EXPRESSION AND DISPLAY RULES OF BASIC AND SELF-CONSCIOUS

EMOTIONS AMONG TURKISH CHILDREN:

ROLE OF AGE, GENDER, SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS AND CONTEXT

ZEYNEP EMİNE OKUR

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2010

EXPRESSION AND DISPLAY RULES OF BASIC AND SELF-CONSCIOUS

EMOTIONS AMONG TURKISH CHILDREN:

ROLE OF AGE, GENDER, SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS AND CONTEXT

Thesis submitted to the

Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Psychology

By

Zeynep Emine Okur

Boğaziçi University

2010

Expression and Display Rules of Basic and Self-Conscious Emotions

Among Turkish Children:

Role of Age, Gender, Socio-Economic Status and Context

The thesis of Zeynep Emine Okur has been approved by

Assoc. Prof. Feyza Çorapçı

(Thesis Advisor)   _____

Prof. Dr. Diane Sunar   _____

Prof. Dr. Falih Köksal   _____

September 2010

Thesis Abstract

Zeynep Emine Okur, *"Expression and Display Rules of Basic and Self-Conscious*
Emotions Among Turkish Children:
Role of Age, Gender, Socio-Economic Status and Context"

Emotion display rules are the prevailing expectations that prescribe socially acceptable
forms of emotion expression in a given context. The aim of the present study was to
examine the unique and interactive roles of children's socioeconomic status (SES),
gender, age, and emotion communication context (father, mother, friend) on the use of
emotion display rules for both basic and self-conscious emotions in Turkish culture.
The sample included 123 children (62 boys, 61 girls) from third and fifth grade.
Schools were selected based on the neighborhood characteristics to ensure variability
in the SES of the participating families. Children's reactions to emotion eliciting
situations were assessed by a structured interview that consisted of five hypothetical
scenarios. Each scenario was designed to elicit a specific emotion, namely happiness,
anger, guilt, shame, and disappointment. After each scenario was read out loud,
children were asked about how they would feel if they were in such a situation and
whether they would show or not show their felt emotion. All children were
interviewed individually in their school. Logistic regression analyses revealed the
interactive role of the SES and gender on the probability of children's decision to
express or not to express their emotion in the situations designed to elicit shame and
guilt. In each of these situations (shame and guilt scenarios), the odds of emotion
expression was less likely for low SES boys than high SES boys. On the other hand,
the relation between children's report of emotion expression and SES was non-
significant for girls in these two scenarios. Secondly, for those shame and guilt
scenarios, grade was revealed to have a predictive role on emotional expression such
that, fifth graders were found to be more likely to express their emotions in those
scenarios than third graders. For anger scenario, SES uniquely predicted children's
emotional expression. The odds of emotion expression of high SES children were
higher than low SES children. The findings were discussed in light of the child rearing
values and beliefs of Turkish culture by highlighting the variations of gender and
sociocultural differences in emotion socialization.

Tez Özeti

Zeynep Emine Okur, "Türk Çocuklarının Öz Bilinç ve Temel Duygularını
Sergileme Kuralları: Bağlamsal ve Demografik Özelliklerin Rolü"

Duygu sergileme kuralları, duyguların sosyal olarak kabul görecek biçimde ifade
edilmesi için toplum tarafından belirlenmiş örtük kurallardır. Bu çalışmanın amacı;
yaş, cinsiyet, sosyo-ekonomik statü (SES) ve duygunun ifade edildiği bağlamın (anne,
baba, arkadaş), çocukların temel ve öz-bilinç duygularını sergileme kuralları
üzerindeki rollerini incelemektir. Çalışma, 9 ve 11 yaşlarındaki 3. ve 5. sınıf ilkokul
öğrencilerinden oluşan 123 çocukla (62 erkek, 61 kız) gerçekleştirilmiştir. Çocuklarda
SES farklılıklarının sağlanması için, çalışma yapılan okullar bulundukları semtlerin
SES özelliklerine göre seçilmiştir. Çocukların duygu sergileme kuralları, 5 varsayımsal
senaryodan, ve bu senaryoların çocuklarda uyandırdığı duygusal tepkileri inceleyen
sorulardan oluşan yapılandırılmış mülakatlarla değerlendirilmiştir. Her bir senaryo,
çocuklarda belirli bir duyguyu (öfke, utanç, mutluluk, hayal kırıklığı ve suçluluk)
uyandırmak için tasarlanmıştır. Senaryolar çocuklara sesli olarak okunduktan sonra,
çocuklara böyle bir durumda olsalardı nasıl hissedecekleri, hissettikleri duyguyu
gösterip göstermeyecekleri ve bu davranışlarının nedenlerine ilişkin sorular
sorulmuştur. Yapılan lojistik regresyon analizlerine göre; çocuklarda suçluluk ve
utanç uyandıran senaryolarda, çocukların SES ve cinsiyetlerinin, çocukların
hissettikleri duyguları ifade etme olasılıklarını tahmin etmede anlamlı bir etkileşimli
rolü olduğu bulunmuştur. Her iki senaryo için de, yüksek SES erkek çocukların
duygularını ifade etme olasılıklarının, düşük SES erkeklere göre daha fazla olduğu
bulunmuştur. Ancak kız çocuklarında, SES ve duygularını ifade etme arasındaki ilişki
anlamlı bulunmamıştır. Suçluluk ve utanç uyandıran senaryolarda, ikinci olarak, yaşın
rolü saptanmıştır. Buna göre, 5. sınıf öğrencilerinin duygularını ifade etme
olasılıklarının 3. sınıf öğrencilerine göre daha fazla olduğu bulunmuştur. Öfke
uyandıran senaryoda, SES'in çocukların duygularını ifade etme ihtimalleri üzerinde
anlamlı bir rolü olduğu saptanmıştır. Tahmin edildiği gibi, öfke uyandıran senaryoda,
yüksek SES çocukların duygularını ifade etme olasılıklarının düşük SES çocuklara
göre daha fazla olduğu bulunmuştur. Bulgular, Türk kültüründe ebeveynlerin çocuk
yetiştirme ve duyguların sosyalleştirilmesine ilişkin değer ve inançlarının, gelişimsel,
cinsiyete ilişkin ve sosyo-kültürel kriterler de göz önünde tutularak, çocukların duygu
sergileme kuralları üzerindeki belirleyici rolü kapsamında tartışılmıştır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Emotions are connected to individuals' central motive states, drives and actions (Izard,

1993; Malatesta, 1982). Subjective, perceptual, cognitive, neurophysiological,

expressive and motoric components interact together in the formation of emotional

experience. There is a common agreement that emotions are internal states, which may

be either positive or negative, evoked by mental or physical events and experiences in

a person's world that carry meaning and significance (Campos, Frankel, & Camras,

2004; Cole, Martin, & Dennis, 2004; Denham, 1998; Izard, 1993; Oatley & Jenkins,

1996; Vasta, Miller, & Ellis, 2004).

Emotions have major functions as an intrapersonal and interpersonal regulator

and appraisal tool for the person (Cole, et al., 2004; Diamond & Aspinwall, 2003;

Denham, 1998; Izard, 1993; Malatesta, 1982). Emotion is known to be adaptive and

functional in nature in that it provides knowledge of the situation to the individual and

in turn, shapes the behavior of the person and people around the person (Cole, et al.,

2004; Izard, 1993; Campos, et al., 2004; Denham, 1998). Besides emotions' inherently

regulatory functions, emotions themselves are also regulated. Specifically, emotion

regulation refers to the alteration of any psychological process such as initiating,

inhibiting, avoiding or sustaining the emotion itself; modifying its form, intensity,

duration, and other cognitive, physiological and behavioral components in order to

achieve individual and social goals (Campos, et al., 2004; Cole, et al., 2004, Eisenberg

& Spinrad, 2004). Thus, emotion regulation promotes a capacity for change and

flexibility in order for an individual to function adaptively in his/her environment and gain emotional competence (Diamond & Aspinwall, 2003; Eisenberg & Spinrad, 2004).

Major components of emotional competence entail the ability to recognize one's own and others' emotions as well as to express and regulate one's own emotions according to the requirements of the situation (Davis, 1995; Roberts, 1999). Emotional competence develops and become more complex throughout the lifespan, yet, the most rapid development is seen during the early childhood years (Denham, 1998; Malatesta, 1982). Of particular relevance to this study is children's emotional expressiveness. Emotion expressiveness refers to the overt expression of emotions by gestures, facial expressions, bodily postures, and words, which are modulated or feigned according to the display rules of the context and culture (Ekman, 1993; Cumberland-Li, Eisenberg, Champion, et al., 2003). Competent emotional expressiveness in social interactions is particularly essential to form positive relationships and achieve social and individual goals in those relationships; therefore, children's emotional expressiveness has implications for social competence (Denham, Blair, De Mulder, et al., 2003; Eisenberg, Cumberland, & Spinrad, 1998; Jones, Abbey & Cumberland, 1998).

Parents expect their children to behave according to socially acceptable norms and socialize their children's emotions in line with the cultural scripts. In other words, children are socialized to inhibit, intensify or maintain their emotional expressions according to the context and culture (Cole, Bruschi & Tamang, 2002; Ekman, 1993; Shipman & Zeman, 2001; Zeman & Garber, 1996). Emotion researchers have defined such "unspoken but tacit norms" that govern the emotional expression in line with the cultural expectations and attitudes as emotion display rules. These rules teach the child how, where, to whom and when to express emotions as well as provide a basis for

emotion regulation (Ekman & Friesen, 1975; Lewis & Michelson, 1982; Malatesta, 1982; Malatesta & Haviland, 1982).

Malatesta (1982) proposed that cultural, gender-related and personal rules are the three broad kinds of display rules. Thus, children's beliefs, norms and rules about displaying emotions are expected to differ across gender, cultures and contexts. Although there is a growing research exploring the use of display rules considering developmental and gender-related changes, there are few studies examining children's emotional expressiveness and display rules outside Western cultures (Cole, Bruschi, & Tamang, 2002; Garrett-Peters & Fox, 2007; Novin, Banerjee, Dadkhah et al., 2008). The paucity of research on emotion display rules in different cultures is striking given the culture's role in the socialization processes of emotional competence. The aim of the present study was to examine the unique and interactive roles of school-aged children's socioeconomic status (SES), gender, age, and emotion communication context on the use of emotion display rules in the Turkish culture.

Basic and Self-Conscious Emotions

Basic emotions (e.g. joy, anger, sadness, fear) and self-conscious emotions (e.g. shame, guilt, empathy) are considered to have distinguishing actions, action tendencies and goals (Ekman, 1993; Izard, 1993; Roseman, Wiest, & Swartz, 1994; Keltner & Buswell, 1996; Lewis, 2000). Basic emotions' primary referent is individuals' internal attributes such as an individual's own needs and goals, and these emotions generally stem from goal blockage, satisfaction or loss. On the other hand, self-conscious emotions' primary referent is another person, and those emotions are usually elicited by the individuals' considerations of behavioral standards as well as others'

perspectives and judgments (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Lewis, 2000). Motivational, phenomenological and expressive components of self-conscious emotions do not have clear distinctive features making those emotions complex to study (Lewis, 2000, Tracy & Robins, 2004). As a consequence, despite self-conscious emotions' significance for psychological and social functioning (Ferguson, Stegge, Miller & Olsen, 1999; Tangney, Wagner, & Gramzow, 1992), the display rules of self-conscious emotions remain overlooked (Lewis, 2000; Tracy & Robins, 2004). The present study aimed to extend the display rule literature by uncovering the tacit norms of school-aged Turkish children's emotional reactions and use of display rules not only for basic emotions (anger and disappointment), but also for self-conscious emotions (shame and guilt).

Assessment of Child Emotional Expressiveness and Display Rules

of Basic and Self-Conscious Emotions

To understand the emotional display rules of children, a method commonly used by many researchers (Cole, et. al., 2002, Ferguson, Stegge & Damhuis, 1991; Reintjes, Stegge, Terwogt & Hurkens, 2007; Saarni, 1979; Shipman & Zeman, 2001; Zeman & Garber, 1996) is to conduct an interview with a child. This interview involves the presentation of a number of hypothetical scenarios which are designed to elicit possible target emotions in children. After each scenario, children are asked to report about their emotional expression and display rules in that particular situation. This method can give rich information about the children's motivations and reasons for emotion display rules from their own perspective. However, one limitation of such a measure may be that children's behavior when they are faced with emotion eliciting

4

events may be different from their verbal responses to the interview questions (Lemerise & Dodge, 2000, Zeman & Garber, 1996).

In observational studies, some conditions are designed in order to elicit target emotions such as anger or sadness and then the reactions of the child are coded (Buss & Kiel, 2004; Cole, 1986; Davis, 1995; Saarni, 1984). For instance, in studies using the disappointing gift paradigm, children's emotional expressions are observed when they are given an attractive and a disappointing gift (Cole, 1986; Davis, 1995; Saarni, 1984). Some methods involve observing children's non-verbal facial expressions in experimental settings and coding the facial movements according to the coding systems such as Facial Expression Coding System (FACES) (Kring, Smith & Neale, 1994) to rate the intensity, duration and valence (positive-negative) of emotional expressions. Coding systems such as Facial Action Coding System (FACS) and EMFACS (Ekman & Friesen, 1975) can also differentiate discrete emotions based on muscle movements. These are more objective and accurate measures in examining the displays of emotions, but they are expensive and time consuming (Robins, Noftle, & Tracy, 2007).

Emotional Expression of Basic Emotions and Display Rules

Functions Regarding the Expression of Basic Emotions

The functionalist approach to emotional expressions asserts that the expression of each emotion plays a role in facilitating the individual's adaptation to his/her social environment (Barrett & Campos, 1987; Shipman, Zeman, Nesin & Fitzgerald, 2003). For instance, the expression of sadness helps the individual recover passively from negative stimuli by eliciting caregiving, understanding or support from others

(Roseman, et al., 1994; Zeman & Shipman, 1996; Buss & Kiel, 2004). On the other hand, display of happiness signals a message that invites others to join the experience (Denham, et al., 2003). Anger expression, however, signals to the individual who evoked anger to leave or withdraw. Anger may elicit different action tendencies such as struggling with difficulty, or fighting with someone in order to correct the situation when a person has met with injustice or when his/her goal has been blocked (Roseman, et al., 1994; Zeman & Shipman, 1996; Buss & Kiel, 2004). Finally, the expression of fear communicates a need to withdraw or to get help, which in turn results in avoidance or approach tendencies depending on the context (Roseman, et al., 1994; Hortsmann, 2003).

Caregivers', peers' and other social figures' differential responding to children's discrete emotions act to influence children's motives for expressing or hiding their emotions (Fuchs & Thelen, 1988; Underwood, Coie, & Hehbsman, 1992; Denham et al., 2003). When maternal socialization practices of anger and fear was compared, Shipman and colleagues have found that mothers tended to invalidate their children's anger more than their fear or sadness (Shipman, Schneider, & Fitzgerald, et al., 2007). Emotion researchers have argued that mothers acknowledge and comfort their children when children are afraid given that the fear expression reveals a child's vulnerability. Yet, as children get older, caregivers may socialize fear differently such that children may be required to control their fear according to the contextual and gender norms (Eisenberg, et al., 1998). Similarly, the expression of sadness was reported to elicit more support from mothers compared to the expression of fear or anger (Zeman & Shipman, 1996; Buss & Kiel, 2004).

Developmental Origins and Changes in Display Rules of Basic Emotions

Basic emotions such as sadness, anger or happiness appear very early in infants and these emotions have prototypical and universal facial expressions (Ekman, 1993; Izard, 1994). Biological processes have been proposed as one of the basic mechanisms for the experience and expression of such emotions (Izard, 1993; 1994). However, recently there is increasing interest in the social and cultural processes that may also act to influence the expression of these emotions (Camras, Kolmodin, & Chen, 2008; Denham, 1998; Eisenberg, et. al., 1998).

Over the first years in life, young children learn to regulate their emotions as a function of their caregiving environment and cultural expectations (Buss & Kiel, 2004; Fox & Calkins, 2003). By toddlerhood, children can experience and understand a variety of feelings, both basic and more complex emotions, and they can express, inhibit, intensify or modify their emotional expression in response to the contextual demands and their own goals (Buss & Kiel, 2004; Dunn & Hughes, 1998; Grolnick, Bridges & Connell, 1996). By preschool years, children learn to mask their actual feelings in order to conform to display rules. For instance, observational "disappointing gift" studies have been designed for preschoolers in order to examine children's conformity to the display rule of "One should look pleased even if s/he has received a disappointing gift" (Saarni, 1979, 1984; Cole, 1986; Davis, 1995; Carlson & Wang, 2007; Garrett-Peters & Fox, 2007) These studies have coded children's facial expressions and demonstrated that children as young as 4 years were able to control their disappointment and substitute their feeling with positive expressions.

With regard to the developmental differences, studies using the disappointing gift paradigm have reported mixed results. For instance, Saarni (1984) found that masking disappointment with positive expressions increased as children get older with

a sample of first, third and fifth graders. Also, two recent studies, one of which was conducted with children aged 51-72 months (Carlson & Wang, 2007) and the other with four and seven year-olds (Garrett-Peters &Fox, 2007), supported the relationship between age and display rules. These studies have also shown that children's positive expressions increase and displays of negative emotional expressions decrease as children get older. However, Cole (1986) and Davis (1995) have failed to document age differences. According to Cole (1986), both preschoolers and school-aged children were equally successful in hiding their negative emotions spontaneously. However, she argued that younger children did not exhibit an awareness of their spontaneous reactions of hiding emotions. Studies based on children's self-report (Saarni, 1979; Zeman & Garber, 1996) lend support to Cole's argument. Children in these studies have reported that their knowledge of display rules increase with age. It is possible that even very young children are socialized to acquire an ability to regulate their spontaneous emotional expressions, which takes place without cognitive references (Maletesta & Haviland, 1982). However, as children's social-cognitive development becomes more advanced, their reasoning about the antecedents and consequences of the situations and their awareness of one's own and other's behavior help them to grasp and internalize emotion display rules (Saarni, 1979; Cole, 1986; Casey, 1993; McElwain, Halberstadt, & Volling, 2007).

Gender Differences in Display Rules of Basic Emotions

Girls and boys are known to be socialized differently according to the gender norms of the society. This different socialization process for boys and girls seem to result in differences in emotion expressiveness and in the use of emotion display rules (Fabes, Eisenberg, Nyman, & Michealieu, 1991; Davis, 1995; Zeman & Garber, 1996; Zeman

& Shipman, 1996; Brody & Hall, 2000). As noted before, emotions such as fear, anxiety and sadness act to reveal one's vulnerability and elicit caregiving or help. Hence, these emotions have been regarded as "submissive" emotions (Chaplin, Cole & Zahn-Waxler, 2005). The expression of such emotions has been found to be compatible with the gender roles of girls. On the other hand, anger expression has been considered as "disharmonious" because it involves dominance, struggling and fighting for one's goal. These behaviors match the masculine gender norms (Roseman, et al., 1994; Zeman & Shipman, 1996; Buss & Kiel, 2004; Chaplin et al., 2005).

