

EXAMINING THE ROLE OF INTERPARENTAL RELATIONSHIP
QUALITY AND PARENTS' EMOTION REGULATION ON CHILD'S
EMOTION REGULATION DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC PERIOD

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
OZYEGIN UNIVERSITY

MELİKE KIRMIZITAŞ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

AUGUST 2022

Copyright © 2022 by Melike Kırmızıtaşı

Özyeğin University
Graduate School of Social Sciences

The thesis of Melike Kırmızıtaşı,
has been approved by:

Jury Member
(Thesis Advisor)

Jury Member

Jury Member
(External Member)

August/2022

ABSTRACT

The COVID-19 pandemic has been a stressful situation with a variety of repercussions on family systems such as economic changes, fear of disease, or social isolation. In a time when so many various stressful events arise, it is crucial to investigate how parents and children regulate their emotions since it might be more challenging for parents and children to manage tough emotions like stress and anxiety during this time. In the family, each part dependent on each other as systems as well as they are independent. In this regard, the interparental relationship is just as crucial to children's ability to control emotions as their parents. Due to the potential for both dependent and independent influences on each member of the family, it is critical to study emotion regulation during COVID-19 within the family systems of the parents, children, and interparental relationship. The aim of the current study is to investigate the relationship among parent emotion regulation, interparental relationship quality, and child emotion regulation in the COVID-19 pandemic. Also, this study attempted to examine the indirect role of maternal emotion regulation in the association between interparental relationship quality and the emotion regulation of children. Also, child age, child gender and family SES were used as control variables. The data was obtained from mothers. The sample consisted of 204 mothers who have 2- to -6 years old children (M: 3.84, SD: 1.34; 55.2% boys, 44.8% girls). The data collection tools were as follows: the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976), Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ; Gross & John, 2003), the Emotion Regulation Checklist (ERC; Shields & Cicchetti, 1999), and the COVID-19 Perceived Stress Scale (Acar et al., 2020). Two separate hierarchical regression analysis were conducted for child emotion regulation and child lability. Results showed that mothers' expressive suppression and interparental relationship consensus predicted the child lability. Also, emotion regulation was predicted by mothers' expressive suppression, but none of the interparental

relationship quality dimensions. Moreover, the mediation analysis revealed that of interparental relationship quality did not predict child emotion regulation through maternal emotion regulation. This study highlights the importance of the influences of interparental relationship and mothers' emotion regulation on the child's emotion regulation.

Keywords: parent emotion regulation, child emotion regulation, interparental relationship quality, COVID-19



ÖZET

COVID-19 salgını, aile sistemi üzerinde ekonomik değişiklikler, hastalık korkusu, sosyal izolasyon, gibi çeşitli yan etkileri olan stresli bir süreç olmuştur. Çeşitli birçok stresli olayların ortaya çıktığı bu dönemde, çocukların ve ailelerin stres ve endişe gibi ağır duyguları düzenlemesinin zor olmasından dolayı, ailelerin ve çocukların duygularını nasıl düzenledikleri ayrıca önem arz etmektedir. Ailedeki her sistem birbirine bağımlı olduğu gibi aynı zamanda birbirinden bağımsızdır. Bu bağlamda, ebeveynler arası ilişki niteliği de çocuğun duygu regülasyonu üzerinde ebeveynin kendisi kadar önemli olabilir. Her bir aile üyesi birbiri ile hem bağlı hem de birbirinden bağımsızdır. Birbirlerine olan bu potansiyel etkilerinden dolayı, COVID-19 salgını boyunca aile sistemindeki ebeveynlerin ve çocukların duygu düzenlemesini ve ebeveynler arasındaki ilişkinin niteliğini çalışmak oldukça kritiktir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, COVID-19 salgınında ebeveynlerin duygu regülasyonu, ebeveynler arası ilişki kalitesi ve çocuk duygu regülasyonu arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Ayrıca, ebeveynler arası ilişki kalitesi ve çocukların duygu regülasyonunun arasındaki ilişkide annenin duygu düzenlemesinin dolaylı rolünü incelemeye çalışmaktadır. Ayrıca çocuk yaşı, cinsiyeti ve aile sosyoekonomik düzeyi kontrol değişkenleri olarak kullanılmıştır. Veriler annelerden alınmıştır. Örneklem 2-6 yaş arası çocuklara (ortalama yaş: 3.84, SS: 1.34; 55.2% oğlan çocukları, 44.8% kız çocukları) sahip 204 anneden alınmıştır. Veri toplama araçları şu şekildedir: Çift Uyum Ölçeği (ÇUÖ; Spanier, 1976), Duygu Düzenleme Ölçeği (DDÖ; Gross & John, 2003), Duygu Düzenleme Becerileri Ölçeği (DDBÖ; Shields & Cicchetti, 1999), ve Algılanan COVID-19 Stresi Ölçeği (Acar et al., 2020). Çocukların duygu düzenlemesi ve duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk alt ölçekleri için iki ayrı hiyerarşik regresyon analizi yürütülmüştür. Sonuçlar, annenin duygu ifadesinin bastırılması ve ebeveynler arası ilişkinin niteliğinin çocuğun duygusal değişkenliğini istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir şekilde yordadığını göstermektedir. Ayrıca, annenin duygu ifadesinin bastırılması çocuğun duygu regülasyonunu

anlamli olarak yordamaktadır; ancak, ebeveynler arası ilişkilerin niteliğinin hiçbir alt boyutunun çocuk duygu regülasyonunu yormadığı görülmüştür. Üstelik, aracı değişken analizinin ortaya çıkardığı üzere ebeveynler arası ilişkinin niteliği, çocuğun duygu regülasyonunu annenin duygu regülasyonu üzerinden yordamamaktadır. Bu çalışma ebeveynler arası ilişkinin ve annelerin duygu regülasyonunun çocuğun duygu regülasyonu üzerindeki etkilerinin önemini vurgular niteliktedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ebeveyn Duygu Regülasyonu, Çocuk Duygu Regülasyonu, Ebeveynler Arası İlişki Niteliği, COVID-19

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My thesis process required me to do a lot of work in a short period. This process required hard work and sacrifice. I would like to thank the people who worked hard with me and helped me through this process.

First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to my advisor Prof. Asiye Kumru. She always believed in me and supported my academic achievements from the very beginning. This project would not have been possible without her patience and feedback. I would like to give my special regard to Dr. İbrahim H. Acar, who has provided continuous and warm support in this process. Whenever I had a question, he always patiently answered all my questions and guided me. I couldn't do this without his directions and support. I'm grateful to Prof. Fatih Bayraktar, for his valuable feedback, contributions to my thesis and being my committee member.

I would like to thank my dearest Ertuğrul Melekoğlu to support me every time I need in every way. His patience and emotional support made me to feel more powerful and motivated. I couldn't make it without him.

Also, I would like to thank best friends, Gülfem Dikici and Beyzanur Yavaşlar, who were with me in all my ups and downs. Moreover, it is impossible to forget my Aparan family with their full support to me emotionally in hard times.

