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ABSTRACT

PARENTAL EMOTION COACHING: HOW DOES IT RELATE TO ATTACHMENT, ANGER, ASSERTIVENESS, AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT?

by Ines S. Cofrin

University of New Hampshire, May, 2007

This study investigated the relationship between participants' retrospective reports of parental emotion coaching (EC) and emotion dismissing (ED) and participants' anger, romantic attachment, assertiveness, and conflict management. EC and ED were assessed by a retrospective self-report developed by the author (RECS; Kroll, 2002), based on Gottman's theory (Gottman, Katz, & Hooven, 1996). Results suggested that for most analyses, EC and ED correlated significantly with all outcome variables, even after controlling for attachment and caregiver emotional stability. Retrospective EC and ED were also assessed directly from primary caregivers through a mailed survey, and correlated with participants' reports of EC and ED. These results suggested moderate inter-rater reliability of the RECS. Possible implications for parenting and counseling are discussed.
INTRODUCTION

For several decades, the study of emotion in psychology had been a rather neglected, even feared, topic. As Haviland-Jones, Gebelt, and Stapley (1997, p. 250) suggested, “we have not recovered from considering emotions to be dangerous in and of themselves….With this fear of emotion as the focus, we usually think of learning how not to be emotional rather than whether or not the emotions are being refined and transformed to mature forms.” Fortunately, it appears that several attempts have been made to contribute to such refinements. For example, investigations have concerned theories and measurement of emotional intelligence (e.g., Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002), the role of emotion in love relationships (e.g., Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Johnson & Denton, 2002), and the role of emotion in parental relationships (e.g., Bell, 1998; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1994; Gottman, 2001).

One particular question concerns the process of emotion socialization and its influence on emotional competence. Eisenberg and colleagues (Eisenberg, Cumberland, & Spinrad, 1998; Fabes, Poulin, Eisenberg, & Madden-Derdich, 2002) argued that the focus here should be on the family, where emotional communication is believed to first take place. Thus, parents may play an important role in teaching children about emotions and emotional experience. In being responsive and talking to their children about emotions, parents help children respect, identify, and label their emotions (Gottman, 2001; Gottman, Katz, & Hooven, 1996, 1997; Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Similarly, Thompson, Flood, and Lundquist (1995) argued that skills of emotional management develop particularly in relational contexts. They suggested that relationships with
attachment figures like parents provide the most salient affective contexts and some of
the strongest incentives for implementing emotional management.

The question remains, however, how parents teach their children emotional skills. Parke (1994) suggested that parents socialize emotions in their children through interactional contexts and through teaching and coaching about emotions (e.g., helping them to identify and label their own and others' emotional states). The purpose of this study was to investigate how such parental emotion coaching relates to adult children's reported emotional experience and perceptions. In line with the idea that particular emotions such as anger and sadness represent a particular challenge to parents, the main focus was on these 'negative emotions' (Gottman et al., 1996). Furthermore, considering the crucial role of emotion in adult intimate relationships and the importance of healthy relationships for individual well-being (Johnson, 2004), this research sought to examine the relationship between caregivers' emotion coaching and their children's attitudes towards and perception of romantic relationships. The specific question of interest here concerns how retrospective reports of parental emotion coaching and emotion dismissing of sadness and anger relates to students' experience and expression of anger, as well as their attachment style, that is, their perception of and attitude towards romantic partners.

The following sections provide a literature review of the main variables of this study. The first part focuses on Gottman et al.'s research on parental emotion coaching and emotion dismissing, including definitions, measurement, and outcomes of these practices. The next section focuses on the relationship between parental emotion coaching/dismissing and children's emotion regulation, particularly with regard to anger. The next part introduces attachment theory, including attachment in childhood and
adulthood, parental vs. romantic attachment, as well as measurement issues. This section is followed by an examination of the relationship between attachment and emotion regulation, again with a focus on anger. Finally, the last part of this literature review focuses on the relationship between adult parental attachment and emotion coaching.

**Emotion-Coaching and Emotion-Dismissing Parents**

Gottman and his colleagues (Gottman et al., 1996, 1997) investigated parents' *meta-emotion philosophy*, which refers to an organized set of thoughts and feelings about one's own and one's children's emotions. They found that meta-emotions varied substantially among parents. Some viewed negative emotions such as anger or sadness as destructive, whereas others found them to be natural emotions that required attention, or helpful indicators that something was missing, or something was upsetting and needed to be solved. These discrepancies between the meaning of emotional arousal were also found by others (e.g., Haviland-Jones, Gebelt, & Stapley, 1997; Thompson, Flood, & Lundquist, 1995).

In describing differences in parental meta-emotion philosophy, Gottman et al. (1996; 1997) referred to two basic types of parenting behavior towards emotions: emotion dismissing and emotion coaching. Emotion-coaching included five components. The first aspect refers to being aware of the child’s emotion, even if those emotions are of low intensity. This enables parents to attend to a child’s first signs of sadness and anger and connect with their children before negative emotions escalate to a high intensity. Second, emotion-coaching parents view their children’s negative emotion as an opportunity for intimacy and teaching. These parents may view sadness, for example, as important information and a sign that something was missing, and use their children's
emotional expressions to connect with them. For example, parents scoring high on this variable felt closer to their children when they were sad (Gottman et al., 1997). The third component refers to validating, or empathizing with the child's negative emotions. This involves communicating to the child that it makes sense to experience negative emotions in certain upsetting situations. Fourth, emotion-coaching parents assist their children in verbally labeling their emotion. That is, they help children to put feelings into words to increase their understanding of their emotional experience. The fifth component of emotion coaching refers to problem-solving with the child. This includes setting limits, for example, “It’s OK to be angry, but it’s not OK to hit your brother” (Gottman et al., 1997, p. 85), describing appropriate behavior, and helping the child to clarify goals and strategies to achieve them.

In contrast, emotion-dismissing parents view their child’s sadness or anger as toxic, or potentially harmful to the child. They believe that it is their job to change these negative emotions as quickly as possible and convey to the child that they are not meaningful or important. For example, they may view sadness as something to get over with and not dwell on, and used means to distract the child from sadness. Furthermore, emotion-dismissing parents may not see a reason for children to be sad in the first place, as reflected in one parent’s comment, “What does a child have to be sad about?” (Gottman et al., 1996, p. 244). Finally, emotion-dismissing parents view the child's anger (without misbehavior) as enough reason for punishment or a time out. Parents with this meta-emotion philosophy equate negative emotions with selfishness, loss of control, passivity, or failure (Gottman, 2001).
However, this does not imply that emotion-dismissing parents are necessarily harsh. In fact, Gottman found that emotion-dismissing parents could be sensitive to their children's feelings and wanted to be helpful, but their approach to negative feelings was to ignore or deny them as much as possible. This dismissing appeared to be due to parents' pain and discomfort in experiencing their children's negative states. In this context, Gottman distinguished between an emotion-coaching parenting style and parental warmth, based on his findings that warm and caring parents can still be dismissive of a child's negative emotion. For example, parents may respond to their child's sadness by saying lovingly, "Sweetheart, cheer up. Just put a smile on your face. Now that's better, isn't it? There's my big girl" (Gottman, 2001, p. 26). Thus, despite good intentions on side of the parent, the emotional experience of sadness is nevertheless dismissed. Gottman et al. (1996) argued that emotion coaching, then, is something additional beyond just warmth that these parents can offer. To further clarify this point, Gottman et al. distinguished emotion coaching from other positive parenting approaches by using the example of a child having a nightmare, "what would we predict an authoritative parent would do (or recommend that he or she should do)? (…) Being warm and structuring provides no real guidelines. Emotion coaching does provide these guidelines." (p. 246).

**Measurement of Emotion Coaching and Child Functioning**

Gottman and his colleagues (Gottman et al., 1996; 1997) assessed parental meta-emotion philosophy by conducting meta-emotion interviews with parents. All parents were separately interviewed about their experience of sadness and anger, their philosophy of emotional expression and control, and their feelings, attitudes, and behavior towards
their own and their children's anger and sadness. Their behavior during this interview was audio taped and coded using a specific checklist rating system that coded for parents' awareness of their anger and sadness, their regulation of anger and sadness, and their awareness and coaching of their child's anger and sadness.

The fundamental question Gottman and his colleagues raised refers to how parental meta-emotion philosophies nurture or impede the development and well-being of children, particularly their understanding and regulation of emotions. In order to test this, several categories of child functioning were investigated. Heart rate and skin conductance levels were measured to assess the child's physiological functioning during parent-child interaction and during viewing of emotion-eliciting films, and vagal tone was computed as an index of parasympathetic activation of the heart. Basal vagal tone is believed to be related to both greater behavioral reactivity and soothability, and the ability to focus attention (Gottman et al., 1996). Using these measures, Gottman and his colleagues contributed to investigations concerning the relationship between parental emotion coaching/dismissing and children's emotion regulation abilities. Their findings and other literature examining this relationship are reviewed in the following section.

**Emotion Coaching and Emotion Regulation**

Gottman et al.'s results suggested that children of emotion-coaching parents displayed higher emotion regulation ability, greater ability to focus attention, and fewer behavior problems as rated by teachers (Gottman et al., 1996, 1997). Similarly, Eisenberg and colleagues (Eisenberg and Fabes, 1994; Eisenberg, Fabes, and Losoya, 1997) suggested positive child outcomes as a result of parents reacting to their children's negative emotions in a positive manner. They argued that children who feel accepted in
their experience and expression of negative emotions and have learned constructive ways to deal with these negative emotions are likely to feel sympathy for others, engage in socially appropriate, positive behavior, and, consequently, are liked by both teachers and peers. With regard to emotion regulation, Eisenberg and Fabes (1994) found that maternal reports of comforting behavior in reaction to children's negative emotions were associated with high levels of constructive anger reactions and low levels of children's venting and anger intensity when angered. Furthermore, Fabes et al. (2002) demonstrated that children whose parents responded in supportive ways to their negative emotional states were better at identifying and expressing emotions. Specifically, parental expressive encouragement of children's negative emotions was positively related to children's expressiveness of emotions, and parental emotion-focused and problem-focused reactions to children's negative emotions were positively associated with children's ability to accurately decode emotions.

Thus, it appears that certain parenting behavior pertaining to emotion coaching is positively associated with several aspects of children's emotional competence, including their ability to identify, understand, and manage their emotion. Considering that research on emotion coaching by Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) distinguished between emotion-coaching and emotion-dismissing parenting behavior, the next section focuses on findings regarding emotion dismissing, particularly with respect to children's emotion regulation.

**Emotion Dismissing and Emotion Regulation**

Where emotion-coaching parents appear to encourage children's emotional expression and foster their understanding and management of emotions, parents who
dismiss or punish expression of children’s negative emotions, on the other side, may undermine their children’s ability for emotional understanding and regulation. From an attachment perspective, Bell (1998) argued that children may not develop a healthy sense for emotional experience and expression, depending on their caregivers’ response to their emotional states. For example, if the caregiver is open to experiencing the full range of an infant’s emotion, the infant will be provided with a sense of stability such that emotions can be explored freely. However, if a distressed infant seeking comfort repeatedly experiences the caregiver’s rejection, the message will be that some emotions are not acceptable. As a consequence, emotions are regulated by minimizing their expression in order to avoid rejection and maintain caregiver involvement. The cost for this behavioral development is constant emotional vigilance and suppression of normal distress.

Attachment literature in general repeatedly reports increased arousal of individuals who have experienced dismissing and rejection from caregivers (e.g., Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978; Dozier & Kobak, 1992).

Parenting literature confirms the idea that negative control strategies as a response to children’s negative emotions are associated with children’s decreased ability to regulate their emotions or behavior (Denham, Mitchell-Copeland, Strandberg, Auerbach, & Blair, 1997; Fabes, Leonard, Kupanoff, & Martin, 2001). Specifically, Eisenberg and Fabes (1994) investigated mothers’ reported socialization practices to their children’s real life anger reactions. Maternal minimizing/punitive responses were associated with maternal perceptions of children’s high negative affect. These findings confirm Buck’s hypothesis (1984, cited in Eisenberg & Fabes, 1994) that children who are punished for the expression of emotions such as anger and sadness gradually learn both to hide their
emotions, and, because of the association between negative sanctions and situations involving emotion, to become physiologically aroused in situations involving emotions. This may in turn affect their ability to deal successfully with emotional experience.

Similarly, Fabes et al. (2002) believed that parenting strategies that are used to control children's negative emotions lead children to suppress these emotions and "store" them away until a later point, when they are reactivated in a more intense manner. This idea was based on Gross and Levenson (1993), who found that emotional suppression results in increased negative emotional arousal and anxiety.

Thus, it is plausible to assume that the intensity of negative emotions that children experience may decrease as a function of how much parents are open and attentive to children's emotions, and how much they invest in teaching the child effective ways to deal with negative emotions. In this respect, parents can assist children in finding healthy and appropriate ways to acknowledge and experience their emotions in order to "get it out of their system" (Gottman et al., 1996, p. 267).

Effective emotion regulation and socialization may also be inhibited by factors within the parent. For example, the emotionality of the caregiver appears to play an important role in being able to attend to and constructively deal with children's emotions. Parents who are emotionally unstable, then, may possess a number of deficits in parenting that could indirectly influence the development of their children's regulatory abilities. Dix (1991), for example, found that emotionally unstable or depressed mothers had a tendency to be more critical, hostile, negative, and less emotionally expressive and cooperative when negotiating with their children. In addition, apart from these apparent deficits on the side of the parent, children may also simply learn maladaptive strategies
for regulating emotion by observing parents who are depressed, angry, or experience marital conflict (Brenner & Salovey, 1997).

So far, the literature review has focused on specific parental behaviors related to emotion coaching and dismissing, and the associations of these practices with children’s ability to regulate their emotions. However, considering that emotion regulation plays a major role in what Bowlby (1973) termed the ‘attachment behavioral system,’ an innate survival mechanisms that ensures the formation and maintenance of attachment bonds between children and their parents, review of parenting literature appears incomplete without highlighting the contribution of attachment theory.

**Attachment Theory**

Bowlby, in his famous trilogy of Attachment and Loss (Bowlby, 1973; 1980; 1982), was the first to describe the attachment process between children and their caregivers, although he emphasized the importance of attachment throughout the life span. In focusing on the need for an intimate and continuous relationship with a caregiver for an attachment bond to develop, Bowlby found that a disruption of this bond was associated with a predictable sequence of behavior, including anger, clinging, despair, and detachment. Furthermore, he suggested that early separations would generate certain behaviors in older individuals, such as excessive demands, anxiety and anger, dependency, and an inability to form deep relationships. With these assumptions he paved the way for later researchers to investigate adult attachment.

In arguing that attachment affects social and personality development, Bowlby (1982) suggested that repeated interactions and experiences with primary caregivers serve to structure and strengthen an internal working model of attachment figures, the
environment, and the self. These internal working models may be relatively flexible and impressionable in early childhood, but upon repeated experience of the same kind become increasingly resistant to change. Rothbard and Shaver (1994) drew an analogy between this process and Piaget's theory of assimilation and accommodation of incoming information. During early childhood, when working models are still in the 'working' phase, new information about attachment figures is assimilated into this existing schema, allowing the internal working model to accommodate (adjust itself) to this new information. However, repeated information of the same kind will eventually lead to the establishment of a representational cognitive schema, that is, an internal working model, of significant others and the self.

The implications of this are apparent: schemas help people make sense of the world and guide their processing of incoming information. For example, if negative information creates a schema, or internal working model of attachment figures, as 'unavailable,' and a schema of the self as 'unlovable,' all incoming information tends to assimilate into this existing cognitive structure, and may therefore lead to distortion, much like a negative filter, through which incoming information may be sorted according to certain expectations. As negative expectations direct certain behaviors that then elicit an undesired response such as rejection, negative internal working models of an unavailable attachment figure may be confirmed, creating a vicious cycle. Thus, even when an individual in later life experiences behavior from significant others entirely different than that of his parents when he was a child, certain patterns of interactions resulting from internal working models persist in a "more or less uncorrected and
unchanged state, (...) having become habitual, generalized, and largely unconscious” (Bowlby, 1982, p. 130).