With the exception of a few studies (Garrett-Peters & Fox, 2007; Safdar, Friedlmeier, & Matsumoto, 2009), a large body of research based on both observational and self-report data has provided support for the differential emotional expression as a function of child's gender (Fuchs & Thelen, 1988, Cole, 1986; Davis, 1995; Fabes et al., 1991; Kring & Gordon, 1998; Zeman & Shipman, 1996). The findings of these studies were in line with the predominant Western socialization practices that encourage girls to suppress anger and express sadness, while boys are encouraged to mask their sadness and pain and express anger (Cassano, Perry-Parrish & Zeman, 2007; Fuchs & Thelen, 1988; Zeman & Shipman, 1996). For instance, disappointing gift studies with preschool and elementary school children have shown that girls were more likely to use emotion display rules given that they were more capable of masking their emotions compared to boys (Cole, 1986; Davis, 1995; Saarni, 1984). Moreover, females' higher expressiveness of both negative and positive emotions was revealed in both studies with elementary school children and undergraduate students (Casey, 1993; Kring & Gordon, 1998). Fabes and his colleagues (1991) have found that three- to five-year old boys, compared to girls, were

more likely to react to negative events with overt anger and less likely to react with overt sadness.

The methods to express emotions have also been reported to differ across gender. Girls tend to use verbal expressions and boys tend to use mild aggressive methods to communicate negative emotions (Jones, et. al. 1998; Zeman & Shipman, 1996). Adults from various cultures also show gender differences such that men express powerful emotions such as anger, contempt and disgust more than women and women expressed powerless emotions such as sadness and fear more than men (Safdar, et al., 2009). These findings indicate the socialization pressures for gender-appropriate behaviors in expressing the emotions.

<u>Display Rules of Basic Emotions Depending on Emotion Display Context</u>

Studies based on observational and self-report data from children and adolescents have shown that the context where the emotion is expressed also contributes to the differential use of display rules (i.e. Fuchs & Thelen, 1988; Dougan, Brand, Zahn-Waxler et. al., 2007; Matsumoto, Hee Yoo, & Fontaine, 2009; Novin, et al., 2008; Zeman & Garber, 1996; Shipman, et al., 2003). For instance, a study based on school-aged children's self-report documented that children expected more positive reactions from their mothers than their fathers if they expressed their sadness (Fuchs & Thelen, 1988). Findings of those studies have suggested that children tend to display their emotions according to the costs and benefits of the display context in line with the socialization pressures. In fact, there is evidence that fathers of school-aged children responded to their children's sadness with minimization, while mothers used expressive encouragement and problem-focused strategies in response to such emotions (Cassano, et al., 2007). There is also evidence that fathers attended to their

daughters' submissive emotions (e.g. sadness or anxiety) and their sons'

disharmonious emotions (e.g. anger) more, while mothers' attentiveness did not differ

for boys and girls (Chaplin, et al., 2005). However, a study based on self-report of

third and fifth graders found no differences in children's anger expression as a function

of the audience (i.e., mothers, fathers), but revealed that older children were less likely

to express their sadness and pain to their fathers than their younger counterparts

(Zeman & Garber, 1996). A notable finding of this study was children's differential

preference for emotion expression towards peers versus parents. Children were found

to mask their anger, sadness and pain more when they were with their peers than when

they were with their mothers, fathers or alone. Children in this study perceived their

parents to be more accepting of their emotional displays than their peers.

There is an emerging body of research that suggests that context and culture

interact in the expression of emotions. For example, Novin and his colleagues (2008)

reported that Iranian children (who are socialized in a collectivistic culture

emphasizing family respect, authority and hierarchy) reported having concealed

emotions for anger, sadness, fear and joy more frequently in the family setting than in

the peer setting. On the other hand, Dutch children (who are socialized in a

predominantly individualistic culture emphasizing personal needs and autonomy)

reported hiding their emotions more frequently in the peer setting than in the family

setting. This finding supports the study by Zeman and Garber (1996) highlighting that

Western children perceive their parents to be more accepting of their emotional display

than their peers.

Display Rules of Basic Emotions in Cultural Context

Cultures have shared beliefs, schemas, social practices, norms and values transmitted across generations (Lehman, Chiu, & Schaller, 2004; Matsumoto, Hee-Yoo, & Fontaine, at al., 2008; Triandis, 2001). Cross-cultural research shows that cultural variations exist in the rules of emotion expression (Camras, et al. 2008; Cole, Bruschi, & Tamang, 2002; Cole, Tamang, & Shrestha, 2006; Dennis, Cole, Zahn-Waxler, & Mizuta, 2002; Garrett-Peters, & Fox, 2007; Matsumoto, et al., 2008; Novin, et. al., 2008). Because emotion expression helps the individual to function properly in his/her environment, displays of emotions need to be shaped according to the cultural norms and needs of the individual to facilitate adaptation and survival in that culture (Izard, 1980). It is argued that members of the individualistic societies are more autonomous and more concerned with their personal rather than collective goals (Lehman, et al., 2004; Kagitcibasi, 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1995, 2001). They analyze the benefits and drawbacks of maintaining relationships, their child-rearing practices are based on independence and self-reliance, and their achievement motivation is individually oriented (Kagitcibasi, 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1995, 2001). On the other hand, members of collectivistic societies with a prevailing interdependent self model are more related, socially connected and modest (Kagitcibasi, 1997; Triandis, 2001). They emphasize group harmony, loyalty, belongingness, and cohesiveness and they define themselves as members of the group, they are more concerned about the group goals and their prosocial behavior is an outcome of group norms, duties and obligations (Kagitcibasi, 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The family life also differs from that of individualistic cultures in that child rearing practices are based on dependence, conformity and obedience to

family and group and there is more hierarchy due to age and gender (Kagitcibasi, 1997, 2002).

Such variations in the models of self construal and family life between collectivistic and individualistic cultures lead to different emotional experiences and emotion display rule usage (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Matsumoto et al., 2008). Members of individualistic cultures tend to attend more to their inner feelings and express these emotions serving their authentic independent selves. Markus and Kitayama (1991) have argued that independent (individualist) selves have to be expert in experiencing and expressing their "ego-focused" emotions (anger, sadness, happiness). However collectivist selves attend more to the "public instrumental" function of the emotional expression and their emotions may or may not reflect their real emotions for the sake of interpersonal relationships (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Interdependent (collectivist) selves are expected to more skillfully experience and express "other-focused" emotions (e.g., shame, guilt, sympathy) fostering the interdependence.

Novin and his colleagues' (2008) findings supported this argument by indicating that Dutch elementary school children were more expressive of their basic (ego-focused) emotions than the Iranian children. This finding was also congruent with a recent study conducted with adults in 33 countries involving both individualistic and collectivistic cultures. This study demonstrated that individualism was positively associated with higher expressivity of basic emotions (Matsumoto et al., 2008). Finally, Safdar and colleagues (2009) found that the expression of powerful emotions such as anger, contempt and disgust, which can disrupt relationship harmony, was significantly less encouraged in Japan than in the U.S or Canada.

A number of studies investigated emotion display rules of different communities within a certain culture (Cole, Bruschi & Tamang, 2002; Raval & Martini, 2009; Cole, et al., 2006). For example, Cole and her colleagues (2002; 2006) compared 7-to 9-year-old children from two ethnic groups (Tamang and Brahman) in Nepal based on their emotional reactions to vignettes that depicted various emotion-eliciting scenarios. They found that Brahman children reported to experience anger more than Tamang children, yet they also acknowledged that they would mask their anger more than Tamang children do (Cole, et al., 2002). This finding was in line with the emotion socialization pattern in these two different ethnic groups in Nepal. Cole and colleagues have reported that the experience of anger among the Tamang children was discouraged due to their lower caste status and due to the tenets of Buddhism preaching minimization of psychic distress and tolerance. In contrast, home observations have revealed that Brahman children's anger was responded to with reasoning but the expression of anger was discouraged due to the high-caste status encouraging strong self-control (Cole, et al., 2006).

Another study in India also compared two communities in Gujarat, one of which is an old-city community emphasizing collective living and social conduct and the other is a suburban community emphasizing educational and occupational success. It was found that Indian parents encouraged the control of sadness and anger more than pain. Yet, within culture analysis revealed that children from the old city reported emotion expression as less acceptable than the suburban children (Raval, Martini, & Raval, 2007; 2009). Taken together, the available studies provide evidence that cultural and ethnic values shape emotion socialization process and emotion display rules.

Display Rules of Basic Emotions in Socio-economic Context

Despite the influential role of the socioeconomic status (SES) on parenting practices,
we have not come across studies regarding the effects of socio-economic context on
children's display rule use. There is evidence that maternal emotional responses to
children's emotions vary as a function of SES (Martini, Root, & Jenkins, 2004).
Martini and his colleagues (2004) revealed that middle SES mothers of preschoolers
were more likely to control their anger when their children expressed sadness and
anger. Middle SES mothers were also more likely to control their anger than their low
SES counterparts in response to their children's fear and sadness. Low SES mothers,
on the other hand, were reported to be more likely than middle SES mothers to control
their sadness and fear in response to children's anger. They argued that higher
authoritarian parenting scores of low SES mothers compared to the high SES mothers
may have contributed to this pattern. They also found a significant correlation between
authoritarian beliefs and mothers' emotion regulation in both low and high SES
groups. In fact, parental negative or punitive reactions to children's emotional displays
may lead children to avoid those emotions rather than properly expressing them
(Morris, Silk, Steinberg, Myers and Robinson, 2007). However, further research is
necessary to explore how display rules of anger, sadness and fear are socialized in
families in their socio-economic context and the use of such display rules by children
in those contexts.

Emotional Expression of Self-Conscious Emotions and Display Rules

Functions Regarding Expression of Self-conscious Emotions

Shame and guilt are both self-conscious, self-referential, internally attributed negative emotions. The triggering events of these emotions may be moral failures or transgressions in an interpersonal context (Schamader & Lickel, 2006; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Sunar (2009) argued that moral violations eliciting disgust or contempt in the audience may elicit shame, while those eliciting anger in the victim may elicit guilt in the violator. The ability to see oneself as distinctively separate from others, and recognize one's own characteristics, as well as understanding the social rules are the prerequisites to experience and express self-conscious emotions like shame and guilt (Denham, 1998, Tangney & Dearing, 2002). These other-focused emotions require appraisal of the self in relation to the society, which makes these emotions more sensitive to the cultural and contextual differences (Lewis, 2000; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Tracy & Robins, 2004). As these emotions do not have universal expressions, the identification of these emotions is generally based on self-reports of subjective experience (Lewis, 2000; Tracy & Robins, 2004). Yet, there are a few studies that included coding of shame through facial and bodily movements (e.g., body is crumpled, corners of the mouth become downward, gazes are downward) (Lewis & Ramsay; 2002; Lewis, Kawakami, Kawakami, & Sullivan, 2010).

Shame and guilt have been differentiated with respect to the role of self. In other words, shame has been considered as a more global reflection of the defective, unpleasant sense of self (Tracy & Robins, 2004), associated with distress (Ferguson, et al., 1999; Tangney, et al., 1992), and also by suspiciousness as well as by resentment. Shamed individuals often take the evaluation of others into consideration and have an

action tendency to avoid those individuals and situations where they experienced shame (Tangney, et al., 1992). On the other hand, researchers have argued that guilt is more concentrated on the specific behaviors rather than to the whole sense of self (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Furthermore, guilt has been considered as a less painful emotional experience than shame given that guilt is primarily experienced as feelings of regret, in contrast to shame, which is experienced as feelings of worthlessness. An individual who feels guilty is motivated to approach and wish to confess, undo or repair the failures or transgressions (Olthof, Ferguson, Bloemers, & Deij, 2004; Schamader & Lickel, 2006; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). As a result, shame-free guilt proneness has been associated with constructive ways of managing anger and relates negatively to resentment and hostility (Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher, Gramzow, 1992; Tangney, Wagner, Hill Barlow, Marschall, & Gramzow, 1996).

Self conscious emotions serve specifically for the social goals of individuals and community such as maintaining social hierarchy and status roles (Tracy & Robins, 2004). The evolutionary view of the shame display argues that shame display lessen the aggression of the dominant party in subordinance situations. Besides, when one fails to conform to norms, shame display boosts social reconciliation and integration. On the other hand, in prestigious competitions, displaying shame may reveal the weakness and vulnerability of the individual leading to the tendency of controlling shame expression (Fessler, 2004).

Developmental Origins and Changes in Display Rules of Self-conscious Emotions
Unlike basic emotions, complex emotional expressions such as shame, guilt, embarrassment, pride, and envy do not appear until 2 years of age when self-recognition and meta-representation of the child emerge (Denham, 1998; Lewis, &

Ramsay, 2002; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Although temperament has a role in the expression of self conscious emotions, cognitive development and socialization experiences are preconditions for experiencing and expressing these emotions (Denham, 1998, Kochanska, Gross, Lin, & Nichols, 2002; Tangney & Dearing, 2002).

As children get older (school-age) they tend to evaluate the consequences and rules of emotion display more indicating increasing concern for social norms as opposed to younger (preschool) children, who primarily consider personal goals in transgression situations (Lagatutta, 2005). These differences are explained in terms of an increased self-awareness concerning shame as the age increases. Indeed, school children attribute more negative emotions to transgression situations than preschool children who still attribute positive emotions to fulfilling desire despite its wrongness (Lagatutta, 2005). Besides, younger children describe shame in behavioral manifestations such as blushing, being ridiculous and escape, while older children describe more global attributions such as being incapable, feeling stupid, and unable to look at other people (Ferguson, et al., 1991). Moreover, school age children (especially 10-12 years) can distinguish shame and guilt as much as adults do such that they associate guilt with moral norm violations, not social mistakes, self-criticism, regret, desire to reverse the situation and fear of punishment while they associate shame with critical audience, and both uncontrollable social mistakes and controllable moral transgressions (Ferguson, et. al., 1991).

In addition to social-cognitive development, socialization of children's emotions also yields the experience of self-conscious emotions. The nature of children's success, failure, wrong doings or transgressions are evaluated by the socializers such that children are given messages regarding the appropriateness of

these behaviors and associated feelings through modeling, contingent responding and coaching (Denham, 1998, Tangney & Dearing, 2002).

Gender Differences in Display Rules of Self-conscious Emotions

There are inconsistent findings with regard to the self-conscious emotion expression as a function of genders. Some studies conducted in Western societies support the view that preschool-aged girls displayed their shame more than boys do (Lewis, Alessandri, & Sullivan, 1992; Lewis & Ramsay, 2002). Experimental studies have shown that mothers' negative feedback to girls' failures and more positive feedback to boys' success have led girls to attribute their failures to their global self (Alessandri & Lewis, 1993; 1996). Observational studies have revealed a negative relation between parents' positive evaluation statements and children's shame expression. Moreover, there is evidence that girls received more negative evaluative statements such as "You are not good at puzzles" and less positive statements such as "Nice job" (Alessandri, & Lewis, 1993). Another observational study that examined guilt in toddlers found that girls showed more guilt-reactions to their wrongdoings than boys (Kochanska et al, 2002).

However, those views indicating girls' proneness to shame and guilt has been criticized given that those studies have used certain types of standard violations or failures in their scenarios that are less acceptable in women than men (Ferguson, Eyre & Ashbaker, 2000). For instance aggressive or insensitive behaviors to others are not appropriate for the female gender role. Violating such a rule would be an unwanted identity, or "dreaded self" for females resulting in more expressed shame than males. Thus, Ferguson and her colleagues (2000) revised the scenarios and found that men reported more shame and guilt than women. Another scenario-based study with children aged 7-to 16-year-olds revealed that gender differences regarding more shame

in girls was statistically significant only in situations about girls' unwanted identity (Olthof, et al., 2004). Thus, it can be concluded that rather than global statements of gender differences regarding shame and guilt expressions, situational antecedents of self-conscious emotions and cultural and contextual norms for the gender roles should be considered.

Display Rules of Self-conscious Emotions Depending on the Emotion Display Context

Research up to now has not focused on the specification of display rules of self-conscious emotions across contexts. Some broad classifications have been reported by Fessler (2004) according to the functionalist-evolutionary approach. As noted before, display of shame would risk an individual's status in the context of prestige competitions, while it would restore the mishap and preserve the relationship harmony in reciprocal relationships. Thus, one may think that children would try to hide their shame and guilt with their peers, especially in competitive situations such as academic achievement or physical rivalry. Yet, with parents shame can be thought to be more adaptive to display because of its function of repairing the mistake. However, there is a gap in research on the relation of emotion display context (e.g. with peers, friends, higher/lower status target) with children's shame as well as guilt expression.

Display Rules of Self-conscious Emotions in Cultural Context

Studies have usually shown that individuals in collectivistic cultures were more prone to self-conscious emotions that require the evaluation of self in relation to others (Bierbrauer, 1992; Fessler, 2004; Fung, 1999; Ho, Fu & Ng, 2004; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Display rules of those self-conscious emotions can be more properly

understood by social motivation (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). For instance, in Japanese collectivism, being distinguished in achievement situation is not a motive for an interdependent self seeking group harmony, integration and connectedness (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Lewis et al., 2010). Lewis and her colleagues (2010) illustrated this argument with their observational study. They found that Japanese preschool children expressed less shame, sadness, pride and more evaluative and exposure embarrassment than American children in achievement and failure situations. In line with motivation and emotion socialization theoretical ground, a study demonstrated that American and Nepali-Tamang children reported to communicate their shame more than Brahman children did (Cole, Bruschi & Tamang, 2002). In fact, Brahman society is known to have a high-caste status where revealing shame would demonstrate children's vulnerability and weakness and threaten their high status (Cole, et al., 2002). Indeed, observations of Brahman caregivers have revealed that they were more likely to ignore shame expressions of their child, while Tamang caregivers were more likely to respond to shame with acceptance, reasoning and nurturance (Cole, et al., 2006). These findings illustrate how religion, ethnicity and social class in a certain cultural value orientation affect emotion socialization in different groups.

Display Rules of Self-conscious Emotions in Socio-economic Context

To date, there is evidence that chronic distress and lack of parental support and education may result in power assertive discipline styles in low SES families (Martini, et al., 2004; McLoyd, 1998). Another line of research has shown that children of mothers relying on power assertive discipline styles displayed less guilt (Kochanska, et al., 2002). However, there is a paucity of research that investigates the display rules of self-conscious emotions in children from different SES.

