally oversolicitous parenting" (e.g., parenting that involves excessive affection, restriction of children's behaviour, overmanagement of situations for children) that constricts a child's environment, which may in turn hinder a child's ability to develop coping strategies (Lagacé-Séguin & Coplan, 2005). As such, the researchers suggested that emotion coaching may not always be the best style to use with all children, under all circumstances, but that instead, there must be goodness of fit (Lagacé-Séguin & Coplan, 2005).

Taking all of this into consideration, the variables in the model were examined through a goodness of fit framework, as it could explain any variance in the findings that result from the fit between children's emotion regulation abilities and parental meta-emotion philosophy.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

This study involved 45 students recruited from five schools (i.e., West Riverview Elementary School, Riverview East School, Riverview Middle School, Frank L. Bowser Elementary School, and Claude D. Taylor School) in Riverview, New Brunswick, and one of their parents/caregivers. Student participants (53.3% female) were in grade four (48.9%,  $n = 22$ ), five (22.2%,  $n = 10$ ), or six (28.9%,  $n = 13$ ), and ranged in age from 9 to 12 years old (15.6% 9-year-olds, 46.7% 10-year-olds, 28.9% 11-year-olds, 8.9% 12-year-olds), with a mean age of

10.31 ( $SD = 0.85$ ). Of the student sample, 91.1 percent ( $n = 41$ ) were Caucasian/White, with an additional 2.2 percent ( $n = 1$ ) indicating African Canadian/Black ethnicity, and the remaining 6.7 percent ( $n = 3$ ) indicating Biracial/Multiracial ethnicity.

Over half of parents/caregivers were female (84.4%,  $n = 38$ ), fell between 40 to 44 (37.8%;  $n = 17$ ) or 45 to 49 (22.2%,  $n = 10$ ) years of age, and indicated that they were married (75.6%,  $n = 34$ ). Of the parent/caregiver sample, 95.6 percent ( $n = 43$ ) were Caucasian, with an additional 2.2 percent ( $n = 1$ ) indicating African Canadian/Black ethnicity, and the remaining 2.2 percent ( $n = 1$ ) indicating Asian Canadian/Asian/Pacific Islander ethnicity. Additionally, the majority of parents/caregivers indicated that the highest level of education completed was college, trade, or technical school (28.9%,  $n = 13$ ), undergraduate university (24.4%;  $n = 11$ ), or graduate university (20%;  $n = 9$ ), and most (42.2%;  $n = 19$ ) reported earning an annual income of \$90,000 or more.

Although participants received no personal incentive for participating, a book was donated to the library of all five schools from which students were recruited.

## Measures

**Demographics.** Parents were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire in which they reported their child's age, grade, gender, and race/ethnicity, in addition to reporting their own age, gender, race/ethnicity, marital status, the highest level of education they have completed, and their average household annual income (see Appendix A). Research on parental meta-emotion philosophy and children's emotion regulation abilities and academic motivation has not been overly focused on individual differences between participants, however, there is research suggesting that individual differences impact these variables (e.g., Daga et al., 2015). As such, all of these demographic questions were included in the demographic questionnaire

because there was reason to believe that these individual characteristics may have had an impact on either parental meta-emotion philosophy or children's emotion regulation abilities or academic motivation.

**Parental meta-emotion philosophy.** The 14-item Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire (PESQ, adapted from Lagacé-Séguin & Coplan, 2005, see Appendix B) was used to measure emotion coaching and emotion dismissing parental meta-emotion philosophies. The questionnaire includes a 7-item emotion coaching (e.g., “when my child is sad, it’s time to problem solve”) subscale and a 7-item emotion dismissing (e.g., “sadness is something that one has to get over, ride out, not dwell on”) subscale. Items were rated on a 5-point rating scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Each subscale yielded a total score from summing the seven responses within the subscale and dividing by seven, with higher scores denoting higher levels of emotion coaching or emotion dismissing meta-emotion philosophies, respectively. Research using various samples of mothers has provided support for the internal consistency of this questionnaire with a Cronbach’s alpha of .90 for the emotion coaching subscale and .92 for the emotion dismissing subscale (Lagacé-Séguin, 2001; Lagacé-Séguin & Coplan, 2005). Additionally, researchers have provided evidence of the questionnaire’s construct validity, as a high degree of association has been found between the PESQ and the Meta-Emotion Interview (MEI), a well-established measure of parental meta-emotion philosophy (Fainsilber-Katz & Gottman, 1999). Specifically, significant correlations have been found between the emotion coaching and emotion dismissing subscales of the PESQ and the MEI assessments of meta-emotion coaching style, with the scores from the MEI measures being highly correlated for both emotion coaching ( $r = .73$ ) and emotion dismissing ( $r = -.75$ ) philosophies on the PESQ (Lagacé-Séguin & Coplan, 2005).

**Emotion regulation.** The Children's Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ, Rothbart, 1996, see Appendix C) was used to measure children's emotion regulation abilities. The questionnaire includes a 14-item attentional focusing (e.g., "sometimes becomes absorbed in a picture book and looks at it for a long time") subscale and a 12-item attentional shifting (e.g., "can easily shift from one activity to another") subscale. The questionnaire also includes 26 items that measure behavioural regulation, but these items were not relevant to the current study. Items were rated on a 7-point rating scale from 1 (*extremely untrue of your child*) to 7 (*extremely true of your child*). A total score was obtained for each subscale by summing all responses and dividing by the number of subscale items, with higher scores indicating better emotion regulation abilities. Researchers have provided support for the internal consistency of this questionnaire with Cronbach's alphas ranging from .67 to .78 (Ahadi, Rothbart, & Ye, 1993; Lagacé-Séguin, 2001; Lagacé-Séguin & Coplan, 2005; Putnam & Rothbart, 2006; Rothbart, 1996; Rothbart, Ahadi, Hersey, & Fisher, 2001). Specifically, Cronbach's alphas as high as .75 and .78 have been found for the attentional focusing and attentional shifting subscales, respectively (Lagacé-Séguin, 2001; Lagacé-Séguin & Coplan, 2005). Researchers have also provided evidence of the CBQ subscales having good temporal stability and good construct and convergent validity and have suggested that the factor structure is consistent across cultures and age groups (Rothbart et al., 2001).

**Academic motivation.** The Elementary-School Motivation Scale (ESMS, Karsenti & Thibert, 1996, see Appendix D) was used to measure children's academic motivation. The scale is composed of five subscales, each of which reflects a different type of motivation. The five types of motivation include intrinsic motivation (i.e., engaging in an activity simply for its inherent satisfaction, or for the enjoyment of the activity itself, rather than for a distinct consequence), amotivation (i.e., non-motivation), and three types of extrinsic motivation (i.e.,

engaging in an activity in order to obtain a distinct consequence or attain a distinct outcome) that can be performed through self-regulation (Karsenti & Thibert, 1996; Ryan & Deci, 2000). The three types of extrinsic motivation include external regulation (i.e., engaging in behaviours to obtain external rewards or satisfy external pressures), introjected regulation (i.e., internalizing external controls and applying them through personal pressures to preserve self-esteem or evade guilt), and identified regulation (i.e., acknowledging behaviours as being important in order to attain outcomes that are personally valued) (Karsenti & Thibert, 1996; Ryan & Deci, 2000). The intrinsic motivation subscale contains 12 items, the amotivation subscale contains four items, the external regulation subscale contains three items, the introjected regulation subscale contains four items, and the identified regulation subscale contains five items, for a total of 28 items. Items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale, with 7 denoting maximum appropriateness. A total score was obtained for each subscale by summing all responses and dividing by the number of subscale items, with higher scores indicating higher academic motivation or amotivation.

Research with children in elementary school (i.e., grades four, five, and six) has provided support for the scale's construct validity and the internal consistency of the five subscales is high, with Cronbach's alphas ranging from .80 to .92 (Karsenti & Thibert, 1996). More specifically, Cronbach's alphas of .91, .88, .80, .90, and .92 were found for amotivation, external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, and intrinsic motivation subscales, respectively (Karsenti & Thibert, 1996). Additionally, findings from the study testing this measure replicated results obtained with similar motivation scales designed for students in high school and college (Karsenti & Thibert, 1996). Thus, support has been found for the scale's validity and reliability.

**Procedure**

After receiving consent from the director of schools to conduct research within the Anglophone East School District, principals of schools in Riverview, New Brunswick were provided with information regarding the study and were asked if they would be interested in allowing the students at their schools to participate in the study. Once principals agreed to allow their students to participate and signed consent to collect data within their schools was obtained (see Appendix E), grade four, five, and six teachers were given data packages to give to each student in their class to send home to their parents/caregivers. Data packages included an information/consent form (see Appendix F) and all measures to be completed by parents/caregivers and students. Children were asked to complete the ESMS to measure their academic motivation and parents/caregivers were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire as well as the PESQ and the CBQ to provide measures of parental meta-emotion philosophy and their child's emotion regulation abilities. Parents/caregivers and their children were asked to complete all measures and return them to school within a week of receiving them. All completed and returned packages were collected from the five schools after one week.

Given the limited amount of time available to collect data packages and the hectic nature of the last day of school, it was not possible to distribute debriefing forms to those who participated on the day that data packages were collected. However, debriefing forms (see Appendix G) were distributed on the second day of school in the fall. Additionally, parents/caregivers have had and will continue to have the option of contacting the principal of their child's school if they have any concerns or questions or want to get in contact with me.