**Attachment Styles in Childhood and Adulthood**

Following Bowlby’s ideas, Ainsworth et al. (1978) investigated attachment styles in infants through a procedure called the ‘Strange Situation.’ In this procedure, infants’ behavior was observed as reactions to separations and reunion with their attachment figure. According to Ainsworth and her colleagues, distinct types of attachment behaviors in infants could be observed as a function of maternal sensitivity and responsiveness. Infants of generally sensitive and responsive mothers were classified as ‘secure.’ They showed interest in their environments in the caregiver’s presence, displayed distress over maternal separation, and sought comfort upon reunion. In contrast, two different types of insecure attachments were identified. Infants of inconsistent mothers whose behavior alternated between being unavailable and being intrusive or overly affectionate were classified as ‘anxious/ambivalent.’ These infants became distressed upon separation, appeared inconsolable and preoccupied with their caregiver’s availability, and as a result, showed little interest in exploring their environment after reunion. ‘Avoidant’ infants, on the other hand, seemed to have learned to avoid their caregivers as a consequence of constant rejection of their request for proximity and comfort. As a result of separation from their caregivers, these infants showed little distress upon separation and did not seek contact upon reunion. Instead, their attention was focused on the environment, that is, toys or other objects. However, they displayed higher physiological arousal, suggesting that while they may appear self-sufficient and uncaring about the separation, they do, in fact, become distressed.
Translating this typology into terms appropriate for adult relationships, Hazan and Shaver (1987) applied attachment theory to adults, and generated a categorical self-report measuring attachment style in adults. One of their findings was that the frequencies with which different attachment styles occurred in adulthood were almost equal to frequencies in infancy, and that attachment style was related to beliefs about the self, partner, romantic love, and recollections of childhood relationships with parents. Specifically, adults who classified themselves as secure also described themselves as being comfortable with closeness and depending on others, while their relationships were marked by happiness, trust, and friendship. Anxious/ambivalent adults, in contrast, worried about being abandoned by partners and experienced emotional highs and lows, jealousy, and obsessive preoccupation with partners in their relationships. Adults describing themselves as avoidant were uncomfortable being close or dependent on others, and tended to distrust intimate relationships. Thus, where avoidantly attached adults appeared to display a fear of intimacy, adults with anxious/ambivalent attachment styles appeared to seek intimacy and fear abandonment. With regard to memories of parents’ behavior, securely attached adults reported their caregivers to be more responsive, accepting, caring, and respectful, while insecurely attached adults showed almost the opposite of this pattern, with avoidantly attached adults describing their mothers as cold and rejecting. These results were compatible with Ainsworth et al.’s (1978) findings about infant-caregiver attachment.

Another line of research on adult attachment was started by George, Kaplan, and Main (1985), who developed the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI). This instrument assesses retrospective experiences with parents and the adult’s current state of mind with
respect to attachment, and was found to be strongly associated with infants’ attachment behavior in the Strange Situation (e.g., Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985, see Hesse, 1999, for a review). According to Main and her colleagues, secure adults were able to access, reflect on, and discuss attachment relationships with their parents in a coherent, integrated way, while insecure individuals seemed to have difficulty recalling and discussing their past attachment relationships. Specifically, avoidant (“dismissing”) adults could not recall painful memories or gave generalized idealized images that did not fit with specific painful memories, a response which was believed to result from repression of memories of vulnerability and rejection by caregivers. Anxious (“preoccupied”) adults recalled many specific incidents and conflicts often in length, but could not articulate a coherent overall picture of their attachment relationships. In interviewing preoccupied adults, the process itself appears to arouse certain memories that in turn give way to the adult’s preoccupation with attachment experiences, often demonstrated by “lengthy, angry discussions of childhood interactions with the parent(s), which may inappropriately move into the present tense and/or into discussions of the present relationship” (Hesse, 1999, p. 398). Thus, the AAI assesses adult attachment styles by revealing defensive strategies and interpreting characteristics of responses (e.g., coherence, anger, believability), rather than by focusing on the content of responses (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002).

There are several important distinctions between the AAI and Hazan and Shaver’s (1987) self-report. First, the AAI is a clinical interview that assesses adult attachment from a developmental/clinical perspective with a focus on parent-child attachment. Hazan and Shaver’s (1987) self-report, on the other hand, assesses attachment styles towards
romantic partners. Second, the AAI assesses attachment by tapping unconscious, defensive processes, while Hazan and Shaver’s self-report measures conscious attitudes and perception towards significant others, although Shaver and Mikulincer (2002) argued that the conceptual gap between the measures may not be as large as perceived by researchers in these two traditions. Furthermore, although both lines of research deal with secure and insecure strategies of affect regulation and measure dimensions believed to be psychodynamically similar to those originally proposed by Ainsworth and her colleagues in 1978 (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002), associations between the two kinds of measures seem to be inconsistent. Nevertheless, Shaver and Mikulincer (2002) suggested that both research traditions contribute relevant aspects to the measurement of attachment. For the present study, however, the focus will be on self-reports of adult attachment.

**Current Self-Report Measures of Adult Attachment**

Following Hazan and Shaver’s (1987) original categorical measure, several attempts have been made to refine measures of adult attachment. For example, Collins and Read (1990) constructed a multi-item scale based on Hazan and Shaver’s original measure, and found three underlying dimensions: comfort with closeness, comfort with dependency on others, and anxiety about being abandoned or unloved. In realizing inconsistencies between Hazan and Shaver’s avoidant type and Main et al.’s (1985) dismissing/avoidant type, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) proposed a different view of attachment styles by suggesting that attachment can be divided into four categories, based on two dimensions according to Bowlby’s original idea: a person’s view of self and view of others. Thus, depending on whether the self is viewed as positive or negative (i.e., worthy of love and support or not) and others are viewed as positive or negative...
(i.e., trustworthy and available, or unreliable and rejecting), four different attachment patterns are derived. For example, a perception of both the self and others as positive would yield secure attachment, while perception of self as negative and others as positive would result in ‘preoccupied’ attachment (corresponding to anxious/ambivalent attachment). In contrast, viewing the self positively and others negatively would signify dismissive-avoidant attachment, and a negative model of both self and others would yield fearful-avoidant attachment. Both avoidant attachment types reflect avoidance of intimacy. However, they are distinguished by a person’s need for others’ acceptance to maintain a positive self-regard.

Extending the idea that a negative view of self is related to anxiety about abandonment, and a negative view of others is related to avoidant behavior, Brennan, Clark, and Shaver (1998) reviewed and factor analyzed existing measures and suggested that a two-dimensional approach to measuring attachment was appropriate. Their resulting Experiences in Close Relationship Scale (ECR) measures these two orthogonal dimensions, termed attachment anxiety (fear of separation and abandonment) and attachment avoidance (discomfort with intimacy and dependency), and has been widely used since (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2004). Brennan et al. (1998) believed that a two-dimensional conceptual structure of attachment was compatible with Collins and Read’s three-factor model, because two of their factors were significantly correlated ($r = .38$), and could be viewed as dimensions underlying avoidance. Furthermore, they believed that attachment as regions in a two-dimensional space was conceptually parallel to the space defined by two discriminant functions in Ainsworth et al.’s (1978) original work on infant-mother attachment, where avoidance refers to discomfort with closeness and
dependency, and anxiety to “crying, failing to explore confidently in the absence of mother, and angry protest directed at mother during reunions after what was probably experienced as abandonment” (Brennan et al., 1998, p. 48).

In this two-dimensional space, what was originally referred to as secure attachment corresponds to a region where both avoidance and anxiety are low. Individuals in this space are comfortable with closeness and interdependence, and have no difficulties seeking and relying on others for comfort when stressed or threatened. The region in which anxiety is high and avoidance is low refers to what was formerly known as anxious/ambivalent attachment. Individuals in this space lack a sense of attachment security, worry about their relationships, and fear being rejected. The original avoidant attachment type occupies the region in which anxiety is low and avoidance is high, a category referred to as ‘dismissing avoidance’, and an added forth category refers to a region in which both anxiety and avoidance are high, that is, fearful avoidance (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Attachment dimensions and corresponding categories. Adapted from Fraley, 2004.
Although romantic attachment may be conceptualized as regions in this way, however, Brennan et al. (1998) emphasized that such categorization does not yield the same precision and power provided by dimensional measures. Similarly, Fraley and Waller (1998), in testing the appropriateness of the typological model of attachment, suggested a dimensional approach to measuring attachment was more accurate. This conclusion was based on their findings that attachment appeared to be a quantitatively distributed variable. Thus, to improve accuracy of findings in this study, the measurement of romantic attachment was based on the dimensional approach. In concluding this section on measurement of adult attachment, the following section focuses on how adult attachment relates to emotion regulation and anger.

**Attachment, Anger, and Affect Regulation**

Several researchers have investigated the role of anger in attachment. Certain attachment related strategies learned in childhood, for example, have been shown to be related to different anger reactions in adult relationships (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005; Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002). More specifically, Roisman et al. (2005) found that adults who were securely attached as infants displayed a higher quality romantic relationship in adulthood with regard to certain aspects including lower levels of anger, hostility, and dyadic negative affect. These findings are not surprising considering that anger, or protest, is the first of a sequence of predictable behaviors as a reaction to separation from an attachment figure (Bowlby, 1982). A securely attached person, then, having learned that the caregiver is responsive, has no need to display anger for proximity-seeking goals, and thus anger and protest as a means to achieve attachment figure responsiveness has fulfilled its purpose and been resolved. This may not be the case, however, with
insecurely attached individuals. Although anger is originally a functional response to separations, it may become maladaptive when separation is prolonged or the attachment figure is chronically unresponsive, as Mikulincer (1998) put it, “This is the case of insecure persons who grow with an insensitive attachment figure and therefore may experience recurrent, overwhelming bouts of dysfunctional anger” (p. 513). Considering that there are different types of insecure attachment, anger, then, may manifest differently, depending on whether someone is insecure-avoidant or insecure-anxious/ambivalent.

In an effort to describe attachment-related strategies of affect regulation, Shaver and Mikulincer (2002) suggested that as a function of the attachment figure’s availability and success of proximity-seeking behavior, the attachment system is either hyperactivated or deactivated. For example, if a caregiver is emotionally unavailable and proximity-seeking behavior is unsuccessful, the attachment system is deactivated to avoid frustration and distress associated with the unavailability of the caregiver (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005). Although this deactivating strategy may fulfill its purpose of reducing distress, it involves the denial of attachment needs and the avoidance of closeness and intimacy. Deactivating strategies appear to be characteristic of people scoring high on the avoidance dimension (Mikulincer, Shaver, & Pereg, 2003). This deactivation of the attachment system, however, does not imply a decrease in anger. In fact, avoidantly attached individuals (i.e., individuals who, as a result of chronic rejection or unavailability of the caregiver, are uncomfortable depending on others and tend to distrust intimate relationships) appear to suppress anger but show increased hostility and emotional arousal when angered (Dozier & Kobak, 1992; Mikulincer, 1998). The suppression of anger may serve to keep threat-
related thoughts from entering consciousness, where these thoughts risk the activation of attachment needs, a process that avoidantly attached individuals seek to avoid. However, the anger appears to persist and emerge in other less overt forms, such as hostility or bodily arousal that may be detected through observations or skin conductance levels (e.g., Dozier & Kobak, 1992). From this perspective, only certain aspects of anger experienced by insecure-avoidant individuals may be detectable by self-reports. For example, Mikulincer (1998) found that avoidant individuals reported low anger arousal and high levels of hostility, that is, critical and hostile attitudes towards others. Hostility among avoidant individuals was also found by Shaver and Mikulincer (2003), who suggested that insecure avoidant partners were less forgiving and more likely to desire strong revenge. Furthermore, if insecure avoidant partners were told to imagine a situation in which they forgave a partner, their feelings and thoughts seemed tinged with hostility and resentment. In sum, insecure-avoidant attachment appears to be associated with less self-reported anger arousal but higher levels of hostility.

As opposed to avoidant attachment, anxious attachment and its behavioral correlates appear to be associated with hyperactivation of the attachment system. In this case, similar to avoidant attachment, the caregiver is perceived as emotionally unavailable. However, in contrast to avoidant individuals, proximity-seeking behavior is a viable option, because hyperactivating strategies (i.e., clinging and controlling) may elicit a desired response from the caregiver (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005). These hyperactivating strategies refer to "energetic, insistent attempts to attain proximity, support, and love" (Mikulincer & Shaver 2005, p. 151). A major part of attachment anxiety, according to this model, stems from the idea that the attachment system is
chronically activated due to increased vigilance to both threat-related cues and cues suggesting attachment figure unavailability. As a result, negative emotional responses to any threats may be intensified. Rumination over threat-related cues may lead to intense and prolonged occurrences of anger, although for fear of alienating and losing the support from others, this anger may be directed toward the self (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005).

Similarly, Rholes, Simpson, and Oriña (1999) suggested that the expression of anger for anxiously attached individuals is complex because it is possibly driven by several and potentially conflicting motives. For example, these individuals are likely to feel anger and resentment in general, probably as a result from inconsistent care of attachment figures, but they also worry about abandonment and whether partners are available to provide comfort and support when needed. As a result, anxiously attached individuals may repress or indirectly express their anger for fear of losing the attachment figure. In line with this notion, Mikulincer (1998) found more self-reported anger-in (i.e., the tendency to retain anger rather than express it) for anxiously attached individuals. Moreover, anxiously attached individuals reported more anger arousal than avoidantly attached individuals. Similarly, Simpson, Rholes, and Philips (1996) found that anxiously attached reported more anger and hostility than avoidantly attached. Calamari and Pini (2003) also found that anxiously attached reported more intense anger than avoidantly attached.

However, contrary to Mikulincer (1998), avoidant attachment was associated with higher anger-in responses than anxious attachment.

In sum, anxious attachment appears to be associated with higher levels of anger-in, although findings are not consistent. Similarly, research does not seem to agree on whether anxious or avoidant individuals report more anger arousal and hostility, although
the tendency seems to be that avoidant individuals are less aware of their anger arousal than anxious individuals, and thus, report less anger. The majority of studies seem to suggest that avoidant individuals report more hostility than anxious individuals, who themselves tend to report more anger-in. Thus, one aspect of this study was to provide further insight into this controversy.

**Emotion Coaching and Adult Attachment**

Interestingly, few studies have investigated the relationship between parental emotion coaching and adult attachment, although it appears plausible that an association exists. For example, both children of rejecting and unavailable caregivers ('avoidant' individuals), and children of emotion-dismissing parents appear to be emotionally dysregulated as a result of emotional suppression, especially with regard to anger. Similarly, considering that responsiveness of the caregiver is a requirement for the development of secure attachment, it would be reasonable to assume that parental emotion coaching – as a form of responsiveness – contributes to the formation of secure attachment, or inhibits the development of insecure attachment. For example, Gottman et al. (1996, 1997) found that parental meta-emotion acted as an inhibitor of parental intrusiveness. Intrusiveness has been found to be associated with the development of anxious/ambivalent attachment (e.g., Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bowlby, 1982, Hesse, 1999). Furthermore, there appear to be parallels between Gottman et al.‘s description of parents who were low in emotion coaching and awareness, and how avoidant individuals deal with emotional experience. For example, parents low in awareness found negative emotions so aversive that they preferred to minimize them or not notice them at all. Thus, they thought the best way to get over them is to ignore the emotion. This way of dealing
with emotional experience is very similar to avoidant individuals, who appear to also minimize the importance of emotional experience.

Cowan (1996) was the first to suggest that exploring the connection between adult attachment as measured by the AAI and emotion coaching may shed some light on emotion socialization processes by "providing a framework for attachment researchers who are seeking to explain the correlations among adult attachment, parenting styles, and children's developmental outcomes" (p. 281). Only one study thus far has investigated this link. DeOliveira, Moran, and Pederson (2005) interviewed adolescent mothers about their attachment representations as measured by the AAI and about their meta-emotion concerning their own and their toddler's emotion. They hypothesized that mothers who are classified as securely attached by the AAI would display more openness towards emotions, get less overwhelmed by children's negative emotions, and are able to validate their children's emotions. Mothers who are classified as dismissing/avoidant, on the other hand, were expected to demonstrate a deactivating attitude towards emotions, including a lack of awareness and acceptance of emotional experience and lack of responsiveness to their child's affect. Preoccupied mothers, in contrast, were expected to report hypervigilance towards their own and their children's emotional experiences and difficulty in emotion regulation.