Context of the Study: Turkish Family and Emotional Life

The traditional Turkish culture implies a hierarchical patriarchical family life with a high degree of proximity between family members that gives rise to familial selves with a relational style preserving group harmony and group goals (Sunar & Fisek, 2005; Kagitcibasi, 2002; 2005). However, social and economic changes, along with the migration from rural to urban areas, have led to changes in the hierarchy, self structure and relational style of different segments in the Turkish society (Fisek & Kagitcibasi, 1999; Sunar & Fisek 2005; Imamoglu & Karakitapoglu-Aygun, 2007). Kagitcibasi (1996; 2002; 2005) coined the term "autonomous-related self" to describe the self construal in urban, middle-high SES families where material dependency on the adult child is low. In this "family model of emotional interdependence" members of the family fulfill their basic needs of both relation and autonomy (Kagitcibasi, 1996). In contrast, most of the low-SES urban and rural families have been still described within the framework of the "family model of interdependence" (Kagitcibasi, 2002, 2005). In these traditional families, the utilitarian and emotional loyalty, self-control, dependence and obedience of the child is valued (Kagitcibasi, 2002).

Display of anger to higher status is firmly inhibited in traditional families. (Sunar, 2002; Sunar & Fisek, 2005). Also, shame induction has been documented as one of the most common emotions for controlling individual's behavior in the family (Kagitcibasi, Sunar & Bekman; 1988 as cited in Sunar, 2002). In Turkey, rural-urbanized low SES parents have been reported to employ authoritarian parenting and punitive discipline styles as opposed to middle-high SES parents with more

22

authoritative parenting and discipline based on rewarding or shame (Sunar, 2002, Sunar, & Fisek, 2005).

The emotional climate in the Turkish family has also changed associated with socioeconomic changes over time (Sunar, 2002). For instance, Sunar (2002) conducted a study with three generations of Turkish urban middle class families and found a trend towards more parental expression of positive emotions towards their children. Moreover, parents' tolerance and encouragement of children's emotional expressiveness has also been reported to increase over time. Yet, the displays of negative emotions such as anger were still found to be discouraged by parents.

In studies conducted with university students, results have shown that students tended to deamplify or neutralize their display of "dangerous emotions" such as anger, contempt, disgust and fear but expressed happiness, sadness and surprise without restraint (Sunar, Boratav & Ataca, 2005; Boratav, Sunar, Ataca, in press). Yet, the status of the person to whom emotion is expressed was found to be a distinctive moderator of the display rules. Specifically, anger, contempt and disgust were less expressed to higher status targets than to lower status targets. On the contrary, fear was preferred to be hidden from the lower status target.

The Present Study

This study aims to examine the expressiveness and display rules of Turkish children as a function of gender, age, socioeconomic characteristics of their family and the audience to which the emotion is displayed (i.e., friend, mother or father). Based on the influence of cultural, contextual and gender-related rules of emotional displays, I propose possible variations among emotional reactions and display rule usage in

23

different emotion-eliciting situations. Children's responses were examined both qualitatively and quantitatively. Narrative analyses based on children's responses regarding their reasoning of expressing/hiding their emotions helped us discern the emotional display rules when children reported discrepancy between felt and expressed emotions.

<div align="center">Emotion Endorsement Hypotheses</div>

In the scenario depicting injustice when the child's goal is thwarted (Candy vignette), a high majority of children were expected to endorse anger. In Western research, according to functionalist approach, goal blockage or injustice was considered as the potential elicitors of anger (Barrett & Campos, 1987; Roseman, et al., 1994; Zeman & Shipman, 1996; Buss & Kiel, 2004). I expect that goal blockage and injustice would also elicit anger in the majority of children in our sample.

In line with previous research about the elicitor of shame (Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Tracy & Robins, 2004), in the scenario depicting publicized mishaps of child (Red Mark vignette), the majority of our sample was predicted to endorse shame. Since transgressions and responsibility lapse in interpersonal context have been regarded as elicitors of guilt (Ferguson et al., 1991, Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Schamader & Lickel, 2006), the majority of children were predicted to endorse guilt in the Book vignette. Finally, in line with previous research, it was hypothesized that scenario about getting an unexpected gift would elicit disappointment.

<div align="center">Hypotheses Regarding Emotional Expressiveness for Antecedents of Emotions</div>

Given that the expression of shame and guilt functions as a means of maintaining social harmony and status roles adaptive in collective societies valuing collective goals

and social harmony (Kagitcibasi, 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991, Tracy & Robins, 2004), a high majority of Turkish children were predicted to express their emotions in situations of 1) publicized mishaps of child (shame eliciting scenario) and 2) transgression and responsibility lapse in interpersonal context (guilt eliciting scenario), in order to repair the situation or maintain status in the eyes of the others. We expected the expression rate even higher among the low SES children.

Given that the expression of anger and disappointment would result in negative interpersonal consequences, receive negative reactions from the audience and threaten the relationship harmony (Sunar, Boratav & Ataca, 2005; Saarni, 1979, Garret-Peters & Fox, 2007), it was hypothesized that the majority of Turkish children would decide to hide these emotions. We expected that children from low SES would be more likely to hide these emotions.

Developmental Hypotheses

Developmental research has indicated that internalized experience and expression of self-conscious emotions require social-cognitive development and an increased ability of meta-cognition and self-awareness (Fraser, 1996, Lagatutta, 2005; Denham, 1998, Kochanska, et al., 2002; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Thus, it was hypothesized that fifth graders would be more likely to express their emotions in shame and guilt eliciting scenarios than their third grade counterparts. It was also predicted that fifth grade children would be more likely to hide their emotional expressions in the anger and disappointment eliciting scenarios than third graders.

Gender-Related Hypotheses

It was hypothesized that in the anger eliciting scenario, boys would be more likely to express their emotions than girls. It was also predicted that girls would be more likely to express their felt emotions than boys did in the scenario about publicized mishaps, and transgression and responsibility lapse in interpersonal context. Based on aforementioned studies, it was predicted that girls would be more likely to report hiding their negative emotions in the disappointing gift scenario than boys.

Hypotheses on Children's Expressiveness in Parents or Peer Context

In Turkish culture, children's anger expression to parents is discouraged as parents are considered high rank within the social hierarchy in the family (Sunar, 2002; Sunar, & Fisek, 2005). In collectivistic cultures with a family model of interdependence, social position of parents, especially father in the family, was higher than peers (Novin, et al, 2008). Thus, it was predicted that in the anger eliciting scenario, children would more likely to express their emotions in peer context than parent context.

As expressing shame and guilt reveals vulnerability and weakness of the person in context of rivalry or competition which is more likely to take place in the peer context than in the parent context, (Fesler, 2004) children were predicted to be more likely to express their emotions in shame and guilt-eliciting scenarios in the parent context than in the peer context.

CHAPTER II:

METHOD

Participants

The sample included 123 children (62 boys, 61 girls). Sixty-one of these children were

enrolled in third grade and 62 of them were enrolled in fifth grade. Child age ranged

between 8.12 and 9.79 years ($M = 8.70$, $SD = .38$) for third graders and between 9.89

and 12.45 years ($M = 8.70$, $SD = .38$) for fifth graders. Sixty-one children (31 boys, 30

girls) were enrolled in schools located in disadvantaged neighborhoods, while 62

children (31 boys, 31 girls) came from schools located in advantaged neighborhoods of

Istanbul and Ankara. In each SES group, half of the children were from the third grade

and the other half was from the fifth grade.

Children were recruited by convenience sampling method from various

elementary schools in Istanbul and Ankara. Schools were selected based on the

neighborhood characteristics (advantaged- vs. disadvantaged neighborhood) to ensure

variability in the socioeconomic status of the participating children. Similar number of

boys and girls were recruited from schools in disadvantaged (30 girls, 31 boys) and

advantaged (31 girls, 31 boys) neighborhoods (See Table 1 for the summary of child

and family characteristics based on neighborhood characteristics the schools reside in).

Mean age of the mothers was 38.13 (SD =6.41) and mean age of fathers was 41.55

(SD =6.48). Mean age of the fathers (M=42.98, SD=5.64) and mothers (M=39.29,

SD=5.11) of children from schools in advantaged neighborhoods were higher than the

mean age of fathers (M=39.41, SD=7.12) and mothers (M=36.52, SD=7.64) of children

from disadvantaged neighborhoods, t (100) = 2.82, p<.01 and t (103) = 2.09, p<.05.

Fathers (*M*=14.1, *SD*=2.34) and mothers (*M*=13.61, *SD*=3.32) of children from schools in advantaged neighborhoods had on average higher number of years of education than fathers (*M*=4.66, *SD*=2.10) and mothers (*M*=3.36, *SD*=3.71) of children from schools in disadvantaged neighborhoods, *t* (111) = 18.47, *p*<.001 and *t* (114) = 15.63, *p*<.001, for fathers and mothers, respectively. In the low SES group, 4 % of the fathers and 5 % of the mothers had at least high school degree, while 98 % of the fathers and 92 % of the mothers in high SES group had at least high school degree, χ^2 (1, N=113) = 101.29, *p*<.001, χ^2 (1, N=116) = 86.31, *p*<.001, for fathers and mothers, respectively. Forty-three percent of the mothers and 7.5 % of the fathers of children were illiterate in low SES, while in high SES only 2% of mothers were illiterate. Fathers of low SES children had temporary jobs in the informal sector such as street vender, cleaner, textile worker, waiter, day-guard, night-guard, dishwasher, etc and 74 % of mothers were housewives and the rest of mothers had temporary jobs such as house cleaning. Both mothers and fathers of high SES children had professional careers and 21% of the mothers of those children were housewives.

Table 1

Child and Family Characteristics by Neighborhood Characteristics of the Schools Location

| Child and Family Characteristics | Neighborhood of Schools | | | |
| | Advantaged (n=61) | | Disadvantaged (n=62) | |
	M	SD	M	SD
Child Age (years)	9.67	1.09	10.16	1.28*
Maternal Age (years)	39.30	5.11	36.52	7.64*
Paternal Age (years)	42.98	5.64	39.41	7.12**
Child sex (male)	50 %		51 %	
Maternal education (% with at least high school degree)	92 %		5 % ***	
Paternal education (% with at least high school degree)	98 %		4 % ***	

Note: Tests of statistical significance of the differences between the public and private school groups are based on Independent samples t-test or Chi-square test.
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Measures

<u>Children's Reactions to Emotion Eliciting Situations</u>

Children's reactions to emotion eliciting situations were assessed by a structured

interview that consisted of five hypothetical scenarios. Each scenario was designed to

elicit a specific emotion, namely happiness, anger, guilt, shame, and disappointment

(See Appendix A). Before using the scenarios generated by Cole and her colleagues

(2002), we explored whether a sample of Turkish children in our pilot study would

also describe similar situations that would elicit happiness, anger, and shame as

described in those vignettes. The way these scenarios were generated is described in

the Procedure section below. After each scenario was presented to the child, the

researcher asked the following questions (See Appendix B).

1. When [the situation] happens to you, how do you feel?

This question assessed the child's felt emotion in that particular situation. First, the child responded to this question in a free-answer format. If the child's answer did not match the response alternatives, then the child was asked to select one of the seven emotions (guilt, anger, happiness, sadness, shame, disappointment and fear) that was closest to his/her spontaneous reply. While the response alternatives were being read aloud by the researcher, they were also pointed to by the researcher on the paper where the emotions were written, in order to ensure that the child remembered all emotions. The frequency of endorsement of each emotion was used in the analysis.

2. Would you display your emotion to your [mother/father/friend]?

This question assessed the child's decision of communicating or not communicating the endorsed emotion. The frequency of child's responses of yes (express the emotion) and no (control the expression of emotion) was used in the analysis.

3. Why would you show/not show your [mother/father/friend] that you were feeling [child's emotional term]?

This open-ended question examined the child's explanations of his/her decision of communicating or not communicating the felt emotion which might reflect the socio-cultural influences on the child's reasoning of emotional display rules. Those responses of the child were examined in order to reveal their justifications of emotion expression or control.

Demographic Information Form

The demographic form consisted of questions regarding the age and gender of the child as well as parent's education and occupation status (See Appendix C).

Procedure

Prior to the main study, a pilot study was conducted in order to evaluate whether the situations that elicited anger (e.g., injustice or thwarted goals), shame (e.g., public mistakes and mishaps) and happiness (e.g., sharing a pleasant event together with parents or friends) in the scenarios from Cole et al.'s (2002) study were also endorsed by the Turkish children. A total of 23 children (9 from high and 14 from low SES group) from 3rd (12 children) and 5th grades (11 children) were recruited by convenience sampling. Ten of these children were female and 13 of them were male. They were asked to describe times when they experienced our target emotions (e.g., happiness, shame, anger) with their parents and friends (See Appendix D). Based on the consistency of children's responses with the scenarios in Cole et al.'s (2002) study, those three scenarios were translated from English into Turkish. Based on Turkish children's responses to guilt-eliciting situations in our pilot study, an additional vignette was developed that was modeled after the guilt stories used in the previous studies (Ferguson et al., 1991; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Finally, a disappointing gift story similar to those used in previous studies (Gnepp & Hess, 1986; Saarni, 1979), was developed and included in order to examine children's reported display rules in a disappointing situation.

For a cross-validation, these vignettes were presented to a second group of elementary school aged children (n = 6). The children were asked what they would feel in such a situation and asked to choose one of the emotions (i.e. anger, shame, happiness, disappointment, guilt, sadness and fear) the researcher read aloud. Sadness and fear were added to the listed emotions since our vignettes have the potential to elicit those emotions, as well. The emotion that was hypothesized to be dominant for each story was supported by children's responses. Yet, because the children tended to

31

generalize the situations in terms of "üzgün" which refers to "upset" in English, the term "üzgün" replaced by "hüzünlü," which describes sadness more valid.

Data collection for the main study started after the necessary permissions from the Institutional Review Board of Bogazici University and the Province and County National Educational Directorates. In order to recruit children, school principals were contacted by phone and invited to the study. First, two schools in economically disadvantaged neighborhoods (Dolapdere and Rumelihisarustu) were contacted to ensure that participants were from low-income families. The neighborhoods of these schools have been reported to have residents who mainly consist of migrants with low education and low income from various regions of Anatolia (Adaman & Keyder, 2006). Both school directors agreed to participate. In order to recruit children from middle, upper-middle class families, 6 private schools and one public school in prosperous neighborhoods of Istanbul and Ankara (e.g., Etiler, Levent, Sarıyer, Beykoz and Çankaya) were invited to the study. Three of those school directors accepted to participate to the study. After the school directors gave permission, consent forms that described the nature of the study were sent to parents (See Appendix E). A total of 442 consent forms were sent out to the parents. Children whose parents signed and returned the forms to school were included in the study. Acceptance rate was 28%.

Parents of the participating children filled out a demographic form that was sent to their home. They returned the form in a sealed envelope to their child's classroom teacher. The forms were collected from the classroom teacher by the researcher. Children were interviewed individually by the researcher in a private and quiet place at school. After the child was informed about the interview and confidentiality issues, each of the five vignettes was read out aloud by the researcher. In each grade condition, children were randomly assigned to one of the three context conditions

(whether the mother, father, or friend elicited the emotion). The order of the vignettes was counterbalanced using a Latin square design. Stories were presented to each child in one of the five orders. The stories were told in the second person in order to enhance the imagery power of the stories. The child then was instructed to think of him/herself in the each of the situations described. Children's responses were audiotaped for later transcription and coding. The average duration of the interviews was approximately 12 minutes. The audio recordings were transcribed verbatim by the researcher and two undergraduate psychology students.

CHAPTER III:

RESULTS

Pilot Study Results

Our pilot interviews have revealed that 86 % of the children reported sharing a

pleasant event together with parents (86%) and with friends (91%) as a situation that

brings about feelings of happiness. Secondly, a majority of children described

situations when they experienced injustice or when their goals were thwarted as

situations that would elicit anger, in the presence of their parents (78 %) or friends (74

%). Third, children portrayed public mistakes and mishaps as situations in which they

feel ashamed. In our pilot sample, moral transgressions and not fulfilling a

responsibility, which usually have been reported to underlie feelings of guilt in the

literature, were also reported to elicit shame, especially in the presence of parents.

Finally, children's responses for guilt-eliciting situations were focused on issues such

as responsibility lapse, property damage and conducting moral transgressions as

commonly reported in the previous literature. Taken together, these responses were in

line with the previous research on the antecedents of basic and self-conscious emotions

and justified the use of the vignettes based on previous research by Cole and

colleagues (2002).

Study Results

In response to the first question (i.e., *When the situation depicted in the vignette

happens to you, how would you feel*?), children were first given a chance to answer in

an open-ended way. If their answer matched one of the basic or self-conscious

emotions, data was entered categorically into data sheet (1= guilty, 2= angry, 3= happy, 4= sad, 5 =shame, 6= disappointed, 7= fear). If a child gave an answer such as "*I would feel bad*" then the researcher read out loud the emotions listed above and asked the child to choose one of these emotions closest to his/her experience.

Table 2 shows the percentage of endorsed emotions in response to each vignette presented. In response to the "Candy" vignette (*story about thwarted goals)*, which was supposed to evoke anger, 50.8 % of the children reported that they would feel angry. The next most frequently endorsed emotions were sadness and disappointment such that 23.8% and 18% of the children reported these feelings, respectively. Feelings of shame, happiness, and fear were endorsed by 1.6%, 4.1%, and 1.6% of the children, respectively.

For the "Red Mark" vignette *(story about public failure)*, 65.9 % of the children reported that they would feel ashamed, as it was predicted. Anger (9.8 %), guilt (8.9 %), sadness (7.3 %), disappointment (4.9 %) and fear (3.3 %) were also reported to be felt by children.

The "Disappointing Gift" vignette elicited disappointment in the majority of the children (56.1 %). Besides, children reported to feel sadness (18.7 %), happiness (14.6 %) and anger (10.6 %), respectively, should they experience such a situation.

The "Book" vignette (s*tory about not fulfilling a responsibility and disappointing someone)* elicited guilt in 44.3% of the children. Feelings of shame (18.9 %), disappointment (16.4 %), fear (11.5 %) and sadness (9 %) were also endorsed by the children.