Finally, I would like to express my endless thanks to my precious mother Filiz and my father Recai. My nuclear Kırmızıtaş family always encouraged me to do better. I am very lucky to have a family that believes in and supports me at every stage of my education life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZET	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	x
1. CHAPTER I	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Conceptual Model of the Study: Family Systems.....	3
2. CHAPTER 2.....	6
LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1 Emotion Regulation.....	6
2.2 Child Emotion Regulation and Parent Emotion Regulation	9
2.3 Child Emotion Regulation and Interparental Relationship Quality	12
2.4 Parent Emotion Regulation and Interparental Relationship Quality	14
2.5 Parent Emotion Regulation, Child Emotion Regulation, and Interparental Relationship Quality	15
2.6 The Present Study.....	17
3. CHAPTER 3.....	19
METHODS	19
3.1 Participants	19
3.2 Measures.....	19
3.3 Procedure.....	21
3.4 Data Analysis	22
4. CHAPTER 4.....	25
RESULTS.....	25
4.1 Preliminary analyses	25
4.2 Do Dimensions of Parent Emotion Regulation and Interparental Relationship Quality Predict the Child Liability?	27
4.3 Do Dimensions of Parent Emotion Regulation and Interparental Relationship Quality Predict the Child Emotion Regulation?	28
4.4 Indirect Effects	30
4.5 Sensitivity Analysis.....	32

5. CHAPTER 5.....	33
DISCUSSION	33
5.1. Discussion	33
5.2. Limitations and Future Directions.....	38
5.3. Conclusion.....	40
APPENDICES.....	41
APPENDIX A	41
APPENDIX B	42
APPENDIX C	44
APPENDIX D	47
APPENDIX E.....	50
REFERENCES.....	52

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables.....	24
Table 2. Pearson Correlations for Study Variables	26
Table 3. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Study Variables and Child Lability/Negativity	28
Table 4. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Study Variables and Child Emotion Regulation.....	30
Table 5. Indirect Effects for Child Lability/Negativity.....	31
Table 6. Indirect Effects for Child Emotion Regulation	32

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) has had several detrimental effects on people in the whole world and made significant changes in our lives since it began. Some people lost their relatives or loved ones, the stress levels increased, and economically difficult times started to be experienced. Also, some people started to work online as well as children started to have homeschooling. The research shows that when children don't go to school, their screen time increases while sleep quality and physical activity decrease (Brazendale et al., 2017). Also, when children were homeschooling, they could not interact with their peers in an ordinary way and their daily routines were disrupted that seemed to increase anxiety (Adadms et al., 2020). Although during COVID-19 pandemic children have needed their parents' psychological support to cope with their anxiety and stress from disrupting daily structures and uncertainty (Adadms et al., 2020; Spinelli et al., 2020), parents have seemed to experience a significant risk of feeling genuine stress about their parenting role, couple role, or other responsibilities (Calvano et al., 2021) as well.

In fact, as an unpredictable and stressful process, the COVID-19 pandemic has brought various emotions such as fear, anxiety, and distress to children, parents, and families. Research has revealed that pandemic-related stress leads to poor parenting practices (Calvano et al., 2021). For example, parents tend to use less adaptive emotional regulation strategies while feeling genuine stress during the pandemic (Taubman- Ben-Ari et al., 2021). Also, increasing social disruptions in interparental relationships during this pandemic negatively influenced parents' ability to realize, understand, and regulate emotions in stressful situations (Preuss et al., 2021; Sopi, 2020).

The effect of the COVID-19 pandemic might be more devastating in young children since parents have a crucial role in their child's social and emotional development in the early

childhood period. In the COVID-19 pandemic, with the precautionary regularities, children and parents spent more time at home, and they may be more likely to be exposed to each other more than usual. Children are mostly exposed to their parents, and parents are their role models while using emotional states and expressing and controlling emotions (Denham, 1998). According to Cluver et al. (2020), parents' stress increased while their tolerance level decreased with the COVID-19 pandemic, which means that they might express negative emotions more and have a hard time regulating their emotions.

Additionally, studies have shown that couples have less marital satisfaction during the pandemic than one year before the pandemic (Taubman- Ben-Ari et al., 2021). Higher marital satisfaction was related to lower parenting stress (Taubman- Ben-Ari et al., 2021). This brings us to some changing dynamics in the family environment, which we can call the emotional climate of the family. The family's emotional climate reflects parents' relationship with the child, interparental relationship, parenting styles, and emotional expressions of the family (Morris et al., 2007). If this climate is negative or intimidating, children may get emotionally reactive, and it gets difficult for them to control their emotions (Morris et al., 2007). In this regard, the marital relationship also matters for the family environment, in turn, for the child because of the conflict environment, children may learn some maladaptive emotion regulation strategies (Cummings & Davies, 2002). Davies and Cummings (1994) found that when the marital conflict increased, child's emotion regulation ability decreased. Due to COVID-19 pandemic with a possible increase in interparental conflicts and decrease in quality, we may see a reflection of the subsystem deterioration in the entire family system. The pandemic can negatively affect an individual's psychological well-being by causing excessive anxiety, fear, or distress (Restubog et al., 2020). This fact makes the emotion regulation ability more crucial in this process. Therefore, this study aimed to examine the quality of the interparental relationship, parents' emotional regulation, and a child's emotional regulation, and the indirect

effects of parent emotion regulation in the association between interparental relationship quality and a child's emotion regulation during COVID-19 pandemic from the family systems perspective. In the following sections, first the conceptual model of the study would be introduced, and then the relevant literature of the studied variables would be provided.

1.1. Conceptual Model of the Study: Family Systems

According to family systems theory, the family resembles an organization in which the subsystems are connected to each other (Cox & Paley, 2003). Namely, the family is constructed by several systems as individuals (parents, child), parent-child relationships, interparental relationships, and siblings. Since they are connected to each other, anything that happens in one system may affect the other. For instance, negativity in interparental relationship influences parents' emotional state and it may reflect to its relationship with the child, or the child may expose to the negativity in the family environment and feel distressed. Positive family relations may result in better emotional experiences for children than families with negative emotional climates (Thompson & Meyer, 2007; Halberstadt & Eaton, 2002). In other words, while positivity in the emotional environment of the family gives rise to the emotional regulation capacity of children, negativity gives rise to the need for some support for the emotional regulation of children (Eisenberg et al., 2005; Fosco & Grych, 2013; Thompson & Meyer, 2007). Every system in the family has a relation to a child's socio-emotional development. As a result, we need to consider the child within its first environment, the family. One such line of research would be to look at the impact of interparental relationship quality on a child's emotion regulation skills, since from the perspective of family systems theory, the interparental relationship and parent itself are both different and integrated subsystems, and these two systems could be related directly as well as indirectly to child emotion regulation (Cox & Paley, 2003).

As a supportive model for family systems theory, Morris et al. (2007) constructed the 'Tripartite Model' that illustrates the role of parent and child characteristics in emotion regulation development, their mutual influence, and the processes involved in family socialization of the emotion regulation. According to the Tripartite Model, the development of emotion regulation occurs through three components: observation/modeling, parenting practices, and the family's emotional climate (Morris et al., 2007). The first component of the Tripartite Model is the observing process suggesting that parents' reactions, emotional displays, or interactions might be models for children. Children imitate their family members' reactions to specific emotions in various situations. Namely, they model their parents' adaptive (e.g., taking a deep breath to calm down) or maladaptive (e.g., shouting when feeling angry) emotion regulation strategies (Morris et al., 2007; Silk et al., 2006). In a study, mothers' toleration capacity in the frustration task, which is used to observe the ability of emotion regulation, is related to their daughter's toleration capacity in the same task (Bariola et al., 2012; Calkins et al., 1999). In a study, Silk et al. (2006) observed children's emotion regulation capacity in distress situations. They found that children of depressed mothers whose reactions were also passive in such cases had more passive (maladaptive) regulation strategies than children of non-depressed mothers.

The second component of the Tripartite Model is the parental practices or characteristics (Morris et al., 2007). Parental emotion regulation is one of the parental characteristics that might have critical effects on a child's emotion regulation. Parents' sensitive behaviors, emotion socialization styles, or parenting styles might be influential on child's emotion regulation (Morris et al., 2007).

The last component of the Tripartite Model is the family's emotional climate (Morris et al., 2007). The reflection of the emotional climate of the family can be seen via relationship

qualities among the family members (Morris et al., 2007). One of the essential relationships in the family that may affect a child's emotional regulation is interparental relationship. In marital relationship, the high levels of conflict or dissatisfaction bring about a 'background anger' that the child is exposed to may indirectly affect the child's social-emotional development (Lemerise & Dodge, 1993). In this context, the child may be exposed to difficulties in regulating emotions from the parents during the conflict, and they may feel the negativity in the family context, which may make the child have difficulties in regulating their emotions.



CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Emotion Regulation

Emotion regulation can be defined as an individual's control, evaluation, altering emotional reactions, and balance in experiencing and talking about emotions (Ahmetoğlu et al., 2018; Thompson, 2011). It is about how one is experiencing and expressing their emotions (Gross, 2013). In other words, emotion regulation is an ability to cope with negative emotions, expressing them appropriately rather than suppressing, so it helps children adapt to social environments (Gülseven et al., 2018). On the other hand, as another emotional process, emotion lability can be defined by being reactive and sensitive to emotional stimulus and having hard times in handling with negative emotions (Dunsmore et al., 2013). In this sense, it is crucial for children's social development. For example, having high emotion regulation leads to better social skills and social competence (Diener & Kim, 2004; Penela et al., 2015). Emotion regulation is also important for later peer relationships. Not suppressing emotions or having flexibility in expressing emotions is associated with positive peer relationships in adolescence (Wang & Hawk, 2020). Also, high emotion regulation ability might be a protective factor for later internalizing and externalizing problems (Aldao et al., 2010; Penela et al., 2015). On the other hand, higher emotion lability might lead to higher anxiety or attention problems (Oattes et al., 2018; Dunsmore et al., 2013). Emotion regulation in children is found to be related to later social engagement abilities and later academic achievement (Kochanska et al., 2001).

Children use different self-management strategies to regulate their emotions (Gross, 2013). This difference depends on the child's age. For instance, in infancy, children show their distress by crying and soothing themselves through external factors such as sucking their finger or mother's breast. Children learn to regulate emotions more on themselves than on external factors when they get older (Gross, 2013). For example, while preschoolers soothe themselves

by hugging their parents, older children do it by listening to music or talking. Within the second year of life, the sense of self becomes autonomous. Before this, the nature of emotion regulation is processed mainly by the sensorimotor (Gross, 2013), but the transition occurs from this sensorimotor to representational capacities with the development of the autonomous self. In this situation, several reorganizations accompany the child's development of emotion regulation. For instance, children start understanding that she/he can behave the way that might affect the situation and the emotion beyond it (Kopp, 1989; Penela et al., 2015). These emotional reorganizations may bring about changes in the relationship between the child and the parent. Namely, in this developmental transition period, the burden of emotion regulation passes from the parent to the child. From 2 years old, the typically developing children recognize emotions better and express these emotions more often. Moreover, they begin to rely on the representations of emotion regulation that they see from their parents. For example, they imitate their parents' reactions in such situations when they feel distressed. Although the child begins to take on the burden of emotion regulation, parents continue to be models and facilitators for helping their children regulate their emotions (Garber & Dodge, 1991). In this age period, preschoolers need additional support to regulate their emotions. Thus, parents are supporting children to control emotions effectively through showing behavioral strategies in emotional situations (Denham & Burton, 2003).

Besides the age of the child, the child's gender is also a noteworthy feature that needs our attention to understand the socioemotional development of the child. There are some controversial findings regarding the gender differences in children's emotion regulation abilities in the literature. Cole et al. (1994) investigated expressive control during the disappointment task of 4- and -5-year-old children. They showed that boys displayed more negative emotions and girls had a better ability to control negative emotions than boys during the tasks (Cole et al., 1994). Moreover, another study conducted with 8- to -10 years-old

children found that boys chose less adaptive emotion regulation strategies than girls in fear triggering scenarios (López-Pérez & Pacella, 2021). On the other hand, other studies indicated that there were no gender differences in emotion regulation among young children (i.e., Batum & Yağmurlu, 2007; Ahmetoğlu et al., 2018). Namely, a study conducted with Turkish children who are seven years old found that there is no statistically significant difference in emotion regulation ability between boys and girls (Batum & Yağmurlu, 2007). Another study conducted with Turkish children between 5 to 6 years old also found no significant relationship between the gender of the child and emotion regulation (Ahmetoğlu et al., 2018).

In a social context, children are most exposed to their parents in early childhood. Parents' have direct or indirect effects on children's emotion regulation abilities. For instance, parental support for the emotional expression of a child might help children to regulate negative emotions better, whereas suppressive behaviors may lead to lower emotion regulation abilities (Denham, 1998; Fosco & Grych, 2013). Moreover, it was found that mothers' emotion regulation strategies might model and supervise their children against high levels of emotion regulation (Bariola et al., 2012; Morris et al., 2007). In a study conducted with an Australian sample, parents' critical and/or lacking support and understanding responses to their children's emotions were associated with low emotion regulation ability in children (Havighurst, 2003). Moreover, parents' own ability to regulate emotions might be a role model for their children and affect their socioemotional development positively as a direct effect (Hajal & Paley, 2020). Besides, as an indirect effect, interparental conflict as a domain of interparental relationship quality might be an influential factor in children's emotion regulation ability. For instance, a study revealed that persistent interparental conflict decreased children's emotion regulation by inhibiting the sense of security (Lindblom et al., 2016).

Children and parent relationship is a bidirectional relationship which means that they affect each other. As parents influence their children's social and emotional development,

children also affect their parents in such domains. For example, Ahmetoğlu et al. (2018) conducted a correlational study to investigate the 5-6-year-old children's emotion regulation, emotional socialization, and attachment to their parents in Turkey. They found that parents who have children with low emotion regulation abilities were more likely to use punitive strategies on their children (Ahmetoğlu et al., 2018). Parents' reactions also change with their child's emotion regulation strategies. In a study, researchers found that children's emotion regulation styles in novel situations were related to mothers' socialization strategies in the long term (Premo & Kiel, 2014). For example, when the toddler sought a mother's contact to regulate himself, the mother's unsupportive reactions decreased one year later (Premo & Kiel, 2014). Negative emotion expression of mothers is linked with low emotion regulation of children (Gross, 2013). Also, research showed that the ability of emotion regulation elevates the relationship quality between the parent and the child (Gross, 2014).

2.2. Child Emotion Regulation and Parent Emotion Regulation

Parental emotion regulation is an ability for parents to understand, express, and control their own emotions in appropriate ways. According to Gross and John (2003), there are two different strategies of emotion regulation as cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression. Cognitive reappraisal can be defined as the attribution of new meaning by reconstructing a situation that will create an emotional reaction in a way that will change its emotional effect (Gross & John, 2003). Expressive suppression is a form of emotion regulation that causes inhibition of ongoing expressive behavior and emotional experiences/expressions (Gross & John, 2003; Özgüle & Sümer, 2017). According to literature, cognitive reappraisal is a positive emotion regulation skill, and the expressive suppression strategy has negative outcomes when used rigidly (Gross & John, 2003; Salters-Pedneault et al., 2010; Werner & Gross, 2010). In parent-child relationship, these strategies might have significance for child emotion regulation.

For instance, when parents dominantly suppress their emotions rather than adaptively express them, child couldn't learn how to deal with their negative emotions (Melim et al., 2019). On the other hand, if they usually reappraise their emotions, this might be an influential for a child to learn how to adaptively regulate emotions. If expressive suppression is used flexibly, it might be a positive emotion regulation skill (Gross & John, 2003).

According to Dix (1991), the adaptively organized and controlled emotions of parents are defined by the affective organizations model of parenting in terms of organizing behaviors, shaping parental reactions, providing a motivation to assist their children in continuing positive behaviors, and stimulating monitoring. Parents' dysregulation of emotions can lead to false emotional expressions and experiences which can lead to poor emotional development in children as well as interpersonal problems between parents and children (Dix, 1991). For a parent to be an effective and sufficient tool for the child, they must have sufficient emotional knowledge and the ability to control their own emotions successfully and harmoniously (Bariola et al., 2012).