Unfortunately, no data was available on the meta-emotion of preoccupied mothers, because all mothers who were classified as preoccupied by the AAI also fell into a category that the AAI describes as 'unresolved with respect to loss or trauma.' In comparing this category to dismissing and preoccupied attachment, which are seen as adaptive and functional strategies for emotion regulation, the unresolved classification
refers to a lack of such strategies, and is often linked with infant attachment disorganization. Analyses in this study were therefore only completed for dismissing/avoidant, secure, and unresolved attachment. Results suggested that dismissing/avoidant mothers, compared to their securely attached counterparts, exhibited significantly lower scores on responsiveness to their children’s sadness, whereas unresolved mothers scored lower in responsiveness to both sadness and anger. Furthermore, secure mothers reported higher awareness of and confidence in regulating their own emotions and more openness towards their children’s emotional experience. In contrast, dismissing/avoidant mothers reported less awareness of and openness towards emotions, together with an apparent unwillingness to deal with emotional experience in themselves: “I don’t really know ‘cause I don’t share my feelings. I just keep them bundled up and stuff... I don’t like sharing my emotions at all... I get really withdrawn... But with my kid around it just kind of keeps things happy and joyful. She does things that make you kill yourself laughing” (DeOliveira et al., 2005, p. 165).

DeOliveira and colleagues suggest that dismissing/avoidant mothers’ discomfort with and dismissing of their own emotional experience, as illustrated in this example, are likely to be related to their inability to validate emotions in their children. In line with research suggesting that dismissing mothers minimize, dismiss, or respond negatively to their infants’ negative emotions (e.g., Dozier and Kobak, 1992), DeOliveira et al. (2005) suggest that as a result of this coping strategy, avoidant/dismissing mothers may distort or minimize negative emotions in their children. Furthermore, along with her tendency to “cut herself off from her internal experiences” (p. 165), a dismissing/avoidant mother may likely have difficulty identifying, discriminating, and understanding her infant’s
emotional experience, as this example demonstrates, "I don’t really know why he’s sad. But I don’t really deal with it... Like – I’ll do the hugging and the “it’s ok” and all that other kind of stuff but I don’t... I try not to feel anything for anything... unless I have to. That’s usually how I deal with it.” (p. 166)

DeOliveira and colleagues provide insight into how adult attachment may be related to parental emotion coaching and emotion dismissing. Considering their target group, adolescent mothers of toddlers, it was appropriate to employ the AAI to assess adult attachment, because the AAI assesses adult attachment representation with regard to the parent-child relationship. Their study confirmed a possible connection between adult attachment and emotion coaching, since attachment style of mothers appeared to be related to the way these mothers dealt with their children’s negative emotions.
CHAPTER I

STUDY

Purpose of This Study

DeOliveira et al.'s study was the first to focus attention on the relationship between parents’ adult attachment and their attitudes towards their children’s negative emotions such as sadness or anger. However, no study has investigated the relationship between parental emotion coaching/dismissing and attachment towards romantic partners as measured by self-reports on romantic attachment. Furthermore, research has not focused on the relationship between parental emotion coaching/dismissing and the experience and expression of anger. Thus, the main purpose of this investigation was to provide insight into how parental emotion coaching and dismissing is related to adult romantic attachment and the experience and expression of anger as measured by the Multidimensional Anger Inventory (MAI; Siegel, 1996). In addition, to assess more constructive ways of expressing and managing anger, assertiveness and conflict management measures were employed and correlated with parental emotion coaching/dismissing. Finally, one aspect of the proposed study was to investigate inter-rater reliability between participants and their caregivers’ retrospective reports of parental emotion coaching and dismissing. For this purpose, an emotion coaching and emotion dismissing measure was constructed for primary caregivers of participants and correlated with participants’ reports of emotion coaching and emotion dismissing.
Research Hypotheses

1. Measurement of Emotion Coaching/Dismissing and Romantic Attachment

It was expected that retrospective reports of parental emotion coaching (EC) of sadness and anger were highly correlated, thus justifying combining these scales into an EC Total scale. Similarly, it was expected that parental emotion dismissing (ED) of sadness and anger were highly correlated so that these scales could be combined into an ED Total. Self-reported romantic attachment was expected to be a global measure, and not relationship specific. Specifically, participants’ reports regarding their romantic attachment in general was expected to correlate highly with their reports of romantic attachment towards their current partner, thus justifying the sole use of the former scale.

2. Emotion Coaching/Dismissing and Romantic Attachment

Students’ retrospective reports of parental EC and ED were expected to be related to their secure attachment to romantic partners. Specifically, high EC was expected to be associated with lower levels of both attachment avoidance and attachment anxiety, and high ED was expected to be associated with higher levels of both avoidance and anxiety. Furthermore, participants who reported both low EC and low ED were expected to display higher avoidant attachment, and participants who reported high levels of both EC and ED were expected to display higher anxious attachment.

3. Emotion Coaching/Dismissing and Anger

Retrospective EC and ED were expected to be related to anger. Specifically, high EC was expected to be related to lower anger arousal, hostility, anger-in, and a lower range of anger-eliciting situations, and high ED was expected to be associated with higher anger arousal, hostility, anger-in, and a wider range of anger-eliciting situations.

Students’ reports of EC and ED were expected to be related to their assertiveness and conflict management. Specifically, high EC was expected to be associated with higher levels of both assertiveness and conflict management, while high ED was expected to be associated with lower levels of assertiveness and conflict management.

5. Romantic Attachment and Anger

Students’ attachment to romantic partners was expected to be related to their anger. Specifically, lower levels of both attachment anxiety and avoidance were expected to be associated with lower anger arousal, anger-in, hostility, and a lower range of anger-eliciting situations. High attachment anxiety\(^1\) was expected to be associated with higher anger-in and higher anger arousal, and high attachment avoidance was expected to be associated with higher hostility.

6. Predicting Anger from Attachment, Emotion Coaching/Dismissing, and Caregiver Emotional Stability

It was expected that anger could be predicted from emotion coaching and emotion dismissing, after controlling for romantic attachment and caregiver emotional stability.

7. Predicting Assertiveness and Conflict Management from Attachment, Emotion Coaching/Dismissing, and Caregiver Emotional Stability

It was expected that assertiveness and conflict management could be predicted from emotion coaching and emotion dismissing, after controlling for romantic attachment and caregiver emotional stability.

---

\(^1\) For the remainder of this study, ‘attachment anxiety’ is referred to as ‘anxiety’.
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8. Relationship Between Students' and Caregivers' Retrospective Reports of EC and ED

Students' retrospective reports of parental EC and ED were expected to correlate with primary caregivers' retrospective accounts of EC and ED. Primary caregivers' retrospective accounts of EC and ED were expected to be related to their feelings and attitudes towards sadness and anger in themselves.

Method

Participants

Participants were 379 psychology undergraduates from the Psychology department participant pool of the University of New Hampshire and their primary caregivers. Seventy-four percent of these students were female, 94% were White/Caucasian, and 94% aged 17-20. Eighty-eight percent of primary caregivers were female, and 95% of these caregivers were biological parents of participants. As compensation, students received three hours of lab credit towards a course requirement. Two hours were granted for participation in the study and another hour for providing their primary caregiver's address and encouraging their response to a brief survey that was being mailed to them. The return rate of these surveys was close to 90%.

Procedure

The survey packet was administered to groups of participants in a classroom setting. Each participant filled out an informed consent form. Participants were told that they would receive two credits for participating in the study and one credit for providing their primary caregiver's address on the envelope included in the survey packet and for calling their caregivers within the next 24 hours to inform them about the questionnaire and to
encourage their responding. To specify the term primary caregiver, participants were told to select that caregiver who 'had the most influence emotionally' on them. It was emphasized that all information, including caregivers’ addresses, would be kept confidential and that only code numbers would be used to identify participants and caregivers. Caregiver survey packets included a letter explaining the study, a brief questionnaire and a self-stamped return envelope, and were sent immediately following each study session. Upon completion of the survey, all participants received a debriefing form. Participants were given 120 minutes to finish the survey. On average, participants took one hour to complete the survey.

Materials (Students)

Experiences in Close Relationships Adult Attachment Questionnaire (ECRO; Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998). This questionnaire measured adult romantic attachment. Two subscales, anxiety and avoidance, assessed the extent to which people are insecure about their partner’s availability and responsiveness, and the extent to which people are uncomfortable being close to or depending on others, respectively. These scales were administered twice, once in the context of participants’ general experience in romantic relationships, and a second time in the context of their current romantic relationships. The reliabilities of these scales were $\alpha = .89$ for avoidance and $\alpha = .88$ for anxiety (for general relationship experience), and $\alpha = .93$ for avoidance and $\alpha = .91$ for anxiety (for current relationship).

Retrospective Emotion Coaching Scale (RECS; Kroll, 2002). Based on Gottman’s theory (Gottman et al., 1997; Gottman, 2001), this retrospective self-report had been constructed by the author prior to this study to measure parental emotion coaching and
emotion dismissing towards sadness and anger. The procedure was as follows: A total of 155 items were constructed and categorized into five subdomains for EC and ED, respectively. The five subdomains for EC were: being aware of children's emotion, helping children label their emotions, recognizing emotional expression as an opportunity for intimacy and teaching, assisting in solving problems or upsetting situations, and validating children's emotions. The five subdomains of ED were: trouble dealing with children's negative emotions, dismissing children's negative emotions, accusing/punishing for expression of negative emotions, viewing negative emotions as harmful, and criticizing/ridiculing the expression of negative emotions.

As a next step, principal component factor analyses were performed for both sadness and anger items. Factors were rotated using oblique procedures, based on the assumption that they might be negatively correlated to some degree. For both sadness and anger items, a two-factor solution seemed appropriate. For sadness items, the two factors accounted for a total of 43.34% of the variance, and for anger items, they accounted for a total of 43.14% of the variance. For both sadness and anger items, the factors were highly interpretable. Items on the first factor were related to EC, and items on the second factor were related to ED in accordance with Gottman's theory. Thus, factors pertaining to EC and ED were retained for each sadness and anger domain.

In order to reduce the number of items to create two shorter EC and ED scales (one for sadness, one for anger), the 10 top items from each factor that loaded above .50 were chosen, based on a joint content (i.e., two items from each subdomain) and face validity criterion. This procedure was used for each of the four subscales, (i.e., EC/sadness and ED/sadness, EC/anger and ED anger). Factor analyses were then performed again on both
sadness and anger items using the retained 10 items for each subscale of EC and ED. By averaging across the retained items, four subscales were created.

For the current study, the internal reliabilities of these scales were $\alpha = .92$ for EC/Sadness; $\alpha = .87$ for ED/Sadness; $\alpha = .94$ for EC/Anger; and $\alpha = .90$ for ED/Anger. Because the two EC scales and two ED scales were highly correlated ($r = .84$, and $r = .69$, respectively), sadness and anger items were combined to form overall EC and ED scales, yielding Total EC and ED scales that contained 10 sadness and 10 anger items each. The reliability of these scales were high, $\alpha = .96$ for EC Total, and $\alpha = .93$ for ED Total. The correlation between EC Total and ED Total was $r = -.66$.

To provide a context, participants were instructed to “Remember times when you felt sad (angry) as a child,” followed by possible caregiver responses to that emotion. Caregiver responses were introduced with, “How often did your primary caregiver do each of the following things?” followed by items describing caregiver behavior pertaining to EC and ED. Emotion coaching examples were, “allowed you to express your sadness (anger)” and “talked to you about your sadness (anger).” Emotion dismissing examples were, “walked out on you when you were sad (angry),” and “viewed your sadness (anger) as loss of control.” Participants responded to the scale using a 1 (never) to 5 (always) response format (see Appendix A).

**Validation of the RECS.** Eisenberg (1996) argued that emotion coaching was conceptually very similar to the construct measured by the Coping with Children’s Negative Emotions Scale (CCNES; Fabes, Poulin, Eisenberg, Madden-Derdich, 2002). The CCNES measures how parents react to negative emotions in their children arising from everyday situations, for example, a child’s anger in response to being sick and not
being able to attend a friend’s birthday, or a child’s sadness due to the loss of a prized possession. Six subscales assess positive and negative parental reactions to their children’s negative emotion. The Problem-Focused Reactions subscale assesses the degree to which parents help the child to solve the problem that caused the negative emotion. The second subscale, Emotion-Focused Reactions, measures the degree to which parents react with strategies designed to help the child feel better, and Expressive Encouragement of negative emotions reflects the degree to which parents are accepting of their children’s emotional expression.

Two subscales, Minimization Reactions and Punitive Reactions, focus on non-supportive coping responses. The Minimization Reactions subscale assesses the degree to which parents discount or devalue their children’s emotional reactions. The Punitive Reactions subscale measures the degree to which parents use verbal or physical punishment to control their children’s negative emotions. The last subscale, Distress Reactions, measures the extent to which parents get distressed by their children’s expression of negative emotions.

To test whether the CCNES was related to emotion coaching, the RECS was correlated with the CCNES (Kroll, 2003). These results indicated that the CCNES and its subscales were not significantly correlated with emotion coaching or emotion dismissing as measured by the RECS. Furthermore, correlations were run to investigate the predictive validity of the CCNES in comparison with the RECS. Specifically, both scales were correlated with emotional intelligence (EI) as measured by the MSCEIT (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002). Only one subscale of the CCNES, the Expressive Encouragement subscale, correlated (r = .18, p < .05) with one subscale of the MSCEIT,
related to the understanding and regulation of emotion. For the RECS, results indicated that both emotion coaching and emotion dismissing significantly correlated with all three subscales of emotional intelligence. In sum, these results suggest that the RECS demonstrates discriminant validity in measuring something beyond the CCNES, and predictive validity regarding emotional intelligence.

Multidimensional Anger Inventory (MAI; Siegel, 1996). Several subscales assessed different domains related to anger: Anger arousal measures the frequency, duration, and intensity of participants' experience of anger; Hostile Outlook assesses the extent to which participants possess a critical attitude and negative expectations towards other people; Anger-In measures a mode of anger expression related to retaining anger and not expressing it towards others, while Anger-Out measures a mode of anger expression related to releasing it onto others; Range of Anger-Eliciting Situations assesses how readily participants experience anger in response to nine hypothetical situations that can potentially trigger anger. The reliabilities of these scales were as follows: Anger arousal, $\alpha = .88$; hostile outlook, $\alpha = .59$; anger-in, $\alpha = .55$; anger-out, $\alpha = .34$; range of anger-eliciting situations, $\alpha = .81$. Correlations among subscales ranged from $r = .35$ (anger-in and anger-out) to $r = .60$ (anger arousal and anger-out). Correlations between hostile outlook and all other anger subscales ranged from $r = .43$ (anger-out) to $r = .51$ (anger arousal). All correlations were significant ($p < .001$). Note: For the remainder of this study, hostile outlook will be referred to as hostility.

Assertiveness and Conflict Management. These two subscales of the ICQ (Interpersonal Competence Questionnaire; Buhrmester, Furman, Wittenberg, and Reis, 1988) assessed the ability to assert oneself in interpersonal relationships and to handle
conflicts in a constructive manner, respectively. The reliabilities of the assertiveness and conflict management scales were $\alpha = .87$ and $\alpha = .83$, respectively.

**Emotional Stability.** This subscale of the IPIP (International Personality Item Pool; Goldberg, 1999) was reworded to assess retrospective emotional stability of primary caregivers. The reliability of this scale was $\alpha = .91$.

**Materials (Parents)**

Retrospective Emotion Coaching Scale (caregivers). Based on Gottman’s theory (Gottman et al., 1997; Gottman, 2001) and the RECS for students, a questionnaire was developed to measure retrospective parental emotion coaching and emotion dismissing towards sadness and anger directly from primary caregivers of students. The items are similar to the RECS. However, to avoid potential defensiveness of caregiver responses, the wording for individual items was either slightly softened, (e.g., “[your primary caregiver] viewed talking about your feeling of sadness as a ‘waste of time’,” was changed to “I didn’t like talking about his/her sadness”), or where replaced by less direct items (e.g., “[your primary caregiver] ridiculed you when you were sad” and “[your primary caregiver] dismissed you when you were angry” were replaced with “I felt uncomfortable with his/her sadness” and “I didn’t give much thought and energy about his/her anger” (see Appendix A).