Table 2

Percentage of Children Based on Their Endorsed Emotions in Each Vignette

Endorsed Emotions	Candy Vignette	Red Mark Vignette	Gift Vignette	Book Vignette
Angry	50.8%	9.8 %	10.6%	0%
Happy	4.1%	0 %	14.6%	0%
Sad	23.8%	7.3 %	18.7%	9%
Ashamed	1.6%	65.9 %	0%	18.9%
Disappointed	18%	4.9 %	56.1%	16.4%
Afraid	1.6%	3.3 %	0%	11.5%
Guilty	0%	8.9 %	0%	44.3%

In response to the second question (i.e., *Would you show how you felt in this situation to your mother/father/friend?),* the child's decision to express (coded as 1) or not to express (coded as 0) the endorsed emotion was recorded for each vignette. The majority of the children in the sample (83%) reported that they would express their emotion in the Book vignette designed to elicit feelings of guilt. In the Candy and Red Mark vignettes, which were supposed to elicit anger and shame, the emotion expression rates were 67% and 65%, respectively. About half of the sample (51%) endorsed anger as their felt emotion in the Candy vignette, and 69% of them reported that they would express their feeling of anger. Finally, 40% of the children reported that they would express their emotion in the Gift vignette. Table 3 shows the rate of emotion expression in response to each vignette presented.

Table 3

Percentage of Children who Chose to Show their Endorsed Emotion in Each Vignette

	Candy Vignette	Red Mark Vignette	Gift Vignette	Book Vignette
Emotion Expression Rate	66%	65%	40%	83%

Chi-Square Analyses

For each vignette, four chi-square tests were used to see if there is a relationship between child's emotion expression decision and (1) gender, (2) grade, (3) SES, (4) context (See Table 4 for the summary of the chi-square analyses).

Candy Vignette

The first chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relation between emotion expression and gender. The relation between these variables was not significant, χ^2 (1, N=122) = .15, p=.70. Boys (69 %) and girls (66 %) were equally likely to express their felt emotion in the Candy vignette.

The second chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relation between emotion expression and grade. The relation between these variables was also not significant, χ^2 (1, N = 122) = .15, p =.70. Third (69 %) and fifth graders (66 %) were equally likely to express their felt emotion in the Candy vignette.

The third chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relation between emotion expression and SES. The relation between these variables was significant, χ^2 (1, N = 122) = 7.3, p <.01. Children from high SES were more likely to express their felt emotion in the Candy vignette compared to children from

low SES. Specifically, within the high SES, 79% of the children preferred to express their emotion, while 56% of the children from the low SES preferred to control their emotions.

The fourth chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relation between emotion expression and context. The relation between these variables was not significant, χ^2 (1, N = 122) = .03, p =.86. Children were equally likely to express their felt emotion in the context of parents (67%) and peers (68 %) in the Candy vignette.

Red Mark Vignette

Similar to the Candy vignette as described above, four sets of chi-square test of independence were performed to examine the relationship between emotion expression and children's gender, SES, grade level, and context. The results revealed that, in response to the shame-eliciting vignette, the percentage of participants who endorsed that they would express their emotion did not differ by gender, χ^2 (1, N=123) = .40, p=.53, by SES, χ^2 (1, N = 123) = 1.02, p=.31, or by context, χ^2 (1, N = 123) = .02, p =.89. A statistically significant relation was detected only between emotion expression and grade level, χ^2 (1, N = 123) = 6.37, p <.01, such that fifth graders were more likely to express their felt emotion in the Red Mark vignette compared to the third graders.

Gift Vignette

In response to the disappointment-eliciting vignette, the percentage of participants who said that they would express their emotion did not differ by gender, χ^2 (1, N=123) = .72, p=.40, by grade, χ^2 (1, N = 123) = .07, p =.80, by SES, χ^2 (1, N = 123) = .39, p=.53, or by context, χ^2 (1, N = 123) = .02, p =.90.

In response to the guilt-eliciting vignette, the percentage of participants who said that they would express their emotion did not differ by gender, χ^2 (1, N=122) = .06, p=.81, by SES, χ^2 (1, N = 122) = 1.64, p=.20, or by context, χ^2 (1, N = 122) = .93, p =.33. Only the relation between emotion expression and grade level was significant, χ^2 (1, N = 122) = 7.40, p <.01, such that fifth graders (92 %) were more likely to express their felt emotion in the Book vignette compared to the third graders (73 %).

Table 4

Relationship between Gender, Grade, Context, SES and Children's Felt Emotion Expression Rates for Each Vignette

Vignettes				
	Candy	Red Mark	Gift	Book
Independent Variables	χ^2			
Gender	.15	.40	.72	.06
Grade	.15	6.37**	.07	7.40**
SES	7.30**	1.02	.39	1.64
Context	.03	.02	.02	.93

** p < .01 significance level

The Unique and Interactive Role of SES, Gender, Grade, and Context

on Children's Decision for Emotion Expression

Logistic regression analyses were performed to assess the unique and interactive role of child's SES, gender, grade, and emotion communication context on the probability of children's decision to express (coded as 1) or not to express (coded as 0) the endorsed emotion in each of the situations depicted in our vignettes. In other words,

we evaluated the probability that a given child would express his/her emotion when the child's SES, gender, grade and communication context were all together taken into consideration. A total of four logistic regression analyses were conducted. The second, third, and fourth logistic regressions included the decision to express the felt emotion in the Red Mark, Gift, and Book vignettes, respectively. In all of these analyses, the logistic regression model contained three independent, dichotomous variables: SES (low or high), gender (boy or girl), and grade (3rd or 5th) in the first block. In the second block, three interactions were entered into the equation: Gender by SES, Gender by Grade, and SES by Grade. If interactions were non-significant, they were removed from the analyses. As context (parent or friend) did not add considerably to the overall findings, but it was necessary to determine whether context should be considered, it was entered into the model in the third block. If context was not significant, it was removed from the analyses.

<p style="text-align:center"><u>Candy Vignette: Story about Thwarted Goals and Injustice</u></p>

The results of the logistic regression revealed that neither the interaction terms nor the context variable was statistically significant indicating that the second and the third blocks did not improve the model. Hence, these variables were removed from the model. A test of the full model against a constant-only model was significant, χ^2 (3, N=122) = 7.79, p=.05, suggesting that only the predictors as a set in the first block could predict children's decision to express their emotion in this vignette.

According to the Wald criterion, SES was the only variable that uniquely predicted children's reports of showing or not showing their emotion in the Candy vignette, χ^2 (1, N=122) = 7.13, p<.01, (See Table 4). The odds ratio of .34 for SES was less than 1 indicating that the odds of emotion expression in the situation depicted in

the Candy vignette is 66% lower when children were from the lower SES than from the higher SES, controlling for all other factors in the model. Table 5 shows the logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, and odds ratio and odds ratio with 95% confidence interval for each of the predictors.

Table 5

Logistic Regression Predicting Likelihood of Emotion Expression for Candy Vignette

Variables	B	Wald χ^2	p	Odds Ratio	95 % C. I. for Odds Ratio	
					Lower	Upper
SES (1=low, 0=high)	-1.09	7.13	.008	.34	.15	.75
Gender (1=girl, 0=boy)	-.17	.19	.66	.84	.38	1.84
Grade (1=3rd, 0=5th)	.18	.19	.66	1.19	.54	2.61
Constant	1.38	7.36	.007	3.97		

Red Mark Vignette: Story about Public Mistakes

There was a good model fit (discrimination among groups) on the basis of the first set of predictors alone, χ^2 (3, N=123) = 7.87, p=.049. After the addition of the three interaction terms (SES by Gender, Grade by Gender, SES by Grade), the fit of the model was improved, χ^2 (6, N=123) = 15.172, p=.019. Context did not add to the full model, hence was removed from the model.

In order to interpret the statistically significant SES by Gender interaction term, χ^2 (1, N=123) = 4.85, p=.028, follow-up chi-square analyses were conducted splitting the data across genders. When the subjects were girls only, the chi-square test of independence that examined the relation between SES and emotion expression decision was non-significant, χ^2 (1, N=61) = .48, p =.49. Yet, in the case of boys, there was a significant relationship, χ^2 (1, N=62) = 4.72, p=.03, Cramer's V= .276. Eighty-

41

one percent of high SES boys reported a decision to express their emotion compared to the 55% of the low SES boys. In terms of odds ratio interpretation, the odds of expressing felt emotions are 71% less likely for the low SES boys than the high SES boys.

Consistent with the chi-square analysis, the main effect of grade also predicted children's emotional expression uniquely, $\chi^2(1, N=123) = 6.00, p=.014$. The odds ratio of .11 for grade was less than 1, indicating that the odds of emotion expression in the situation depicted in the Red mark vignette is 89% lower when children are third graders than they are fifth graders, controlling for all other factors in the model.

Table 6 shows the logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, and odds ratio and odds ratio with 95% confidence interval for each of the predictors.

Table 6

Logistic Regression Predicting Likelihood of Emotion Expression for Red Mark Vignette

Variables	B	Wald χ^2	p	Odds Ratio	95 % C. I. for Odds Ratio	
					Lower	Upper
SES (1=low, 0=high)	-2.21	6.005	.014	.110	.019	.643
Gender (1=girl, 0=boy)	-1.81	.4.01	.045	.164	.028	.962
Grade (1=3rd, 0=5th)	-2.21	6.01	.014	.110	.019	.643
Gender (1) by SES (1)	1.89	4.85	.028	6.62	1.23	35.61
Gender (1) by Grade (1)	.79	.83	.361	2.20	.405	11.95
Grade (1) by SES (1)	1.34	2.36	.124	3.82	.692	21.10
Constant	2.86	10.70	.001	17.51		

Gift Vignette: Story about a Disappointing Gift

Sequential logistic regression analyses revealed that the test of the full model with all the variables including the interaction terms against the constant-only model was not statistically significant χ^2 (7, N=123) = 4.27, p=.75, indicating that the predictors as a set did not distinguish between children who reported to express or hide their emotions. After the non-significant interaction terms were removed from the model, the predictors as a set still could not distinguish children expressing or hiding their emotion. According to the Wald criterion, no variable uniquely predicted a child's decision to express his/her emotion.

Book Vignette: Story about Responsibility Lapse and Disappointing Someone

The full model included predictor variables of participants' gender, grade and age in the first block and the interaction terms of grade by SES, gender by grade, and gender by SES in the second block. Context did not add to the full model, hence was removed from the model. A test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was statistically significant, χ^2 (6, N=123) = 16.38, p=.012. In this model, only the contribution of the SES by Gender interaction term reached a significance level according to the Wald criterion, χ^2 (1, N=123) = 4.36, p=.037. In order to interpret the interaction term, follow up chi-square analyses were conducted by splitting data across genders. The results revealed that the relationship between SES and children's reports of emotional expression did not reach significance among the girls, χ^2 (1, N=61) = .40, p=.52. However, for boys, there was a significant relationship, χ^2 (1, N=61) = 5.72, p=.017, Cramer's V= .017. Ninety-four percent of the high SES boys reported a decision to express their emotions compared to the 70% of the low SES boys. The

odds ratio interpretations also revealed that low SES boys were 84 % less likely to express their emotions than high SES boys.

Table 7 shows the logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, and odds ratio and odds ratio with 95% confidence interval for each of the predictors.

Table 7

Logistic Regression Predicting Likelihood of Emotion Expression for Book Vignette

Variables	B	Wald χ^2	p	Odds Ratio	95 % C. I. for Odds Ratio	
					Lower	Upper
SES (1=low, 0=high)	-.96	.59	.44	.38	.034	4.38
Gender (1=girl, 0=boy)	-1.50	1.54	.22	.22	.21	2.39
Grade (1=3rd, 0=5th)	-.96	.59	.44	.38	.03	4.38
Gender (1) by SES (1)	2.39	4.36	.04	10.87	1.16	101.9
Grade (1) by SES (1)	-1.35	1.13	.29	.26	.02	3.13
Gender (1) by Grade (1)	.40	.08	.78	1.45	.12	17.64
Constant	3.24	8.28	.004	25.40		

Reasons for Expressing or Hiding the Felt Emotions- A Qualitative Look

The third question in the interview was open-ended and investigated children's reasons for the expression and control of their felt emotions. For each vignette, those children who reported the target emotion were selected and their reasons to express or hide their emotion expression were examined. Children's responses were categorized based on the coding schemes used in previous research (Cole, et al., 2002; Raval & Martini, 2007; Zeman & Shipman, 1996). Apart from those categories, additional categories were generated based on the responses of participants in this study. See Appendix F

for the coding categories that were used for children's reasons for emotion expression and control.

Candy Vignette: Story about Thwarted Goals and Injustice

Reasons to Express Anger

The most frequently cited reason to express anger was self-evident justifications which describe just the facts of the situation. These justifications indicate children's notion that their anger expression would be expected in such a situation without the necessity of affective control. Examples:

1. I would show my anger because my father ate my candy.
2. I would show my anger because my father did not want to share the candy; he took it and ate it all.

The next frequently cited reason for anger expression was children's desire to prevent future occurrence of the situation again. Examples:

1. When I showed my anger, he would not do the same thing again.
2. If I did not show my anger, my mother would go on to eat my candy, and I would crave for it.

Thirdly, children justified their anger expression with the expectation of positive instrumental consequences. Examples:

1. If I showed my anger, he would buy me a new candy and apologize for taking my candy.
2. If I showed I was angry, he would buy a new candy.

Finally, a child reported to express his anger in order to receive positive interpersonal consequences. Example: "I would show my anger so that she could understand how I felt."

<u>Reasons to Hide Anger</u>

Those children who reported to hide/control their anger expression mostly justified

their behaviors with prosocial reasons concerning other's feelings and relationship

with the target person. Examples:

1. If I showed my anger, he would be upset.
2. I do not want to lose her, whatever she does, I love her.

Children also reported that they would hide their anger in order to avoid being scolded

or punished. Examples:

1. My father would scold me and warn me to respect my elder.
2. He would beat me and ask me why I did not want the candy before he ate it.

Children also mentioned the importance of the norms and family hierarchy as

justifications for controlling anger expression. Examples:

1. She carried me for nine months and endured the pain. We should also endure her behaviors.
2. She is my mother, I cannot go against her.

Finally, some children minimized the significance of the event. Examples:

1. Just for one candy, there is no need to be angry.
2. Everybody can make a mistake, because she made a mistake once, I cannot end my friendship.

<u>Red Mark Vignette: Story about Public Mistakes</u>

<u>Reasons to Express Shame</u>

The majority of the children justified their expression of shame by their wish to get

positive interpersonal consequences. Examples:

1. I would show my shame so that he would apologize for humiliating me in front of others.
2. Because when I was ashamed he would understand me and help me and we would overcome what I was ashamed together. For example I am afraid of aliens but I cannot tell this anyone because I am ashamed of this- as nobody is afraid of aliens. But my friend tells me to look at the aliens and no more afraid of them.

The next frequently cited reason for shame expression was self-evident justifications which reveal child's feelings by referring just to the facts of the situation. Examples*:*

1. Beause I did not do my homework and I was humiliated in front of everyone.
2. Because I unintentionally did my homework bad.

Children reported to express their shame in order to compensate their mishaps that they feel regret and discipline themselves on this matter, as well. This type of justifications seems to reveal children's tendency to appraise those situations with guilt reactions.

Examples:

1. I knew and I was aware that I did my homework without really caring. Thus, I ended up punishing myself by regretting it.
2. Because there were guests and I was unsuccessful, my mother would be upset and I would be ashamed…If I expressed my shame, I would learn from it.

Children also expressed their shame in order to avoid being scolded or teased.

Examples:

1. If I did not show I was ashamed, things would get worse; he would get angry with me. If I expressed my shame, at least he would not scold me.
2. Thus, he would not get angry with me... When he saw that I was ashamed, he would only scold me a little.
3. So, I would not be humiliated… If I did not show that I was ashamed, I would be humiliated more.
4. They would tease me for not being ashamed in such a situation… Being ashamed, I would show that I was sorry for doing such a bad homework.

Children also reported to express their shame because the expression is automatic and uncontrollable as a result of intense emotionality. Examples:

1. …If I did not express my shame, it would stick inside me… If it stuck inside me, one day it would blow out like a mentos (a kind of candy) in a glass of coke. This is because I can not hide my emotions much.
2. Because it is a big problem and I would feel really bad.

Finally one child reported to show that he was ashamed in order to prevent the future occurrence of the event. Example: "Thus, he would understand that I was ashamed and he would not do the same thing again."

Reasons to Hide Shame

Most of the children reported to hide their shame in order to avoid humiliation or being teased and in order to maintain their self-esteem. Examples:

1. If I showed how I felt, I would fall into a bad situation and everybody would laugh at me.
2. Once a situation like that happened to me and everybody teased me. After that event, I have not shown my shame to anybody.

Secondly, children reported to control their shame expression for positive interpersonal consequences. They believed that expressing their shame would cause the target person feel bad about the situation. Examples:

1. -Because my mother would be upset…
   -Why would she feel upset?
   -Because I would not complete my school.
2. Because I love my father. I would not want him to be upset when I showed that I was ashamed.

Thirdly, children reasoned their control of shame expression by their justification of avoiding being scolded. Examples:

1. Because I would be afraid… He could beat me or scold me.
2. If my father saw me in shame he would scold me because I would be disgraced in front of everyone.
3. He would tell me "Do not be ashamed, you always do mistakes and are you still ashamed after all?"

One child reported to control his shame expression in order to prevent future occurrence of the event. Example:

If I showed my shame, he would understand that I was ashamed and he would do the same thing again in order to make me ashamed again.

One child justified his control of shame by a category unique to our Turkish sample. He reported to hide his shame in order to maintain his parents' self-esteem and honor.

Example: If I showed I was ashamed, the other people around would say "He has such

a bad son!" behind his back."

<div align="center">Gift Vignette: Story about a Disappointing Gift</div>

Reasons to Express Disappointment

Children used self evident justifications which refer to the facts of the situation. This

type of justification signifies children's sense that their emotion expression is usual in

such a situation. Examples:

1. Because he did not buy what I wanted.
2. Because I didn't like that gift. If she bought the other gift, because I would be happier, I would show my happiness.

Children also reported to express their disappointment in order to get positive

interpersonal consequences. Examples:

1. When I show I am upset, my mother never wants me to feel so. Thus, if I showed how I felt, she would explain me why she did such thing. I would try to solve the problem quickly.
2. So that he could understand that I was unhappy.

Children justified their disappointment expression by their wish to communicate how

they felt and thought. Examples:

1. In order to ask why he didn't buy it… I would say "You could buy it or tell me you have no money.
2. If I expressed this indirectly, I would feel relieved… in order that I would not feel under pressure of my feelings.

Finally, children expressed their disappointment in order to get positive instrumental

benefits. Examples:

1. Maybe he could buy a much better gift in my next birthday. Actually I am sure that he could, because once, a situation like that happened to me.
2. Next time he would buy exactly what I wanted.