Children learn emotion regulation skills by observing their parents and through parental sensitive behavior (Milojevich et al., 2020). As observers, children need their parents in stressful situations to regulate their emotions as facilitators and models in the regulation of emotion for themselves. For instance, Milojevich et al. (2020) found that parental emotion regulation difficulties are a strong predictor of a child's emotion regulation, in the sample consisting of adversity-exposed children (between 4-7 years old) and parents. The children, who cannot observe the necessary regulation skills in their parents or cannot get the necessary support to cope with negative emotions, cannot learn their regulation strategies. Also, a difficult thing for parents is to cope with their distress while helping their children facilitate their regulation of emotions (Rutherford et al., 2015). When they are highly distressed and coping with regulating these emotions, it is getting harder to teach and show adaptive regulatory

strategies to their children. On the other hand, several studies showed conflicting results (Lai, 2020; Melim et al., 2019). In a study, Lai (2020) investigated the associations among 16-24 months old children's emotion regulation, parents' emotion regulation difficulties, and parent emotion socialization. It was found that there was no significant relationship between parents' emotion regulation and a child's emotion regulation behaviors. Also, Melim et al. (2019) investigated the parent-child relationship quality, child emotion regulation, parent emotion suppression as an emotion regulation strategy, and exhaustion from work. They collected data from married couples who had children between 2-6 years old. The study results showed that only the relationship between child emotion regulation and liability and father-child relationship quality was significant when parents suppressed their emotions less (Melim et al., 2019). Namely, the lower usage of expressive suppression by fathers as maladaptive strategy of emotion regulation may bring better quality in relationship between father and child; together with that, the child's ability to regulate emotions was getting better as the liability was decreasing.

Considering as a mechanism affecting the child's emotion regulation, parents' ability to regulate emotions might be a determinant for sensitive parenting behaviors (Carreras et al., 2019). According to Thompson (1994), parental emotion regulation has a functional role in facilitating sensitive parenting behavior. Sensitivity in parenting consist of being aware of a child's emotional cues, then understanding and responding to them appropriately (Ainsworth, 1969). In other words, if the parents can adaptively regulate emotions in adverse situations, they might be able to read their children's emotional states, respond to them appropriately, and be able to support their children. When parents are sensitive, supportive, and show warmth to their child's emotional expressions, they can create an environment that is beneficial for the child's development of adaptive emotion regulation abilities (Fosco & Grych, 2013; Ramsden & Hubbard, 2002). Mothers' emotional dysregulation was found to be predictors of less sensitive

parenting and emotional availability (Kim et al., 2012). In a study conducted with preschoolers' parents who are from low SES, Carreras et al. (2019) found that parental emotion regulation plays a mediational role in the relationship between distress and sensitive parenting. This means that when parents feel distressed, they may not control their emotions and emotional reactions, which makes them unable to respond to their children's emotional needs such as regulating emotions and calming down. The inability of parents to regulate their own emotions may make it difficult for them to respond appropriately and usefully to their children's distress and may lead them to adopt maladaptive regulation skills by modeling their parents.

2.3. Child Emotion Regulation and Interparental Relationship Quality

One of the essential components of the family system is the interparental relationship. The relationship between the parents has been investigated for a long time as a unidimensional construct. Recently, the interparental relationship has been considered a multidimensional construct that has various domains such as 'relationship quality,' 'hostile behavior,' 'frequency of conflicts,' 'constructive behavior,' 'child-related conflict' and 'disengaged behavior' (van Eldik et al., 2020). The present study focuses on the relationship quality dimension because it is logical to believe that during the COVID-19 pandemic the quality of the relationship between couples may matter more for the adjustment of all family members to the adverse situation of COVID-19. In a review study, the definition of relationship quality includes dyadic adjustment or happiness, dyadic satisfaction, the consensus of both parents on the different issues, and dyadic cohesion (van Eldik et al., 2020).

According to the family systems model, a child's adjustment is associated with the interparental relationship quality (Cox & Paley, 2003). Low levels of interparental relationship quality may have detrimental effects on a child's emotion regulation. As a member of the family system, the child may detect, feel, and be exposed to any conflict or distress in the subsystem

of the interparental relationship, and they may respond with adverse behaviors such as aggression or depressive behaviors (van Eldik et al., 2020). When children are exposed to hostile behaviors between parents, they may feel extreme distress and dysregulation (Davies et al., 2009; Fosco & Grych, 2013). Several studies found a relationship between interparental relationships and child emotion regulation. For instance, researchers found that interparental conflict has a detrimental effect on the level of a child's distress regulation (van Eldik et al., 2020). Also, according to Davies and Cummings (1994), marital conflict affects a child's behavioral responses such as behavioral dysregulation and avoidance, and emotional responses such as emotional dysregulation. Moreover, a study investigated the associations among child emotion regulation, parent-child synchrony, and interparental relationship satisfaction in the sample of parents and 18-27 months of age toddlers showed a negative relationship between interparental relationship satisfaction and a child's adaptive regulation (Kerr et al., 2021). In a longitudinal study conducted by Gallegos and colleagues (2017), children and families were observed in terms of marital conflict before birth, interactions between parent-child at 8 months of age, and child emotion regulation at 24 months of age. It was found that there is a negative correlation between prenatal marital negative effects and a toddler's emotion regulation at 24 months (Gallegos et al., 2017).

The influences of interparental relationship quality on a child might be differentiated in terms of gender and socioeconomic status of the family (van Eldik et al., 2020). For instance, in a correlational study, it was found that girls showed more anxiety than boys when fathers were more aggressive during conflict (Kerig, 1996). The family income might influence the effects of interparental relationships (Davies et al., 2016). According to Davies et al. (2016), there is a negative relationship between family income and interparental conflict. Therefore, the SES of the family and child's gender should be controlled while examining the associations between interparental relationship quality and child emotion regulation.

2.4. Parent Emotion Regulation and Interparental Relationship Quality

Emotion regulation abilities of partners play an important role in the interparental relationship. Since emotions are at the forefront in the relationship, expressing and controlling emotions has massive importance for the relationship quality (Bloch et al., 2014; Rick et al., 2017). During the relationship, there might be several situations that might cause to feel stress or anxiety and have hard times in which negative emotions increase such as having a child, low socioeconomic status, or communication problems. Related with changes in life or adverse conditions, the ability to regulate emotions becomes more crucial for the relationship. Appropriately controlling negative emotions may lead couples to handle difficulties (Bloch et al., 2014).

Adult emotion regulation and relationship quality between parents have been investigated but there are limited studies on this issue. Although the interparental refers to the relationship in the presence of the child, while the 'marital' used independent from having a child, in the relevant literature, the concept of 'marital' and 'interparental' terms were sometimes used interchangeably (Grych & Fincham, 2001). Thus, studies investigating child emotion regulation and marital relationship quality also included. These limited studies suggest that emotion regulation and marital relationship are closely related to each other. One recent 13-year longitudinal study conducted with middle-aged couples revealed that there was a strong association between emotion regulation and marital satisfaction (Bloch et al., 2014). Specifically, higher levels of regulating emotions are correlated with higher levels of marital satisfaction (Bloch et al., 2014). Moreover, in their study, Rick, and colleagues (2017) conducted a study to investigate emotion regulation dimensions and relationship satisfaction with 104 married couples who were seeking family therapy. They found a positive relationship between the access to regulation for both spouses and relationship satisfaction for their own as well as the lower emotion regulation also predicted lower relationship satisfaction (Rick et al.,

2017). Another study that investigated the link between emotion regulation and dimensions of dyadic adjustment in a sample of Romanian adults revealed that emotion regulation predicts dyadic consensus and dyadic satisfaction (Ursu & Turliuc, 2020). They also found that emotion regulation was negatively correlated with dyadic satisfaction, but positively correlated with dyadic consensus and cohesion (Ursu & Turliuc, 2020). The conflictive environment or dissatisfaction in the relationship might also make it harder to regulate negative emotions.

2.5. Parent Emotion Regulation, Child Emotion Regulation, and Interparental Relationship Quality

Besides the devastating effect of Covid 19 pandemic in children's life itself, one of the important changes that pandemic brings into children's life is their parent, whose well-being is affected by increased stress levels because of the pandemic situation (Fiese et al., 2019; Prime et al., 2020). When the parent's well-being is threatened, the relationship between the spouses and the child seemed to be disrupted (Conger & Elder Jr., 1994). Thus, another change in children's adjustment during pandemic might be related to the parents' relationship with each other. When the parents are not satisfied with their relationship or have too many conflicts, the child can also feel distressed and exposed to emotional negativity in the family environment (Prime et al., 2020). Also, interparental conflict or relationship dissatisfaction may directly affect the parents' emotional states or stress levels which may lead to emotional unavailability, dysregulation, or adverse reactions to the child. In this sense, parental characteristics, specifically emotion regulation, might play a mediational role between parental relationship quality and a child's emotional regulation (Faubert et al., 1990).