**Results**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the predictor variable EC and ED and the outcome variables attachment, anger, assertiveness, and conflict management. Results were organized in the following way: The first section focuses on information concerning the measurement of EC and ED and
romantic attachment. Next, each set of relationships between EC and ED and all outcome variables is reported, in the following order: EC/ED with attachment, EC/ED with anger, and EC/ED with assertiveness and conflict management. One additional section concerns the relationship between romantic attachment and anger. Each of these relationships is described by Pearson correlations and comparison of group means, based on a median split of the variables EC and ED (see p. 38 for more details). The next section focuses on whether the outcome variables anger, assertiveness, and conflict management can be predicted from EC and ED when other correlated variables (i.e., romantic attachment, caregiver emotional stability) are controlled. The unique contribution of each predictor variable with respect to explaining variance in the outcome variables is described by hierarchical multiple regressions analyses. Finally, the last section concerns the correlation between participants' and their caregivers' retrospective reports of EC and ED.

1. Measurement of Emotion Coaching/Dismissing and Romantic Attachment

EC sadness and anger were highly correlated \( r = .84 \), and ED sadness and anger were highly correlated \( r = .69 \). Thus, both EC scales were combined into an EC Total scale, and both ED scales were combined into an ED Total scale. Both subscales and total scales were used for all correlation analyses. For multiple regression analyses predicting anger, assertiveness, and conflict management, only the anger EC and ED subscales were used.

The correlation between attachment to romantic partners in general and attachment to current partner was high, \( r = .81, p < .001 \) for avoidance, and \( r = .87, p < \)
.001 for anxiety. Because attachment in both contexts was highly correlated, only the former was used for analyses, since it was available for a greater amount of respondents.

2. Emotion Coaching/Dismissing and Romantic Attachment

Table 1 shows the zero-order correlations between all EC and ED scales and both attachment scales. As predicted, retrospective reports of parental EC correlated negatively with both attachment scales. Specifically, EC/Sadness correlated negatively with Avoidance and Anxiety, $r = .31, p < .001$, and $r = .29, p < .001$, respectively. EC/Anger correlated negatively with Avoidance and Anxiety, $r = .28, p < .001$, and $r = .28, p < .001$, respectively. EC Total correlated negatively with Avoidance and Anxiety, $r = .31, p < .001$, and $r = .30, p < .001$, respectively.

Table 1. Correlations Between EC and ED Scales and Attachment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Avoidance</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotion Coaching:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/Sadness</td>
<td>-.308***</td>
<td>-.291***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/Anger</td>
<td>-.287***</td>
<td>-.282***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/Total</td>
<td>-.310***</td>
<td>-.299***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotion Dismissing:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/Sadness</td>
<td>.239***</td>
<td>.292***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/Anger</td>
<td>.209***</td>
<td>.334***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/Total</td>
<td>.241***</td>
<td>.343***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All significant correlations are printed in bold. *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$, two-tailed.

Also in line with predictions, students’ retrospective reports of parental ED correlated positively with Avoidance and Anxiety. Specifically, ED/Sadness correlated positively with Avoidance and Anxiety, $r = .24, p < .001$, and $r = .29, p < .001$, respectively. ED/Anger correlated positively with Avoidance and Anxiety, $r = .21$,
ED Total correlated positively with Avoidance and Anxiety, $r = .24, p < .001$, and $r = .34, p < .001$, respectively.

To compare means between groups with different reported levels of EC and ED, four groups were formed using a median split procedure. The low EC group ranged from the lowest value through the median of 3.94, and the high EC group ranged from 3.95 through the highest value. The low ED group ranged from the lowest value through the median of 1.44, and the high ED group ranged from 1.45 through the highest value. This way a new variable was created with four different categories of EC and ED: An indifferent group with low levels of both EC and ED, a dismissed group with high levels of ED and low levels of EC, a coached group with high levels of EC and low levels of ED, and a mixed group with high levels of both EC and ED.

Using this new variable, ANOVAs were performed comparing means of all four groups regarding attachment avoidance and anxiety. The overall $F$ was statistically significant for both attachment categories: For Avoidance, $F(3, 369) = 8.68, p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .066$; for Anxiety, $F(3, 369) = 14.91, p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .108$. Tukey HSD tests were performed to assess mean differences between groups. Regarding Avoidance, statistically significant differences were found between the coached group and the dismissed group ($p < .001$), as well as between the dismissed group and the mixed group ($p < .05$), suggesting that the dismissed group scored higher in Avoidance than both coached group and the mixed group. In addition, the mean difference between the indifferent group and the coached group approached significance, $p = .058$, suggesting that the indifferent group displayed higher scores on avoidance than the coached group.
With Anxiety as dependent variable, statistically significant differences were found between the *coached* group and both the *dismissed* group \((p < .001)\) and the *mixed* group \((p < .01)\), as well as between the *dismissed* group and the *indifferent* group \((p < .01)\).

These findings suggest that the *coached* group displayed lower levels of anxiety compared with the *dismissed* and the *mixed* group, and the *indifferent* group displayed lower levels of anxiety than the *dismissed* group. Table 2 displays the cell means on Avoidance and Anxiety for all four EC/ED groups.

Table 2. Cell Means on Attachment for Four Groups of EC/ED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC Group</th>
<th>Levels of EC</th>
<th>Levels of ED</th>
<th>Avoidance</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coached</strong></td>
<td><strong>HI</strong></td>
<td><strong>LO</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.58</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note*: the coached group (in bold) consistently shows the most favorable outcome.

### 3. Emotion Coaching/Dismissing and Anger

Table 3 shows the zero-order correlations between all EC and ED scales and the anger scales. As predicted, students' retrospective reports of parental EC correlated negatively with all anger scales, while reports of parental ED correlated positively.

To compare means between EC and ED groups derived from the median split procedure described above, five 2 X 2 ANOVAs were performed comparing means of all four groups regarding anger arousal, hostility, anger-in, anger-out, and range of anger-eliciting situations. The overall F was statistically significant for all anger categories: For anger arousal, \(F(3, 369) = 16.17, p < .001, \eta^2 = .116\); for hostility, \(F(3, 369) = 10.00, \eta^2 = .116\).
Table 3. Correlations Between EC and ED Scales and Anger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arousal</th>
<th>Hostility</th>
<th>Anger-in</th>
<th>Anger-out</th>
<th>Range of AES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/Sadness</td>
<td>-.238***</td>
<td>-.214***</td>
<td>-.237***</td>
<td>-.120*</td>
<td>-.136**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/Anger</td>
<td>-.283***</td>
<td>-.233***</td>
<td>-.245***</td>
<td>-.179**</td>
<td>-.177**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/Total</td>
<td>-.272***</td>
<td>-.234***</td>
<td>-.251***</td>
<td>-.157**</td>
<td>-.164**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/Sadness</td>
<td>.206***</td>
<td>.191***</td>
<td>.212***</td>
<td>.189***</td>
<td>.131*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/Anger</td>
<td>.393***</td>
<td>.260***</td>
<td>.261***</td>
<td>.303***</td>
<td>.256***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/Total</td>
<td>.338***</td>
<td>.249***</td>
<td>.261***</td>
<td>.275***</td>
<td>.219***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AES = Anger-eliciting situations. All significant correlations are printed in bold, *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001, two-tailed.

p < .001, $\eta^2 = .075$. for anger-in, $F(3, 369) = 10.39, p < .001, \eta^2 = .078$; for anger-out, $F(3, 369) = 9.51, p < .001, \eta^2 = .072$; for range of anger-eliciting situations, $F(3, 369) = 5.16, p < .01, \eta^2 = .040$. Tukey HSD tests were performed to assess mean differences between groups. Regarding anger arousal, statistically significant differences were found between the coached group and both the dismissed group and the mixed group ($p < .001$ and $p < .01$, respectively), as well as between the dismissed group and the indifferent group ($p < .001$), suggesting that the coached group scored lower in anger arousal than both dismissed group and the mixed group, and the dismissed group scored also significantly higher in anger arousal than the indifferent group. With hostility as dependent variable, statistically significant differences were found between the dismissed group and both the coached and indifferent group ($p < .001$ and $p < .01$, respectively).

These findings suggest that the dismissed group displayed higher levels of hostility compared with the coached and the indifferent group. With anger-in as dependent variable, the only statistically significant differences was found between the dismissed
group and the *coached* group ($p < .001$), suggesting that the *dismissed* group displayed significantly higher levels of anger-in compared with the *coached* group. With anger-out as dependent variable, statistically significant differences were found between the *coached* group and both the *dismissed* and *mixed* group ($p < .001$ and $p < .01$, respectively). These findings suggest that the *coached* group displayed lower levels of anger-out than the *dismissed* group and the *mixed* group. With range of anger-eliciting situations as dependent variable, the only statistically significant differences was found between the *dismissed* group and the *coached* group ($p < .01$), suggesting that the *dismissed* group scored higher on range of anger-eliciting situations compared with the *coached* group. Table 4 displays the cell means on all anger scales for all four EC/ED groups.

**Table 4. Cell Means on Anger for Four Groups of EC/ED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC Group</th>
<th>Levels of EC</th>
<th>Levels of ED</th>
<th>Anger arousal</th>
<th>Hostility</th>
<th>Anger-in</th>
<th>Anger-out</th>
<th>Anger-eliciting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coached</strong></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td><strong>2.16</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.80</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.80</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* the coached group (in bold) consistently shows the most favorable outcome.

**4. Emotion Coaching/Dismissing, Assertiveness, and Conflict Management**

Table 5 shows the zero-order correlation between all emotion coaching scales, assertiveness, and conflict management. As predicted, all emotion coaching scales were positively related to both assertiveness and conflict management, while all emotion dismissing scales were negatively related to these variables.
Table 5. Correlations Between EC and ED Scales, Assertiveness, and Conflict Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion Coaching:</th>
<th>Assertiveness</th>
<th>Conflict Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC Sadness</td>
<td>.256***</td>
<td>.199***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Anger</td>
<td>.263***</td>
<td>.216***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Total</td>
<td>.271***</td>
<td>.217***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Dismissing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED Sadness</td>
<td>-.181***</td>
<td>-.131*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED Anger</td>
<td>-.146**</td>
<td>-.212***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED Total</td>
<td>-.176**</td>
<td>-.192***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All significant correlations are printed in bold. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001, two-tailed.

In order to compare means between EC and ED groups derived from the median split procedure described above, two one-way ANOVAs were performed to compare means of all four groups regarding assertiveness and conflict management. The overall F was statistically significant for both categories: For assertiveness, $F(3, 369) = 7.01, p < .001, \eta^2 = .055$; for conflict management, $F(3, 369) = 5.24, p < .01, \eta^2 = .041$.

Regarding assertiveness, Tukey HSD tests revealed statistically significant differences between the *coached* group and both the *dismissed* group and the *indifferent* group ($p < .001$ and $p < .01$, respectively), suggesting that the *coached* group scored higher in assertiveness than the *dismissed* group and the *indifferent* group. With conflict management as dependent variable, statistically significant differences were found between the *coached* group and the *dismissed* group ($p < .01$), suggesting that the coached group displayed higher levels of conflict management than the *dismissed* group.

Table 6 displays the cell means on assertiveness and conflict management for all four EC/ED groups.
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Table 6. Cell Means on Assertiveness and Conflict Management for Four Groups of EC/ED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC Group</th>
<th>Levels of EC</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Assertiveness</th>
<th>Conflict Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coached</strong></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td><strong>4.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* the coached group (in bold) consistently shows the most favorable outcome.

5. Romantic Attachment and Anger

Table 7 shows the zero-order correlations between attachment avoidance and anxiety and all anger scales. With the exception of range of anger-eliciting situations, both avoidance and anxiety correlated positively with all anger scales. Contrary to predictions that only avoidance would be related to hostility and only anxiety would be related to anger-in and anger arousal, both avoidance and anxiety correlated significantly with these variables. With regard to the strength of correlations, attachment anxiety consistently correlated higher with all anger scales than attachment avoidance.

Table 7. Correlations Between Attachment and Anger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance</th>
<th>Arousal</th>
<th>Hostility</th>
<th>Anger-in</th>
<th>Anger-out</th>
<th>Range of AES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anxiety</strong></td>
<td>.179***</td>
<td>.195***</td>
<td>.210***</td>
<td>.103*</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.442***</td>
<td>.413***</td>
<td>.408***</td>
<td>.363**</td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* AES = Anger-eliciting situations. All significant correlations are printed in bold, *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001, two-tailed.

To investigate how much each predictor variable contributes in explaining variance in anger, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were performed. Furthermore, to ensure that emotional stability of primary caregivers did not represent a confounding variable, it was included as a control variable. Before these hierarchical regressions, exploratory analyses were conducted to determine which EC and ED scales to include in the model. Thus, to assess the extent to which each subscale of EC and ED contributed to explaining variance in anger, standard multiple regression analyses were conducted. Since ED/Sadness ED/Anger were highly correlated (r = .804), ED/Sadness appeared to add relatively little in prediction when ED/Anger was entered into the model. Similarly, since EC/Anger was highly correlated with ED/Anger, the contribution of EC/Anger in predicting anger arousal returned to zero when ED/Anger was entered into the model. As a result of these analyses as well as theoretical considerations, only the subscale ED/Anger was used for the following multiple regression analyses.

The predictor variables were entered in the following order: step 1, avoidance, anxiety, and caregiver emotional stability; step 2, ED Anger. The hierarchical procedure was performed in order to assess whether ED Anger explains significant variance in anger arousal when caregiver emotional stability, avoidance, and anxiety were controlled.

The first multiple regression was performed with anger arousal as the dependent variable. On step 1, with caregiver emotional stability and attachment alone as predictors, the step 1 $R^2 = .217$, $F(3, 369) = 34.19, p < .001$. The unique contribution of each variable on step 1 was statistically significant for attachment anxiety, $sr^2 = .123$, $t(369) =$
7.6, \( p < .001 \), and for caregiver emotional stability, \( sr^2 = .013, t(369) = 2.5, p < .01 \). When ED Anger was added to the model on step 2, the overall \( R^2 \) for all four variables was \( .267, F(4, 368) = 33.45, p < .001 \). The increase in \( R^2 \) was statistically significant, \( R^2_{\text{inc}} = .049, F(1, 368) = 24.68, p < .001 \). The unique contribution on step 2 was statistically significant for ED Anger, \( sr^2 = .049, t(368) = 4.97, p < .001 \) and for anxiety, \( sr^2 = .093, t(368) = 6.83, p < .001 \).

To summarize: the overall regression model predicting anger arousal was statistically significant at both steps. The variables that made statistically significant contributions to explained variance were anxiety and caregiver emotional stability (entered on step 1), and ED Anger (entered on step 2). Avoidance did not uniquely produce a statistically significant increment in \( R^2 \). Table 8 summarizes the findings on this multiple regression predicting anger arousal, including the changes in squared multiple R as variables entered the model.

### Table 8. Summary Table of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Anger Arousal from Attachment, Caregiver Emotional Stability, and Emotion Dismissing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>IV added to model</th>
<th>Overall ( R^2 )</th>
<th>( R^2_{\text{inc}} )</th>
<th>( sr^2_{\text{unique}} )</th>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>avoidance</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emotional stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ED Anger</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next multiple regression was performed with hostility as the dependent variable. On step 1, with attachment and caregiver emotional stability alone as predictors, the step 1 \( R^2 = .197, F(3, 369) = 30.10, p < .001 \). The unique contribution of each variable on step 1 was statistically significant for attachment anxiety, \( sr^2 = .102, t(369) = \)
6.85, \( p < .001 \), and caregiver emotional stability, \( sr^2 = .013, t(369) = 2.42, p < .05 \). The unique contribution of avoidance approached significance, \( sr^2 = .008, t(369) = 1.96, p = .050 \). When ED Anger was added to the model on step 2, the overall \( R^2 \) for all four variables was .202, \( F(4, 368) = 23.30, p < .001 \). The increase in \( R^2 \) was not significant, \( R^2_{\text{inc}} = .006, F(1, 368) = 2.53, p = 1.12 \).

To summarize: the overall regression model predicting hostility was statistically significant at both steps. The variables that made statistically significant contributions to explained variance were anxiety and caregiver emotional stability (entered on step 1). Avoidance and ED Anger did not uniquely produce a statistically significant increment in \( R^2 \). Table 9 summarizes the findings on this multiple regression predicting hostility, including the changes in squared multiple \( R \) as variables entered the model.