<u>Reasons to Hide Disappointment</u>

Majority of children reported to hide their disappointment for prosocial reasons

concerning other's feelings if the emotion was expressed. Examples:

1. When she saw that I did not like the gift, she would be very upset since she would think she could not make me happy.
2. Even though I did not like the gift- if I showed how I felt, my friend would be offended.
3. May be she did not have money to buy that toy, she had money only for a pencil. Thus, I did not want her to notice that I was disappointed.

Secondly, children reported to control their disappointment expression in order to

maintain the norm behavior when somebody gets a present. Examples:

1. In order to be polite. My friend would say, "I tried hard in order to wrap the gift attractively, and my friend did not like it.
2. Because he is my friend. This emotion should not be shown to a friend. Otherwise, I would be ashamed.
3. Anyway, he bought me a gift. I would not want to reject the gift.

Finally, children justified their control of disappointment expression by minimizing the

significance of the event. Examples:

1. Because what was important for me was not taking the gift that I wanted, but his thoughtfulness of my birthday.
2. Because, anything my father bought me would be fine, that gift would be also fine to me. That doll was not more valuable than what my father bought.

<u>Book Vignette: Story about Responsibility Lapse and Disappointing Someone</u>

<u>Reasons to Express Guilt</u>

Children most frequently reported to express their guilt in order to compensate their

mistakes they feel regret about. Examples:

1. My feeling would be like regret, because my mother loved this book very much, it was a very precious book, and because of that I would feel very guilty and show it.
2. If I did not show my guilt, my friend would think that I did it on purpose.
3. When I showed I was guilty, I would show that I did not do it on purpose, I did it by accident and I would like to apologize.

4. Because I was really guilty. Although I promised my mother, I should not have spilled the juice-though it was by mistake.

Children also revealed their guilt by self-evident justifications which might indicate that revealing guilt was expected in such a situation. Examples:

1. Because I took her book, spilled the fruit juice on it
2. Because I spilled fruit juice on his book.

Children also reported that they would express their guilt so that they would not deceive others and they would reveal their honesty. Examples:

1. In order not to tell a lie and since I did not keep my promise, I would show it.
2. Because I would want to be honest and say that I was sorry for doing that.

Children reported to show their guilt in order to avoid scolding as well. Examples:

1. Because when my father saw that I went on my living without feeling guilty after what I did, he might have got angry with me… I mean, not so angry, but he might have been offended.
2. In order that he would not scold much more…
3. Because, when I make a mistake and I seem as if I don't care, my mother gets angry with me. For instance, she says "Why are you so irresponsible?" But I would definitely find a way; I would buy a new one for instance… Even a better one would I buy.

Children also justified their guilt expression by their wish to receive positive interpersonal consequences. Examples:

1. Because he could understand that I was upset.
2. When my mother saw that I felt guilty, she would understand me and forgive me.

Children also reported to show feeling guilty in order to maintain the norms of behaving in such a situation. Examples:

1. Because I ruined that book and that book was the one my mother loved so much. If I did not feel guilty, I would be an abnormal child-or if I seemed happy.
2. Because it was his book. Why shouldn't I show it? I would show it and the next day, I would buy a new one with my money.
3. Because he is my father, of course I would show it.

Finally, one child justified her guilt expression by her wish to get positive instrumental consequences. Example: *"If I did not show, when-for example- my mother bought another book; she would not give it to me any more."*

Reasons to Hide Guilt

Only seven children (13 %) reported to hide their expression of guilt and two of them reported that they did not know why they would not show their guilt.

Prosocial reasons were introduced by children such that they appraised expressing guilt as a threat to their relationship. Examples:

1. He would not speak to me any more and I would be upset.
2. When I felt guilty, he might have been upset about giving me the book.

Finally, children justified their control of guilt expression by their willingness to avoid scolding. Examples:

1. Because my mother would become angry with me.
2. Because I would be afraid that he would scold me.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

The aim of the present study was to examine the unique and interactive roles of

children's socioeconomic status (SES), gender, age, and emotion communication

context (parents, peers) on the use of emotion display rules of Turkish school-aged

children. Our study has extended recent research on display rules of emotions (e.g.,

Camras, et al., 2008; Cole, et al., 2002; 2006; Dennis, et al., 2002; Garrett-Peters, &

Fox, 2007; Matsumoto, et al., 2008; Novin, et. al., 2008) in a number of ways. First,

although there is growing research investigating gender and developmental differences

in children's use of display rules as well as their reasons for showing or controlling

their emotions, these patterns have been understudied outside the Western societies

with a few exceptions (Cole, et al., 2002; Garrett-Peters & Fox, 2007; Novin, et al.,

2008). Children's decision to express or hide the basic (i.e., anger) as well as self-

conscious emotions such as shame and guilt were investigated in this study based on

children's self-report to hypothetical vignettes. The inclusion of these self-conscious

emotions was a strength of the present study given that those emotions have not drawn

considerable attention in the emotion display rule literature despite the importance of

guilt and shame for psychological adjustment (Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Tracy &

Robins, 2004).

Emotion Endorsement

Our vignettes were based on hypothetical situations that were supposed to elicit anger,

shame, happiness, disappointment, and happiness based on the previous literature on

socio-emotional development. The results of our interviews revealed that most children

53

endorsed the target feelings associated with the scenarios. In line with our expectations and previous research (Balkaya & Sahin, 2003; Lewis & Ramsay, 2005; Weber, 2004), 51% of the children in our sample associated a situation (i.e., the candy vignette) that involved injustice or blocking of personal goals with feelings of anger. Following anger, the next frequently cited emotions children reported were sadness (by 24% of the children) and disappointment (by 18% of the children). It is possible that a substantial number of children might have preferred to endorse softer, less provocative negative emotions like sadness given that such emotions are more acceptable in the Turkish culture (Sunar, Boratav & Ataca, 2005) and given the cultural view of anger as a "dangerous emotion" that might disrupt the harmony of social relationships.

Secondly, in line with previous studies on the situational antecedents of emotions, 66% of the Turkish children associated a situation that involved public mishaps or failures (i.e., the red mark vignette) with feelings of shame (Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Tracy & Robins, 2004).

Our gift scenario involved a situation in which a child received an unexpected and unwanted gift. This scenario was adapted from the previous, laboratory-based disappointing gift studies in which children receive their least preferred prize after they complete tasks (e.g., Cole, 1986; Davis, 1995; Saarni, 1984, Garrett-Peters & Fox, 2007). This scenario elicited disappointment in 56% of the Turkish children. Not surprisingly, many children also associated feelings of sadness and anger with this situation. Some children indicated happiness claiming that receiving a gift is always nice and no matter what the gift is, just to be remembered was sufficient for being happy.

Finally, our hypothetical situation that involved a transgression in an interpersonal context and a responsibility lapse based on previous research (Ferguson

54

et al., 1991, Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Schamader & Lickel, 2006) elicited feelings of guilt among 44% of the Turkish children. 20% the children reported that they would have felt ashamed. This is not surprising given that shame is an emotion elicited when one evaluates himself in relation to others and has guilt like functions of morality in collectivistic cultures, with the difference of more emphasized duties to society rather than the individual himself (Bedford & Hwang, 2003). In fact, there are studies criticizing the Western cultures' model of conceptualization of shame and guilt (i.e. relating shame with maladaptive defective global self and guilt with more constructive and mature behaviors of managing transgressions) calling attention to the fact that the role of shame and guilt may differ across cultures (Bedford & Hwang, 2003; Dost &Yağmurlu, 2008; Shweder, 2003) . For instance shame in Confucian cultures, unlike American cultures, may be based on specific actions and is related to morality, especially in failure to fulfill positive responsibilities (Bedford & Hwang, 2003). In Turkey, where relatedness and responsibilities for groups rather than individual goals is emphasized (Kagitcibasi, 1996; Sunar & Fisek, 2005), shame may also function as a moral emotion in governing individuals' behavior- as guilt function in Western societies- resulting in shame and guilt so being intertwined in children's responses in the present study. In fact, in the shame eliciting scenario, guilt was not a very frequently endorsed emotion (9 %) while guilt eliciting situation was appraised as a shaming situation by 19 % of the children, compared to almost half of the children who endorsed guilt (44 %).

All together, the pattern of these results suggests that Turkish children's knowledge and understanding of the phenomenology of emotions seem to be similar to children's emotional knowledge in Western societies. However, the frequent endorsement of sadness and disappointment so commonly in an anger eliciting

situation may reflect a culture-specific pattern suggesting children's preference to appraise anger-arousing situations in terms less threatening emotions such as sadness or disappointment to maintain relationship harmony.

Decisions to Express or not to Express Emotions in an Anger Eliciting Situation

Similar to previous studies on emotion display rules (Cole, et al, 2002; Shipman & Zeman, 2001; Zeman & Garber, 1996; Raval, et al., 2007), we asked children whether they would express or hide their felt emotion. Sixty-six percent of the children reported that they would show their felt emotion in the anger eliciting situation. The high emotion expression rate in the anger-eliciting situation was particularly surprising given that emotion expression associated with anger is considered as a threat to a relationship harmony and hence, the expression of anger is discouraged in traditional Turkish families (Sunar, 2002; Sunar & Fisek, 2005). It is important to point out that 41% of the children endorsed sadness and disappointment as their felt emotion in this vignette. Therefore, we selected only those children who endorsed anger as their felt emotion (51% of the whole sample) and found that 69% of these children reported that they would express their feeling of anger.

There may be two possible reasons for the relatively high anger expression rate. First of all, the findings of this study are based on children's self reports, which may not accurately reflect children's observable emotional reactions in real life settings. The findings of an observational study would be a more reliable reference for the assessment of children's real emotional reactions when their goals are blocked or when they are met with injustice. Secondly, when administering the interview, we asked the question in a forced-choice format (i.e. "Would you show or not show how you felt?").

Children were not given a chance to choose along response alternatives such as deamplifing or qualifing their felt emotion. Indeed, in a study conducted with adults in Turkey, it was revealed that participants chose to manage their anger by deamplifying its intensity rather than by hiding their affect (Sunar, Ataca, & Boratav, 2005).

With regard to the age, gender, context and SES differences, we found that SES was the only significant factor that predicted children's decision to express or hide their emotion in the anger-eliciting situation. As expected, the emotion expressiveness rates of high SES children were higher than low SES children. Previous work on Turkish families has also shown that the expression of anger was particularly discouraged in traditional families (Sunar & Fisek, 2005). It has been argued that low SES families in Turkey endorse more collectivistic attitudes and hence emphasize appropriate conduct, obedience, and the control of emotional expression due to the strict hierarchical roles in the family and the considerations of relationship harmony (Kagitcibasi, 2002; Sunar, 2002; Sunar & Fisek, 2005). On the other hand, according to the family model proposed by Kağıtçıbaşı (1996; 2005), the childrearing orientation of the urban, middle-high class parents integrates autonomy with relatedness to foster an "autonomous-relational" self. Thus, autonomy is now part of the socialization goals of Turkish parents (Yağmurlu, Citlak, & Leyendecker, 2009) because of the competitive requirements of urbanization as well as changing economic and demographic conditions. Our finding that high SES children were more willing to express their felt emotion in an anger-eliciting situation makes sense when we consider these changing socialization beliefs, goals and parenting practices in the family model of interdependence compared to the socialization beliefs and practices of more traditional low SES parents.

In fact, when we looked more closely to the open-ended responses of the high

SES children as to why they would express their anger, their answers suggested that these children wanted to show their feeling in order to protect their rights to meet their individual needs and provided self-evident justifications. Specifically, these children claimed that they would perceive the situation as unfair and that they would react to this unfairness by expressing their emotions. These children also reported that by expressing their emotion they would prevent similar situations in the future (e.g. "*If I would show that I was angry, he would understand how I felt and he would not do the same thing again*" or "*So that he would realize his demerit, otherwise he would do the same thing again and everyone would part their company with him.*"). In contrast, the responses of the low SES children, who preferred to hide their anger, illustrated features of the collectivistic belief systems that are characterized as valuing harmonious interactions, cooperation and conformity to others' expectations. A few illustrative examples are the following: "*She carried me nine months, we should tolerate her behaviors*" or "*My father would scold me and warn me to respect my elders.*"

The SES difference in school-age children's anger expression detected in the present study is remarkably similar to a study with a sample of Indian school-aged children, who also provided data on their emotion expression based on self-report (Raval, et al, 2007). Raval and colleagues have collected data from children who resided in an Indian suburban community where parents have high education and income levels and emphasize academic and individual achievement. They compared the responses of these high SES children to the responses of children from the old city community, which was characterized by traditional norms, less family education and income level. Results of this study revealed that more children from the old city than the suburb believed that their expression of anger, sadness as well as pain would not be

acceptable in their social environment. Furthermore, the old city children reported that they would control these emotions to a greater extent than their peers living in the suburb. Raval and colleagues explained this pattern of their results based on the differences in parental socialization beliefs and practices in the old city and the suburb. Similar to the Turkish low-SES families, parents in the old city were characterized by their strong beliefs in raising children with appropriate social conduct, which in turn appears to influence children's beliefs about emotion expression and their use of emotion display rules.

Studies with school-aged children in Nepal also found that children from two different communities in the same country, specifically Brahman and Tamang children, differed in terms of their decisions to express or control their emotions (Cole & Tamang, 1998; Cole et al., 2002). But the pattern of results from the Nepali samples with regard to the decision to communicate feelings of anger as a function of SES level was in the opposite direction to our results. In the Nepali society, Brahmans represent a higher social status based on the Hindu caste system compared to the Tamang people who are considered tribal, lower status people due to their minority status. Cole and colleagues have found that Brahman children, who by virtue of their high caste status, endorsed feelings of anger more than the Tamang children. However, when children were asked whether they would communicate their anger, Brahman children reported that they would be more likely to hide their felt anger compared to the Tamang children. Cole and colleagues argued that Brahman children are socialized to strictly control their emotions as a necessity of their high-caste status, while Tamang children are socialized not to feel strong emotions and if they did, not to hide emotions at all as a tenet of their Buddhist belief. This study illustrates the important role of the subcultural rules such as of Brahmans to hide anger in order to respect authority,

preserve group harmony and maintain self-control in relation to others within the caste system.

Decisions to Express or not to Express Emotions in Self-Conscious Emotion Eliciting Situations

Self-conscious emotions, which are other-focused emotions, were of particular importance for this study for two reasons. First, only a few available studies (Cole, et al., 2002; Kochanska, et al., 2002; Alessandri & Lewis, 1993; 1996) examined the emotion display rules of guilt and shame; hence we have very limited knowledge. Second, this study is the first one to study such emotions within the context of the Turkish culture where social evaluations and group connectedness may contribute to parents' cultivation of such self-conscious emotions in order to teach them significant social norms and ideal resulting in children's compliance with socially shared ideals (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Fisek & Sunar, 2005, Fredrickson, 1998).

Shame Eliciting Situation

As we expected, most Turkish children (65% of the children) reported that they would express their felt emotion in response to the shame-eliciting situation. This finding fits the previous research on the traditional Turkish family where shame and anxiety of punishment have been identified as major ways of controlling children (Kagitcibasi, Sunar & Bekman; 1989 as cited in Sunar, 2002). Indeed, previous research has pointed out the socialization goals of collectivistic cultures to cultivate children's morality based on the feeling of shame (Bedford & Hwang, 2003; Dost &Yağmurlu, 2008; Shweder, 2003). Also, there are studies showing that members of collectivistic cultures

react more with shame compared to the individualistic cultures in similar situational antecedents (e.g. Fessler, 2004; Bierbrauer, 1992). It has been argued that revealing shame fosters interdependence, social compromise and integration in reciprocal relationships; hence the expression of shame has been encouraged in collectivistic societies (Fessler, 2004; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). For instance, previous research of Cole and her colleagues (2002) have revealed that, Tamang children who were socialized to be selfless and have communal, egalitarian relationships were found to endorse their shame more than American and Brahman children and express their shame more than Brahman children. Feeling of shame and expression of it in Tamang community seems to have a function of maintaining the other oriented identity and egalitarian, reciprocal relationships and resulting in harmonious social integratedness.

Available studies reported gender differences in the experience and expression of shame feelings such that girls were found to display shame to a greater extent than boys (Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Lewis & Ramsay, 2002; Alessandri & Lewis, 1993; 1996). Indeed, mothers' negative responses to girls' failures than boys and their overlooking of their daughters' success have been proposed to results in girls' experience and expression of shame very prominent compared to boys Alessandri & Lewis, 1993; 1996). Also, females have been reported to be socialized to be more sensitive to other's needs and thoughts and express emotions lessening the conflict or disagreements (Brody & Hall, 2000; Fergusson & Crowley, 1997). This gender difference was not supported in the shame eliciting scenario of our study. However, a more complex relationship than a simple prediction by gender was revealed. We found a significant interaction between gender and SES. Specifically, among the girls, SES was not related to children's decision to express or hide their feeling in the shame-eliciting situation. Our results have revealed that similar numbers of girls in low and

high SES groups, namely 66% of the low SES and 58% of the high SES girls chose to express their felt emotion. On the other hand, among the boys, SES was related to emotion expression decision such that a higher percentage of boys (81%) from high SES families reported to express their felt emotions in the shame eliciting scenario compared to boys from lower SES families (55%).

When the responses of children were examined as to why they would hide their shame, the majority of the children told that if they would express their shame they would meet a negative consequence such as being teased, humiliated, embarrassed, or scolded by the target or people around. These responses can be explained by the fact that expressing shame in prestige competitions and achievement situations would reveal the weakness of the individual (Fessler, 2004). Revealing shame, which indicates vulnerability of the person, is not compatible with the traditional patriarchal gender role that men should be powerful (Lewis & Ramsay, 2002). Therefore, it is possible that more low SES boys than high SES boys reported to hide their shame. However, high SES boys, who are most likely not being raised with the traditional gender roles, but with the emphasis of academic achievement and success, reported to express their shame in order to get positive interpersonal consequences and avoid being scolded or teased. It is important to highlight that avoidance of scolding was reported as justification for both expression and control of emotional display by children. It seems that while low SES boys expect scolding or teasing in expression of shame in academic failure situation, high SES boys expect scolding or teasing if they did not display how they were ashamed. A few illustrative examples of justifications for shame expression are the following: "*If I showed that I was ashamed, my mother would understand that I was sorry and she would not get angry at me.*" or "*So that they would not laugh at me and I would not be humiliated any more*". Thus, they might

have wanted to receive interpersonal support by revealing their shame and they might have normalized their shame by their self-evident justifications. However, low SES boys' responses pointed out that they reported to anticipate being teased or being scolded if they had revealed their shame.