**Results**

Before data analyses were completed, an effort was made to ensure that data was

normally distributed and all relevant assumptions were met. As expected, the naturally occurring data was normally distributed and all assumptions were met. However, it should be noted that missing data was substituted with the series mean. Data analyses were then completed in two stages: a) preliminary analyses and b) hypotheses evaluation using correlations and hierarchical regressions.

### **Preliminary Analyses**

To begin, preliminary analyses were conducted in order to provide a comprehensive description of the sample. Descriptive statistics were conducted to provide means, standard deviations, and ranges for demographic characteristics of the sample. T-tests and correlations were then run using sample characteristics and measures in order to examine any individual differences (e.g., gender differences) that may have existed in the sample. No statistically significant individual differences were found.

Correlations among all measures were then run to determine if their reliabilities align with previous research. Correlations among the variables of interest, the mean of each measure, and Cronbach's alphas are presented in Table 1. Significant positive correlations were found between external regulation and both introjected regulation ( $r = .60, p < .001$ ) and amotivation ( $r = .67, p < .001$ ), and between identified regulation and both introjected regulation ( $r = .33, p = .029$ ) and intrinsic motivation ( $r = .66, p < .001$ ). A significant negative correlation was also found between intrinsic motivation and amotivation ( $r = -.50, p < .001$ ).

Table 1

*Correlations Between Measures*

	$\bar{X}$	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. EC	3.82	0.46	(.61)								
2. ED	3.08	0.59	.04	(.73)							
3. AF	4.65	0.85	.02	-.31*	(.79)						
4. AS	4.49	0.94	.16	-.04	.21	(.83)					
5. ER	2.32	1.26	.07	.44**	-.20	-.23	(.59)				
6. InR	3.80	1.55	.16	.35*	.04	-.16	.60**	(.76)			
7. IdR	6.18	0.86	-.11	.16	.36*	.03	-.03	.33*	(.78)		
8. IM	5.31	1.10	-.05	.08	.44**	.28	-.18	.21	.66**	(.91)	
9. AM	2.36	1.25	.08	.19	-.28	-.40**	.67**	.21	-.26	-.50**	(.71)

*Note.* EC = Emotion Coaching; ED = Emotion Dismissing; AF = Attentional Focusing; AS = Attentional Shifting; ER = External Regulation; InR = Introjected Regulation; IdR = Identified Regulation; IM = Intrinsic Motivation; AM = Amotivation. Cronbach's alphas are presented on the diagonal in brackets.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

## Hypothesis Testing

### **Relationships between variables.**

#### ***Correlations between parental meta-emotion philosophy and emotion regulation.***

Correlational analyses were conducted between the two typologies of parental meta-emotion philosophy (i.e., emotion coaching and emotion dismissing) and the two emotion regulation variables (i.e., attentional focusing and attentional shifting). The results are presented in Table 2. A significant negative correlation was found between emotion dismissing parental meta-emotion philosophy and attentional focusing ( $r = -.31, p = .041$ ).

#### ***Correlations between parental meta-emotion philosophy and academic motivation.***

Correlational analyses were conducted between the five types of academic motivation (i.e., external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, intrinsic motivation, and amotivation) and both emotion coaching and emotion dismissing parental meta-emotion philosophies. The results are presented in Table 3. Significant positive correlations were found between emotion dismissing parental meta-emotion philosophy and both external regulation ( $r = .44, p = .003$ ) and introjected regulation ( $r = .35, p = .017$ ).

#### ***Correlations between emotion regulation and academic motivation.***

Correlational analyses were conducted between the two components of emotion regulation (i.e., attentional focusing and attentional shifting) and the five types of academic motivation (i.e., external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, intrinsic motivation, and amotivation). The results are presented in Table 4. Significant positive correlations were found between attentional focusing and both identified regulation ( $r = .36, p = .014$ ) and intrinsic motivation ( $r = .44, p = .002$ ) and a significant negative correlation was found between attentional shifting and amotivation ( $r = -.40, p = .006$ ).

Table 2

*Correlations Between Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Emotion Regulation*

	Emotion Regulation	
	Attentional Focusing	Attentional Shifting
	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i>
Emotion Coaching	.02	.16
Emotion Dismissing	-.31*	-.04

*Note.* \*  $p < .05$ .

Table 3

*Correlations Between Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Academic Motivation*

	Academic Motivation				
	External Regulation	Introjected Regulation	Identified Regulation	Intrinsic Motivation	Amotivation
	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i>
Emotion Coaching	.07	.16	-.11	-.05	.08
Emotion Dismissing	.44**	.35*	.16	.08	.19

*Note.* \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 4

*Correlations Between Emotion Regulation and Academic Motivation*

	Academic Motivation				
	External Regulation	Introjected Regulation	Identified Regulation	Intrinsic Motivation	Amotivation
	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i>
Attentional Focusing	-.20	.04	.36*	.44**	-.28
Attentional Shifting	-.23	-.16	.03	.28	-.40**

*Note.* \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

**Proposed model.**

To examine the proposed model, a series of three-stage hierarchical regressions were conducted. In these hierarchical regressions, meta-emotion philosophy and emotion regulation (i.e., attentional focusing or attentional shifting) were the predictor variables and academic motivation (i.e., external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, intrinsic motivation, or amotivation) was the outcome variable.

In the first set of five hierarchical regressions, each subtype of academic motivation (i.e., external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, intrinsic motivation, or amotivation) was entered as the dependent variable. For each regression, emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy was entered in the first step to determine whether it was a significant predictor of academic motivation and to determine the amount of variance in academic motivation it accounts for. In Step two, attentional focusing was entered to determine whether it was a significant predictor of academic motivation and to determine the amount of variance in academic motivation it accounts for. An interaction term was computed by multiplying emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy by attentional focusing. The interaction term emotion coaching x attentional focusing was entered in the third step to determine whether the combination of these variables significantly predicted academic motivation and to determine the amount of variation in academic motivation they account for together. Regression statistics are presented in Table 5 to Table 9.

Table 5

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Attentional Focusing Predicting External Regulation*

Criterion	Predictors	<i>B</i> ( <i>SE</i> )	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	$\Delta F$	$\Delta R^2$
ER	Step 1				0.24	.01
	EC	0.20 (0.42)	0.07	0.49		
	Step 2				1.85	.04
	EC	0.22 (0.42)	0.08	0.52		
	AF	-0.30 (0.22)	-0.21	-1.36		
	Step 3				1.36	.03
	EC	2.60 (2.09)	0.94	1.25		
	AF	1.59 (1.64)	1.08	0.97		
	EC X AF	-0.51 (0.44)	-1.57	-1.16		

*Note.* ER = External Regulation subscale from the Elementary-School Motivation Scale; EC = Emotion Coaching subscale from the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire; AF = Attentional Focusing subscale from the Children's Behavior Questionnaire.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 6

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Attentional Focusing Predicting Introjected Regulation*

Criterion	Predictors	<i>B</i> ( <i>SE</i> )	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	$\Delta F$	$\Delta R^2$
InR	Step 1				1.09	.03
	EC	0.53 (0.51)	0.16	1.04		
	Step 2				0.06	.00
	EC	0.53 (0.52)	0.16	1.03		
	AF	0.07 (0.28)	0.04	0.24		
	Step 3				1.49	.03
	EC	3.63 (2.59)	1.07	1.40		
	AF	2.53 (2.04)	1.39	1.24		
	EC X AF	-0.67 (0.55)	-1.66	-1.22		

*Note.* InR = Introjected Regulation subscale from the Elementary-School Motivation Scale; EC = Emotion Coaching subscale from the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire; AF = Attentional Focusing subscale from the Children’s Behavior Questionnaire.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 7

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Attentional Focusing Predicting Identified Regulation*

Criterion	Predictors	<i>B</i> ( <i>SE</i> )	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	$\Delta F$	$\Delta R^2$
IdR	Step 1				0.50	.01
	EC	-0.20 (0.29)	-0.11	-0.71		
	Step 2				6.62**	.14
	EC	-0.22 (0.27)	-0.12	-0.81		
	AF	0.37 (0.15)	0.37	2.57*		
	Step 3				0.42	.01
	EC	-1.08 (1.37)	-0.57	-0.79		
	AF	-0.32 (1.08)	-0.31	-0.29		
	EC X AF	0.19 (0.29)	0.83	0.65		

*Note.* IdR = Identified Regulation subscale from the Elementary-School Motivation Scale; EC = Emotion Coaching subscale from the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire; AF = Attentional Focusing subscale from the Children’s Behavior Questionnaire.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 8

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Attentional Focusing Predicting Intrinsic Motivation*

Criterion	Predictors	<i>B</i> ( <i>SE</i> )	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	$\Delta F$	$\Delta R^2$
IM	Step 1				0.11	.00
	EC	-0.12 (0.37)	-0.05	-0.33		
	Step 2				10.25**	.20
	EC	-0.15 (0.34)	-0.06	-0.43		
	AF	0.58 (0.18)	0.44	3.20**		
	Step 3				0.04*	.00
	EC	0.17 (1.71)	0.07	0.10		
	AF	0.83 (1.35)	0.64	0.61		
	EC X AF	-0.07 (0.36)	-0.24	-0.19		