Table 9. Summary Table of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Hostility from Attachment, Caregiver Emotional Stability, and Emotion Dismissing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>IV added to model</th>
<th>Overall ( R^2 )</th>
<th>( R^2_{\text{inc}} )</th>
<th>( sr^2_{\text{unique}} )</th>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>avoidance</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emotional stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ED Anger</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next multiple regression was performed with anger-in as the dependent variable. On step 1, with attachment and caregiver emotional stability alone as predictors, the step 1 \( R^2 = .209, F(3, 369) = 32.51, p < .001 \). The unique contribution of each variable on step 1 was statistically significant for attachment avoidance, \( sr^2 = .010, t(369) = 2.11, p < .05 \), attachment anxiety, \( sr^2 = .088, t(369) = 6.40, p < .001 \), and caregiver emotional stability, \( sr^2 = .025, t(369) = 3.43, p < .01 \). When ED Anger was added to the
model on step 2, the overall $R^2$ for all four variables was $0.212, F(4, 368) = 24.77, p < 0.001$. The increase in $R^2$ was not significant, $R^2_{inc} = 0.003, F(1, 368) = 1.459, p = 0.23$.

To summarize: the overall regression model predicting anger-in was statistically significant at both steps. The variables that made statistically significant contributions to explained variance were avoidance, anxiety, and caregiver emotional stability (entered on step 1). ED Anger did not uniquely produce a statistically significant increment in $R^2$.

Table 10 summarizes the findings on this multiple regression predicting anger-in, including the changes in squared multiple $R$ as variables entered the model.

Table 10. Summary Table of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Anger-In from Attachment, Caregiver Emotional Stability, and Emotion Dismissing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>IV added to model</th>
<th>Overall $R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{inc}$</th>
<th>$sr^2_{unique}$</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>avoidance</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emotional stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ED Anger</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next multiple regression was performed with anger-out as the dependent variable. On step 1, with attachment and caregiver emotional stability alone as predictors, the step 1 $R^2 = 0.142, F(3, 369) = 20.42, p < 0.001$. The unique contribution of each variable on step 1 was statistically significant for attachment anxiety, $sr^2 = 0.087, t(369) = 6.13, p < 0.001$, and caregiver emotional stability, $sr^2 = 0.009, t(369) = 2.00, p < 0.05$. When ED Anger was added to the model on step 2, the overall $R^2$ for all four variables was $0.170, F(4, 368) = 15.20, p < 0.001$. The increase in $R^2$ was statistically significant, $R^2_{inc} = 0.027, F(1, 368) = 12.11, p = 0.001$. The unique contribution on step 2 was statistically significant for ED Anger, $sr^2 = 0.027, t(368) = 3.48, p = 0.001$ and for anxiety, $sr^2 = 0.068, t(367) = 5.5, p < 0.001$. 
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To summarize: the overall regression model predicting anger-out was statistically significant at both steps. The variables that made statistically significant contributions to explained variance were anxiety and caregiver emotional stability (entered on step 1), and ED Anger (entered on step 2). Avoidance did not uniquely produce a statistically significant increment in R². Table 11 summarizes the findings on this multiple regression predicting anger-out, including the changes in squared multiple R as variables entered the model.

Table 11. Summary Table of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Anger-Out from Attachment, Caregiver Emotional Stability, and Emotion Dismissing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>IV added to model</th>
<th>Overall R²</th>
<th>R² inc</th>
<th>sr² unique</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>avoidance</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emotional stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ED Anger</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>=.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last multiple regression was performed with range of anger-eliciting situations as the dependent variable. On step 1, with attachment and caregiver emotional stability alone as predictors, the step 1 \( R^2 = .176, F(3, 369) = 26.19, p < .001 \). The unique contribution on step 1 was only statistically significant for attachment anxiety, \( sr^2 = .13, t(369) = 7.65, p < .001 \). When ED Anger was added to the model on step 2, the overall \( R^2 \) for all four variables was \( .188, F(4, 368) = 21.32, p < .001 \). The increase in \( R^2 \) was significant, \( R^2_{\text{inc}} = .013, F(1, 368) = 5.70, p < .05 \). The unique contribution on step 2 was statistically significant for ED Anger, \( sr^2 = .013, t(368) = 2.39, p < .05 \).

To summarize: the overall regression model predicting range of anger-eliciting situations was statistically significant at both steps. The variables that made statistically
significant contributions to explained variance were anxiety (entered on step 1), and ED Anger (entered on step 2). Caregiver emotional stability and avoidance did not uniquely produce a statistically significant increment in $R^2$. Table 12 summarizes the findings on this multiple regression predicting range of anger-eliciting situations, including the changes in squared multiple $R$ as variables entered the model.

Table 12. Summary Table of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Range of Anger-Eliciting Situations from Attachment, Caregiver Emotional Stability, and Emotion Dismissing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>IV added to model</th>
<th>Overall $R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{inc}$</th>
<th>$R^2_{unique}$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>avoidance</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emotional stability</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ED Anger</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In order to investigate how much each predictor variable contributes to explaining variance in assertiveness and conflict management, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were performed. Emotional stability of primary caregivers was again included as a control variable. Exploratory analyses were conducted again to determine which EC and ED scales to include in the model. Results from these analyses indicated that EC was a better predictor than ED. Moreover, the subscale EC Anger seemed to be a better predictor than EC Sadness. As a result of these analyses as well as theoretical considerations, only the subscale EC Anger was used for the following multiple regression analyses. The predictor variables were entered in the following order: step 1, avoidance, anxiety, and caregiver emotional stability; step 2, EC Anger. The hierarchical
procedure was performed in order to assess whether EC Anger explain significant variance in assertiveness and conflict management when avoidance, anxiety, and caregiver emotional stability were controlled.

The first multiple regression was performed with assertiveness as the dependent variable. On step 1, with attachment and caregiver emotional stability alone as predictors, the step 1 $R^2 = .120, F(3, 369) = 16.77, p < .001$. The unique contribution of each variable on step 1 was statistically significant for attachment avoidance, $sr^2 = .057, t(369) = -4.89, p < .01$, and caregiver emotional stability, $sr^2 = .015, t(369) = -2.5, p < .05$. When EC Anger was added to the model on step 2, the overall $R^2$ for all four variables was .135, $F(4, 368) = 14.36, p < .001$. The increase in $R^2$ was statistically significant, $R^2_{inc} = .015, F(1, 368) = 6.37, p < .05$. The unique contribution on step 2 was statistically significant for EC Anger, $sr^2 = .015, t(368) = 2.52, p < .05$ and for avoidance, $sr^2 = .044, t(368) = -4.31, p < .001$.

To summarize: the overall regression model predicting assertiveness was statistically significant at both steps. The variables that made statistically significant contributions to explained variance were avoidance and caregiver emotional stability (entered on step 1), and EC Anger (entered on step 2). Anxiety did not uniquely produce a statistically significant increment in $R^2$. Table 13 summarizes the findings on this multiple regression predicting assertiveness, including the changes in squared multiple $R$ as variables entered the model.

The next multiple regression was performed with conflict management as the dependent variable. On step 1, with attachment and caregiver emotional stability alone as predictors, the step 1 $R^2 = .084, F(3, 369) = 11.24, p < .001$. The unique contribution of
Table 13. Summary Table of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Assertiveness from Attachment, Caregiver Emotional Stability, and Emotion Coaching Anger.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>IV added to model</th>
<th>Overall $R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{inc}$</th>
<th>$\sigma_R^2_{unique}$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>avoidance</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.277</td>
<td>-.248</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emotional stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ED Anger</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>-2.52</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each variable on step 1 was statistically significant for attachment avoidance, $sr^2 = .021$, $t(369) = -2.92, p < .01$, and attachment anxiety, $sr^2 = .024, t(369) = -3.11, p < .01$. When EC Anger was added to the model on step 2, the overall $R^2$ for all four variables was $0.094, F(4, 368) = 9.57, p < .001$. The increase in $R^2$ was statistically significant, $R^2_{inc} = .010, F(1, 368) = 4.25, p < .05$. The unique contribution on step 2 was statistically significant for EC Anger, $sr^2 = .010, t(368) = -2.50, p < .05$, and for anxiety, $sr^2 = .020, t(368) = -2.88, p < .01$.

To summarize: the overall regression model predicting conflict management was statistically significant at both steps. The variables that made statistically significant contributions to explained variance in conflict management were both attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance (entered on step 1) and EC Anger (entered on step 2). Caregiver emotional stability did not uniquely produce a statistically significant increment in $R^2$. Table 14 summarizes the findings on this multiple regression predicting conflict management, including the changes in squared multiple $R$ as variables entered the model.
Table 14. Summary Table of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Conflict Management from Attachment, Caregiver Emotional Stability, and Emotion Coaching Anger.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>IV added to model</th>
<th>Overall R²</th>
<th>R² incr</th>
<th>Sr unique</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>avoidance</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emotional stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ED Anger</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Relationship Between Students' and Caregivers' Retrospective Reports of EC and ED

Table 15 shows the zero-order correlations between students' and caregivers' retrospective reports of emotion coaching and dismissing. As predicted, students' EC and ED correlated positively with caregivers' EC and ED respectively. These correlations were consistent across all subscales, suggesting a high inter-rater-agreement between students' and caregivers' retrospective reports of EC and ED.

Table 15. Correlations Between Students' and Caregivers' EC and ED Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Caregiver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC/Sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/Sadness</td>
<td>.289***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/Anger</td>
<td>.252***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/Total</td>
<td>.281***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/Sadness</td>
<td>-.209***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/Anger</td>
<td>-.224***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/Total</td>
<td>-.232***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All significant correlations are printed in bold, *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001, two-tailed.
In addition, as part of the survey, caregivers were asked about their attitudes towards their own experience of sadness and anger. Table 16 shows the zero-order correlations between caregivers’ openness to and difficulty with sadness and anger and their own reports of EC and ED.

Table 16. Correlations Between Caregivers’ Reports of EC and ED and Caregivers’ Openness To and Difficulty With Their Own Sadness and Anger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sad/Open</th>
<th>Anger/Open</th>
<th>Sad/Difficulty</th>
<th>Anger/Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC/Sadness</td>
<td>.407***</td>
<td>.314***</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>-.103*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/Anger</td>
<td>.330***</td>
<td>.470***</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/Total</td>
<td>.399***</td>
<td>.423***</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.108*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/Sadness</td>
<td>-.357***</td>
<td>-.262***</td>
<td>.279***</td>
<td>.274***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/Anger</td>
<td>-.302***</td>
<td>-.312***</td>
<td>.197***</td>
<td>.345***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/Total</td>
<td>-.367***</td>
<td>-.324***</td>
<td>.265***</td>
<td>.350***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All significant correlations are printed in bold, *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001, two-tailed.

Results suggested that caregivers’ reports of EC were positively related to their openness toward both their own sadness and anger, and negatively related to their difficulty dealing with anger. Caregivers’ reports of EC were also negatively related to their difficulty dealing with their own sadness, although these correlations were not significant. Caregivers’ reports of ED were positively related to their difficulty dealing with both their own sadness and anger, and negatively related to their openness towards sadness and anger. Finally, Table 17 shows the zero-order correlations between these scales and students’ reports of EC and ED. Results suggested that caregivers’ openness to their own sadness correlated positively with students’ EC reports and negatively with students’ ED reports. Openness to anger correlated positively with students’ reports of EC sadness and negatively with students’ reports of ED Anger.
Table 17. Correlations Between Students’ EC and ED and Caregivers’ Openness To and Difficulty With Their Own Sadness and Anger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sad/Open</th>
<th>Anger/Open</th>
<th>Sad/Difficulty</th>
<th>Anger/Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC/Sadness</td>
<td>.176**</td>
<td>.115*</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/Anger</td>
<td>.149**</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/Total</td>
<td>.169**</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/Sadness</td>
<td>-.152**</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/Anger</td>
<td>-.184**</td>
<td>-.118*</td>
<td>.119*</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/Total</td>
<td>-.182**</td>
<td>-.114*</td>
<td>.111*</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All significant correlations are printed in bold, *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001, two-tailed.

and ED Total. Correlations between caregiver reports on difficulty dealing with their own sadness and anger indicated that caregivers’ difficulty dealing with sadness was significantly related to ED Anger and ED Total.

**Discussion**

**Measurement of Emotion Coaching/Dismissing and Romantic Attachment**

Emotion coaching of anger and sadness were highly correlated, as were ED of anger and sadness, suggesting that parental coaching of emotions is global rather than emotion specific. Similarly, the high correlation between romantic attachment in general and romantic attachment to a current romantic partner suggests that romantic attachment appears to be global rather than relationship specific. These findings supported both the creation of EC Total and ED Total scales and the generalization of attachment dimensions, thereby justifying the sole use of the general attachment scales.

**Emotion Coaching/Dismissing and Romantic Attachment**

With regard to the relationship between EC/ED and romantic attachment, results were in line with predictions. Higher levels of retrospective EC were associated with
lower levels of both avoidance and anxiety, whereas high levels of ED were associated with higher levels of both avoidance and anxiety. When four groups were formed to compare the outcome of different combinations of EC and ED, the coached group consistently reported lower levels of avoidance and anxiety, while the dismissed group reported higher levels. Thus, in line with predictions, it appears that parenting that combines high levels of EC and low levels of ED has the most favorable outcome with respect to romantic attachment.

In looking at the other combinations, results suggested that indifferent parenting that involves low levels of both EC and ED is associated with higher attachment avoidance, while mixed parenting involving high levels of both EC and ED appeared to be related to attachment anxiety. Thus, the two parenting groups seem to display an opposite pattern concerning the two attachment variables. These findings are in line with previous research suggesting that avoidant attachment may develop as an adaptation to an unavailable – or, in our terms, indifferent – caretaker (Ainsworth et al., 1978). It could be, then, that the aspect of unavailability becomes especially apparent in parents’ behavior towards their children’s emotions such as sadness or anger, as assessed through the EC and ED scales.

Caretaker behavior that alternates between involvement and rejection – as in the mixed group – appears, on the other hand, to result in the development of an anxious attachment style. This also confirms previous research suggesting that anxious attachment, or the extreme worry about abandonment and lack of involvement of romantic partners, develops as a result of the constant push-pull that accompanies a caregiver’s alternating caring and rejecting behavior (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Again, this
mixture may have particularly detrimental effects in moments of emotional distress, such as in sadness and anger, when the involvement and compassion of caretakers appears crucial for developing trust in the responsiveness and availability of significant others. In this respect, findings relating EC and ED to romantic attachment may offer additional information on how parental behavior concerning specific emotions may affect children’s internal working models of attachment figures, that in turn affect their perception of and experience with romantic partners.

In sum, these findings suggest that secure attachment, defined as low levels of both avoidance and anxiety, is associated with caregivers’ emotion coaching behavior. It appears to be important, however, that emotion coaching behavior is conveyed as a clear message, that is, high levels of EC are combined with low levels of ED, because any other combination of EC and ED may have negative outcomes regarding romantic attachment.

**Emotion Coaching/Dismissing and Anger**

In line with predictions, high parental EC seemed to be associated with lower levels of self-reported anger, while high parental ED was associated with higher levels of anger. Furthermore, in comparing groups with different levels of parental EC and ED, the coached group consistently showed significantly lower scores for all anger scales than the dismissed group. In addition, the mixed group scored significantly higher than the coached group in anger arousal and anger-out. Thus, parental behavior involving mixed messages of both EC and ED seem to lead to higher anger arousal as well as the tendency to get anger out of the system rather than hold it in (as assessed by the anger-out scale).
Similar to the association found between mixed parenting behavior and anxious attachment, these results possibly reflect the idea that mixed EC and ED behavior may result in increased vigilance and intensity of emotions such as anger, reflected in higher anger arousal. The indifferent group, on the other hand, scored significantly lower in anger arousal than the dismissed group. These findings make sense in connection with previous research suggesting that avoidant individuals tend to report less anger than their anxious counterparts (Mikulincer, 1998). Thus, in the same way that low EC and ED – or a lack of parental involvement – seems to be associated with avoidant attachment, this parenting behavior may also be linked to lower self-reported anger arousal. However, again the question remains whether anger arousal levels of avoidant individuals are indeed lower or whether self-report results may simply reflect a lack of awareness of these individuals concerning their anger arousal. Future replications employing physiological measures may shed some light on this issue.