Parenting practices and discipline strategies in the family may have also affected children's emotional expression rates. In Turkey, low socioeconomic level, traditional families tend to use power-assertive techniques including physical punishment, scolding and other material threats while the while middle-class, urban families tend to use more democratic practices such as reasoning and rewarding (Sunar, 2002, Fisek & Sunar, 2005). Indeed, studies have shown that children raised with power-assertive discipline styles show less indications of internalized morality and conscience development and express moral emotions less compared to children raised with more induction discipline styles (i.e. explaining and reasoning the consequences of the misbehavior and encouraging the child take initiative in correcting behavior) (Hoffman, 1963; 1971; Kochanska, et al., 2002; Kochanska & Aksan, 2006). Those factors might have contributed to high SES boys' decision to express their felt emotion, while children from low SES might have tried to conceal their emotion because they might have been afraid of or anxious about being punished. A few illustrative examples from low SES children are the following: "*Because he would scold me*" or "*Because he would tell everybody and they would tease me*". Low SES boys' inability to reason why they would not show their shame may also reflect their less internalized conscience (Hoffman, 1963; 1971) and knowledge concerning feeling of shame and consequences of shame display. An illustrative dialog with a boy is the following:

-Why would not you show you felt ashamed?
-… (The child did not answer)

63

-So if you showed that you felt ashamed to your father, what would
happen?
-Nothing happens.
-Then why would you hide how you felt?
-…
-Lets think together, if you showed how you felt, what would your
father do?
-He would do nothing.
-Why would you then hide how you felt from your father?
-I don't know.

In the case of girls, parents typically expect their daughters to display regulated

conduct to a greater extent than boys (Fergusson et al., 1999). Hence, in the case of

mishaps, the experience of shame may be very salient to girls, regardless of their SES

level, which could result in equal rates of expression rate among the girls.

Guilt Eliciting Situation

To our knowledge there is not yet much attempt across cultures to unearth display

rules of guilt although there is a body of research on conceptual and phenomenological

aspects of guilt (i.e., Zahn-Waxler, Kochanska, Krupnick, & McKnew, 1990;

Fergusson, et al., 1999; Tangney, et al., 1992; Teroni &Deonna, 2008) and a few

studies investigating children's display rules of guilt in Western cultures (i.e.

Kochnska, et al., 2002; Kochanska & Aksan, 2006). The findings of the present study

extend the literature on display rules of guilt by revealing Turkish children's decisions

to express or hide their emotions and their reasonings of those display rules.

In our guilt eliciting scenario, as it was predicted, the majority of our sample

(83%) reported that they would express their felt emotion. This rate was, in fact, the

highest rate of emotion expression of all our scenarios. This result was in line with our

expectations given that expressing self-conscious feelings, especially the feeling of

guilt, functions as a means for repairing or undoing the situation and thus maintaining

the social harmony in transgression situations (Tracy & Robins, 2004). In fact, our

qualitative data also confirmed this argument. Specifically, children's justifications for expressing their guilt illustrate well how communicating guilt feelings contribute to both social and self-relieving goals (i.e. "*I would show that I felt guilty so that she could understand that I was sorry for ruining her book*").

Our hypothesis that more high SES than low SES children would express their emotions in guilt eliciting scenario was supported partially, such that among the boys, a higher percentage of high SES boys than low SES boys reported that they would show their felt emotion. However, among the girls, low and high SES children did not differ in terms of their emotion expression rates in our guilt eliciting scenario. This trend showed correspondence with the findings of the Red Mark vignette that was aimed to elicit shame. This correspondence might be related to the fact that both shame and guilt are self conscious emotions which may be encouraged to be expressed by high SES more than low SES boys.

The reason why we detected SES differences among the boys may be more clearly understood by a further look at the reasoning of high SES boys for expressing and low SES boys for hiding their guilt. Once justifications of high SES boys for displaying their guilt were examined, it was revealed that high SES boys could have an obvious knowledge and understanding about consequences of displaying guilt. They could distinguish that by displaying their guilt, they would make explicit how they felt sorry for their lapse and their intention or willingness for repairing or compensating the transgression and receive positive interpersonal consequences (i.e. "*Then he would forgive me for what I did.*" or "*So that I would explain I did not do it on purpose but it happened unintentionally thus I would indicate that I wanted to apologize.*"). They also demonstrated their ability to predict the negative consequences, such as scolding or losing of trust, if they would not show how they felt guilty about their transgressions

(i.e. *"If I did not show, my father would think that I did not care about it and he would not give me his belongings anymore and I would make him upset."*).

On the other hand, when justifications of low SES children for hiding their guilt were investigated, it was seen that they either reported not to know why they would hide their emotions or they reported to anticipate negative reactions from the target person if they revealed their emotions. A few illustrative examples are the following:

-Why wouldn't you show you felt guilty to your mother?
-Just so.
-Why would not you show but you hide you felt guilty?
-…
-What would happen if you showed you felt guilty?
-…I don't know.

Although guilt elicits positive responses from the target given that guilt expression indicates regret of the person, brings about reparation behavior and restores social harmony (Zahn-Waxler, et al., 1990; Kochanska, et al., 2002), those boys from low SES hiding their guilt seem to be lacking emotional understanding and knowledge of the functions and consequences of guilt display and ways of showing their emotions. They were unable to distinguish that their guilt expression may bring on the target person's support. However, when they were asked what they would do following feeling guilty and did not show their emotion, most of those low SES children reported that they would apologize to the target. Indeed, apologizing is also way of expressing guilt, but those children did not seem to recognize apologizing as a kind of guilt expression. They seemed not to be able to distinguish "being guilty" or "feeling guilty" and assumed that expression of guilt might identify them as guilty child and might make public their transgression. Indeed, guilt is known to be an emotion requiring a well developed self-other differentiation as well as ability to differentiate one's self and actions, that is differentiation between global self and specific actions of self (Lewis, 2000; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). In other words, cognitive operations in

order to evaluate one's own behavior according to social standards and role taking

skills, or theory of mind development, in predicting other's needs and reactions is

required in guilt reactions (Hoffman, 1963; 1971; Denham, 1998; Lewis, & Ramsay,

2002; Kochanska, et al., 2002). Those low SES boys deciding to hide their guilt

expression somehow exhibited a narrow emotional maturity. They thought that by

expressing their guilt, they would be emphasizing their transgressions and the target

would also charge them as guilty then react to them negatively. Thus, they expected

that the target would scold them or may be upset when they express their feeling of

guilty (i.e. "*I would be afraid if he would scold me.*" or "*Because he would be sad…*").

Their egocentric thinking (Piaget, 1932) reflects their immature cognitive development

which is the prerequisite for the experience and expression of self-conscious emotions

(Denham, 1998; Lewis, & Ramsay, 2002; Tangney & Dearing, 2002) might be

examined in future studies in order to see whether the difference might be related to

children's theory of mind development.

A study with 8-9 (younger group) and 11-12 (older group) year old children

relevant to our study is worth to mention (Fraser, 1996). In this study, empathy and

guilt were positively related for girls and older boys, while these variables were

negatively related for younger boys. This trend was explained by the developmental

immaturity concerning cognitive requirements of guilt in younger boys relative to

older boys and girls. It was suggested that younger boys' relative immaturity compared

to their girl counterparts is the product of differential parental discipline styles for boys

and girls. Hoffman's finding (1975) in this respect was set forth indicating parents'

discipline of girls with more affection and induction and less power assertion

compared to boys.

The finding of low SES boys' immaturity and egocentric thinking in evaluating

the consequences of guilt expression make sense in this respect. Hoffman (1975; 1994) indicated that power assertive discipline styles control the child by eliciting anxiety, fear or hostility in response to threat of external sanctions and reduce the opportunity for child to evaluate the consequences of the behavior, take responsibility and internalize the rules. Consistent with this finding, low SES children were more likely to feel anxious about their misbehavior, which in turn led to their withdrawn behavior without the expression of guilt (Hoffman, 1963). On the other hand, inductive discipline styles point out to the rational demands of situation and consequences of child's behavior for others rather than of punishment. Thus, while inductive discipline provide cognitive evaluations for moral behavior to the child, power assertive discipline styles interferes with the children's assimilation of cognitive content of moral behavior (Hoffman, 1963; Kochanska, et al., 2002; Kochanska, Aksan & Nichols, 2003).

In Turkey, low SES families have been stated to implement authoritarian parenting based on power-assertive discipline styles including physical punishment, scolding or threats and with rarely reasoning in contrast to urban middle SES families' discipline styles based on reasoning, rewarding, withdrawal of love or shaming (Sunar, 2002; Sunar & Fisek, 2005). Based on the aforementioned relationship between parents' discipline styles and children's moral conduct, low SES boys' narrow understanding for ramifications of guilt expression is understandable.

The question of why, then, this pattern was revealed only for boys but not for girls comes to mind. This question can be well explained by differential parenting practices in disciplining boys and girls. It may be suggested that parental discipline styles might differ across genders such that low SES boys might be exposed to power-assertive parental discipline to a greater extent than low SES girls, who may be

punished with shaming. In fact, Hoffman (1975) in his study found that mothers reported to express more affection and implement more induction and less power-assertion to girls than they did to boys. A relatively recent observational study with toddlers and preschoolers has also revealed that girls received less power assertion than boys in prohibitions and had higher scores on moral conduct and moral cognition (Kochanska et al., 2003). Thus, in our sample, the differential effect of parental discipline style across SES levels might have revealed its existence on boys rather than girls. Future research is needed to investigate the discipline styles and socialization strategies of Turkish parents across gender within each SES level to better interpret our results.

Children's Emotional Reactions to Disappointing Gift Scenario

More than half of the children in our sample (60%) reported to hide their felt emotion in this disappointment eliciting scenario. Studies that conducted the disappointing gift paradigm have already shown that children, even as young as four year old, tend to control their disappointment by hiding or masking their emotions with positive affect (Cole, 1986; Saarni, 1984, Garrett-Peters & Fox, 2007). In our sample also, most children reported that they would not show their emotions by justifying their responses by prosocial reasons such that they were concerned about the target's hurt feelings and the harmony of the relationship with that target person. A few illustrative examples are the following: "*Because my mother would be sad and she would think that I did not like the gift.*" "*If I showed I was disappointed my father would feel upset and I can not bear to upset him, otherwise I would also feel upset*." A few children who reported their decisions towards expressing their disappointment reasoned their behavior with

the fact that they wanted to receive social support from the target or they explained their behaviors with self-evident justifications (i.e. "*So that she could understand that I was unhappy and did not like the gift*" or "*Because he bought me a gift that I did not like*").

Gender differences in the disappointing gift paradigm have been reported in previous studies (Saarni, 1984; Cole, 1986; Davis, 1995). However, the findings of the present study failed to detect any gender differences in children's decision to hide their feeling in our disappointment-eliciting vignette. This result may stem from the methodology of the study such that children's self-reports may reflect children's emotional display rule knowledge but not children's actual emotional behavior. Both girls and boys know that one should hide disappointment and look pleased when receiving a disappointing gift and both genders may try to conform to this rule. Observational studies may be methodologically stronger to detect gender differences. The second explanation for the lack of gender differences is the fact that gender differences in disappointing gift studies are especially pronounced in terms of masking the emotion with positive affect (i.e. smiling when the gift is received) (Cole, 1986; Davis, 1995). However, in our study we only inquired about hiding or showing the emotion. It is possible that the gender difference would be found in terms of masking the negative emotion with positive emotions skillfully. Observational measures using specific facial emotion expression coding systems would be a more reliable source for testing gender and age differences in the disappointing gift paradigm.

In Shame and Guilt Eliciting Situations

The hypothesized age difference for guilt and shame was also supported by our findings such that older children are more likely to express their felt emotions in shame and guilt eliciting scenario than younger children. This finding is compatible with the previous research that older children experience and express shame and guilt more compared to younger children on account of further cognitive development and socialization experiences which are necessary for experiencing and expressing these emotions (Lagatutta, 2005; Denham, 1998, Kochanska, et al., 2002; 2003, Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Hoffman, 1963; 1971; Lewis, & Ramsay, 2002). Older children's explanations for revealing their self-conscious emotions evidently illustrates the cognitive demands of shame and guilt such as bringing forward more mentalistic and abstract explanations about social rules, standards and goals, connecting those with their emotional experience, representing those explanations in relation to self and other and regarding the consequences of their emotional actions.

In Anger and Disappointment Eliciting Situations

The findings of the present study failed to support our hypotheses that older children would hide their anger and disappointment feelings to a greater extent than their younger counterparts.

In fact, the findings are mixed regarding age differences in hiding disappointment. There are studies supporting the age differences such that older children are more skilled in the disappointing gift task (i.e. Saarni, 1984; Garrett-Peters & Fox, 2007). But there are also studies documenting no age differences (i.e. Cole,

71

1986, Davis, 1995). Methodological and cultural reasons have been presented for these mixed findings with regard to the inconsistent developmental differences (Cole, 1986, Garrett-Peters & Fox, 2007). Indeed, studies reporting age differences are usually based on self reports which indicate that knowledge of display rules increase with age (i.e. Saarni 1979; Zeman & Garber, 1996; Underwood, et al, 1992). However children's actual conformity to display rules in observational studies has not revealed consistent patterns (i.e. Cole, 1986, Davis, 1995; Saarni, 1984).

Effects of cultural norms have also been proposed for inconsistent results. For instance in one of those studies, it was found that both seven year old Chinese American and European American children showed more positive expressions in a disappointing gift experiment than four year old children. However, in terms of negative emotional displays, older European American children showed lesser negative displays than their younger counterparts while Chinese American children did not (Garrett-Peters & Fox, 2007). They explained this difference with the fact that Chinese children exhibit relatively less rapid development of emotional knowledge and understanding. They argued that this less rapid development has to do with Chinese mothers' more behavioral but less cognitive approach with few explanations or reasoning in teaching proper conduct in contrast to European America mothers providing more verbal and cognitive accounts in their emotional discourse with their child in socializing their children's emotional competence.

It can be speculated that children's emotional socialization process may be the basis for the lack of age difference in our sample. The display rule in the Turkish cultural context that one should seem pleased when receiving any gift should be learned and practiced at an early age, thus the knowledge and practice of this display rule may be already internalized and may not change between 9 and 11 year olds.

Age differences on children's emotional expressiveness in anger eliciting situation is not supported in our study. Third and fifth graders displayed their emotions at similar rates. This finding was unexpected given that previous studies in Western cultures indicates that as the child gets older, in line with their social-cognitive development their reasoning and knowledge about the antecedents and consequences of emotion expression and their consideration of others' needs develops and become more complex (Saarni, 1979; Cole, 1986; Casey, 1993; Denham, 1998; McElvain, et al., 2007, Zeman & Garber, 1996). It seems that the developmental pattern reported in previous research in Western cultures did not emerge in Turkish children. In this respect, the argument of Garret-Peters and Fox (2007) is relevant in our discussion of the absence of age difference. Based on their argument, it may be suggested that, compared to parents in Western cultures, Turkish parents might be providing less cognitive explanations in their emotional discourse with their children resulting in a more gradual change in children's display rules through development.

A second explanation for the lack of age difference may pertain to the methodological concerns. First of all, the responses of children were received upon forced choice format. As injustice and goal blockage is very apparent in our Candy scenario, expression of anger might be justified for protecting one's rights. In fact, children's high expressivity rate (66 %) in this scenario verifies the salience of the injustice and subsequent anger expression. When children were forced to choose between express or not express without mentioning other expression regulation strategies such as deamplifying the expression, both younger and older children may chose the most salient choice of expressing emotion in response to apparent injustice and goal blockage. It may be suggested that if children are given chance to choose along response alternatives in regulating emotional expression such as masking,

deamplifying, hiding, etc. rather than forced-choice format, age differences might be revealed in children's display rules knowledge and use.

Contextual Differences

The results of the present study revealed that children did not change their decision to express or hide their emotions as a function of the target person in the situation. In other words, children were equally likely to express or hide their feelings to their parents or their peers. This finding is not consistent with previous studies conducted in the West as well as in East (i.e. Iran) which have revealed the importance of context in children's decisions for revealing their emotion (Fuchs & Thelen, 1988; Novin, et al., 2008; Zeman & Garber, 1996). For instance in one of those studies conducted with 10-11 years old Iranian and Dutch children, it was found that Iranian children were more likely to hide sadness, anger, fear and happiness with family audience and less likely to hide with peer audiences compared to their Dutch counterparts (Novin, et al., 2008). Also, Iranian children were found to be more likely than Dutch children to use self protective and prosocial justifications for use of display rules in family audience and less likely to have self-protective motives in peer audience. These findings also supports the notion that Iranian families in a collectivistic culture valuing hierarchy and authority within the family context socialize their children's emotional expressiveness with respect to maintaining this harmony in the family rather than peer relationships (Novin, et al., 2008). In contrast, as Zeman and Garber (1996) revealed, Western children reported to conceal their sadness, fear and anger with peer audience than parent audience. Indeed, Novin and colleagues (2008) revealed that, Dutch children justified their display rules with self-protective justifications more than

74

Iranian children indicating the unacceptability of those negative emotions in Western peer relationships where self needs are prioritized.

The lack of contextual differences was also surprising given the previous work with Turkish adults. A recent study found that status (age differences) and kinship degree (family vs. acquaintance) of the person to whom the emotion is expressed to was affected by the participants' regulation of emotional expression (Sunar, Boratav, Ataca, 2005). Specifically, anger was found to be expressed to higher status targets more compared to equal or higher status targets. Also for all basic emotions, emotion expression is permitted more to family targets compared to targets outside of the family. Perhaps, we failed to elicit children's differential imagination of the context that involves their father, mother or friends just by reading the scenario. Future research may investigate Turkish children's display rules by observational methods using coding systems for children's facial, behavioral and verbal responses or a second inventory from the parents of those children about their children's emotional reactions.

Another possible explanation has to do with Turkish children's developmental features in relation to their ability to distinguish display rules between contexts. As it was above argued, many collectivistic cultures (i.e. Chinese, Iranian, Indian, Tamang) tend to implement behavioral approach in teaching children proper conduct to a greater extent than cognitive approach and verbal explanations. Accordingly, as Garrett-Peters and Fox (2007) have argued, children's development of knowledge and understanding of emotions may be more gradual in those cultures compared to Western cultures. Thus, it might be speculated that elementary school age children have not distinguished the knowledge and understanding regarding the consequences of emotional displays in different contexts. In fact, adolescence period, when the attitudes of friends toward self gains importance and children become more cognitively skillful

in elaborating their emotional behavior, shall be an appropriate period to examine display rules in different contexts.

Limitations and Future Directions

Although the present study is one of the initial studies uncovering the display rules of Turkish children for both basic and self conscious emotions, several limitations to generalizability, reliability and validity of the findings are worth mentioning. First, the method of data collection of the present study is based on children's self-reports about hypothetical scenarios. Yet, what children are aware about their emotional reactions, what they disclose to the interviewer about those reactions as a means of social desirability and what they actually do reveal of those emotional reactions in real life-setting might be very different from each other. Thus, what we measured as children's emotional reactions and display rules may not reflect children's actual emotional reactions and display rules.