*Note.* IM = Intrinsic Motivation subscale from the Elementary-School Motivation Scale; EC = Emotion Coaching subscale from the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire; AF = Attentional Focusing subscale from the Children's Behavior Questionnaire.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 9

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Attentional Focusing Predicting Amotivation*

Criterion	Predictors	<i>B</i> ( <i>SE</i> )	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	$\Delta F$	$\Delta R^2$
AM	Step 1				0.27	.01
	EC	0.22 (0.42)	0.08	0.52		
	Step 2				3.57	.08
	EC	0.23 (0.41)	0.08	0.57		
	AF	-0.41 (0.22)	-0.28	-1.89		
	Step 3				4.48*	.09
	EC	4.31 (1.97)	1.57	2.19*		
	AF	2.84 (1.55)	1.92	1.83		
	EC X AF	-0.88 (0.41)	-2.70	-2.12*		

*Note.* AM = Amotivation subscale from the Elementary-School Motivation Scale; EC = Emotion Coaching subscale from the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire; AF = Attentional Focusing subscale from the Children's Behavior Questionnaire.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

As can be seen in Table 5, adding the interaction term in Step three of the regression accounted for an additional 3 percent of variation in external regulation and this change in  $R^2$  was not significant,  $F(3, 41) = 1.16, p = .339$ . Similarly, Table 6 shows that the addition of the interaction term in Step three accounted for an additional 3.4 percent of variation in introjected regulation and this change in  $R^2$  was not significant,  $F(3, 41) = 0.87, p = .464$ . Additionally, as can be seen in Table 7, introducing the interaction term in Step three accounted for an additional 0.9 percent of variation in identified regulation and this change in  $R^2$  was not significant,  $F(3, 41) = 2.50, p = .073$ .

However, Table 8 shows that introducing the interaction term to the regression model in Step three accounted for an additional 0.1 percent of the variance in intrinsic motivation and this change in  $R^2$  was significant,  $F(3, 41) = 3.39, p = .027$ . To examine the interaction, participants were separated at the median and follow-up correlational analyses were conducted separately for individuals high in attentional focusing and low in attentional focusing. Results suggest that when participants are separated into high attentional focusing ( $r = -.04, p = .827$ ) and low attentional focusing ( $r = .15, p = .700$ ) groups, the correlations between emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy and intrinsic motivation were not statistically significant.

As can be seen in Table 9, introducing the interaction term in Step three accounted for an additional 9 percent of variance in amotivation and this change in  $R^2$  was significant,  $F(3, 41) = 2.88, p = .047$ . To examine the interaction, participants were separated at the median and follow-up correlational analyses were conducted separately for individuals high in attentional focusing and low in attentional focusing. Results suggest that when participants are separated into high attentional focusing ( $r = -.13, p = .435$ ) and low attentional focusing ( $r = .45, p = .230$ ) groups,

the correlations between emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy and amotivation were not statistically significant.

In the second set of five hierarchical regressions, again, each subtype of academic motivation (i.e., external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, intrinsic motivation, or amotivation) was entered as the dependent variable. For each regression, emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy was entered in the first step to determine whether it was a significant predictor of academic motivation and to determine the amount of variance in academic motivation it accounts for. In Step two, attentional shifting was entered to determine whether it was a significant predictor of academic motivation and to determine the amount of variance in academic motivation it accounts for. An interaction term was computed by multiplying emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy by attentional shifting. The interaction term emotion coaching x attentional shifting was entered in the third step to determine whether the combination of these variables significantly predicted academic motivation and to determine the amount of variation in academic motivation they account for together. Regression statistics are presented in Table 10 to Table 14.

Table 10

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Attentional Shifting Predicting External Regulation*

Criterion	Predictors	<i>B</i> ( <i>SE</i> )	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	$\Delta F$	$\Delta R^2$
ER	Step 1				0.24	.01
	EC	0.20 (0.42)	0.07	0.49		
	Step 2				2.71	.06
	EC	0.31 (0.42)	0.11	0.75		
	AS	-0.33 (0.20)	-0.25	-1.65		
	Step 3				0.02	.00
	EC	0.69 (2.45)	0.25	0.28		
	AS	-0.02 (2.07)	-0.01	-0.01		
	EC X AS	-0.08 (0.52)	-0.29	-0.15		

*Note.* ER = External Regulation subscale from the Elementary-School Motivation Scale; EC = Emotion Coaching subscale from the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire; AS = Attentional Shifting subscale from the Children's Behavior Questionnaire.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 11

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Attentional Shifting Predicting Introjected Regulation*

Criterion	Predictors	<i>B</i> ( <i>SE</i> )	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	$\Delta F$	$\Delta R^2$
InR	Step 1				1.09	.03
	EC	0.53 (0.51)	0.16	1.04		
	Step 2				1.49	.03
	EC	0.63 (0.52)	0.19	1.23		
	AS	-0.31 (0.25)	-0.19	-1.22		
	Step 3				0.99	.02
	EC	3.56 (2.99)	1.05	1.19		
	AS	2.19 (2.53)	1.33	0.87		
	EC X AS	-0.64 (0.64)	-1.86	-0.99		

*Note.* InR = Introjected Regulation subscale from the Elementary-School Motivation Scale; EC = Emotion Coaching subscale from the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire; AS = Attentional Shifting subscale from the Children’s Behavior Questionnaire.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 12

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Attentional Shifting Predicting Identified Regulation*

Criterion	Predictors	<i>B</i> ( <i>SE</i> )	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	$\Delta F$	$\Delta R^2$
IdR	Step 1				0.50	.01
	EC	-0.20 (0.29)	-0.11	-0.71		
	Step 2				0.10	.00
	EC	-0.22 (0.29)	-0.12	-0.74		
	AS	0.04 (0.14)	0.05	0.31		
	Step 3				0.00	.00
	EC	-0.30 (1.72)	-0.16	-0.17		
	AS	-0.03 (1.46)	-0.03	-0.02		
	EC X AS	0.02 (0.37)	0.09	0.05		

*Note.* IdR = Identified Regulation subscale from the Elementary-School Motivation Scale; EC = Emotion Coaching subscale from the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire; AS = Attentional Shifting subscale from the Children’s Behavior Questionnaire.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 13

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Attentional Shifting Predicting Intrinsic Motivation*

Criterion	Predictors	<i>B</i> ( <i>SE</i> )	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	$\Delta F$	$\Delta R^2$
IM	Step 1				0.11	.00
	EC	-0.12 (0.37)	-0.05	-0.33		
	Step 2				3.86	.08
	EC	-0.24 (0.36)	-0.10	-0.65		
	AS	0.35 (0.18)	0.29	1.97		
	Step 3				0.01	.00
	EC	-0.00 (2.13)	-0.00	-0.00		
	AS	0.55 (1.80)	0.46	0.30		
	EC X AS	-0.05 (0.46)	-0.21	-0.11		

*Note.* IM = Intrinsic Motivation subscale from the Elementary-School Motivation Scale; EC = Emotion Coaching subscale from the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire; AS = Attentional Shifting subscale from the Children's Behavior Questionnaire.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 14

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emotion Coaching Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Attentional Shifting Predicting Amotivation*

Criterion	Predictors	<i>B</i> ( <i>SE</i> )	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	$\Delta F$	$\Delta R^2$
AM	Step 1				0.27	.01
	EC	0.22 (0.42)	0.08	0.52		
	Step 2				9.04**	.18
	EC	0.40 (0.39)	0.15	1.03		
	AS	-0.57 (0.19)	-0.43	-3.01**		
	Step 3				0.86*	.02
	EC	2.46 (2.26)	0.90	1.09		
	AS	1.19 (1.91)	0.89	0.62		
	EC X AS	-0.45 (0.48)	-1.62	-0.93		

*Note.* AM = Amotivation subscale from the Elementary-School Motivation Scale; EC = Emotion Coaching subscale from the Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire; AS = Attentional Shifting subscale from the Children's Behavior Questionnaire.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

As can be seen in Table 10, adding the interaction term to the regression model in Step three accounted for an additional 0.1 percent of the variation in external regulation and this change in  $R^2$  was not significant,  $F(3, 41) = 0.97, p = .416$ . Similarly, Table 11 shows that adding the interaction term to the regression model in Step three accounted for an additional 2.2 percent of the variation in introjected regulation and this change in  $R^2$  was not significant,  $F(3, 41) = 1.91, p = .325$ . As shown in Table 12, adding the interaction term to the regression model in Step three did not account for any additional variance in identified regulation and this change in  $R^2$  was not significant,  $F(3, 41) = 0.19, p = .901$ . Additionally, adding the interaction term to the regression model in Step three did not account for any additional variance in intrinsic motivation and this change in  $R^2$  was not significant,  $F(3, 41) = 1.30, p = .288$ , as can be seen in Table 13. However, as can be seen in Table 14, introducing the interaction term to the regression model in Step three explained an additional 1.7 percent of the variation in amotivation and this change in  $R^2$  was significant,  $F(3, 41) = 3.39, p = .027$ . To examine the interaction, participants were separated at the median and follow-up correlational analyses were conducted separately for individuals high in attentional shifting and low in attentional shifting. Results suggest that when participants are separated into high attentional shifting ( $r = .05, p = .768$ ) and low attentional shifting ( $r = .27, p = .403$ ) groups, the correlations between emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy and amotivation were not statistically significant.