Results further suggested that the indifferent group displayed lower hostility, while the dismissed group displayed higher hostility. In relating these findings to previous research on attachment and hostility, the data appear inconsistent with findings suggesting an association between a lack of parental involvement and both avoidant attachment and higher hostility scores (e.g., Mikulincer, 1998), but consistent with other findings suggesting that avoidant attachment is associated with lower hostility than anxious attachment (e.g., Simpson, Rholes, and Philips, 1996). Thus, findings in this study relating EC and ED to hostility may offer some new insights into these discrepant research findings. One possible explanation may be that individuals who experienced low EC and ED, or, in our terms, indifferent parenting, may themselves develop an indifferent...
attitude towards others as an adaptive strategy, which may then be reflected in lower levels of hostility. This is especially true when considering the idea that in order for hostile feelings to develop, some level of investment in others may need to be present, and this may not be the case with avoidant individuals.

**Emotion Coaching/Dismissing, Assertiveness, and Conflict Management**

In order to provide more insight into how EC and ED may relate to more constructive ways of expressing anger in interpersonal situations, assertiveness and conflict management were the next focus of this investigation. Results confirmed predictions that high EC was associated with higher levels of both assertiveness and conflict management, while high ED was associated with lower levels of these variables. In comparing groups with different levels of EC and ED, results confirmed that the coached group scored significantly higher in both assertiveness and conflict management than the dismissed group. In addition, the coached group displayed significantly higher scores in assertiveness than the indifferent group, and a similar pattern approaching significance was found for conflict management. These findings could be explained by the idea that indifferent parents may not provide appropriate models for assertiveness and conflict management due to their lack of involvement. Both assertiveness and conflict management may be considered a social skill that is learned through observational learning as well as appropriate environmental reinforcements, both of which indifferent parenting may not provide. In sum, these findings suggest that parents who take the time to coach and teach their children about negative emotions such as anger may help their children to develop more adaptive ways to express dislike or anger towards others, as reflected in both the ability to assert oneself and to manage conflict in productive ways.
**Romantic Attachment and Anger**

As predicted, both attachment scales correlated with certain aspects of anger. Specifically, with the exception of range of anger-eliciting situations, both avoidance and anxiety correlated significantly with all anger scales. The hypothesis that avoidance would be highly correlated with hostility, while anxiety would be highly correlated with anger-in and anger arousal was partially confirmed. Although avoidance was associated with hostility, anxiety consistently showed higher correlations with all anger scales, including hostility, anger-in, and anger arousal. It is possible that anxiety correlated higher with these aspects of anger because, as mentioned earlier, anxious attachment has been found to be associated with more intense experiences of anger that may generalize to several different aspects of anger.

Findings suggesting that anxious attachment shows stronger associations with all anger scales may also be connected to the idea that anxiously attached individuals seem more hypervigilant toward unavailable attachment figures, that may exacerbate their vulnerability to experiencing intense emotional responses related to anger. Although this anger is generally understood as a response to cues suggesting attachment figure unavailability, rumination over such cues, as reflected in higher anger-in scores, may be linked to more intense and prolonged occurrences of anger. This anger, then, may generalize to other areas in life, as suggested by our results. Finally, it may make sense that anger-in appears higher for anxious attachment, considering that anxiously attached individuals may fear alienating and losing support from others, and as a result, may be more prone to direct anger toward the self (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005).
A potential confound to be considered when interpreting these results pertains to the means for assessing anger. Specifically, the measurement of anger relied solely on self-reports rather than physical measurements of anger arousal, thus requiring participants’ awareness of and willingness to report their anger. Previous research suggested that avoidantly attached individuals report less anger, however, this may not reflect whether they actually experience less anger or are simply not aware of, or perhaps unwilling to report, their anger. In fact, Mikulincer (1998) found that avoidantly attached reported less anger but displayed physiological signs of anger arousal in anger-eliciting situations. Thus, it is possible that actual anger arousal levels of avoidantly attached are higher than reported. In addition, the hostility subscale of the MAI may not assess the type of hostility that some literature suggested to be correlated with avoidant attachment. For example, one question from this scale, ‘People talk about me behind me back’ may assess beliefs related to paranoia rather than hostility that may confound the measurement of hostile attitudes. Future research may investigate the relationship between attachment and hostility by using other hostility measures.

Predicting Anger from Romantic Attachment, Emotion Dismissing, and Caregiver Emotional Stability

One question of interest in this investigation pertained to how much each parenting variable contributes to explaining variance in several aspects of anger as measured by the MAI. Results suggested that anger arousal could be predicted from anxious attachment and the dismissing of anger. Initially, caregiver emotional stability contributed to explaining variance in anger arousal. However, the significance of this contribution dropped to zero when ED was entered into the model. These findings confirm predictions
in several ways. First, it appears that it is anxious attachment rather than avoidant attachment that contributes to anger arousal. Second, this contribution appears to be independent of caregiver emotional stability. Finally, parental emotion dismissing of anger predicted anger arousal, suggesting that parental behavior pertaining to ignoring, dismissing, and punishing of anger may actually result in an increase in anger arousal.

In predicting hostility, caregiver emotional stability and anxiety were the only variables that provided significant contributions. Neither avoidance nor ED Anger appeared to explain a significant amount of variance in hostility. The contribution of ED Anger was significant before, but not after, caregiver emotional stability was included, suggesting that ED Anger provided predictive information redundant with information provided by caregiver emotional stability. These findings confirm previous research, suggesting that it is anxious attachment rather than avoidant attachment that predicts hostility (Simpson, Rholes, and Philips, 1996). Furthermore, it appears that caregiver emotional instability plays a major role in the development of hostile attitudes towards others. Thus, in response to previous inconsistencies regarding the role of hostility in attachment, these findings add further information about the variables involved in predicting hostility.

In predicting anger-in, the only variables that explained a significant amount of variance were caregiver emotional stability, avoidance, and anxiety. The largest contribution was provided by attachment anxiety, suggesting that worry about abandonment and rejection by significant others predicts how likely someone may withhold their anger instead of expressing it. These findings are in line with previous
ideas suggesting that anxiously attached may refrain from expressing their anger for fear of rejection or abandonment (e.g., Mikulincer, 1998).

The fact that avoidance also predicted anger-in may be explained by the idea that avoidantly attached individuals may suppress their anger as an adaptive way to deal with unavailable caregivers, and that this suppression is related to retaining anger. It should be noted, however, that the reliability of the anger-in subscale of the MAI was not very high ($\alpha = .54$), and that some items may measure aspects different from holding anger in. For example, some items seem to measure rumination (e.g., “When I hide my anger from others, I think about it for a long time”) while others seem to assess other dimensions, possibly related to harshness or negative intentions (“If I let people see the way I feel, I’d be considered a hard person to get along with”). Further research employing clearer measures of anger-in may provide further insight into the relationship between romantic attachment and anger-in.

Finally, results suggested that caregiver behavior pertaining to dismissing anger did not add any further information in predicting anger-in. Thus, although ED Anger showed significant zero-order correlations with anger-in, its unique contribution in predicting anger-in appeared to overlap with contributions of both caregiver emotional stability and attachment.

Interestingly, ED Anger did not contribute to explaining variance in anger-in, but its unique contribution to explaining variance in anger-out was significant. The contribution of caregiver emotional stability to predicting anger-out was also significant but dropped to zero when ED Anger was added to the model. This suggests that caregiver emotional stability did not provide predictive information about anger-out beyond ED Anger. For
the predictor variable romantic attachment, it appeared that avoidant attachment did not predict the outward expression of anger as measured by the MAI, whereas anxious attachment did.

It is interesting that anxious attachment appears to predict both anger-in and anger-out, considering that one might expect these modes of anger expression to be bipolar. One possible explanation may be that, as previous research suggested, anxious attachment seems to be associated with more intense and prolonged experiences of anger (Mikulincer, 1998), which may result in holding anger in for the purpose of avoiding rejection by others. However, this retaining of anger may also lead to a build-up of anger that may then necessitate its outward expression, in the sense of a pressure release model. The lack of predictive contribution of avoidant attachment, on the other hand, may be related to the idea that avoidantly attached individuals possess a more indifferent disposition, reflected in less need to take anger out. It should be noted, however, that the interpretation of these results is challenged by the fact that the anger-out subscale of the MAI showed very low reliability ($\alpha = .34$). This may be due to the variety of dimensions the anger-out scale appears to assess. For example, whereas the items “When I am angry with someone, I take it out on whoever is around” and “I try to get even when I’m angry with someone” appear to measure the tendency to ‘blow off steam,’ with somewhat negative intentions, the item “When I am angry with someone, I let that person know” could be seen as measuring a more functional way of dealing with anger. Finally, the item “Even after I have expressed my anger, I have trouble forgetting about it” seems to add yet another dimension, namely the extent to which anger extends beyond the outward
expression. Thus, further research should address these issues by the use of more reliable and specific measures of anger-out.

Finally, in predicting range of anger-eliciting situations, the significant contribution of anxiety dropped to zero when ED Anger was added to the model, suggesting that parental dismissing of anger appeared to be the best predictor of how readily anger becomes triggered by different situations. These findings can be connected to previous research suggesting that the dismissing of anger may actually lead to an increase in anger arousal (Gross & Levenson, 1993). This arousal, then, may be associated with increased vulnerability to experience anger in response to a wider range of situations.

Predicting Assertiveness and Conflict Management from Romantic Attachment, Emotion Coaching, and Caregiver Emotional Stability

Multiple regression results suggested that EC was a better predictor of both assertiveness and conflict management than ED. Furthermore, findings indicated that it was the coaching of anger rather than sadness that was predictive of both outcome variables. These results are interesting in light of previous findings in this study, suggesting that ED was a better predictor in other outcomes, including anxious attachment and anger. A case could be made that ED is a better predictor for negative outcomes such as anxiety and anger, whereas EC is a better predictor of positive outcomes, such as assertiveness and conflict management. This makes sense considering that parental coaching of anger seems to teach something about the experience, understanding, and appropriate expression of anger, and this learning (i.e., by observation and/or appropriate reinforcements) may in turn affect the appropriate application of assertiveness in interpersonal situations.
Caregiver emotional stability did not seem to contribute to either outcome variable. For assertiveness, emotional stability of caregivers was initially significant in its contribution. However, this contribution returned to zero when EC Anger was introduced. This finding suggests that a caregiver’s coaching of anger predicts assertiveness regardless of the caregiver’s emotional stability. In addition, it should be noted that exploratory analyses revealed that ED was also a significant predictor of conflict management. However, this was only the case for the ED anger subscale. Thus, for conflict management skills, parental dismissing of anger may have a stronger impact than parental dismissing of sadness. This makes sense in light of previous findings in this study, suggesting that ED Anger is associated with higher anger arousal, which in turn may play an important role in conflict management.

In sum, it appears that in the coaching of anger, parents may have their greatest chance in not only helping children understand and label their anger, but also teaching them appropriate ways to manage their anger. This, in turn, may then be reflected in greater ability to assert oneself and manage conflict, especially considering that anger management may be crucial for handling conflict constructively.

For the predictor variable attachment, results suggested that avoidance contributed significantly to explaining variance in assertiveness, whereas anxiety did not. It is possible that for avoidantly attached individuals, who are less worried about abandonment, assertiveness may be an easier task than for anxiously attached individuals, who may refrain from asserting themselves for fear of rejection. In predicting conflict management, both anxiety and avoidance were significant contributors. It is possible that this association reflects a general difficulty of insecurely attached individuals to apply
constructive solutions to interpersonal conflict. Specifically, both the worry about abandonment and the fear of intimacy may be viewed as maladaptive reactions to attachment threats in interpersonal relationships. Conflict, especially in interpersonal relationships, may trigger such threats and thus activate the attachment system and its corresponding behavior patterns. Conflict management, as assessed in this study, may thus be in part predicted by these attachment behavior patterns.

**Relationship Between Students' and Caregivers' Retrospective Reports of EC and ED**

As predicted, students' and caregivers' reports of EC and ED were significantly correlated. These results suggest that there is a fair amount of agreement between caregiver and student retrospective reports of EC and ED, contributing to inter-rater reliability of the EC and ED scales. It is interesting that the relationship between students' and parents' retrospective reports of EC and ED appeared so consistent, considering that one could have expected a certain degree of defensiveness or denial on side of caregivers, especially considering the negative connotation that emotion dismissing behavior may carry. Similarly, there seemed to be a consistent relationship between caregivers' reports of EC and ED and caregivers' openness towards their own sadness and anger, suggesting that more openness was associated with more coaching and less dismissing. Results also indicated that caregivers who were uncomfortable with their own sadness and anger were more likely to be emotion dismissing and less likely to be emotion coaching, although the latter only applied to caregivers' difficulty dealing with anger. These results are in line with Gottman and colleagues (1996), who found that both parents' openness towards and
difficulty with negative emotions in themselves were related to their emotion-coaching and emotion-dismissing behavior.

Caregivers’ reports of their openness to and difficulty with their own negative emotions were also related to students’ reports of EC and ED. Findings suggested that this relationship was weaker but in the same direction. Thus, students’ reports of EC were associated with caregivers’ openness toward their own emotions, although this relationship was more consistent with openness towards sadness. Caregivers’ difficulty dealing with their own anger did not appear to be significantly related to students’ reports of EC and ED. It is likely that the association between EC and ED, on the one hand, and caregivers’ attitudes towards their own negative emotions, on the other, is stronger for caregivers’ reports than for students’ reports, because these correlations pertain to data from within participants (i.e., both variables were assessed from the same caregiver) rather than between participants (i.e., one variable was assessed from students, and the other from caregivers).

Some of these findings may also be in part explained by the idea that parents may have an easier time admitting to their difficulty with sadness rather than anger, considering that the latter may carry more negative connotations in our society. Similarly, it may be easier for parents to report about their openness to sadness and anger rather than their difficulty with these emotions, thus explaining the more consistent findings regarding openness and coaching/dismissing.

It was surprising that caregivers’ openness toward anger was significantly related to students’ reports of EC Sadness but not EC Anger, considering that one could have expected an association between openness towards anger and the coaching of anger. One
possible explanation may be that while openness toward negative emotions such as sadness and anger may result in higher coaching of sadness, the coaching of anger may involve further aspects not assessed by our self-reports. For example, it may be easier for parents to attend to a sad child, using the emotion as an "opportunity for intimacy and teaching" (Gottman, 2001), whereas an angry child may possibly arouse several potentially conflicting reactions from parents, such as anger, helplessness, sadness, and empathy. These, in turn, may make it harder on parents to be consistent in their reactions to their children's anger. Further research may shed more light on the mechanisms involved in parents' thoughts and feelings towards their own anger and their coaching behavior regarding anger in their children. In sum, there appears to be agreement between caregivers' and students' reports of EC and ED, and caregivers' coaching and dismissing behavior may in part be explained by their openness towards these emotions in themselves.

To conclude, results suggest that for most analyses, EC and ED correlated significantly with all outcome variables, even after statistically controlling for correlated variables, such as romantic attachment and caregiver emotional stability. Furthermore, EC appeared to be a better predictor of assertiveness, whereas ED appeared to be a better predictor for anger arousal. Thus, it appears that there is a relationship between parenting variables pertaining to emotion coaching/dismissing and important outcomes such as anger arousal, assertiveness, and conflict management. By highlighting these relationships, this study adds important information to both research on parenting and research on romantic attachment.
Implications

It is not surprising that caregivers’ emotion coaching and dismissing appear to be related to both anger and romantic attachment in their offspring. From an attachment perspective, anger serves as an organizing response that activates the attachment system, motivating the individual to seek responsiveness and accessibility from attachment figures (Bowlby, 1982, 1988). Parenting that is dominated by emotion dismissing behavior, then, may chronically activate this particular emotional response in the child. As a long-term response to a chronically inaccessible attachment figure, children may learn to deactivate the attachment system and withdraw. If, on the other hand, caregivers are emotionally available at times and dismissing at others, their sporadic availability may act as intermittent reinforcement for constant vigilance and effort to achieve caregiver proximity. Both deactivating and hyperactivating attachment strategies, however, may be viewed as maladaptive ways of affect regulation (Mikulincer, Shaver, & Pereg, 2003).

From this perspective, parental emotion dismissing may play an important role at several points in this process. It may contribute to the perception of caregiver emotional unavailability, especially when dismissing occurs during times of stress. It appears to be involved in both the deactivation and hyperactivation of the attachment system. In addition, emotion dismissing in itself may represent a stressor that, according to attachment theory, requires the emotional availability of the caregiver to ensure optimal affect regulation in distress situations. In this regard, emotion dismissing as a type of caregiver unavailability may exacerbate attachment insecurity.
Emotion coaching and dismissing may also contribute to the formation of internal working models of the self and others. These models guide the experience of adult love relationships by influencing expectations for and beliefs about significant others that were derived from early experiences with attachment figures. Some research points to the validity of such a "prototype hypothesis" (Roisman et al., 2005). Results suggesting a relationship between students' attachment towards romantic partners and their experience of parental EC and ED, then, may reflect students' internal working models of important attachment figures.