Second, in the qualitative section of the study, children's responses have not been coded by a second researcher which limits the reliability of fitting children's responses to the proper category. Third, the participants of the study were limited to children living in Istanbul and Ankara and the findings cannot be generalized to Turkish children's display rules. A more comprehensive study conducted in East and other West regions of Turkey, investigating the participants' families' cultural orientation (i.e. individualism and collectivism or autonomy and relatedness), emotional socialization practices and child discipline strategies, would unearth the relationship between cultural context and children's display rules by revealing the possible determinants of children's display rule.

In conclusion the present study supports the notion that the socioeconomic level by itself and together with child gender contributes to differences in children's decisions to communicate their certain basic and self-conscious emotions, even in childhood years.

While we expected that children from high SES families and those older ones would report to express their emotions in guilt and shame eliciting situations more freely; we found the SES difference was present for boys only. Boys from high socio-economic class were the ones who reported to express their self-conscious emotions more compared to their low SES counterparts. Seeing that revealing shame and guilt was functional in terms of receiving positive interpersonal consequences in our scenarios, boys from high socio-economic class did demonstrate those functional behaviors more frequently. Our prediction that high SES children would express their emotions in anger eliciting situations more than low SES children was also confirmed. High SES families' encouragement of children's behaviors serving to individual goals and support of emotional expressiveness was proposed for this SES difference.

Thus, it may be suggested that starting from the preschool period, programs that foster children's, especially disadvantaged children's emotion competence is particularly important. Those programs should target to increase children's emotional understanding by providing rich causal explanations for antecedents and consequences of emotions, and focus on appropriate emotional expression ways to support children's emotion regulation. Also anger management programs aiming to teach children regulation of anger and appropriate expression of it by emphasizing the causes and consequences of anger expression should be implemented.

APPENDICES

MÜLAKAT HİKAYELERİ

Yönerge: Şimdi sana annenle, babanla ya da arkadaşlarınla yaşayabileceğin kısa hikayeler anlatacağım. Senden kendini bu durumlardayken hayal etmeni istiyorum. Daha sonra bu durumlarda hissettiğin duygularla ilgili sana sorular soracağım ve senden bu sorulara cevap vermeni isteyeceğim. Bu soruların doğru veya yanlış cevapları yok. Sadece sen böyle bir durumda nasıl hissederdin diye düşünmeni ve bana anlatmanı istiyorum. Anlattıkların ikimizin arasında kalacak. Ancak söylediklerini daha sonra hatırlamam için konuştuklarımızı kaydedeceğim ve çalışmam bitince bu kayıtları sileceğim.

Haksızlık ve engellenmiş amaçlarla ilgili hikaye:
1. Elinde bir parça şekerin var. Bu çok güzel ve lezzetli şekeri yemek için şekerin kâğıdını açıyorsun. Annen/arkadaşın/baban de seninle beraber ve şekeri senden kapıyor. Sen "Şekerimi geri ver" diyorsun fakat onu söylerken annen/baban/arkadaşın şekeri yemiş bile.

Toplum içinde ortaya çıkan kusurlarla ilgili hikaye:
2. Öğretmenin ödevinin bir sayfasına, yanlış yaptığın için kırmızı kalemle kocaman bir çarpı koymuş. Okuldan eve geldiğinde, evde misafirleriniz olduğunu görüyorsun. Baban/arkadaşın/annen defterini alıyor ve öğretmeninin defterine koyduğu o büyük kırmızı çarpıyı görüyor ve ailene/ arkadaşlarına da gösteriyor. Baban/arkadaşın/annen sana "Bu ödevi bu kadar kötü nasıl yapabildin, hiç uğraşmadın mı?" diyor. Bunun üzerine oradaki herkes sana bakıyor.

Güzel olaylar ve etkileşimlerle ilgili hikaye:
3. Güzel, güneşli bir gün. Dışarıda annenle/arkadaşınla/babanla oturuyorsun. Arkadaşınla/annenle/babanla konuşuyorsun ve gülüyorsun. Sonra oyun oynamak istiyorsun ve arkadaşına/annene/babana bunu söylediğinde seninle beraber oyun oynuyor. Annen/baban/arkadaşın sana gülümsüyor ve sen kendi kendine "Annem/arkadaşım/babam benimle beraber bir şeyler yapmaktan hoşlanıyor, beraber ne kadar iyi vakit geçiriyoruz" diyorsun.

Hayal kırıklığı ile ilgili hikaye:

4. Bir pazar günü arkadaşınla/annenle/babanla bir oyuncakçı mağazasına uğruyorsunuz. Sen mağazada çok hoşuna giden bir oyuncak görüyorsun ve bunu arkadaşına/annene/babana söylüyorsun. İki gün sonra da senin doğum günün var. Arkadaşın/annen/baban sana doğum günün için çok beğeneceğin bir hediye aldığını söylüyor ve sen arkadaşının/annenin/babanın o beğendiğin oyuncağı aldığını düşünüyorsun. Doğum günün geldiğinde annen/arkadaşın/baban sana hediyeni veriyor, sen heyecanlı bir şekilde hediyeni açıyorsun. Ancak hediye paketini açtığında, arkadaşının/annenin/babanın sana çok da beğenmediğin bir kalem aldığını görüyorsun.

Eşyaya zarar verme ile ilgili hikaye:

5. Baban/arkadaşın/annen parlak resimleri olan güzel bir kitabı çok beğenmiş ve almış. Sen babandan/arkadaşından/annenden kitaba bakmak için kitabı istiyorsun. Arkadaşın/baban/annen kitabı çok sevdiği için sana vermek istemiyor ama sen kitabı çok iyi koruyacağına dair annene/babana/arkadaşına söz veriyorsun ve kitabı ondan alıyorsun. Sonra masaya oturup meyve suyu içerken kitabın resimlerine bakıyorsun. O sırada kolun meyve suyuna çarpıyor ve meyve suyu olduğu gibi kitabın üzerine dökülüyor. Daha sonra annen/baban arkadaşın yanına geliyor ve kitabı mahvolmuş halde görüyor.

1. Böyle bir durumla karşı karşıya kalırsan nasıl hissedersin?

   Serbest yanıt:

   Eğer cevap vermez ise: Peki şu duygulardan hangisini hissedersin? (Duygu listesi okunur)

   Şıklardaki yanıtlardan birini vermez ise: (Çocuğun belirttiği duygusal durumu) hissedersin, peki bu hissettiğin duygu aşağıdaki duygulardan hangisine yakın?

   1. suçlu   2. kızgın   3. mutlu   4. hüzünlü   5.utanmış
   6. hayal kırıklığı   7. korkmuş

2. Babana/arkadaşına/annene (çocuğun belirttiği duygusal durumu) hissettiğini gösterir miydin?

   1. Evet   0. Hayır

3. Babana/arkadaşına/annene (çocuğun belirttiği duygusal durumu) hissettiğini neden gösterirdin/göstermezdin?

4.
   4.A. (Çocuğun belirttiği duygusal durumu) hissediyorsun ama (Çocuğun belirttiği duygusal durumu) hissettiğini babana/arkadaşına/annene göstermek istemiyorsun. O zaman böyle bir durumda ne yapardın?

   4.B. (Çocuğun belirttiği duygusal durumu) hissediyorsun ve (Çocuğun belirttiği duygusal durumu) hissettiğini babana/arkadaşına/annene göstermek istiyorsun. Bunu nasıl gösterirdin?

5. Eğer (çocuğun belirttiği duygusal durumu) hissettiğini babana/arkadaşına/annene gösterseydin/gösterdiğinde,

   5.A. O ne yapardı?

   5.B. Nasıl hissederdi?

DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİ FORMU

Genel Bilgi Formu

Formu Dolduran Kişi: Anne (   )   Baba (   )   Diğer (

)

1. Çocuğun adı ve soyadı: _____

2. Anketi doldurduğunuz tarih: Gün____   Ay_____   Yıl_____

3. Çocuğun doğum tarihi: Gün____   Ay_____   Yıl_____

4. Çocuğun cinsiyeti (lütfen işaretleyiniz): Erkek____   Kız____

5. Annenin doğum yılı:

6. Babanın doğum yılı:

7. En son geldiğiniz eğitim düzeyini işaretleyiniz

(geldiğiniz en yüksek düzey; lütfen hem anne hem de baba için işaretleyiniz.)

	Anne	Baba
Okuma yazma bilmiyor	1	1
İlkokul mezunu	2	2
Ortaokul mezunu	3	3
Lise mezunu	4	4
Yüksek okul mezunu (2 yıllık)	5	5
Üniversite mezunu (4 yıllık)	6	6
Uzmanlık derecesi var (Master, doktora gibi)	7	7

8. Annenin Mesleği: _____

9. Babanın Mesleği: _____

PİLOT ÇALIŞMA MÜLAKAT FORMU

Tarih: Form no:
Yaş: Cinsiyet:

Yönerge: Şimdi sana bazı durumlarda hissettiğin duygularla ilgili sorular soracağım. Senden bu sorulara cevap vermeni istiyorum.

1. Her çocuk zaman zaman ailesiyle beraberken mutlu hisseder. Senin ailenle beraberken en çok mutlu hissettiğin zamanlar hangileri?

2. Her çocuk zaman zaman ailesiyle beraberken kızgın hisseder. Senin ailenle beraberken en çok kızgın hissettiğin zamanlar hangileri?

3. Her çocuk zaman zaman arkadaşlarıyla beraberken kızgın hisseder. Senin arkadaşlarınla beraberken en çok kızgın hissettiğin zamanlar hangileri?

4. Her çocuk zaman zaman arkadaşlarıyla beraberken mutlu hisseder. Senin arkadaşlarınla beraberken en çok mutlu hissettiğin zamanlar hangileri?

5. Her çocuk zaman zaman ailesiyle beraberken suçlu hisseder. Senin ailenle beraberken en çok suçlu hissettiğin zamanlar hangileri?

6. Her çocuk zaman zaman arkadaşlarıyla beraberken suçlu hisseder. Senin arkadaşlarınla beraberken en çok suçlu hissettiğin zamanlar hangileri?

7. Her çocuk zaman zaman ailesiyle beraberken utanmış hisseder. Senin ailenle beraberken en çok utandığın zamanlar hangileri?

8. Her çocuk zaman zaman arkadaşlarıyla beraberken utanmış hisseder. Senin arkadaşlarınla beraberken en çok utandığın zamanlar hangileri?

BİLGİLENDİRİLMİŞ OLUR FORMU

Bilgilendirilmiş Olur Formu

Araştırmayı destekleyen kurum: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Psikoloji Bölümü
Araştırmanın adı: Okul Çağındaki Çocuklarda Duyguların İfadesi ve Duygu İfade Kuralları
Araştırmacıların adı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Feyza Çorapçı, Zeynep Emine Okur
Adresi: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Psikoloji Bölümü, 34342 Bebek-İstanbul
E-posta: feyza.corapci@boun.edu.tr, emine.okur@boun.edu.tr
Telefon: (212) 359 7323

Sayın Veli:

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümünde "Okul Çağındaki Çocuklarda Duyguların İfadesi ve Duygu İfade Kuralları" adı altında bilimsel bir araştırma projesi yürütmekteyiz. Bu çalışmanın amacı çocukların günlük hayatta karşılaşabilecekleri, mutluluk, korku ve kızgınlık gibi duygular uyandırabilecek çeşitli durumlarda duygularını nasıl ifade ettiklerini incelemektir. Sizi bu araştırma projesine katılmaya davet ediyoruz. Kararınızdan önce araştırma hakkında sizi bilgilendirmek istiyoruz. Bu bilgileri okuduktan sonra araştırmaya katılmak isterseniz lütfen bu formu imzalayıp, zarfa koyup, okula iletmesi için çocuğunuza veriniz.

Araştırma projesine katılmayı kabul ederseniz, size gönderdiğimiz genel bilgi formunu doldurmanızı rica edeceğiz. İkinci olarak, gittiği okulda çocuğunuzla ortalama 12 dakika sürecek bir mülakat gerçekleştirilecektir. Bu mülakat esnasında çocuğunuza çeşitli kısa hikayeler okunup bu hikayelerdeki durumlarda hissedeceği duygularla ilgili sorular sorulacaktır. Çocuğunuzun yanıtları, üzerinde daha sonra çalışmak için ses kayıt cihazı ile kaydedilecektir. Bu kayıtlarda çocuğunuzun ismi yerine bir numara kullanılacaktır. Ses kayıtları veri toplama sürecinin sonunda tamamen silinecektir.

Bu araştırma bilimsel bir amaçla yapılmaktadır ve katılımcı bilgilerinin gizliliği esas tutulmaktadır. Bu araştırmaya katılmak tamamen isteğe bağlıdır. Katıldığınız takdirde çocuğunuz, mülakatın herhangi bir aşamasında herhangi bir sebep göstermeden mülakattan çekilmek hakkına da sahip olacaktır. Elde edilecek verilerden kişisel sonuçlar çıkarılmayacak, sonuçlar bütün katılımcılar için toplu halde

değerlendirilecektir. Araştırma projesi hakkında ek bilgi almak istediğiniz takdirde lütfen Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Zeynep Emine Okur ile temasa geçiniz.

Çalışmaya katılmak istiyorum

Çalışmaya katılmak istemiyorum

Katılımcı Çocuğun Adı-Soyadı:...

Velinin Adı Soyadı:...

İmzası:..

Adresi:..

Telefon ve E-posta: ....

Tarih (gün/ay/yıl):...../......./..............

APPENDIX F: CODING CATEGORIES OF JUSTIFICATIONS FOR DISPLAY

RULES

1. *"Self Evident Justifications"* (Cole, Bruschi & Tamang, 2002): Child's justifications which explain just the child's feelings and the facts of the situation. These justifications seem to indicate child's view that expression of emotion is expectable for the situation and the child does not think about any control of emotion.

2. *"Positive interpersonal consequences"* (Zeman & Shipman, 1996): Child's justification for display rules which involves child's anticipation of receiving support, encouragement or empathy from the target person.

3. *"Positive instrumental consequences"* (Zeman & Shipman, 1996): Child's justification for display rules which involves child's anticipation of receiving help or benefit (i.e. material benefit) from the target person.

4. *"Preventing future occurrence"* (Raval, Martini & Raval, 2007): Child's justification for display rules that involve child's act to prevent the situation eliciting child's emotion occur again in the future.

5. *Compensation of the fault & self-discipline*:* Child's justification for display rules that involve child's attempt to compensate their mistakes that they feel regret or child's self-discipline on this matter.

6. *"Avoiding scolding"* (Raval, et al., 2007): Child's justification for display rules that involve child's attempt to avoid negative interpersonal consequences (i.e. being scolded, beaten, etc.) especially with parents.

7. *Avoiding teasing*:* Child's justification for display rules that involve child's attempt to maintain self-esteem (Raval, et al., 2007), avoid being teased, humiliated or embarrassed by the target person.

8. *"Expression uncontrollable"* (Raval, et al., 2007): Child's justification for display rules that indicates the expression is automatic or uncontrollable attributable as a result of intense emotionality.

9. *"Communication"* (Raval, et al., 2007): Child's justification of display rule intending just to communicate the emotion and achieving a positive outcome (Zeman & Shipman, 1996) of just to communicate and relieve.

10. *Justifications for honesty*:* Child's justification of display rule involving their demonstration of honesty by revealing the emotion in order not to deceive others.

11. *"Norm maintenance"* (Zeman & Shipman, 1996): Child's justification of display rule by stating the social rules and conventions such as family hierarchy about emotional expression.

12. *"Prosocial reasons"* (Raval, et al., 2007): Child's justification of emotions involving considerations of caring for how the target person feel and how their relationship would be affected.

13. *"Minimizing the significance of the event"* (Raval et al., 2007): Child's justifications of display rule that involves reappraising the situation that minimizes its significance in causing the emotion.

14. *Maintaining parents' self esteem or honor*:* Child's justification of display rule in order to preserve parent's self esteem or honor in the eyes of the others.

* Note: Justification categories generated from the responses of the study sample

REFERENCES

Adaman, F., & Keyder, Ç. (2006). Poverty and social exclusion in the slum areas of large cities in Turkey. Report prepared for the European Commission, Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities with grant of Research Foundation of Boğaziçi University. Retrieved from ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=4460&langId=en

Alessandri, S. M., & Lewis, M. (1993). Parental evaluation and its relation to shame and pride in young children. *Sex Roles, 29, 5/6,* 335-343.

Alessandri, S. M., & Lewis, M. (1996).Differences in pride and shame in maltreated and nonmaltreated preschoolers. *Child Development, 67,* 1857-1869.

Balkaya, F., & Sahin, N. H. (2003) Çok Boyutlu Öfke Ölçeği. *TürkPsikiyatri Dergisi,* 14, 3, 192-202.

Barrett, K., & Campos, J. (1987). Perspectives on emotional development: II. A functionalist approach to emotions. In J. Osofsky (Ed.), *Handbook of infant development* (2 nd ed., pp. 555 – 578). New York: Wiley.

Bedford, O., Kwang-Kuo, H. (2003). Guilt and shame in Chinese culture: A cross-cultural framework from the perspective of morality and identity. *Journal for the theory of social behavior, 33(2),* 127-144.

Bierbrauer, G., 1992. Reactions to violation of normative standards: A cross-cultural analysis of shame and guilt. *International Journal of Psychology, 27(2), 181-193.*

Brody, L. R., & Hall. J. A. (2000). Gender, emotion, and expression (2000). In M. Lewis, & J. M. Haviland-Jones, (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions.* Guilford Press: New York.

Buss, K. A. & Kiel, E. J. (2004). Comparison of sadness, anger, and fear facial expressions when toddlers look at their mothers. *Child Development, 75, 6,* 1761 – 1773.

Campos, J. J., Frankel, C. B., & Camras, L. (2004). On the nature of emotion regulation.
Child Development, 75, 2, 377 – 394.

Camras, L., Kolmodin K., & Chen, Y. (2008). Mothers' self-reported emotional expression in Mainland Chinese, Chinese American and European American families *International Journal of Behavioral Development*; *32,* 459-463.

Carlson, S. M., & Wang, T. S. (2007). Inhibitory control and emotion regulation in preschool children. *Cognitive Development, 22,* 489-510.

Casey, R. (1993). Children's emotional experience: Relations among expression, self-report and understanding. *Developmental Psychology, 29, 1,* 119-129.