### **Discussion**

The purpose of the study was to fill a gap in current literature by examining a model hypothesizing that parental meta-emotion philosophy is related to children's emotion regulation abilities and this relationship predicts children's academic motivation. Four key findings are of notable mention. First, while emotion coaching parental meta-emotion philosophy was not

related to children's emotion regulation abilities, links were found between emotion dismissing parental meta-emotion philosophy and children's emotion regulation abilities. Second, although emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy was not related to children's academic motivation, emotion dismissing meta-emotion philosophy was. Third, children's emotion regulation abilities were related to their academic motivation. Fourth, the combination of emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy and children's emotion regulation abilities predicted children's academic motivation and amotivation. These findings are expanded on below.

### **Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Emotion Regulation**

Past researchers have consistently demonstrated that emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy is related to better emotion regulation abilities in children (e.g., Cunningham et al., 2009; Gottman et al., 1996; Hurrell et al., 2017). Given these findings, correlational analyses were undertaken to test the hypothesis that emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy would be related to better emotion regulation abilities in children. Although positive correlations were found between emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy and both aspects of emotion regulation (i.e., attentional focusing and attentional shifting) in the current study, the correlations were not significant. This suggests that parents' emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy was not related to children's emotion regulation abilities in the study's sample. Thus, the current study was not successful in supporting this hypothesis and replicating past results. In interpreting these results, it is possible that in the current sample, parents engaging in emotion coaching prevented children from developing emotion regulation skills. Specifically, it is possible that with their parents consistently providing assistance with emotions and helping problem solve with regard to emotions, children became reliant on their parents to help them when negative emotions arose. With their parents to lean on, these children may not have been motivated to

develop the skills that would enable them to regulate their emotions unaided and are therefore now unable to regulate their emotions well without parent support.

Researchers have also found that children of parents with an emotion dismissing meta-emotion philosophy have poor emotion regulation abilities (e.g., Lunkenheimer et al., 2007). The current study was successful in replicating these results, as a significant negative correlation was found between emotion dismissing meta-emotion philosophy and the attentional focusing aspect of emotion regulation. This indicates that the more emotion dismissing parents engage in, the more difficulty their children have focusing their attention on tasks and, more broadly, regulating emotions. This relationship is not surprising, as it is reasonable to expect that if parents deny or ignore their child's negative emotions and distract their child when they occur, their child will experience more difficulty developing the skills necessary to regulate these emotions (Gottman et al., 1996). In order to develop emotion regulation skills, a child must not ignore or be distracted from their emotions, but explore them and learn how to appropriately deal with them.

### **Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy and Academic Motivation**

Past researchers have also demonstrated that children of parents with an emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy have higher levels of academic achievement (e.g., Hooven et al., 1995) and higher levels of academic motivation in children predict higher levels of academic achievement (e.g., Kwon et al., 2016; Steinmayr & Spinath, 2009). Given the evidence of the relationship between parental meta-emotion philosophy and academic achievement and between academic motivation and academic achievement, these relationships were extended and it was hypothesized that parental meta-emotion philosophy could be related to academic motivation in the same way it is related to academic achievement. Correlational analyses were run in order to test the hypothesis that emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy would be related to higher

levels of academic motivation in children.

Contrary to expectations, the current study did not find that an emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy was significantly related to children's academic motivation. However, significant positive correlations were found between emotion dismissing meta-emotion philosophy and two forms of extrinsic motivation (i.e., external regulation and introjected regulation). This indicates that when parents have an emotion dismissing meta-emotion philosophy, their children are more likely to engage in an activity in order to obtain a specific consequence or attain a specific outcome.

The positive correlation between emotion dismissing meta-emotion philosophy and external regulation suggests that when children are exposed to emotion dismissing, they are more likely to engage in behaviours in order to obtain external rewards or satisfy external pressures (Karsenti & Thibert, 1996; Ryan & Deci, 2000). In terms of academic motivation, this suggests that children of parents with an emotion dismissing meta-emotion philosophy are more likely to be extrinsically academically motivated in the sense that they go to school in order to obtain a tangible reward (e.g., a grading gift) or because their parents make them and/or they want to avoid confrontations or being disciplined (Karsenti & Thibert, 1996).

The positive correlation between emotion dismissing meta-emotion philosophy and introjected regulation suggests that when children are exposed to emotion dismissing, they are more likely to internalize external controls and apply them through personal pressures to preserve self-esteem or evade guilt (Karsenti & Thibert, 1996; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Considering academic motivation, this suggests that children of parents with an emotion dismissing meta-emotion philosophy are more likely to be extrinsically academically motivated, such that they go to school because they are afraid of and want to avoid obtaining poor grades or failing the school

year and/or because they feel guilty when they stay home (Karsenti & Thibert, 1996).

In interpreting these relationships, it is possible that children with parents who deny their negative emotions and teach them that negative emotions should be ignored and avoided are more likely to try to avoid experiencing these emotions themselves and evoking them in others. As such, these children might go to school because they do not want to make their parents or teachers angry, as it may result in discipline that may cause them to experience anger and/or sadness themselves (i.e., external regulation). In an additional effort to avoid negative emotions, these children might also attempt to elicit positive emotions by expecting a reward for going to school, for example. Additionally, obtaining poor grades or failing the school year is likely to evoke a range of negative emotions in both children and parents, so these children may be motivated to go to school to avoid these fates and feel guilty when they do not go to school, as it may increase the likelihood of these scenarios becoming a reality (i.e., introjected regulation).

### **Emotion Regulation and Academic Motivation**

The relationship between children's emotion regulation abilities and academic motivation was also considered, as researchers have found that children with better emotion regulation abilities have higher levels of academic motivation (e.g., Kwon et al., 2016). Correlational analyses were run to test the hypothesis that better emotion regulation abilities in children would be related to higher levels of academic motivation. This hypothesis was supported, as significant positive correlations were found between attentional focusing (i.e., emotion regulation) and both intrinsic motivation and a type of extrinsic motivation (i.e., identified regulation).

The positive correlation between attentional focusing and intrinsic motivation suggests that the better children are at focusing their attention on specific tasks, and in general, regulating their emotions, the more likely they are to engage in an activity simply for its inherent

satisfaction or for the enjoyment of the activity itself. This suggests that the better attentional focusing or emotion regulation abilities children have, the more likely that they go to school because they like school and enjoy learning, being knowledgeable, and being challenged (Karsenti & Thibert, 1996). These children are eager to learn more and are more likely to go to school for the mere satisfaction of succeeding there and feeling good when they complete schoolwork (Karsenti & Thibert, 1996). Considering attentional focusing, it is possible that when students are able to focus their attention on academic tasks with little difficulty, completing the tasks may be less challenging and this may result in them enjoying the tasks and more generally, enjoying the process of learning, which translates into being intrinsically academically motivated. Looking more broadly at emotion regulation abilities, it is possible that children who are able to effectively regulate their emotions do not have to worry about the possibility of experiencing negative emotions at school and not being able to regulate them, which could result in an emotional outburst. Without this anxiety present, children are free to enjoy the learning experience and are perhaps more likely to feel good about being at school. Conversely, students who have difficulty regulating their emotions may be anxious about this possibility, as it has perhaps happened in the past, and this may hinder their ability to enjoy school. Additionally, if emotional outbursts have happened in the past, it is possible that these experiences and the reactions of others have caused them to have a negative view of school and the learning environment. As such, these children may be less likely to be intrinsically motivated to be at school and instead may be extrinsically motivated or even unmotivated.

The positive correlation between attentional focusing and identified regulation suggests that the better children are at focusing their attention on tasks and in general regulating their emotions, the more likely they are to acknowledge that certain behaviours are important in order

to attain outcomes that are personally valued (Karsenti & Thibert, 1996; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

This translates into academic motivation such that children with better attentional focusing and emotion regulation abilities are more likely to go to school because they want to pass their school year, but also because they understand that school is important, as it will enable them to have a better future (Karsenti & Thibert, 1996). These children are more likely to go to school because in the future, they want to make a good living and succeed in the career they choose (Karsenti & Thibert, 1996). It is possible that this is the case because when children have good attentional focusing abilities, they are able to focus their attention on tasks in front of them with minimal effort, which enables them to challenge themselves by putting their energy into focusing their attention on things not directly in front of them. For example, while students with poor attentional focusing abilities might need to put all of their effort into focusing their attention on completing an assignment that is due, students with good attentional focusing abilities may be more likely to focus on passing the school year and having a successful future. More generally, it is possible that students with better emotion regulation abilities are aware that they possess the skills necessary to control their emotions and may be more likely to want to have control over other aspects of their life as well, including their schooling and how it impacts their future.

Support was also found for a relationship existing between emotion regulation abilities and academic motivation, as a significant negative correlation was found between attentional shifting and amotivation. This indicates that the poorer children are at shifting from one task to another and regulating their emotions, the less likely they are to be motivated. This suggests that children with poor emotion regulation abilities are more likely to be unmotivated to go to school, be unsure of why they go to school, feel like they are wasting their time at school, and just want to get school over with (Karsenti & Thibert, 1996). It is possible that when children are not able

to easily shift their attention from one task to another, they have difficulty in school, as there is an expectation that children shift their attention between subjects, tasks, and concepts. As such, these children likely become easily frustrated in school, which may result in them being academically unmotivated. Additionally, as mentioned earlier, it is possible that when children have difficulty regulating their emotions, they experience or are afraid of experiencing emotional outbursts at school. As such, it is likely that there is more energy and motivation put into trying to regulate emotions than into academics and it is possible that due to past emotional outbursts, the child has a negative view of school, which may translate into academic amotivation.