This study contributes to existing literature on relationships and emotion by connecting research on emotion coaching, attachment, and anger. In emphasizing the importance of parental emotion coaching in addition to emotional availability, it therefore expands on previous research on attachment and parenting. Likewise, it expands on Gottman et al.'s research on parenting and emotion coaching in relating it to the common denominator attachment and emphasizing negative outcomes of emotion coaching related to attachment to significant others.

Findings in this study also point to the importance of parental emotion coaching in relation to emotional competence. For example, the coaching of anger may teach children about the constructive use of this emotion, in viewing it as an adaptive signal that something is upsetting and needs to be solved (Gottman, Katz and Hooven, 1997). Such parenting that combines openness and acceptance of anger with teaching children effective ways to manage their anger may then help to decrease the intensity of children's emotional experience, as suggested by findings regarding anger arousal. In addition,
children may learn to manage and express anger constructively, as suggested by findings
relating emotion coaching to both assertiveness and conflict management competencies.

From an attachment perspective, anger also has adaptive value in signaling a threat
to attachment bonds. Emotion coaching that highlights and teaches about the adaptive
nature of anger may then also serve to improve attachment bonds in adult relationships.
For example, Emotionally Focused Couple Therapy (EFT; Johnson, 2004) is geared
towards focusing on emotional responses such as anger between couples and utilizing
these emotions to create more secure attachment between partners. “Emotion is so
compelling and powerful, particularly in intimate relationships, that if it is not enlisted
into the service of therapy, it is at the very least a powerful force left unused, and at worst
an active undermining agent” (Johnson, 2004, p. 67).

In order to make use of this ‘powerful force’ of anger, EFT therapists reflect and
validate anger as a secondary reactive response within the attachment framework, and
then expand this response into the underlying, primary emotions that are often ignored or
disowned and therefore remain unexpressed in the relationship (Johnson & Whiffen,
1999). As a result, anger may be revealed as covering up vulnerability and hurt as a result
of unmet attachment needs, the expression of which, in turn, helps partners to be less
defensive and more emotionally responsive. In this way, couples are coached to (re-)
create secure attachment. This appears to be an important process and EFT has been
recognized as an effective approach to couples therapy (Johnson, Hunsley, Greenberg,
and Schindler, 1999).

From this perspective, therapists may act as ‘emotion coaches’ themselves
(Greenberg, 2006), by helping individuals to become aware of, understand, and accept
their emotions. In individual emotion-focused therapy, the process of bringing emotions into awareness and articulating them serves to construct new emotional experience believed to assist the integration of cognition and emotion. This, in turn, appears to be a crucial for self-organization and optimal adaptation (Greenberg, 2006).

Findings in this study thus augment both parenting and counseling approaches to emotion coaching. An underlying common thread between these approaches is that they view paying attention to emotions as both important and necessary for well-being. Furthermore, they realize the need for emotional openness both within the person and in the context with significant others. Such an emotional openness should ideally start in the family of origin. Emotion coaching children, however, requires that parents are able to understand, accept, and manage their own emotions effectively. Findings in this study do indeed suggest that parental emotion coaching is related to parents’ openness towards their own emotions. Thus, one next step may be to focus on developing strategies for parents, but also for individuals without children, to learn openness, respect, and acceptance of one’s own and other’s emotions, especially in situations when intense emotional experience may represent a challenge.

In sum, although there is some doubt regarding the extent to which parents really influence their children (e.g., Harris, 1995), findings in this study still point to a relationship between certain parenting variables and important aspects such as anger and attachment. Furthermore, in relating parenting, anger, and romantic relationships to the common denominator attachment, this study may serve as a reminder to the adaptive function of emotions in creating and maintaining significant relationships. In this respect,
this investigation may be a step towards realizing the need for emotional openness within the family, for it may well lay the groundwork for all later attachment relationships.

**Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

One limitation of this study refers to the fact that information about parental behavior was gathered through retrospective self-reports that relied entirely on accuracy of memory of participants. In this context, Bell (1998) suggested that there may be individual biases in recall of childhood experiences related to family expressiveness. Specifically, she found an association between dismissing attachment and low levels of family expressiveness. However, it is not known whether dismissing individuals actually experienced less expressiveness in their families or whether they may be especially unlikely to recall their affective experiences. Similarly, dismissing, or avoidant, attachment has been associated with lack of emotional involvement and negation of attachment needs (e.g., Brennan, Clark, and Shaver, 1998; Hazan and Shaver, 1987). Thus, it is possible that participants may have been biased in recalling their emotional experiences due to their suppression of negative memories such as parental emotion dismissing that may potentially elicit these attachment needs. Future replications using longitudinal observational studies may help to avoid this potential problem. Similarly, the measurement of anger was conducted through self-reports and therefore relied entirely on participants’ awareness of and willingness to admit to their anger. Future studies may employ physiological measures to assess aspects of anger not easily detectable by self-report measures.

Due to the nature of this study, no causal inferences can be made concerning whether parenting directly affects child outcomes, or whether certain child characteristics
may elicit particular parenting responses. For example, Eisenberg & Fabes (1994) suggested that parenting behavior is a function of the child's temperamental characteristics. They found that mothers of children who expressed highly intense negative emotion used strategies likely to reduce their own distress and were relatively punitive and nonsupportive. In contrast, mothers reported more supportive and constructive socialization reactions if they viewed their children as emotionally well-regulated. Thus, children differing in characteristics might trigger different behaviors from parents: those who express highly intense negative emotion may elicit more emotion dismissing from their caregivers, whereas emotionally well-regulated children may be more likely to receive emotion coaching from parents. Some evidence suggests, however, that parental behavior towards children's emotions is independent of children's temperament. Gottman et al. (1996), for example, found that coaching was uncorrelated with the amount of child negative affect, the amount of child positive affect, and the amount of child total affect. Furthermore, he found that the direct benefits of emotion coaching are unaffected by the child's basal vagal tone, an index of the child's ability to emotion-regulate. Similarly, Eisenberg & Fabes (1994) found that the relations of children's anger reactions to less negative maternal practices (i.e., strategies that are likely to reduce maternal arousal, encourage the child to talk about his or her emotions, and comfort the child) were still significant when children's temperamental characteristics associated with the given maternal practice were controlled. They concluded that maternal practices seemed to be associated with children's anger-based behavior regardless of children's temperament, and therefore played a main role in shaping children's emotion-based behavior in general. Thus, some evidence points to the
importance of parenting variables regardless of child temperamental characteristics. This study may provide further insights into those aspects of parenting that specifically concern the coaching of and teaching about emotional experience in children, such as sadness and anger.

Finally, it would be interesting to investigate the extent to which parental emotion coaching and dismissing, as well as parental openness towards negative emotions in themselves may be a function of the attachment style of caregivers. For example, DeOliveira and colleagues (2005) found that mothers classified as securely attached in the AAI displayed more openness and awareness towards emotions than mothers classified as dismissing/avoidant. From this perspective, attachment style of caregivers may in part explain the openess, or lack thereof, of parents toward challenging emotions such as sadness and anger. Thus, future studies may investigate the relationship between caregivers’ attachment, their meta-emotions about their own sadness and anger, and their coaching and dismissing behavior.

Conclusion

This study sought to raise awareness of the relationship between parenting variables and emotional experience, both intra-individually and in relationships with significant others. It provided further insight into the complex interplay between critical experiences with parents regarding sadness and anger, the experience and expression of anger as an adult, and the perception of and attitudes towards romantic partners. Findings in this study may serve as a reminder of the importance of not only paying attention to, but also respecting and celebrating the experience of critical emotions such as sadness and anger, emotions that seem to fulfill an important purpose in our lives. This importance of
emotional acceptance and support, although particularly important in younger years, appears to extend beyond the parent-child relationship. If life is viewed as an ongoing process of making sense of emotional experiences as part of our phenomenological field, then learning about these experiences and using them for adaptive purposes appears to be crucial for healthy development. In this respect, both Bowlby and Gottman may be right in suggesting that negative, or challenging, emotions in those closest to us may indeed represent an opportunity for intimacy and teaching, an intimacy that contributes to the formation of a secure base that appears to be so critical for personal growth.
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APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRES

Student Questionnaire

ID ______

PLEASE USE THE COMPUTER SCORABLE ANSWER SHEET TO ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS.

Please answer the following questions about yourself.

1. What is your gender?
   A. male
   B. female

2. What is your age?
   A. 17-18
   B. 19-20
   C. 21-22
   D. 23-24
   E. 25 and above

3. What is your ethnicity?
   A. White/Caucasian
   B. African-American
   C. Asian-American
   D. Hispanic
   E. Other

Listed below are statements concerning your feelings about romantic relationships. Please indicate your agreement on the score sheet referring to how you generally experience romantic relationships, not just in what is happening in a current relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down</td>
<td>A------- B--------- C------ D----- E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I worry about being abandoned</td>
<td>A------- B--------- C------ D----- E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners</td>
<td>A------- B--------- C------ D----- E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I worry a lot about my relationships</td>
<td>A------- B--------- C------ D----- E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Just when romantic partners start to get close to me</td>
<td>A------- B--------- C------ D----- E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find myself pulling away</td>
<td>A------- B--------- C------ D----- E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them</td>
<td>A------- B--------- C------ D----- E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner
wants to be very close ................................................................. A----------B--------C--------D-------E

11. I worry a fair amount about losing a romantic partner ........... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

12. I don’t feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners ....... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

13. I often wish that a romantic partner’s feelings for me
were as strong as my feelings for him/her .................................... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

14. I want to get close to romantic partners,
but I keep pulling back ............................................................... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

15. I often want to merge completely with romantic
partners, and this sometimes scares them away. ......................... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

16. I am nervous when partners get too close to me ..................... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

17. I worry about being alone ........................................................ A----------B--------C--------D-------E

18. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts
and feelings with romantic partners ........................................... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

19. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away .......... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

20. I try to avoid getting too close to romantic partners ............... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

21. I need a lot of reassurance that I am
loved by romantic partners..................................................... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

22. I find it relatively easy to get close to romantic partners ...... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

23. Sometimes I feel that I force romantic partners to show
more feeling, more commitment ................................................ A----------B--------C--------D-------E

24. I find it difficult to allow myself to
depend on romantic partners .................................................... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

25. I do not often worry about being abandoned ......................... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

26. I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners .................... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

27. If I can’t get romantic partners to show interest in me,
I get upset or angry ............................................................... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

28. I tell romantic partners just about everything .......................... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

29. I find that my partners don’t want to get
as close as I would like ............................................................ A----------B--------C--------D-------E

30. I usually discuss my problems and concerns
with romantic partners ............................................................ A----------B--------C--------D-------E

31. When I’m not involved in a relationship, I feel
somewhat anxious and insecure ................................................ A----------B--------C--------D-------E

32. I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners ............... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

33. I get frustrated when romantic partners are not around
as much as I would like .......................................................... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

34. I don’t mind asking romantic partners
for comfort, advice, or help .................................................... A----------B--------C--------D-------E

35. I get frustrated if romantic partners are not
available when I need them .................................................... A----------B--------C--------D-------E
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36. It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need ....... A -------- B -------- C -------- D ----- E
37. When romantic partners disapprove of me, I feel really bad about myself .................................................. A -------- B -------- C -------- D ----- E
38. I turn to romantic partners for many things, including comfort and reassurance ........................................ A -------- B -------- C -------- D ----- E
39. I resent it when romantic partners spend time away from me .......................................................... A -------- B -------- C -------- D ----- E

Please answer the following questions:

40. Did you base your answers to these last questions on experiences in actual relationships?
   A. My answers were based on my experiences in actual relationships.
   B. I don’t have enough relationship experience to know how I would really feel, so I just tried to imagine how I would feel in a relationship when I answered these questions.

41. Have you ever been in love? Yes  No A B
42. How many romantic relationships (longer than 3 months) have you had? None 1 2 3 4 and more A ---- B ---- C ---- D ---- E
43. At present, are you involved in a romantic relationship that has lasted longer than 3 months? Yes  No A B
   ➔ If you answered “No” to Question 43, please skip questions 44 to 80 and go on to question 81.
   ➔ If you answered “Yes” to Question 43, please answer the following questions, specifically focusing on your present romantic relationship with your current partner.

44. What is the gender of your romantic partner?
   A. male
   B. female

Listed below are statements concerning your feelings in your current relationship. Please fill in the letter on the score sheet that best reflects your agreement with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. I prefer not to show my partner how I feel deep down ......... A -------- B -------- C -------- D ----- E
46. I worry about being abandoned by my partner........................................ A -------- B -------- C -------- D ----- E
47. I am very comfortable being close to my partner........................................ A -------- B -------- C -------- D ----- E
48. I worry a lot about my relationship ....................................... A  B  C  D  E
49. Just when my partner starts to get close to me
    I find myself pulling away ............................................... A  B  C  D  E
50. I worry that my partner won’t care about me
    as much as I care about him/her ...................................... A  B  C  D  E
51. I get uncomfortable when my partner
    wants to be very close ....................................................... A  B  C  D  E
52. I worry a fair amount about losing my partner .................... A  B  C  D  E
53. I don’t feel comfortable opening up to my partner ............. A  B  C  D  E
54. I often wish that my partner’s feelings for me
    were as strong as my feelings for him/her ............................ A  B  C  D  E
55. I want to get close to my partner, but I keep pulling back ...... A  B  C  D  E
56. I often want to merge completely with my
    partner, and this sometimes scares him/her away .................. A  B  C  D  E
57. I am nervous when my partner gets too close to me ............. A  B  C  D  E
58. I worry about being alone ..................................................... A  B  C  D  E
59. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts
    and feelings with my partner ........................................... A  B  C  D  E
60. My desire to be very close sometimes
    scares my partner away ................................................ A  B  C  D  E
61. I try to avoid getting too close to my partner .................... A  B  C  D  E
62. I need a lot of reassurance that I am loved by my partner .... A  B  C  D  E
63. I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner ............. A  B  C  D  E
64. Sometimes I feel that I force my partner to show
    more feeling, more commitment ........................................... A  B  C  D  E
65. I find it difficult to allow myself to
    depend on my partner ................................................ A  B  C  D  E
66. I do not often worry about being abandoned .................... A  B  C  D  E
67. I prefer not to be too close to my partner ....................... A  B  C  D  E
68. If I can’t get my partner to show interest in me,
    I get upset or angry ..................................................... A  B  C  D  E
69. I tell my partner just about everything ............................ A  B  C  D  E
70. I find that my partner doesn’t want to get
    as close as I would like ................................................ A  B  C  D  E
71. I usually discuss my problems and concerns
    with my partner ............................................................. A  B  C  D  E
72. When I’m not involved in a relationship, I feel
    somewhat anxious and insecure ...................................... A  B  C  D  E
73. I feel comfortable depending on my partner .................... A  B  C  D  E
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74. I get frustrated when my partner is not around as much as I would like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. I don’t mind asking my partner for comfort, advice, or help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. I get frustrated if my partner is not available when I need him/her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. It helps to turn to my partner in times of need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. When my partner disapproves of me, I feel really bad about myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. I turn to my partner for many things, including comfort and reassurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. I resent it when my partner spends time away from me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Everybody gets angry from time to time. A number of statements that people have used to describe the times they get angry are included below. Read each statement and fill in the letter on the score sheet that best reflects your agreement with the statement. There are no right or wrong answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81. I tend to get angry more frequently than most people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Other people seem to get angrier than I do in similar circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. I harbor grudges that I don’t tell anyone about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. I try to get even when I’m angry with someone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. I am secretly quite critical of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. It is easy to make me angry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. When I am angry with someone, I let that person know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. I have met many people who are supposed to be experts who are no better than I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Something makes me angry almost every day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. I often feel angrier than I think I should.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. I feel guilty about expressing my anger.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. When I am angry with someone, I take it out on whoever is around.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Some of my friends have habits that annoy and bother me very much.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. I am surprised at how often I feel angry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Once I let people know I’m angry, I can put it out of my mind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. People talk about me behind my back.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
97. At times, I feel angry for no specific reason

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

98. I can make myself angry just by thinking about it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

99. Even after I have expressed my anger, I have trouble forgetting about it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100. When I hide my anger from others, I think about it for a long time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