Several models investigated the effects of subsystems in the family on children's emotion regulation abilities. Fosco and Grych (2013) tested models, including interparental conflict, maternal and paternal warmth (as parental features), and child's emotion regulation.

They found that the best model explaining the associations among those constructs is the 'Interparental Indirect Effects Model,' which visualizes the interparental relationship and its indirect effects on child emotion regulation. This model suggested that interparental conflict as one domain of the relationship is related to children's emotion regulation through maternal or paternal warmth and emotional sensitivity as parental features (Fosco & Grych, 2013). Namely, any disruption in the interparental relationship may lead to high levels of stress and negativity in each parent, which may hinder the parents' ability to be emotionally available, show warmth and sensitivity towards the child or regulate their own emotions against the spouse or the child. Therefore, the children may not receive the support they need, especially in distress situations, to control emotions.

From this point of view, during the pandemic period, the quality of the parents' relationship might directly and indirectly influence child's emotional regulation. Based on the family systems model as mentioned above, parents' ability to regulate their own emotions is related to the quality of the interparental relationship (e.g., conflict, satisfaction) as well as the child's ability to regulate emotions. In the relevant literature, studies have shown that when the quality of the relationship between parents is low, both parent and child have difficulties in regulating their emotions, and negative parenting factors such as low emotion regulation, parental sensitivity, and warmth can affect the regulation of the child more than ordinary times (Fosco & Grych, 2013; Kerr et al., 2021). In accordance with this, the relationship between interparental relationship quality and child emotion regulation may be mediated by the parents' emotion regulation skills. Therefore, all these structures can be related to each other. In this direction, it is necessary to examine the relationships between interparental relationship quality, parent emotion regulation, and child emotion regulation during the COVID-19 pandemic period.

2.6. The Present Study

The goal of the present study is to examine the role of mothers' emotion regulation and interparental relationship quality on a child's emotion regulation during the COVID-19 pandemic. In line with the relevant literature, we hypothesized that:

H1.a: Parents' cognitive reappraisal would positively predict the child emotion regulation.

H1.b: Parents' expressive suppression would positively predict the child liability.

H1.c: Parents' expressive suppression would negatively predict the child emotion regulation.

H1.d: Parents' cognitive reappraisal would negatively predict child liability.

H2.a: Interparental relationship consensus would negatively predict the child liability.

H2.b: There would be a positive correlation between relationship consensus and parents' cognitive reappraisal.

H2.c: There would be a negative association between relationship satisfaction and parents' expressive suppression.

H3: The relationship between the child's emotion regulation and interparental relationship quality would be mediated by parental emotion regulation.

As we mentioned above, a child's emotion regulation ability is affected by several factors in the family system. One of the factors related with the family is the family's socioeconomic status (SES). The SES is influential on child's development because it affects parents' stress or opportunities for the child. When parents live with financial problems, they might feel overwhelmed, and their emotional regulation is affected negatively (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). According to Gülseven et al. (2018), the family's socioeconomic status is positively associated with Turkish children's emotion regulation abilities; they found that children from high SES families have better emotion regulation capacities. Also, children use

different self-management strategies to regulate their emotions depending on their age (Gross, 2013) and gender (Cole et al., 1994). Therefore, we are examining the SES, age, and gender as control variables in this study.

This study has the potential to contribute to our understanding of how family dynamics affect child emotion regulation during the COVID-19 pandemic from the family system theory perspective in Turkey. Also, to the best of our knowledge, there is no study in the literature that explains the relationship between child emotion regulation and interparental relationship quality through parent emotion regulation. Thus, this study is important to fill this gap in the literature.



CHAPTER 3

METHOD

3.1. Participants

For the study, 330 people attempted to fill the forms but 151 completed all the scales so 179 people were excluded from the study. A total of 151 mothers participated in the present study. The children's age ranged from 2 years to 6 years ($M= 3.84$, $SD= 1.34$, 112 boys and 91 girls). Any data from participants' whose child has psychiatric diagnose were excluded.

Mothers' age ranged from 21 years to 49 years ($M= 33.98$, $SD= 4.61$). 1.5% of mothers finished primary school, 4.4% of them finished middle school, 14.7% of mothers graduated from high school, 59.3% of mothers were graduated from university, and 20.1% have post-graduate education. The monthly family income ranged from 2.000 Turkish Liras to 100.000 Turkish Liras ($M= 16.580$, $SD= 16.760$).

3.2. Measures

Demographic information. Mothers were asked about their demographic information such as their age, education level and years, family income, child's gender, and age, and if their child have any psychiatric diagnose (e.g., autism) or not. The family SES was constructed by the average of standardized scores of years of education and family income.

Emotion Regulation Checklist (ERC). The Emotion Regulation Checklist (Shields & Cicchetti, 1999) was used to assess a child's emotion regulation. ERC is a 4-point Likert scale (from 1= "Never" to 4= "Always") and consists of 24 items with two subscales. The Lability-Negativity subscale has 18 items (e.g., "Exhibits wide mood swings") and Emotion Regulation subscale has 8 items (e.g., "Can say when she/he is feeling sad, angry, or mad, fearful or afraid?") (Batum & Yağmurlu, 2007). The Turkish form and the original form of ERC show discriminant validity and high internal consistency (Yağmurlu & Altan, 2010; Shields &

Cicchetti, 1999). In their study, Batum and Yağmurlu (2007) found internal consistencies as .73 and .75. In the present study the internal consistency of the Lability-Negativity subscale increased from .81 to .83 after the item 17 was removed; and for the Emotion Regulation subscale, the alpha value increased from .43 to .56 after items 23,19, and 21 were removed. The alpha level was no more improved with any other item deletion. Unfortunately, it was a low alpha level for the reliability compared to other findings from Turkish samples (internal consistencies of this scale were .77 in Ahmetoğlu et al.'s (2018) study, .73 in Batum and Yağmurlu's (2007) study, and .72 in Orta et al.'s (2013) study).

Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ). Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (Gross & John, 2003) was used to assess parents' emotion regulation abilities. Gross and John (2003) developed the questionnaire and Yurtsever (2004) adapted the scale into Turkish. ERQ was designed to assess adults' emotion regulation strategies, consisting of 10 items and two subscales as Cognitive Reappraisal and Expressive Suppression. The 7-point Likert scale was used for both subscales. The Reappraisal subscale has 6 items (e.g., "When I want to feel less negative emotion, I change the way I am thinking about the situation") and the Expressive Suppression has 4 items (e.g., "When I feel negative emotions, I make sure not to express them"). For the Turkish version, Cronbach's alpha values were .88 for the Cognitive Reappraisal subscale and .82 for the Expressive Suppression subscale (Yurtsever, 2004). In the present study, Cronbach's alpha levels were found .88 for the Cognitive Reappraisal and .82 for the Expressive Suppression subscale.

Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS). To assess interparental relationship quality, the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) developed by Spanier (1976) was used. The DAS has 32 items with four subscales responding on a 5 to 7- point Likert scale and yes/no questions. Dyadic consensus subscale is about the level of agreeing on important subjects in marriage (13 items, e.g., "Agree on handling family finances"). Dyadic satisfaction subscale is evaluating the positive and

negative aspects of emotions and communication (10 items, e.g., “How often do you discuss or considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?”). The affectional expression subscale is about agreeing about the ways of showing affection (4 items, e.g., “Is being too tired a problem between you and your spouse?”). Lastly, the dyadic cohesion subscale is about behaviors, sharing ideas, and calm discussion during the time spent together (5 items, e.g. “How often do you laugh together?”). The total score shows the level of couple satisfaction and adjustment. This scale was translated into Turkish by Fıfıloğlu and Demir (2000) and the internal consistency was found as .92, and split-half reliability was found as .86 In the present study, Cronbach’s alphas were .91 for relationship consensus subscale, .82 for dyadic satisfaction subscale the alpha value increased from .72 to .82 after the item 31 was removed, and .73 for dyadic cohesion subscale, and .72 for the affectional expression subscale.