### **Parental Meta-Emotion Philosophy, Emotion Regulation, and Academic Motivation**

Given that parental meta-emotion philosophy, emotion regulation, and academic achievement have all been linked in a model and emotion regulation and academic achievement have been linked to academic motivation, it was theorized that academic motivation could replace academic achievement in the existing model to create a novel model. Additionally, as parenting in general and parents supporting children's problem solving have been shown to influence children's academic motivation, it was expected that other aspects of parenting, such as parents helping their children problem solve with regard to emotions (i.e., emotion coaching), would also be related to children's academic motivation. Further, as emotion coaching has been linked to better emotion regulation abilities in children and good emotion regulation abilities have been linked to higher levels of academic motivation in children, it was theorized that an emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy would be linked to good emotion regulation abilities in children and this would predict higher levels of academic motivation. Hierarchical regressions were conducted to test this hypothesis. It was expected that parental meta-emotion philosophy and emotion regulation would be significant predictors of academic motivation and the

interaction between these variables would better predict and account for a larger proportion of variance in academic motivation than either variable would individually.

Contrary to expectations, it was found that the interaction between emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy and children's emotion regulation abilities did not predict or impact children's academic motivation in many cases. Specifically, the combination of emotion coaching and attentional focusing did not significantly predict external regulation, introjected regulation, or identified regulation. Similarly, the combination of emotion coaching and attentional shifting did not significantly predict external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, or intrinsic motivation. This indicates that parents having an emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy was not linked to children having better emotion regulation abilities and this did not predict higher levels of academic motivation in children. These findings did not align with previous literature suggesting that emotion coaching is linked to good emotion regulation abilities in children, parenting practices such as helping a child problem solve are linked to higher levels of academic motivation in children, and good emotion regulation abilities in children are linked to them having higher levels of academic motivation.

However, it was found that the combination of emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy and attentional focusing significantly predicted intrinsic motivation, but not in the direction that was expected. More specifically, it was found that when parents have an emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy and children have good attentional focusing or emotion regulation abilities, children are less likely to be intrinsically motivated. It was also found that the combination of emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy and attentional shifting significantly predicted amotivation, but again, not in the direction that was expected. Specifically, it was found that when parents have an emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy

and children have good attentional shifting abilities, they are more likely to be unmotivated.

In interpreting these results, it is possible that the lack of significant findings and these unexpected findings were the result of the goodness of fit between parents' emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy and children's emotion regulation abilities being poor. Specifically, although good attentional focusing abilities are related to increased intrinsic motivation and good attentional shifting abilities are related to lower levels of academic amotivation, it is possible that for children in the sample with good emotion regulation abilities, emotion coaching led to anxiety, similar to results found by Lagacé-Séguin (2001) and Lagacé-Séguin and Coplan (2005). As explained by the researchers, for children with good emotion regulation abilities, emotion coaching mirrors "emotionally oversolicitous parenting", which constricts children's environment and may hinder their ability to develop coping strategies (Lagacé-Séguin, 2001; Lagacé-Séguin & Coplan, 2005). If this is the case, this could explain why the combination of emotion coaching and children's good emotion regulation abilities did not predict children's academic motivation, predicted amotivation, or predicted decreased intrinsic motivation, as a negative correlation has been found between anxiety and academic motivation (Gottfried, 1982). However, it is important to note that these findings do not suggest that emotion coaching has a negative impact on children's academic motivation, they merely suggest that when child and parent characteristics are not well matched, it can have a negative impact on children's outcomes. As elaborated on below, it is possible that these results were a product of factors such as the study's sample and measures and that with a different sample and different measures, this hypothesis could be supported and emotion coaching could be positively related to children's academic motivation.

Despite the unexpected and lack of significant findings, it was found that the combination

of emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy and attentional focusing significantly predicted amotivation. Specifically, results suggest that when parents have an emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy and children have good attentional focusing abilities, children are less likely to be academically unmotivated. In interpreting these results, it is possible that when children are exposed to emotion coaching, it enables them to develop better attentional focusing or emotion regulation abilities and this combination protects them from being academically unmotivated. Specifically, when parents validate children's emotions, teach children about emotions, and help children problem solve with regard to emotions, children are likely to develop emotion regulation abilities such as attentional focusing, and with the ability to focus attention and regulate emotions, it is reasonable to expect that school will be less challenging and, as such, there will be less reason for a child to be academically unmotivated.

### **Limitations and Future Directions**

Although this study was successful in replicating past results and making new discoveries, there were also several unexpected non-significant results that may have been the result of artifacts that existed within the study.

One limitation of the study may have been related to the sample of participants. Given that data could only be collected during the last week of school, which is a hectic time, the response rate was lower than expected. Although over 550 data packages were distributed, only 45 were returned, which resulted in a relatively small sample size. This may have occurred because people did not feel they had enough time to fill out the questionnaires. It is also possible that those who did fill out the questionnaires were busy and in an effort to finish quickly, did not put considerable thought into their answers. Additionally, participants were all recruited from a small town in New Brunswick, resulting in a sample that greatly lacked diversity, both ethnically

and financially. As such, the sample may not have been representative of all families.

Researchers report differences in the application of emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy as a function of child age. For example, it has been found that mothers engage in more emotion coaching with younger children and this may be because parents expect that children be able to regulate their emotions as they age, so less emotion regulation support is given (Daga et al., 2015; Eisenberg, Cumberland, & Spinrad, 1998). As such, it may be found that younger and older children differ in their emotion regulation abilities. Specifically, it is possible that older children would have poorer emotion regulation abilities, as they are not receiving as much emotion coaching.

In addition to emotion coaching, academic motivation also differs as a function of ethnicity and perhaps age. For example, Urdan and Bruchmann (2018) provide evidence that students from various ethnic groups differ in levels of academic motivation as a function of a variety of variables (e.g., values, ethnic identity, teacher beliefs and expectations). Additionally, it is possible that grade six students in middle school are more mature and are academically motivated for different reasons than students in grade four. Perhaps students in grade six are beginning to realize that schooling impacts one's future, whereas students in grade four go to school to get a grading gift. As the sample was primarily 10-year-old grade four students and was not ethnically diverse, it is possible that if the sample had been more diverse, there may have been more variability in academic motivation. Regardless of the results, having a more representative sample will increase the generalizability of the findings.

The measures used in the study may have been subject to some limitations. The external regulation subscale of the ESMS and the emotion coaching subscale of the PESQ had low internal consistency reliabilities in the present sample. This may serve to attenuate relationships

between the variables of interest, making the correlations obtained smaller than what may have been expected. Future researchers should explore different measures of parental meta-emotion philosophy and academic motivation, as they may garner different results.

### **Implications and Contributions**

Notwithstanding limitations and the inability to support some hypotheses and find what was expected, this study resulted in many interesting and potentially influential findings.

Unlike many other child outcomes, academic motivation had not previously been examined as a possible child outcome resulting from parental meta-emotion philosophy. As such, the information my study yielded concerning academic motivation is novel, contributes to existing literature on parental meta-emotion philosophy and its association with child outcomes, and helps fill the gap in the literature. Although emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy was not directly related to children's academic motivation, the combination of emotion coaching and children having good attentional focusing (i.e., emotion regulation) abilities predicted that children are less likely to be academically unmotivated. Additionally, it was found that when parents engage in emotion dismissing, their children are more likely to be extrinsically academically motivated and have difficulty with attentional focusing and regulating emotions.

Despite some unanticipated findings, results indicate that a relationship does exist between parental meta-emotion philosophy and child emotion regulation and academic motivation, which further strengthens the argument that parental meta-emotion philosophy is an important predictor of positive child outcomes. As such, results should communicate to parents the importance of understanding and being aware of their own emotions, as it can help them understand and be aware of their children's emotions and teach their children about emotions, which, along with children having good attentional focusing abilities, can help protect them from

being academically unmotivated. Results also provide parents with insight into how to help their children become academically motivated. Specifically, parents should be encouraged to help their children develop emotion regulation skills, as results indicate that when children have good emotion regulation abilities, they are more likely to be extrinsically and intrinsically academically motivated and less likely to be academically unmotivated.

In general, results contribute to literature suggesting that interventions be created that are aimed at changing parents' philosophies, attitudes, and experiences with emotion, in addition to teaching strategies for emotionally coaching their children, as parents adopting a parental meta-emotion philosophy is likely to have widespread effects on children's cognitive, social, and emotional development (Havighurst, Wilson, Harley, & Prior, 2009; Havighurst, Wilson, Harley, Prior, & Kehoe, 2010; Hooven et al., 1995). However, results also suggest that emotion coaching may not be the best emotion socialization approach to use with all children, under all circumstances, as it could lead to adverse outcomes for children (Lagacé-Séguin & Coplan, 2005). Instead, there must be a good fit between parents' emotion socialization practices and children's existing emotion regulation abilities. As such, results suggest that professionals such as school psychologists who work with parents and children should communicate to parents the importance of helping children develop emotion regulation abilities. Additionally, as long as children's existing emotion regulation abilities will allow for a good fit, they should also encourage parents to develop an emotion coaching meta-emotion philosophy in order to positively influence children's outcomes.