101. People can bother me just by being around.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

102. When I get angry, I stay angry for hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

103. When I hide my anger from others, I forget about it pretty quickly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

104. I try to talk over problems with people without letting them know I'm angry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

105. When I get angry, I calm down faster than most people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

106. I get so angry, I feel like I might lose control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

107. If I let people see the way I feel, I'd be considered a hard person to get along with.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

108. I am on my guard with people who are friendlier than I expected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

109. It's difficult for me to let people know I’m angry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

110. I get angry when someone lets me down.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

111. I get angry when people are unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

112. I get angry when something blocks my plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

113. I get angry when I am delayed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

114. I get angry when someone embarrasses me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

115. I get angry when I have to take orders from someone less capable than I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

116. I get angry when I have to work with incompetent people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

117. I get angry when I do something stupid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

118. I get angry when I am not given credit for something I have done.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Listed below are scenarios describing assertiveness in interpersonal situations. Referring to how you generally would respond to significant others (i.e., partners, dates, close acquaintances), please fill in the letter on the score sheet that best reflects your agreement with the scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>119. Telling a companion you don’t like a certain way he or she has been treating you</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120. Saying “no” when a date/acquaintance asks you to do something you don’t want to do</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121. Turning down a request by a companion that is unreasonable</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122. Standing up for your rights when a companion is neglecting you or being inconsiderate</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. Telling a date/acquaintance that he or she is doing something that embarrasses you</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124. Confronting your close companion when he or she has broken a promise</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125. Telling a companion that he or she has done something to hurt your feelings</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. Telling a date/acquaintance that he or she has done something that made you angry</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listed below are scenarios describing conflict management in interpersonal situations. Referring to how you generally would behave in conflict with significant others (i.e., partners, dates, close acquaintances), please fill in the letter on the score sheet that best reflects your agreement with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>127. Being able to admit that you might be wrong when a disagreement with a companion begins to built into a serious fight</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128. Being able to put begrudging (resentful) feelings aside when having a fight with a close companion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129. When having a conflict with a close companion, really listening to his or her concerns and not trying to “read” his/her mind</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130. Being able to take a companion’s perspective in a fight and really understand his or her point of view</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131. Refraining from saying things that might cause a disagreement to build into a big fight</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132. Being able to work through a specific problem with a companion without resorting to global accusations (“you always do that”)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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133. When angry with a companion, being able to accept that he/she has a valid point of view even if you don’t agree with that view .............................................. A ———— B ———— C ———— D ———— E

134. Not exploding at a close companion (even when it is justified) in order to avoid a damaging conflict .............. A ———— B ———— C ———— D ———— E

Listed below are questions regarding your primary caregiver. Please fill in the letter on the score sheet that applies to you.

135. Please think of the parent or primary caregiver who you think had the most influence on you when you were growing up. Was this person male or female?
   A. male
   B. female
   C. there was not a single/stable primary caregiver during this time in my life.

136. How was this person related to you?
   A. your biological parent
   B. an adoptive or foster parent
   C. a stepparent
   D. other relative (such as aunt, uncle, grandparent, older sibling)
   E. person who was not a relative (such as friend’s mother, neighbor)

➔ PLEASE ANSWER ALL FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WITH THE PERSON YOU HAVE IDENTIFIED AS YOUR PRIMARY CAREGIVER IN MIND.

Remember times when you felt sad as a child. How often did your primary caregiver do each of the following things?

never rarely sometimes often always

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>137. helped you to become aware of your feeling of sadness</td>
<td>..........</td>
<td>A ———— B ———— C ———— D ———— E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138. asked about your sadness</td>
<td>.................................................</td>
<td>A ———— B ———— C ———— D ———— E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139. discussed with you what you could do in those situations that make you sad</td>
<td>.................................................</td>
<td>A ———— B ———— C ———— D ———— E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140. talked to you about your sadness</td>
<td>.................................................</td>
<td>A ———— B ———— C ———— D ———— E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141. viewed paying attention to your sadness as positive and healthy</td>
<td>.................................................</td>
<td>A ———— B ———— C ———— D ———— E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142. told you your feelings of sadness were okay</td>
<td>.................................................</td>
<td>A ———— B ———— C ———— D ———— E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143. supported you when you felt sad</td>
<td>.................................................</td>
<td>A ———— B ———— C ———— D ———— E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144. allowed you to express your sadness</td>
<td>.................................................</td>
<td>A ———— B ———— C ———— D ———— E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145. solved the problem with you (not for you)</td>
<td>.................................................</td>
<td>A ———— B ———— C ———— D ———— E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146. could tell if you were sad</td>
<td>.................................................</td>
<td>A ———— B ———— C ———— D ———— E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147. viewed your feeling of sadness as toxic</td>
<td>A-----</td>
<td>B------</td>
<td>C---------</td>
<td>D------</td>
<td>E------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148. viewed your sadness as &quot;loss of control&quot;</td>
<td>A-----</td>
<td>B------</td>
<td>C---------</td>
<td>D------</td>
<td>E------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149. told you that you were selfish when you felt sad</td>
<td>A-----</td>
<td>B------</td>
<td>C---------</td>
<td>D------</td>
<td>E------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150. ridiculed you when you were sad</td>
<td>A-----</td>
<td>B------</td>
<td>C---------</td>
<td>D------</td>
<td>E------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151. was frightened of your sadness</td>
<td>A-----</td>
<td>B------</td>
<td>C---------</td>
<td>D------</td>
<td>E------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152. viewed talking about your feeling of sadness as a &quot;waste of time&quot;</td>
<td>A-----</td>
<td>B------</td>
<td>C---------</td>
<td>D------</td>
<td>E------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153. viewed your sadness as embarrassing</td>
<td>A-----</td>
<td>B------</td>
<td>C---------</td>
<td>D------</td>
<td>E------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154. worried that your sadness may make you stop trying</td>
<td>A-----</td>
<td>B------</td>
<td>C---------</td>
<td>D------</td>
<td>E------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155. interpreted your sadness as manipulation</td>
<td>A-----</td>
<td>B------</td>
<td>C---------</td>
<td>D------</td>
<td>E------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156. walked out on you when you were sad</td>
<td>A-----</td>
<td>B------</td>
<td>C---------</td>
<td>D------</td>
<td>E------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, please remember times when you felt angry as a child. How often did your primary caregiver do each of the following things?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>157. encouraged you to find out what it is that makes you angry</td>
<td>A-----</td>
<td>B------</td>
<td>C---------</td>
<td>D------</td>
<td>E------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158. viewed paying attention to your anger as positive and healthy</td>
<td>A-----</td>
<td>B------</td>
<td>C---------</td>
<td>D------</td>
<td>E------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159. encouraged you to be aware of your anger</td>
<td>A-----</td>
<td>B------</td>
<td>C---------</td>
<td>D------</td>
<td>E------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160. soothed you when you felt angry</td>
<td>A-----</td>
<td>B------</td>
<td>C---------</td>
<td>D------</td>
<td>E------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE GO ON TO THE SECOND COMPUTER SCORABLE ANSWER SHEET FOR THE REMAINING QUESTIONS:

1. discussed with you what you could do in those situations that make you angry | A-----| B------| C---------| D------| E------|
2. talked to you about your anger                                         | A-----| B------| C---------| D------| E------|
3. told you your feelings of anger were okay                                | A-----| B------| C---------| D------| E------|
4. asked about your anger                                                  | A-----| B------| C---------| D------| E------|
5. could tell if you were angry                                           | A-----| B------| C---------| D------| E------|
6. allowed you to express your anger                                      | A-----| B------| C---------| D------| E------|
7. viewed your feeling of anger as toxic                                   | A-----| B------| C---------| D------| E------|
8. viewed your anger as "loss of control"                                 | A-----| B------| C---------| D------| E------|
9. worried that your being angry may turn you into a violent person         | A-----| B------| C---------| D------| E------|
10. viewed your anger as embarrassing                                      | A-----| B------| C---------| D------| E------|
11. dismissed you when you were angry (without misbehaving)                 | A-----| B------| C---------| D------| E------|
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12. blamed you when you were angry (without misbehaving) ............................................................
   A------- B------- C------- D ------- E

13. punished you when you were angry (without misbehaving) ............................................................
   A------- B------- C------- D ------- E

14. walked out on you when you were angry (without misbehaving) ............................................................
   A------- B------- C------- D ------- E

15. tried to control your feeling of anger .................................................................................................
   A------- B------- C------- D ------- E

16. ignored you when you were angry .................................................................................................
   A------- B------- C------- D ------- E

Listed below are statements concerning your primary caregiver's emotions. Please read each of the following items and fill in the letter on the score sheet that best reflects your agreement with the statement.

   completely disagree neither agree nor disagree completely agree
   A   B   C   D   E

17. she/he got stressed out easily .............................................................................................................
   A------- B------- C------- D ------- E

18. she/he worried about things ..............................................................................................................
   A------- B------- C------- D ------- E

19. she/he was easily disturbed ..............................................................................................................
   A------- B------- C------- D ------- E

20. she/he got upset easily .........................................................................................................................
   A------- B------- C------- D ------- E

21. she/he changed her mood a lot .........................................................................................................
   A------- B------- C------- D ------- E

22. she/he had frequent mood swings ....................................................................................................
   A------- B------- C------- D ------- E

23. she/he often felt blue .........................................................................................................................
   A------- B------- C------- D ------- E

24. she/he was relaxed most of the time .................................................................................................
   A------- B------- C------- D ------- E

25. she/he seldom felt blue .......................................................................................................................
   A------- B------- C------- D ------- E
Parent Questionnaire

Dear Parent:

Thank you for taking the time to respond to this survey. The purpose of this study is to investigate how parents or caregivers feel about their own experience of sadness and anger, and how they respond to their child’s sadness and anger. With your responses to these questions as the primary caregiver, you are helping us to gain insights directly from caregivers regarding their attitudes towards their own and their child’s emotions. (Although you may have more than one child, please respond to these questions with regard to your son/daughter from UNH).

Your responses to these questions are entirely anonymous and will be kept confidential. (Please do not put your name on this answer sheet).

Please answer all questions on this sheet.

1. What is your gender? (Please circle)
   Male   Female

I am interested in your thoughts and feelings about experiencing sadness and anger in yourself and in your child. There is a broad range of attitudes towards these emotions, and consequently there are different answers, neither of which are right or wrong.

Sadness

First, please think of times when you feel sad. How well do the following statements describe your experience and thoughts about sadness? (Please indicate your agreement by circling the appropriate letter).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. I accept this emotion (it has value, it’s part of life)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel comfortable with the expression of this emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I share this emotion with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I accept rather than avoid this emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I find it important to talk about this emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I find it difficult to regulate the intensity of this emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have found this emotion to be a problem or concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have found that this emotion can be dangerous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have needed some help with this emotion (e.g., friends, counseling)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I try to avoid this emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Now I would like you to remember times when your child felt sad. How often did you do each of the following things? (Please circle the appropriate letter).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When my child was sad...

12. I helped him/her to become aware of his/her feeling of sadness
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

13. I asked him/her about his/her sadness
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

14. I discussed with him/her what he/she could do in those situations that make him/her sad
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

15. I talked to him/her about his/her sadness
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

When my child was sad...

16. I viewed paying attention to his/her sadness as positive and healthy
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

17. I told him/her his/her feelings of sadness was okay
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

18. I supported him/her when he/she felt sad
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

19. I allowed him/her to express his/her sadness
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

20. I solved the problem with him/her (not for him/her)
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

21. I could tell if he/she was sad
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

22. I told him/her it would be best to control his/her sadness
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

23. I thought that he/she was selfish when he/she felt sad
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

24. I didn’t like talking about his/her sadness
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

25. I didn’t like him/her showing his/her sadness
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

26. I felt embarrassed about his/her sadness
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

27. I worried that his/her sadness may make him/her stop trying
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

28. I interpreted his/her sadness as manipulation
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

29. I felt uncomfortable with his/her sadness
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

30. I didn’t give much thought or energy about his/her sadness
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E

31. I walked out on him/her when he/she was sad
   A-------- B------ C------ D------ E
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Anger

Now, please think of times when you feel angry. How well do the following statements describe your experience and thoughts about anger? (Please indicate your agreement by circling the appropriate letter).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When I am angry...

32. I accept this emotion (it has value, it’s part of life) ............... A——— B——— C——— D——— E
33. I feel comfortable with the expression of this emotion .......... A——— B——— C——— D——— E
34. I share this emotion with others ........................................ A——— B——— C——— D——— E
35. I accept rather than avoid this emotion .......................... A——— B——— C——— D——— E
36. I find it important to talk about this emotion .............. A——— B——— C——— D——— E
37. I find it difficult to regulate the intensity of this emotion .. A——— B——— C——— D——— E
38. It have found this emotion to be a problem or concern ........ A——— B——— C——— D——— E
39. I have found that this emotion can be dangerous ............ A——— B——— C——— D——— E
40. I have needed some help with this emotion (e.g., friends, counseling) ........................................... A——— B——— C——— D——— E
41. I try to avoid this emotion ........................................... A——— B——— C——— D——— E

Now I would like you to remember times when your child felt angry. How often did you do each of the following things?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When my child was angry...

42. I encouraged him/her to find out what it is that made him/her angry ............................................... A——— B——— C——— D——— E
43. I viewed paying attention to his/her anger as positive and healthy .................................................... A——— B——— C——— D——— E
44. I encouraged him/her to be aware of his/her anger ............... A——— B——— C——— D——— E
45. I soothed him/her when he/she felt angry .......................... A——— B——— C——— D——— E
46. I discussed with him/her what he/she could do in those situations that made him/her angry ................ A——— B——— C——— D——— E
47. I talked to him/her about his/her anger .............................. A——— B——— C——— D——— E
48. I told him/her his/her feelings of anger was okay ............... A——— B——— C——— D——— E
49. I asked about his/her anger ........................................... A——— B——— C——— D——— E
50. I could tell if he/she was angry ........................................ A——— B——— C——— D——— E
51. I allowed him/her to express his/her anger ......................... A——— B——— C——— D——— E
52. I worried that his/her being angry may turn him/her into a violent person ................................... A——— B——— C——— D——— E
53. I felt embarrassed about his/her anger ................................ A——— B——— C——— D——— E
54. I felt uncomfortable with his/her anger ................................ A——— B——— C——— D——— E
55. I punished him/her for being angry (without misbehaving) ........... A------- B-------- C-------- D ------- E
56. I felt at a loss over how to deal with his/her anger .................. A------- B-------- C-------- D ------- E
57. I didn’t give much thought or energy about his/her anger........ A------- B-------- C-------- D ------- E
58. I didn’t like talking about his/her anger.............................. A------- B-------- C-------- D ------- E
59. I walked out on him/her when he/she was angry (without misbehaving) .............................................. A------- B-------- C-------- D ------- E
60. I tried to control his/her feeling of anger ........................................ A------- B-------- C-------- D ------- E
61. I ignored him/her when he/she was angry .............................. A------- B-------- C-------- D ------- E

Dear Parent,

Thank you very much for completing this survey!
Please use the included stamped envelope to return this survey to:

Ines Kroll
University of New Hampshire
Psychology Department
Conant Hall
10 Library Way
Durham, NH 03824
May 1, 2007

Ines Kroll
Psychology
Durham, NH 03824

Study: Parental emotion coaching: Does it predict adult attachment, anger and conflict management?

Approval Date: 08/30/2006

The Psychology Departmental Review Committee, a subcommittee of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, reviewed and approved the protocol for your study as Exempt as described in Federal Regulations 45 CFR 46, Subsection 101 (b).

Approval is granted to conduct the project as described in your protocol. Changes in your protocol must be submitted to this committee for review and approval prior to their implementation.

The protection of human subjects in your study is an ongoing process for which you hold primary responsibility. In receiving approval for your protocol, you agree to conduct the project in accordance with the ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects in research, as described in the Belmont Report. The full text of the Belmont Report is available on the Office of Sponsored Research (OSR) webpage at http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/belmont.htm or by request from the OSR.

There is no obligation for you to provide a report to this committee upon project completion unless you experience any unusual or unanticipated results with regard to the participation of human subjects. Please report such events to this office promptly as they occur.

If you have questions or concerns about your project or this approval, please feel free to contact a member of the Psychology Departmental Review Committee.

For the IRB,

Julie F. Simpson
Manager

cc: File