COVID-19 Perceived Stress Scale. To understand the participants’ COVID-19 stress COVID-19 Perceived Stress Scale (Acar et al., 2020) was used. The scale was developed as 13 items which were about pandemic related stress; however, because the quarantine had finished and some items didn’t load on any factor after confirmatory factor analysis, 3 items were removed. Thus, the scale has 10 items with 5-Likert type. Acar et al. (2020) found Cronbach’s Alpha level as .86 with 10 items. In the present study, the reliability of the scale was found as .86.

3.3. Procedure

The ethical consent was gained from Ozyegin University Ethics Committee. After the scales were selected, the questionnaire form was constructed via the online tool Qualtrics software. The link of the online survey was distributed online via social media accounts from November 2021 to April 2022 when the quarantine didn’t continue, but the precautions about COVID-19 (wearing mask, measuring fever, isolations) were continuing. Participants received

the consent via the informed consent form at the beginning of the questionnaire and then they were asked to fill the questionnaires. Filling the questionnaires lasted 23.2 minutes on average with ranging 6.7 minutes to 50.9 minutes.

3.4. Data Analysis

For the data analysis, the SPSS *version 27* Packaged Program (IBM Corp. Released 2020) was used. In the data screening procedure, the data was checked in terms of missing values, normality, and multicollinearity assumptions. Then the missing data and outliers were checked. Three participants were excluded because their children have a psychiatric diagnose (ADHD, Autism, or learning disabilities). Thirteen participants were excluded because they were not in the expected child age range (2-6 years). Univariate outliers were identified by calculating Z-Scores. For a score to be a potential outlier, it must be exceeded the limits of 3.3 and -3.3 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). In addition, Mahalanobis Distance was used to identify the multivariate outliers (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2013). There was no multivariate outlier which were above the χ^2 -value of 26.12 cut-off score which was determined depending on the number of variables in the study, $p < .001$ (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). The normality assumption was checked, and the skewness and kurtosis scores were between the scores of |3| (Kline, 2005; see Table 1).

In the following step, multicollinearity assumption was checked by using Tolerance and VIF (Variance Inflation Factor). Tolerance and VIF values were distinguished to understand the multicollinearity of the independent variables. The results showed the following tolerance values; parent cognitive reappraisal .98, parent expressive suppression .88, relationship consensus .40, relationship cohesion .52, relationship satisfaction .59, relationship affection .48. Also, the results showed the following VIF values; parent cognitive reappraisal 1.02, parent expressive suppression 1.14, relationship consensus 2.51, relationship cohesion 1.93,

relationship satisfaction 1.71, relationship affection 2.08. There were no VIF and tolerance values out of the accepted range for multicollinearity (Tolerance < .10 and VIF > 10; Pallant, 2016). Thus, the multicollinearity assumption was not violated (Pallant, 2016).



Table 1*Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables*

	Range (Min-Max)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skewness	Kurtosis	Cronbach's Alpha
Child Emotion Regulation Dimensions						
Child Emotion Regulation	1.60-4.00	3.28	.44	-.845	.837	.56
Child Lability/Negativity	1.07-3.73	1.92	.41	1.234	2.512	.83
Parent Emotion Regulation Dimensions						
Cognitive Reappraisal	1.33-7.00	5.17	1.09	-.197	1.714	.88
Expressive Suppression	1.00-6.75	3.68	1.48	.042	-.946	.82
Interparental Relationship Quality Dimensions						
Relationship Consensus	1.77-6.00	4.70	.77	-.836	.795	.91
Relationship Satisfaction	-1.21-2.30	.000	.64	.504	1.129	.82
Relationship Cohesion	-2.27-1.37	-.0123	.74	-.726	.606	.73
Relationship Affection	-2.12-.98	.000	.73	-.710	.002	.72
COVID-19 Stress	1-4.88	2.56	1.63	.517	-.216	.86
Family SES	.75-20.00	8.07	2.58	.519	2.538	

Note. Min= Minimum, Max = Maximum, M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.1. Preliminary Analysis

Bivariate Pearson correlations were conducted to examine the relationships among all variables (Child Emotion Regulation, Child Lability/Negativity, Parent Cognitive Reappraisal, Parent Expressive Suppression, Relationship Satisfaction, Relationship Affection, Relationship Cohesion, Relationship Consensus, COVID-19 Stress, COVID-19 Attitude, child age, child gender, and family SES, see Table 2). The correlation coefficients showed that there was a significant relationship between child age and relationship cohesion, relationship consensus, and COVID-19 stress. In addition, the family SES was found to be significantly correlated with child emotion regulation, relationship cohesion, parent expressive suppression, and cognitive reappraisal.

Pearson correlation results indicated that there was a statistically significant correlation between child lability and parent expressive suppression, relationship consensus, relationship cohesion and relationship affection (see Table 2). Also, family SES was found statistically significantly correlated with child lability. Other variables were not found statistically significantly correlated with child lability ($p > .05$).

Bivariate Pearson correlation results also showed that child emotion regulation was significantly associated with relationship consensus, relationship affection and relationship cohesion. Also, results indicated that there is a significant correlation between child emotion regulation and parent expressive suppression. Moreover, the correlation analysis results showed that there were significant associations between parent cognitive reappraisal and relationship cohesion and relationship consensus.

Table 2*Pearson Correlations for Study Variables*

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.Child Age	-	.152*	-.037	-.069	.056	-.078	-.030	-.161*	-.211**	.036	-.148	-.160*
2. Child Gender		-	-.033	.007	-.029	-.120	-.014	-.052	-.069	-.179*	.068	-.035
3.Family SES			-	.162*	-.237**	.163*	-.214**	.148	.175*	-.003	.078	-.060
4.Child Emotion Regulation				-	-.573**	.152	-.275**	.344**	.264**	-.133	.310**	-.072
5.Child Lability/Negativity					-	-.176*	.166*	-.386**	-.216**	.160*	-.273**	.128
6.Parent Cognitive Reappraisal						-	.163*	.232**	.290**	-.140	.137	-.075
7.Parent Expressive Suppression							-	-.060	-.150	-.093	-.057	.020
8.Relationship Consensus								-	.625**	-.543**	.678**	-.133
9.Relationship Cohesion									-	-.448**	.512**	.113
10.Relationship Satisfaction										-	-.512**	.054
11.Relationship Affection											-	-.110
12.COVID-19 Stress												-

Note * $p < .05$ (2-tailed), ** $p < .001$ (2-tailed), Gender (Girls =1, Boys= 0).

4.2. Do Dimensions of Parent Emotion Regulation and Interparental Relationship Quality Predict the Child Lability?

Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted in which child lability and child emotion regulation were regressed on the parent emotion regulation (expressive suppression and cognitive reappraisal) and interparental relationship variables (relationship satisfaction, relationship consensus, relationship cohesion and relationship affection). Also, the age and gender of the child, and income were entered in the first block as control variables. In the first block, the results showed that the family SES, child gender, and child age accounted for 6% of the variance in child lability. In this step, only family SES significantly predicted child lability, but child age and child gender did not.

The parental emotion regulation variables (parent cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression) were added in the second block to see how much variance the parental variables accounted for child lability. In the block 2, results showed that parent cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression significantly accounted for 4.7% of additional variance in child lability. Regression analysis showed that parent cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression significantly predicted child lability.

Interparental relationship quality variables (relationship cohesion, relationship consensus, relationship affection, and relationship satisfaction) were entered in the third block. Results showed that relationship quality variables accounted for 10.9% additional variance of child lability. Among these relationship quality variables, only relationship consensus significantly predicted the child lability, but relationship cohesion, relationship satisfaction, and relationship affection did not significantly predict the child lability. See Table 3 for hierarchical regression analyses on child lability variable.