## **Conclusion**

The current study aimed to add to the current literature on parental meta-emotion philosophy by replicating past results and demonstrating that a link exists between parental meta-

emotion philosophy and children's academic motivation. This study was the first to explore how parental meta-emotion philosophy impacts children's academic motivation and how children's emotion regulation abilities influence this relationship. The study was successful in replicating some past results, such as the positive relationship between children's emotion regulation abilities and their academic motivation, however, some hypotheses were not supported.

The findings from this study should be combined with the findings of future studies that take the recommendations provided and continue searching for answers. If this occurs and existing studies are also taken into consideration, perhaps significant progress can be made so that parental meta-emotion philosophy becomes a household name and the backbone of parenting in households around the world, as there is no lack of research to support that in many circumstances this has the potential to elicit significant positive change.

References

- Ahadi, S. A., Rothbart, M. K., & Ye, R. (1993). Children's temperament in the US and China: Similarities and differences. *European Journal of Personality, 7*(5), 359-377. doi: 10.1002/per.2410070506
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology, 4*, 1-103. doi: 10.1037/h0030372
- Broussard, S. C., & Garrison, M. B. (2004). The relationship between classroom motivation and academic achievement in elementary-school-aged children. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 33*(2), 106-120. doi: 10.1177/1077727X04269573
- Burgueño, R., Sicilia, Á., Medina-Casabón, J., Alcaraz-Ibáñez, M., & Lirola, M. (2017). Academic Motivation Scale revised inclusion of integrated regulation to measure motivation in initial teacher education. *Anales De Psicología, 33*(3), 670-679. doi: 10.6018/analesps.33.3.249601
- Chess, S., & Thomas, A. (1991). Temperament and the concept of goodness of fit. In J. Strelau & A. Angleitner (Eds.), *Explorations in temperament: International perspectives on theory and measurement* (pp. 15-28). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Cunningham, J. N., Kliewer, W., & Garner, P. W. (2009). Emotion socialization, child emotion understanding and regulation, and adjustment in urban African American families: Differential associations across child gender. *Development and Psychopathology, 21*(1), 261-283. doi: 10.1017/S0954579409000157
- Daga, S. S., Raval, V. V., & Raj, S. P. (2015). Maternal meta-emotion and child socioemotional functioning in immigrant Indian and White American families. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, 6*(3), 233-241. doi: 10.1037/aap0000014

- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behaviour. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227-268. doi: 10.1207/S15327965PLI1104\_01
- Denham, S. A., Mitchell-Copeland, J., Strandberg, K., Auerbach, S., & Blair, K. (1997). Parental contributions to preschoolers' emotional competence: Direct and indirect effects. *Motivation and Emotion, 21*(1), 65-86. doi: 10.1023/A:1024426431247
- DiPerna, J. C., & Elliott, S. N. (1999). Development and validation of the Academic Competence Evaluation Scales. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 17*(3), 207-225. doi: 10.1177/073428299901700302
- Dunsmore, J. C., Booker, J. A., & Ollendick, T. H. (2013). Parental emotion coaching and child emotion regulation as protective factors for children with oppositional defiant disorder. *Social Development, 22*(3), 444-466. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2011.00652.x
- Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., & Spinrad, T. L. (1998). Parental socialization of emotion. *Psychological Inquiry, 9*(4), 241-273. doi: 10.1207/s15327965pli0904\_1
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Shepard, S. A., Murphy, B. C., Guthrie, I. K., Jones, S., ... Maszk, P. (1997). Contemporaneous and longitudinal prediction of children's social functioning from regulation and emotionality. *Child Development, 68*(4), 642-664. doi: 10.2307/1132116
- Fainsilber-Katz, L., & Gottman, J. (1999). *Parent Meta-Emotion Interview*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington.
- Gose, A., Wooden, S., & Muller, D. (1980). The relative potential of self-concept and intelligence as predictors of achievement. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 104*(2), 279-287.

- Gottfried, A. E. (1982). Relationships between academic intrinsic motivation and anxiety in children and young adolescents. *Journal of School Psychology, 20*(3), 205-215. doi: 10.1016/0022-4405(82)90050-4
- Gottfried, A. E. (1990). Academic intrinsic motivation in young elementary school children. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(3), 525-538. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.82.3.525
- Gottman, J., & Declaire, J. (1997). *Raising an emotionally intelligent child: The heart of parenting*. New York: Fireside.
- Gottman, J., Fainsilber-Katz, L., & Hooven, C. (1997). *Meta-emotion: How families communicate emotionally*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gottman, J. M., Katz, L. F., & Hooven, C. (1996). Parental meta-emotion philosophy and the emotional life of families: Theoretical models and preliminary data. *Journal of Family Psychology, 10*, 243-268. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.10.3.243
- Graziano, P. A., Reavis, R. D., Keane, S. P., & Calkins, S. D. (2007). The role of emotion regulation in children's early academic success. *Journal of School Psychology, 45*(1), 3-19. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2006.09.002
- Grolnick, W. S., Friendly, R. W., & Bellas, V. M. (2009). Parenting and children's motivation at school. In K. R. Wenzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 279-300). New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Gumora, G., & Arsenio, W. F. (2002). Emotionality, emotion regulation, and school performance in middle school children. *Journal of School Psychology, 40*(5), 395-413. doi: 10.1016/S0022-4405(02)00108-5
- Havighurst, S. S., Wilson, K. R., Harley, A. E., & Prior, M. R. (2009). Tuning into kids: An emotion-focused parenting program—Initial findings from a community trial. *Journal of*

- Community Psychology*, 37(8), 1008-1023. doi: 10.1002/jcop.20345
- Havighurst, S. S., Wilson, K. R., Harley, A. E., Prior, M. R., & Kehoe, C. (2010). Tuning in to kids: Improving emotion socialization practices in parents of preschool children – Findings from a community trial. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 51(12), 1342-1350. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2010.02303.x
- Hooven, C., Gottman, J. M., & Katz, L. F. (1995). Parental meta-emotion structure predicts family and child outcomes. *Cognition and Emotion*, 9, 229-264. doi: 10.1080/02699939508409010
- Hurrell, K. E., Houwing, F. L., & Hudson, J. L. (2017). Parental meta-emotion philosophy and emotion coaching in families of children and adolescents with an anxiety disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 45(3), 569-582. doi: 10.1007/s10802-016-0180-6
- Johnson, B. D., Berdahl, L. D., Horne, M., Richter, E. A., & Walters, M. (2014). A parenting competency model. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 14(2), 92-120. doi: 10.1080/15295192.2014.914361
- Karsenti, T. P., & Thibert, G. (1996, April 8-12). *A motivation scale for elementary-school children: Refining the extrinsic/intrinsic dichotomy*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.
- Kwon, K., Hanrahan, A. R., & Kupzyk, K. A. (2016). Emotional expressivity and emotion regulation: Relation to academic functioning among elementary school children. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 32(1), 75-88. doi: 10.1037/spq0000166
- Lagacé-Séguin, D. G. (2001). *Fostering emotional and social well-being: Examining the correlates of maternal emotional styles in early childhood* (Doctoral dissertation, Carleton University). Retrieved from <https://curve.carleton.ca/15e33bae-53d8-4415-8907->

3dd506e2216b

- Lagacé-Séguin, D. G., & Coplan, R. (2005). Maternal emotional styles and child social adjustment: Assessment, correlates, and outcomes in early childhood. *Social Development, 14*(4), 613-636.
- Lloyd, J., & Barenblatt, L. (1984). Intrinsic intellectuality: Its relations to social class, intelligence, and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*(3), 646-654. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.46.3.646
- Lunkenheimer, E. S., Shields, A. M., & Cortina, K. S. (2007). Parental emotion coaching and dismissing in family interaction. *Social Development, 16*(2), 232-248. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2007.00382.x
- Putnam, S. P., & Rothbart, M. K. (2006). Development of Short and Very Short Forms of the Children's Behavior Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 87*(1), 102-112. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa8701\_09
- Rothbart, M. (1996). *Child Behaviour Questionnaire*. University of Oregon.
- Rothbart, M. K., Ahadi, S. A., Hersey, K. L., & Fisher, P. (2001). Investigations of temperament at three to seven years: The Children's Behavior Questionnaire. *Child Development, 72*(5), 1394-1408. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00355
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*, 54-67. doi: 10.1006/ceps.1999.1020
- Shortt, J. W., Stoolmiller, M., Smith-Shine, J. N., Mark Eddy, J., & Sheeber, L. (2010). Maternal emotion coaching, adolescent anger regulation, and siblings' externalizing symptoms. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 51*(7), 799-808. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-

7610.2009.02207.x

- Singh, P., & Singh, N. (2013). Difficulties in emotion regulation: A barrier to academic motivation and performance. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 39*(2), 289-297.
- Smith, M. (2010). Good parenting: Making a difference. *Early Human Development, 86*(11), 689-693. doi: 10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2010.08.011
- Spinath, B., Spinath, F. M., Harlaar, N., & Plomin, R. (2006). Predicting school achievement from general cognitive ability, self-perceived ability, and intrinsic value. *Intelligence, 34*(4), 363-374. doi: 10.1016/j.intell.2005.11.004
- Steinmayr, R., & Spinath, B. (2009). The importance of motivation as a predictor of school achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences, 19*(1), 80-90. doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2008.05.004
- Thomas, A., & Chess, S. (1977). *Temperament and development*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Urdañ, T., & Bruchmann, K. (2018). Examining the academic motivation of a diverse student population: A consideration of methodology. *Educational Psychologist, 53*(2), 114-130. doi: 10.1080/00461520.2018.1440234

Appendix A

**Demographic Questionnaire**

The following questions ask about some demographic information about your child and yourself. For each question, please circle the response that is most accurate for you or your child.