Cassano, M., Perry-Parrish, C., & Zeman, J. (2007). Influence of gender on parental socialization of children's sadness regulation. *Social Development, 16, 2,* 210-231.

Chaplin, T., M., Cole, P. M., Zahn-Waxler, C. (2005). Parental socialization of emotion expression : Gender differences and relations to child adjustment. *Emotion, 5, 1,* 80-88.

Cole, P. (1986). Children's spontaneous control of facial expression. *Child Development, 57,* 1309-1321.

Cole, P. M., & Tamang, B. L. (1998). Nepali children's ideas about emotional displays in hypothetical challanges. *Developmental Psychology, 34, 4,* 640-646.

Cole, P. M., Bruschi, C. J. & Tamang, B. L. (2002). Cultural differences in children's emotional reactions to difficult situations. *Child Development, 73,* 983-996.

Cole, P. M., Martin, S. E. & Dennis, T. A. (2004). Emotion regulation as a scientific construct: methodological challenges and directions for child development research. *Child Development, 75,* 317 – 333.

Cole P. M., Tamang, B. L., & Shrestha, S. (2006). Cultural variations in the socialization of young children's anger and shame. *Child Development, 77,* 1237-1251.

Cumberland-Li, Eisenberg, N., Champion, C., Gershoff, E., & Fabes, R. A. (2003). The relation of parental emotionality and related dispositional traits to parental expression of emotion and children's social functioning. *Motivation and Emotion, 27, 1,* 27-56.

Davis, T. L. (1995). Gender differences in masking negative emotions: Ability or motivation? *Developmental Psychology, 31,* 660-667.

Denham, S. (1998). *Emotional development in young children.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Denham, S. A., Blair, K. A., DeMulder, E., Levitas, J., Sawyer, K., Auerbach-Major, S., & P. Queenan (2003). Preschool emotional competence: Pathway to social competence? *Child Development, 74, 1,* 238–256.

Dennis, T. A., Cole, P. M., Zahn-Waxler, C., & Mizuta, I. (2002). Self in context: Autonomy and relatedness in Japanese and U.S. mother-preschool dyads. *Child Development, 73,* 1803-1817.

Diamond, L. M., & Aspinwall, L. G. (2003). Emotion regulation across the life span: An integrative perspective emphasizing self-regulation, positive affect, and dyadic processes *Motivation and Emotion, 27,*125-156.

Dost, A., & Yağmurlu, B. (2008). Are constructiveness and destructiveness essential features of guilt and shame feelings respectively? *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 38, 2,* 109-129.

Dunn, J. & Hughes, C. (1998). Young children's understanding of emotions within close relationships. *Cognition and Emotion, 12,* 171-190.

Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., & Spinrad, T. L. (1998). Parental socialization of emotion. *Psychological Inquiry*, 9, 241-273.

Eisenberg, N., & Spinrad, T. L. (2004). Emotion-related regulation: Sharpening the definition. *Child Development, 75,* 334 – 339.

Ekman, P. (1993). Facial expression and emotion. *American Psychologist, 49, 4,* 176-379.

Ekman, P. & Friesen, W. V. (1975). *Unmasking the face: A guide to recognizing emotions from facial clues.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Fabes, R. A., Eisenberg, N., Nyman, M., & Michealieu, Q. (1991). Young children's appraisals of others' spontaneous emotional reactions. *Developmental Psychology, 27,* 858-866.

Ferguson, T. J., Stegge, H., & Damhuis, I. (1991). Children's understanding of guilt and shame. *Child Development, 62,* 827-83.

Ferguson, T. J., & Crowley, S. L. (1997). Gender differences in the organization of guilt and shame. *Sex Roles, 37(1/2),* 19-44.

Ferguson, T. J., Stegge, H., Miller, E. R., & Olsen, M. E. (1999). Guilt, shame and symptoms in children. *Developmental Psychology, 35,* 347-357.

Ferguson, T. J., Eyre, H. L., & Ashbaker, M. (2000). Unwanted idntities: A key variable in shame-anger links and gender differences in shame. *Sex Roles, 42(3/4),* 133-157.

Fessler, D. M. T. (2004). Shame in two cultures: Implications for evolutionary approaches. *Journal of Cognition and Culture, 4, 207-262.*

Fisek, G. O. & Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1999). Multiculturalism and psychotherapy: the Turkish case. In P. Pedersen (Ed.), *Multiculturalism as a fourth force.* Frances & Taylor.

Fox, N. A. & Calkins, S. D. (2003). The development of self-control of emotion: Intrinsic and extrinsic influences. *Motivation and Emotion, 27,* 7-26.

Fraser, S. (1996). Guilt and shame in children: Relationship with empathy and aggression. (Masters thesis, Simon Fraser University, 1996). Retrieved from http://ir.lib.sfu.ca/bitstream/1892/8345/1/b1802659x.pdf

Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). Cultivated emotions: Parental socialization of positive emotions and self-conscious emotions. *Psychological Inquiry, 9, 4,* 279-281.

Fuchs, D., & Thelen, M. H. (1988). Children s expected interpersonal consequences of communicating their affective state and reported likelihood of expression, *Child Development, 59,* 1314-1322

Fung, H. (1999). Becoming a moral child: The socialization of shame among young Chinese children. *Ethos, 27(2),* 180-209.

Garrett-Peters, P. T., & Fox, N. A. (2007). Cross-cultural differences in children's emotional reactions to a disappointing situation. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31,* 161–169.

Gnepp, J., & Hess, D. L. R (1986). Children's understanding of verbal and facial display rules. *Developmental Psychology, 22, 1,* 103-108.

Grolnick, W. S., Bridges, L. J, & Connell, J. P. (1996). Emotion regulation in two-year-olds: Strategies and emotional expression in four contexts. *Child Development, 67, 928-941.*

Ho, D. Y., Fu, W., & Ng, S. M. (2004). Guilt, shame and embarrassment: Revelations of face and self. *Culture Psychology, 10, 1,* 64-84.

Hoffman, M. L. (1963). Parent Discipline and the child's consideration for others. *Child Development, 34,* 573-588.

Hoffman, M. L. (1971).Identification and conscience development. *Child Development, 42,* 1071-1082.

Hoffman, M. L. (1975). Sex differences in moral internalization and values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 4,* 720-229.

Hoffman, M. L. (1994). Discipline and internalization. *Developmental Psychology, 30, 1,* 26-28.

Horstmann, G. (2003). What do facial expressions convey: Feeling states, behavioral intentions, or action requests? *Emotion, 3, 2,* 150-166.

Imamoglu, E. O., Karakitapoglu-Aygun, Z. (2007). Relatedness of identities and emotional closeness with parents across and within cultures. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 10,* 145-161.

Izard, C. (1980). Cross-cultural perspectives on emotion and emotion communication. pp: 185-221. In H. C. Triandis, & W. Lonner, (Eds), *Handbook of Cross-cultural Psychology. Basic Processes, Vol.3.*

Izard, C. E. (1993). Four systems for emotion activation: Cognitive and non-cognitive processes. *Psychological Review, 100,* 68-90.

Izard, C. E. (1994). Innate and universal facial expressions: Evidence from developmental and cross-cultural research. *Psychological Bulletin, 115,* 288-299.

Jones, D. C., Abbey, B. B., & A. Cumberland (1998). The development of display rule knowledge: Linkages with family expressiveness and social competence. *Child Development, 69,* 1209-1222.

Kagitcibasi, C. (1996). The autonomous-relational self: A new synthesis. *European Psychologist, 1(3).* 180-186.

Kagitcibasi, C. (1997). Individualism and collectivism. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, & C. Kagitcibasi (Eds), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology, (Vol. 3).* Boston: Allyn & Bacon

Kagitcibasi, C. (2002). Cross-cultural perspectives on family change. In E. Özdalga & R. Liljestrom (Eds.), *Autonomy and dependence in family: Turkey and Sweden in critical perspective (pp. 19-38).* Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute.

Kagitcibasi, C. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context: Implications for self and family. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 36*, 403-422.

Keltner, D., & Buswell, B. N. (1996). Evidence for the distinctiveness of embarrassment, shame, and guilt: A study of recalled antecedents and facial expressions of emotion. *Cognition and Emotion, 10, 2,* 155-171.

Klimes-Dougan, B., Brand, A. E., Zahn-Waxler, C., Usher, B., Hastings, P. D., Kendziora, K., & Garside, R. B. (2007). Parental emotion socialization in adolescence: Differences in sex, age and problem status. *Social Development, 16, 2,* 326-342.

Koch-Hattem, A., Hattem, D. M., & Plummer, L. P. (1987). The role of mental-health resources in explaining family adaptation to stress: A preliminary analysis. *Family Systems Medicine, 5,2,* 206-219.

Kochanska, A., Aksan, N., & Nichos, K. E. (2003). Maternal power assertion in discipline and moral discourse contexts: Commonalities, differences, and Implications for children's moral conduct and cognition.

Kochanska, G. & Aksan, N. (2006). Children's conscience and self regulation. *Journal of Personality, 74, 6,* 1587-1618.

Kochanska, G., Gross, J. M., Lin, M., & Nichols, K. E. (2002). Guilt in young children: Development, determinants, and relations with a broader system of standards. *Child Development, 73,* 461–482.

Kring, A. M., Smith, D. A., & Neale J. M. (1994). Individual differences in dispositional expressiveness: Development and validation of the Emotional Expressivity Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66,* 934-949.

Kring, A. M., & Gordon, A. H. (1998). Sex Differences in Emotion: Expression, Experience, and Physiology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 7, 3,* 686-703.

Lagattuta, K. H. (2005). When you shouldn't do what you want to do: Young children's understanding of desires, rules, and emotions. *Child Development, 76,* 713 – 733.

Lehman, D. R., Chiu, C., & Schaller M. (2004). Psychology and culture. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55*, 689–714.

Lemerise, E. A., & Dodge, K. A. (2000). The Developmet of anger and hostile interactions. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland-Jones, (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotions.* The Guilford Press, New York.

Lewis M. & Michalson L. (1982). The Socialization of Emotions. In T. Field & A. Fogel (Eds), *Emotion and Early Interaction*. Broadway: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Lewis, M., Alessandri, S. M., & Sullivan, M. W. (1992). Differences in shame and pride as a function of children's gender and task difficulty. *Child Development, 63,* 630-638.

Lewis, M. (2000). Self-conscious emotions: embarrassment, pride, shame and guilt. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (2nd ed.), New York, NY: The Guilford Press

Lewis, M. & Ramsay, D. (2002). *Cortisol response to embarrassment and shame. Child Development, 73,* 1034–1045.

Lewis, M., & Ramsay, D. (2005). Infant Emotional and Cortisol Responses to Goal Blockage, *Child Development, 76, 2,* 518 – 530

Lewis, M., Takai-Kawakami, K., Kawakami, K., & Sullivan, M. W. (2010). Cultural differences in emotional responses to success and failure. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 34(1),* 53-61.

Malatesta, C. Z. (1982). The expression and regulation of emotion: A lifespan perspective. In T. Field & A. Fogel (Eds.), *Emotion and Early Interaction.* Broadway: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Publishers.

Malatesta, C. Z., & Haviland, J. M. (1982). Learning display rules the socialization of emotion expression in infancy. *Child Development, 53,* 991-1003.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion, and Motivation. *Psychological Review, 98,* 224-253.

Martini, T. S., Root, C. A., & Jenkins, J. M. (2004). Low and middle income mothers' regulation of negative emotion: Effects of children's temperament and situational emotional responses. *Social Development, 13,* 515-530.

Matsumoto, D., Hee Yoo, S. & Fontaine, J. et al. (2008). Mapping expressive differences around the world: The relationship between emotional display

rules and individualism versus collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 39, 55-74.

Matsumoto, D., Hee Yoo, S. & Fontaine, J. et al. (2009). Hypocrisy or Maturity? Culture and Context Differentiation. *European Journal of Personality, 23,* 1-14.

McElwain, N. L., Halberstadt, A., Volling, B. L. (2007). Mother- and father-reported reactions to children's negative emotions: Relations to young children's emotional understanding and friendship quality. *Child Development, 78, 5,* 1407-1425.

McLoyd, V. C. (1998). Socio-economic disadvantage and child development. *American Psychologist, 55, 2,* 185-204.

Morris, A. S., Silk., J. S., Steinberg, L., Myers, S. S., Robinson, L. R. (2007). The role of the family context in the development of emotion regulation. *Social Development, 16,2,* 361-388.

Novin, S., Banerjee, R., Dadkhah, A., & Rieffe, C. (2008). Self-reported use of emotional display rules in the Netherlands and Iran: Evidence for sociocultural influence. *Social Development, 1-15.*

Oatley K. & Jenkins, M. (1996). *Understanding emotions.* Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Olthof, T., Ferguson, T. J., Bloemers, E. and Deij, M.(2004) Morality- and identity-related antecedents of children's guilt and shame attributions in events involving physical illness. *Cognition & Emotion, 18,* 383-404.

Piaget, J. (1932). *The moral judgement of the child.* London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. ltd.

Raval, V. V., Martini, T. S., & Raval, P. H. (2007). 'Would others think it is okay to express my feelings?' Regulation of anger, sadness and physical pain in gujarati children in India. *Social Development, 16(1),* 79-105.

Raval, V. V., & Martini, T. S. (2009). Maternal socialization of children's anger, sadness and physical pain in two communities in Gujarat, India. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 33(3),* 215-229.

Reijntjes, A., Stegge, H., Terwogt, M. M. & Hurkens, E. (2007). Children's depressive symptoms and their regulation of negative affect in response to vignette depicted emotion-eliciting events. *International Journal of Behavioral Development ,31*, 49–58.

Roberts, W. L. (1999). The socialization of emotional expression: Relations with prosocial behavior and competence in five samples. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 31, 2,* 72-85.

Robins R. W. & Noftle, E. E. (2007). Assessing self-conscious emotions: A review of self-report and nonverbal measures. In J. L. Tracy, R. W. Robins, & J. M. Tangney (Eds.), *The Self-Conscious Emotions: Theory and Research*. New York: Guilford.

Roseman, I. J., Wiest, C., & Swartz, T. S. (1994). Phenomenology, behaviors and goals differentiate discrete emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67, 2,* 206-221.

Saarni, C. (1979). Children's understanding of display rules for expressive behavior. *Developmental Psychology, 15,* 424-429.

Saarni, C. (1984). An observational study of children's attempts to monitor their expressive behavior. *Child Development, 55,* 1504-1513.

Safdar, S., Friedlmeier, W., & Matsumoto, D. (2009). Variations of emotional display rules within and across cultures: A comparison between Canada, USA, and Japan. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 41,* 1-10.

Schmader, T. & Lickel, B. (2006). The approach and avoidance function of guilt and shame emotions: Comparing reactions to self-caused and other-caused wrongdoing. *Motivation and Emotion, 30, 43-56.*

Shipman, K. L., & Zeman, J. (2001). Socialization of children's emotion regulation in mother-Child dyads: A developmental psychopathology perspective. *Development and Psychopathology, 13*, 317-336.

Shipman, K. L., Zeman, J., Nesin, A. E., & Fitzgerald, M. (2003). Children's strategies for displaying anger and sadness: What works with whom? *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 49, 1,* 100-122.

Shipman, K. L., Schneider, R., Fitzgerald, M., Sims, C., Swisher, L., & Edwards, A. (2007). Maternal emotion socialization in maltreating and non-maltreating families: Implications for children's emotion regulation. *Social Development, 2,* 268-285.

Shweder, R. A. (2003). Toward a deep cultural psychology of shame. *Social Research, 70, 4,* 1109-1130.

Sunar, D. & Fisek, G. (2005). Contemporary Turkish families. In U. Gielen & J. Roopnarine (Eds.), *Families in global perspective* (pp. 169-183). Allyn & Bacon/Pearson.

Sunar, D. (2002). Change and continuity in the Turkish middle class family. In E. Özdalga & R. Liljestrom (Eds.), *Autonomy and dependence in family: Turkey and Sweden in critical perspective* (pp. 217-238). Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute.

Sunar, D., Bolak Boratav, H., Ataca, B. (2005, August). Emotional display rules among Turkish students: Status and context effects. Paper presented at the APA Annual Convention, Washington, D.C.

Sunar, D., Bolak Boratav, H., Ataca, B. (2005, July). Gender differences in emotional display rules among Turkish students. Paper presented at the VII. IACCP Regional Conference, San Sebastian, Spain.

Sunar, D. (2009). Suggestions for a new integration in the psychology of morality. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 3, 4,* 447-474.

Tangney, J. P., & Dearing, R. L. (2002). *Shame and Guilt.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P., Fletcher, C., & Gramzow, R. (1992). Shamed Into Anger? The Relation of Shame and Guilt to Anger and Self-Reported Aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 62,* 669-675.

Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P., Gramzow, R. (1992). Proneness to shame, proneness to guilt, and psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 10,* 469-478.

Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P. E., Hill-Barlow, D., Marschall, D. E., & Gramzow, R. (1996). Relation of shame and guilt to constructive versus destructive responses to anger across the lifespan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70,* 797-809.

Teroni F., & Deonna, J. A. (2008). Differentiating shame from guilt. *Consciousness and Cognition, 17,* 725-740.

Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004). Putting the self into self-conscious emotions: A theoretical model. *Psychological Inquiry, 15(2),* 103-105.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *New directions in social psychology: Individualism & Collectivism.* Boulder, Westview Pres, Inc.

Triandis, H. C. (2001). Individualism-Collectivism and Personality. *Journal of Personality, 69, 907-924.*

Underwood, M. K., Coie, J. D., & Hehbsman, C. R. (1992). Display rules for anger and aggression in school-age children. *Child Development, 63,* 366-380.

Vasta, R., Miller, S. A., & Ellis, S. (2004). *Child Psychology, Fourth Edition.* USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Weber, H. (2004). Explorations in the social construction of anger. *Motivation and Emotion, 28, 2,* 197-219.

Yagmurlu, B., Citlak, B., Dost, A, & Leyendecker, B. (2009). Child socialization goals of Turkish mothers: An investigation of education related within-culture variation. *Turkish Journal of Psychology, 24, 63,* 1–15.

Zahn-Waxler, Kochanska, G., Krupnick, J., McKnew, D. (1990). Patterns of guilt in children of depressed and well mothers. *Developmental Psychology, 26, 1,* 51-59.

Zeman, J., & Garber, J. (1996). Display rules for ager, sadness, and pain: It depends on who is watching. *Child Development, 67,* 957-973.

Zeman, J., & Shipman, K. (1996). Children's expression of negative affect: Reasons and methods. *Developmental Psychology, 32,* 842-849.

Zeman, J. & Garber, J. (1996). Display rules for anger, sadness, and pain: It depends on who is watching. *Child Development, 67,* 957-973.