Table 3*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Study Variables and Child Lability/Negativity*

	Block 1	Block 2	Block 3
	$F(3,146) = 3.091, p = .029, R^2 = .060$	$F(5,144) = 3.453, R^2 = .107, p = .006, R^2\Delta = .047, p = .024$	$F(9,140) = 4.289, R^2 = .216, p < .001, R^2\Delta = .109, p = .001$
Variable			
Intercept (B)	(2.160**)	(2.232**)	(3.075**)
Child Age	.049	.047	.013
Child Gender	.034	.010	.016
SES	-.233**	-.167*	-.137
Parent CR		-.166*	-.119
Parent ES		.179*	.166*
RCN			-.372**
RCH			.126
RS			-.014
RA			-.054

Note. Standardized Coefficients were shown. B= Unstandardized B. CR= Cognitive Reappraisal; ES= Expressive Suppression; RCN= Relationship Consensus; RCH= Relationship Cohesion; RS= Relationship Satisfaction; RA= Relationship Affection, Gender (Girls =1, Boys= 0).

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

4.3. Do Dimensions of Parent Emotion Regulation and Interparental Relationship Quality Predict the Child Emotion Regulation?

The hierarchical analysis results showed that in the first block, SES, child gender and child age accounted for 4.6% of the variance in child emotion regulation. In this model, only

SES significantly predicted child emotion regulation. Results showed that child age and child gender did not significantly predict the child emotion regulation.

The parental emotional regulation variables (parent cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression) were entered in the second block to see how much variance the parental variables accounted for child emotion regulation. Results showed that in the Block 2, the parent cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression accounted for 9% of additional variance in emotion regulation. These variables significantly predicted child emotion regulation.

The interparental relationship quality variables (i.e., relationship cohesion, relationship consensus, relationship affection, and relationship satisfaction) were entered in the third block. Results showed that relationship quality variables accounted for 8.6% additional variance of child emotion regulation. None of these interparental relationship quality subscales significantly predicted child emotion regulation. In the third block, only parent expressive suppression significantly predicted the child emotion regulation. See Table 4 for hierarchical regression results on child emotion regulation.

Table 4*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Study Variables and Child Emotion Regulation*

Variable	Block 1	Block 2	Block 3
	$F(3,146) = 2.333, p = .077, R^2 = .046.$	$F(5,144) = 4.505, R^2 = .135, p < .001, R^2\Delta = .090, p < .001$	$F(9,140) = 4.411, R^2 = .221, p < .001, R^2\Delta = .086, p = .005$
Intercept (B)	3.197**	3.275**	2.776**
Child Age	-.094	-.097	-.051
Child Gender	-.042	-.021	-.034
SES	.178*	.091	.067
Parent CR		.165*	.113
Parent ES		-.286**	-.260**
RCN			.213
RCH			-.031
RS			.038
RA			.160

Note. Standardized Coefficients were shown. B = Unstandardized B. CR= Cognitive Reappraisal; ES= Expressive Suppression; RCN= Relationship Consensus; RCH= Relationship Cohesion; RS= Relationship Satisfaction; RA= Relationship Affection, Gender (Girls =1, Boys= 0).

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

4.4. Indirect Effects

To test the indirect effects, 16 separate models were run in which parent emotion regulation variables (cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression) were mediators, child emotion regulation variables (emotion regulation and lability/negativity) were dependent variables and interparental relationship quality variables (relationship satisfaction, relationship

cohesion, relationship consensus, relationship affection) were independent variables. Because the study data was cross-sectional, we examined the indirect effects. I used SPSS *version 27* and the additional program PROCESS Macro v4.1 (Hayes, 2013). For the significance of the indirect effects, bootstrapping analyses (2000 replications) with %95 confidence intervals was used (Hayes, 2012; MacKinnon et al., 2007). Also, child age, gender and family income were controlled. Since 16 separate models were run, Bonferroni Correction for p values were made. The p value ($p = .05$) was divided by 16, and new p value ($p = .003$) was used. Results showed that there was no significant indirect effect of parent cognitive reappraisal or expressive suppression ($p > .003$, see Table 5 and Table 6). Thus, parents' emotion regulation did not have significant indirect effects in the relationship between child emotion regulation and interparental relationship quality.

Table 5

Indirect Effects for Child Lability/Negativity ($n = 142$)

	Parent Expressive Suppression		Parent Cognitive Reappraisal	
	β	%95 CI	β	%95 CI
Relationship Consensus	-.004	-.037/.017	.001	-.011/.028
Relationship Affection	.005	-.014/.037	.000	-.021/.019
Relationship Satisfaction	-.016	-.056/.006	.002	-.017/.030
Relationship Cohesion	-.015	-.047/.004	-.009	-.057/.019

Note. $p > .003$. CI = Confidence Intervals.

Table 6*Indirect Effects for Child Emotion Regulation (n = 142)*

	Parent Expressive Suppression		Parent Cognitive Reappraisal	
	β	95% CI	β	95% CI
Relationship Consensus	-.008	-.033/.056	-.001	-.018/.018
Relationship Affection	-.009	-.052/.031	-.001	-.026/.013
Relationship Satisfaction	.030	-.012/.080	-.003	-.031/.016
Relationship Cohesion	.028	-.006/.074	.010	-.019/.052

Note. $p > .003$. CI = Confidence Intervals.

4.5. Sensitivity Analysis

We ran post-hoc power analysis to test whether there was enough power to detect found effects in statistical models (Cohen, 1988). In the hierarchical multiple regression analysis, results indicated that at $\alpha = .05$ and given a medium effect size acquired from hierarchical regression analysis results were (.21) for both child lability and child emotion regulation, the statistical power were .99 for both outcomes with $n = 151$.

In addition, the Monte Carlo simulations were run to understand whether the power was enough or not to detect effects in mediation analysis (Schoemann et al., 2017). One mediator model with a sample size of 151 was used with 2000 replications. Power for indirect effects ranged from .05 to .07 across mediations models, indicating there was not enough power to detect proposed effect sizes in indirect effects.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

5.1. Discussion

The main goal of the study was to examine the relationship between child emotion regulation and both parent emotion regulation and interparental relationship quality with mothers of preschool children in Turkey based on the family systems perspective suggested by Cox and Paley (2003). Also, this study examined the relationship between the interparental relationship quality and parent emotion regulation as well as the indirect effects of the parent emotion regulation in the association between child emotion regulation and interparental relationship quality based on the tripartite model that was developed by Morris et al. (2007) and family systems (Cox & Paley, 2003) during the Covid 19 pandemic period.

First, before getting into to discussing the main findings, it is important to see how Covid 19 stress was related the studied variables. The result of this research showed that the stress of COVID-19 was negatively correlated with only the age of the child but not any other variables (child emotion regulation, parent emotion regulation, interparental relationship quality). Consistent with the literature (Morelli et al., 2022), the stress of COVID-19 increases as the child's age decreases. Recent studies examining parents' stress and child emotional problems during pandemic period were conducted mostly when COVID-19 increased (Romero et al., 2020; Spinelli et al., 2019). However, the present study was conducted when the quarantine was over, and the COVID-19 vaccination has already started. When the present study was conducted the COVID-19 was not at its highest time; thus, the stress level of the parents and children related to the pandemic could decrease. That might be one reason that this study didn't find any significant association between COVID-19 stress and other study variables (family SES, child emotion regulation, parent emotion regulation, interparental

relationship quality) because families and children might develop adaptations to pandemic processes in general.