**NOTE: Please make certain to answer questions on BOTH SIDES of the page.**

1. What is your child's age?
  - a. 9
  - b. 10
  - c. 11
  - d. 12
  - e. Other \_\_\_\_\_
  
2. What is your child's grade?
  - a. 4
  - b. 5
  - c. 6
  
3. What is your child's gender?
  - a. Male
  - b. Female
  - c. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
  
4. Which best describes your child's race/ethnicity?
  - a. Aboriginal/Native Canadian
  - b. African Canadian/Black
  - c. Asian Canadian/Asian/Pacific Islander
  - d. Caucasian/White
  - e. Hispanic/Latino/Latina
  - f. Biracial/Multiracial
  - g. Other

*Demographic questions about the parent*

5. What is your age?
  - a. 20-24
  - b. 25-29
  - c. 30-34
  - d. 35-39
  - e. 40-44
  - f. 45-49
  - g. 50-54
  - h. 54-59
  - i. 60-64
  - j. 65 or older
  
6. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
  - a. Some high school
  - b. High school
  - c. Some college, trade, or technical school
  - d. College, trade, or technical school
  - e. Some university (undergraduate degree)
  - f. University (undergraduate degree)
  - g. Some university (graduate degree)
  - h. University (graduate degree)
  
7. What is your average household annual income?
  - a. \$0- \$20 000
  - b. \$21 000- \$30 000
  - c. \$31 000- \$40 000
  - d. \$41 000- \$50 000
  - e. \$51 000- \$60 000
  - f. \$61 000- \$70 000

- g. \$71 000- \$80 000
  - h. \$81 000- \$90 000
  - i. \$90 000 or above
8. What is your gender?
- a. Male
  - b. Female
  - c. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
9. Which best describes your race/ethnicity?
- a. Aboriginal/Native Canadian
  - b. African Canadian/Black
  - c. Asian Canadian/Asian/Pacific Islander
  - d. Caucasian/White
  - e. Hispanic/Latino/Latina
  - f. Biracial/Multiracial
  - g. Other
10. Which best describes your marital status?
- a. Single
  - b. Married
  - c. Common Law
  - d. Divorced
  - e. Separated
  - f. Widowed
  - g. Other

Appendix B

**The Parental Emotional Styles Questionnaire**

On this page you will see statements that describe feelings in yourself and your child. We would like to know your opinions about each of these statements. For each statement please decide to what extent you agree or disagree and circle your choice. Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers. And please use the following scale to indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements:

**1** = strongly disagree   **2**=disagree   **3**= neutral   **4**=agree   **5**=strongly agree

1. When my child is sad, it's time to problem solve	1	2	3	4	5
2. Anger is an emotion worth exploring	1	2	3	4	5
3. When my child is sad I am expected to fix the world and make it perfect	1	2	3	4	5
4. When my child gets sad, it's a time to get close	1	2	3	4	5
5. Sadness is something that one has to get over, to ride out, not to dwell on	1	2	3	4	5
6. I prefer my child to be happy rather than overly emotional	1	2	3	4	5
7. I help my child get over sadness quickly so he/she can move onto other things	1	2	3	4	5
8. When my child is angry, it's an opportunity for getting close	1	2	3	4	5
9. When my child is angry, I take some time to try to experience this feeling with him/her	1	2	3	4	5
10. I try to change my child's angry moods into cheerful ones	1	2	3	4	5
11. Childhood is a happy-go-lucky time, not a time for feeling sad or angry	1	2	3	4	5
12. When my child gets angry my goal is to get him/her to stop	1	2	3	4	5
13. When my child is angry I want to know what he/she is thinking	1	2	3	4	5
14. When my child is angry, it's time to solve a problem	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix C

**Children's Behavior Questionnaire**

Instructions: Please read carefully before starting:

On the next pages you will see a set of statements that describe children's reactions to a number of situations. We would like you to tell us what your child's reaction is likely to be in those situations. There are of course no "correct" ways of reacting; children differ widely in their reactions, and it is these differences we are trying to learn about. Please read each statement and decide whether it is a "true" or "untrue" description of your child's reaction within the past six months. Use the following scale to indicate how well a statement describes your child:

- | Circle # | If the statement is:                 |
|----------|--------------------------------------|
| 1        | extremely untrue of your child       |
| 2        | quite untrue of your child           |
| 3        | slightly untrue of your child        |
| 4        | neither true nor false of your child |
| 5        | slightly true of your child          |
| 6        | quite true of your child             |
| 7        | extremely true of your child         |

If you cannot answer one of the items because you have never seen the child in that situation, for example, if the statement is about the child's reaction to your singing and you have never sung to your child, then circle NA (not applicable).

We ask that you please try to circle a number or NA for every item, but if you are not comfortable answering a question, you are free to leave it blank.

**NOTE: Please make certain to answer questions on BOTH SIDES of the page.**

**MY CHILD:**

1. Can lower his/her voice when asked to do so.  
1      2      3      4      5      6      7      NA
2. Is hard to get her/his attention when s/he is concentrating on something.  
1      2      3      4      5      6      7      NA
3. Usually rushes into an activity without thinking about it.  
1      2      3      4      5      6      7      NA
4. When picking up toys or other jobs, usually keeps at the task until it's done.  
1      2      3      4      5      6      7      NA
5. Is good at games like "Simon Says," "Mother, May I?" and "Red Light, Green Light."  
1      2      3      4      5      6      7      NA
6. Sometimes interrupts others when they are speaking.  
1      2      3      4      5      6      7      NA
7. Can easily shift from one activity to another.  
1      2      3      4      5      6      7      NA
8. Has a hard time following instructions.  
1      2      3      4      5      6      7      NA
9. When practicing an activity, has a hard time keeping her/his mind on it.  
1      2      3      4      5      6      7      NA
10. Decides what s/he wants very quickly and goes after it.  
1      2      3      4      5      6      7      NA
11. Will move from one task to another without completing any of them.  
1      2      3      4      5      6      7      NA

12. Often rushes into new situations.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

13. Prepares for trips and outings by planning things s/he will need.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

14. Takes a long time in approaching new situations.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

15. Can wait before entering into new activities if s/he is asked to.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

16. Usually stops and thinks things over before deciding to do something.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

17. Is slow and unhurried in deciding what to do next.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

18. Has difficulty waiting in line for something.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

19. Has a lot of trouble stopping an activity when called to do something else.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

20. Tends to say the first thing that comes to mind, without stopping to think about it.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

21. Has trouble sitting still when s/he is told to (at movies, church, etc.).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

22. When eager to go outside, sometimes rushes out without putting on the right clothes.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

23. Is able to resist laughing or smiling when it isn't appropriate.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

24. When drawing or coloring in a book, shows strong concentration.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

25. Is good at following instructions.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

26. Approaches slowly places where s/he might hurt her/himself.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

27. When building or putting something together, becomes very involved in what s/he is doing, and works for long periods.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

28. Approaches places s/he has been told are dangerous slowly and cautiously.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

29. When s/he sees a toy or game s/he wants, is eager to have it right then.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

30. Has difficulty leaving a project s/he has begun.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

31. Is not very careful and cautious in crossing streets.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

32. Can easily stop an activity when s/he is told "no."

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

33. Is among the last children to try out a new activity.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

34. Is easily distracted when listening to a story.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
35. Has an easy time leaving play to come to dinner.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
36. Is “slow to warm up” to others.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
37. Sometimes doesn't seem to hear me when I talk to her/him.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
38. Is usually able to resist temptation when told s/he is not supposed to do something  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
39. Sometimes becomes absorbed in a picture book and looks at it for a long time.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
40. Has a hard time concentrating on an activity when there are distracting noises.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
41. Has trouble concentrating when listening to a story.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
42. When watching TV, is easily distracted by other noises or movements.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
43. Is distracted from his/her projects when you enter the room.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
44. Often shifts rapidly from one activity to the next.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA








45. Will ignore others when playing with an interesting toy.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
46. Has a hard time shifting from one activity to another  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
47. Is good at games with rules, such as card games.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
48. Can easily leave off working on a project if asked.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
49. Often doesn't seem to hear me when he/she is working on something  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
50. Sometimes has a dreamy quality when others talk to him/her, as if s/he were somewhere else.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
51. Needs to complete one activity before being asked to start on another one.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA
52. Seems to follow her/his own direction, even when asked to do something different.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

**Please check back to make sure you have completed all the pages of the questionnaire.  
Thank you very much for your help!**







































































Appendix D



































































































**NOTE: Please make certain to answer questions on BOTH SIDES of the page.**





























**The Elementary-School Motivation Scale (ESMS)**

Do not agree at all	Do not agree	Agree a bit	Moderately agree	Agree enough	Agree a lot	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
						

*Why do you go to school? (Answer as honestly as possible)*

1	To avoid being disciplined by my teacher	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
2	Because I like to learn	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
3	Because I want to pass my school year	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
4	Because I enjoy learning	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
5	No reason	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
6	I like to be challenged	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
7	To avoid failing my school year	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
8	To make a good living some day	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
9	Because I like to know things	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
10	To do well in my chosen career	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 

11	Because I like school	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
12	I think I'm wasting my time at school	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
13	For the satisfaction of succeeding at school	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
14	Because I'm afraid that I'll get poor grades if I miss school	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
15	To avoid confrontations	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
16	To find out about all kinds of things	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
17	So I'll have a better future	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
18	To have fun and be with my friends	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
19	Sometimes, I don't know why. I feel like I'm wasting my time at school.	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
20	To do interesting projects	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
21	Because I'm afraid of flunking my year	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
22	Because my parents make me	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
23	To learn more	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
24	Because it's important for my future	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 

25	To make new friends	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
26	I don't know. I just want to get it over with	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
27	I feel good when I complete my assignments	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 
28	Because I feel guilty when I stay home	1 	2 	3 	4 	5 	6 	7 

**A big THANK YOU for your participation!!!**

Appendix E

**School Principal Consent Form**



Dear Principals,

My name is Molly Chase and I am a graduate student completing a Master of Arts in School Psychology degree at Mount Saint Vincent University. In partial fulfillment of the requirements for my master's degree, I am conducting research to complete a thesis. I am interested in examining the relationship between parenting and child outcomes. More specifically, I am focusing on parental meta-emotion philosophy, a novel parenting concept that focuses on the feelings and thoughts parents have about their own emotions and their children's emotions. The aim of my study is to determine how parental meta-emotion philosophy is related to children's emotion regulation abilities and their academic motivation. I am also collecting data for my classmate, Cassie Fralic, who is examining parental meta-emotion philosophy and its relationship with children's temperaments and peer interactions as a part of her master's thesis. Cassie and I are both working under the supervision of Dr. Daniel Séguin, who is a Professor of Psychology at Mount Saint Vincent University.

The participants that I am hoping to recruit for my study are students in grades four, five, and six and their parents/caregivers. As such, I am asking that you provide me with the opportunity to conduct research in your school. My research will simply consist of providing classroom teachers with an information/consent form and a package of questionnaires to send home with students. Teachers will only be asked to hand out the materials I provide them with and collect the materials that students bring back. I will collect all materials from teachers at a time that is convenient for them. Distributing and collecting materials is not expected to be time consuming or effortful for teachers and will greatly assist me in completing my research.

Please note that the information acquired during the study will remain anonymous and confidential. In an effort to ensure that specific information pertaining to individual participants remains confidential and anonymous and the identity of individuals is not linked to their data, a participant number will replace the names of participants. All data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet that only authorized personnel will have access to and will only be seen by members of the research team. Additionally, the data will be entered into a computer software program on a computer that is password-protected and will be retained for five years after the

completion of the study. Any publications that arise from this study will include only general information about participants to maintain confidentiality and anonymity.

It must be made clear that participation in this study is completely voluntary and withdrawal from participation is permitted at any time without penalty until the data has been analyzed and published. Participants will also have the choice to answer only the questions that they feel comfortable answering. If participants choose to withdraw from the study, their data will be immediately destroyed.

**By signing this consent form, you are indicating that the information above is fully understood and you agree to allow research to be conducted within your school.**

**Principal's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**School:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

To show our appreciation for allowing us to collect data within the school, the research team will donate a book to the school library.

It should be noted that the results of the study will be formally written about in academic papers and will be presented in academic settings. It is the hope of my research team that results will be useful for parents and other professionals working with children and their parents.

If you are interested in learning about the results of the study and want a summary of the results to be sent to you, please circle YES and provide your email address in the space below. If not, simply circle NO.

YES                      NO

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

If you have any questions about the study that you would like answered, please feel free to contact the primary researcher, Molly Chase ([molly.chase@msvu.ca](mailto:molly.chase@msvu.ca)).

This research has been reviewed and cleared by the Mount Saint Vincent University Research Ethics Board. If you have any other questions or concerns about this study, you may contact the MSVU Research Office by phone (902-457-6350) or by email ([research@msvu.ca](mailto:research@msvu.ca)).

Kindest regards,

*Molly Chase*

BSc (Hons)  
Graduate Student (MSVU School Psychology)

Appendix F

**Parent/Caregiver Consent Form**



Dear Parents/Caregivers,

My name is Molly Chase and I am a graduate student completing a Master of Arts in School Psychology degree at Mount Saint Vincent University. In partial fulfillment of the requirements for my master's degree, I am conducting research to complete a thesis. I am interested in examining the relationship between parenting and child outcomes. More specifically, I am interested in a novel parenting concept that focuses on the feelings and thoughts parents have about their own and their children's emotions. The aim of my study is to determine how this parenting concept is related to children's emotion regulation abilities and their academic motivation. I am also collecting data for my classmate, Cassie Fralic, who is examining this parenting concept and its relationship with children's temperaments and peer interactions as a part of her master's thesis. Cassie and I are both working under the supervision of Dr. Daniel Séguin, who is a Professor of Psychology at Mount Saint Vincent University.

The participants that I wish to recruit for my study are students in grades four, five, and six and their parents/caregivers. You are receiving this letter, as you and your child fall into this category. Your participation in this study would be greatly appreciated, as it will help me complete my degree, enabling me to continue my journey toward becoming a psychologist. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete three questionnaires, one of which covers demographic information, one regarding your perceptions of emotions, and one about your child's emotion regulation abilities. Your child will also be asked to fill out three questionnaires, one of which evaluates his/her academic motivation, one about his/her temperament, and one about how he/she views his/her relationships with peers and parents. It is estimated to take you and your child approximately 20-30 minutes to complete the questionnaires. As the child's parent/caregiver, allowing this data to be collected and used in research is your decision.

Please note that the information acquired during the study will remain anonymous and confidential. In an effort to ensure that specific information pertaining to individual participants remains confidential and anonymous and the identity of individuals is not linked to their data, a participant number will replace the names of participants. All data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet that only authorized personnel will have access to and will only be seen by members of the research team. Additionally, the data will be entered into a computer software program on a computer that is password-protected and will be retained for five years after the completion of the study. Any publications that arise from this study will include only general information about participants to maintain confidentiality and anonymity.

It must be made clear that participation in this study is completely voluntary and withdrawal from participation is permitted at any time without penalty until the data has been analyzed and published. You and your child will also have the choice to answer only the questions that you feel comfortable answering. If you choose to withdraw from the study, your data will be immediately destroyed.

**By signing this consent form, you are indicating that the information above is fully understood and you agree to participate and allow your child to participate in this study.**

**Parent/Caregiver's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Child's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

To show our appreciation for your participation in the study, the research team will donate a book to your child's school library.

It should be noted that the results of the study will be formally written about in academic papers and will be presented in academic settings. It is the hope of my research team that results will be useful for parents and other professionals working with children and their parents.

If you are interested in learning about the results of the study and want a summary to be sent to you, please circle YES and provide your email address below. If not, simply circle NO.

YES                      NO

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

If you have any questions about the study that you would like answered, please feel free to contact the primary researcher, Molly Chase (molly.chase@msvu.ca).

This research has been reviewed and cleared by the Mount Saint Vincent University Research Ethics Board. If you have any other questions or concerns about this study, you may contact the MSVU Research Office by phone (902-457-6350) or by email (research@msvu.ca).

**\*Please Note: I will return to your child's school in one week to collect this package.** If you decide to participate, please ensure that you sign the consent form, complete the questionnaires, and send the package back to school with your child to give to his/her teacher or the principal within this time frame. Thank you!

Kindest regards,

*Molly Chase*

BSc (Hons.)  
Graduate Student (MSVU School Psychology)

Appendix G

**Parent/Caregiver Debriefing Form**



Dear Parents/Caregivers,

Thank you for participating and allowing your child to participate in this study examining the relationships between an emotional aspect of parenting and children's emotion regulation abilities and academic motivation as well as the study examining the relationships between an emotional aspect of parenting and children's temperaments and peer interactions. Rest assured that all answers provided by you and your child will remain confidential and all identifying information will be removed from the data before it is analyzed and included in publications.

If participating in the study or answering any of the questions caused you or your child any emotional or psychological discomfort, you are encouraged to contact the following resources if you feel that they would be beneficial for you:

Community Mental Health Centres:

Horizon Health Network: 856-2444

Vitalité Health Network: 862-4144

Mental Health Mobile Crisis: 1-866-771-7760

CHIMO Helpline (24/7): 1-800-667-5005

Kids Help Phone: 1-800-668-6868 or [kidshelpphone.ca](http://kidshelpphone.ca)

To show our appreciation for your participation in this study, a book has been donated to the library at your child's school.

If you have any other questions, please contact Molly Chase ([molly.chase@msvu.ca](mailto:molly.chase@msvu.ca)) or the study's supervisor, Dr. Daniel Séguin ([daniel.seguin@msvu.ca](mailto:daniel.seguin@msvu.ca)).

Gratefully yours,

*Molly Chase*

BSc (Hons)

Graduate Student (MSVU School Psychology)