Related with the first research question about the association between child's emotion regulation and mothers' emotion regulation, as expected, the study revealed that mothers' expressive suppression, as a maladaptive strategy of emotion regulation, was negatively correlated with child emotion regulation. Namely, when mothers have maladaptive emotion regulation strategies, children's ability to regulate their emotions decreases. Also, in line with the expectation, this study revealed that parent expressive suppression was positively correlated with child lability/negativity. This finding is consistent with the previous literature that suppression, as a maladaptive strategy of emotion regulation, seems to increase child lability (Denham, 1998; Silk et al., 2006). In line with this result, Kao et al. (2020) indicated that 3 years-old preschoolers had lower emotion regulation skills when their parents used expressive suppression, a maladaptive emotion regulation strategy. In line with the current study, Silk et al. (2006) suggested that parents with maladaptive emotion regulation strategies had children who also used maladaptive emotion regulation strategies. It is possible that children with high level of lability might take parents' maladaptive emotion regulation strategies as role models (Denham, 1998; Morris et al., 2007; Thomas, 1994). Parents are an important role models for their children so children may internalize the emotion regulation strategies of their parents.

In this study, contrary to the hypothesis, maternal emotion regulation strategy of cognitive reappraisal did not predict child emotion regulation. In fact, the result on the relationship between maternal cognitive reappraisal and child emotion regulation is mixed in the relevant literature. For instance, Lai (2020) didn't find any correlation between child emotion regulation and mothers' self-reported emotion regulation while Kao et al. (2020) found that 3-years old children have better emotion regulation skills when their parents use adaptive emotion regulation strategies as cognitive reappraisal. In these studies, different measurement

methods such as observational, physiological, or self-report were used to assess cognitive reappraisal (Kao et al., 2020; Lai, 2020). This might be one possible reason that in the present study the results did not reveal significant relationship because of the usage of self-report measure for cognitive appraisal. Moreover, children may observe expressive suppression more apparently than cognitive reappraisal (Lai, 2020). Therefore, it would be important to examine the relationship between mother's cognitive reappraisal and child emotion regulation with different assessment techniques such as observation and physiological tool.

As hypothesized, this study revealed that maternal cognitive reappraisal negatively predicted child lability. In other words, children showed less lability/negativity when mothers used cognitive reappraisal strategy, as an adaptive emotion regulation behavior. It is possible that adaptive emotion regulation strategies of parents seem to provide more positive family environment and higher parent sensitivity (Are & Shaffer, 2016; Milojevich, 2020) that may decrease the child's lability or negativity.

Moreover, both child lability and child emotion regulation were found to be correlated with interparental relationship quality dimensions. As expected, this study showed that interparental relationship consensus and affection, signs of a good relationship quality, negatively predicted child lability/negativity. Also, results revealed that child emotion regulation was positively predicted by interparental relationship consensus, cohesion, and affection. The family environment is affected by several factors such as relationship between parents, siblings, and parent-child. When positive traits such as satisfaction, consensus, or affection in the interparental relationship are high, parents might be able to recognize the needs of the child more, thus children's social-emotional development influenced positively. Positive family environment is related with better relationship between parents, and this is an important predictor of child emotion regulation (Fosco & Grych, 2013). Cummings et al. (2002) also

suggested that children's emotional reactions are highly consistent with parents' emotions and behavioral responses.

The association between adult emotion regulation dimensions and interparental relationship quality was also investigated. Although there were limited studies examining those associations in the context of the family, previous research found that emotion suppression was related with relationship satisfaction (Rick et al., 2017; Velotti et al., 2012). Contrary to these findings, this study showed that there was no relationship between parents' expressive suppression and relationship satisfaction. On the other hand, consistent with the study of Ursu and Turliuc (2020), it was found that parent emotion regulation strategy of cognitive reappraisal was related with relationship consensus and cohesion. Parents who use adaptive regulation strategies feel more satisfied because they have tool to manage their conflict and consensus issued in their relationship (Kirby & Baucom, 2007; Rick et al., 2017).

As the final research question, this study investigated the indirect effect of interparental relationship quality on the child emotion regulation through maternal emotion regulation. Results revealed that there were no indirect effects of interparental relationship quality in the child emotion regulation. Previous studies indicated that the relationship quality between parents had indirect effects on child emotion regulation through other family-related processes such as parent sensitivity, warmth, or reactions to emotions (Fauber et al., 1990; Fosco & Grych, 2013; Morris et al., 2007). As an important parental feature, the sensitivity of the parent could be influential on the relationship between child emotion regulation and interparental relationship quality. When the parental sensitivity was low, it might be hard for the parent to detect child's negativity or emotion regulation abilities which were measured by maternal reports in this study. Thus, it might be the reason that parent interparental relationship quality had no indirect effect alone. Also, the warmth or sensitivity of the parent may recover the low parent emotion regulation. Future research may examine the impact of the parental sensitivity

in this relationship. Moreover, in fact, emotion regulation is a construct that is highly related with the child temperament. For instance, children with high reactivity may have parents who have more difficulties in emotion regulation, and those parents might have less satisfaction and consensus in their interparental relationship (Ahmetoğlu et al., 2018; Are & Shaffer, 2016; Batum & Yağmurlu, 2010; Cummings et al., 2002). Therefore, it might be valuable to examine the moderating role of the child temperament in the associations between interparental relationship quality and the child's emotion regulation.

In this study, the socioeconomic status, child age, and child gender were used as control variables. Results showed that only the SES predicted the child emotion regulation and child lability/negativity. According to previous research, the family socioeconomic status was an important factor in child's life, because it affected the families' opportunities, parents' stress, and parents' behaviors (Blair & Raver, 2012; Deater-Deckard, 2004). In addition, other studies have shown that children from high income families have more adaptive emotion regulation strategies (Gülseven et al., 2018; Kao et al., 2020). Moreover, the study results revealed that family SES was related with parent cognitive reappraisal, expressive suppression, relationship cohesion, and relationship affection. Other studies also showed that having better SES (income and education) was related to higher relationship quality, and lower expressive suppression (Ursu & Turliuc, 2020; Velotti et al., 2016). Low SES parents might have huge life stress related with working conditions or opportunities; thus, it might be more difficult to cope with distress and have lower emotion regulation. It may also reflect to interparental relationship quality because the satisfaction or the consensus may decrease. In this sense, the result of present study is consistent with the existing literature as indicating that SES were related with child emotion regulation, parent emotion regulation, and interparental relationship quality.

This study was based on family systems which considers the family as well as it has a hierarchical structure (subsystems formed within a system) (Cox & Paley, 2003). This study

supports the family's hierarchical and integrated structure by showing that the subsystems (interparental relationship quality, mother emotion regulation, and child emotion regulation) were in association with each other. Also, apart from parent emotion regulation as a parenting characteristic, interparental relationship consensus predicted the child regulation which could provide a broader perspective to family factors. However, one problem here is that we took the parent subsystem as only mother rather than both spouses, and this was a limitation that is lacked to take the family with dyadic relationships.

This study was conducted during the COVID-19 period so that the study supported the view that the family is a system that is open to adaptation and difficulties (Cox & Paley, 2003), since there was no significant relationship between COVID-19 stress and interparental relationship quality, parent emotion regulation, and child emotion regulation. On the other hand, the present findings did not reveal that interparental relationship quality influences the child emotion regulation through the parent's own characteristics which is their own emotion regulation strategies. This is not consistent with the family systems model suggesting that interparental subsystem is the leader of the family system, and the idea of any disruption in the interparental subsystem have influence on the whole family members (Cox & Paley, 2003; Fosco & Grych, 2013; Minuchin, 1988).

5.2. Limitations and Future Directions

As this study has some important findings and strengths, it also has several limitations. One of the limitations is that this study was not a longitudinal or experimental study, and this study analyzed the indirect effects on child emotion regulation and lability with the cross-sectional data; therefore, it is problematic to claim any cause-effect relationship by testing mediation analysis. Also, the sensitivity analysis showed that there were not enough power to detect indirect effects, that is another limitation of the current study. Furthermore, to increase

the reliability, items were removed from the child emotion regulation subscale that may influence the validity of the measure.

Only mothers participated in the present study. Interparental relationship quality should be examined in a dyadic relationship because both parents' contributions are valuable. Although studies about fathers' impact on child emotion regulation were very limited, the existing literature showed the importance of the fathers' contribution on child social-emotional development (Morris et al., 2007; Spinelli et al., 2021; Qian et al., 2020). Therefore, future research should examine the paternal contribution to both child development and the interparental relationship.

It is valuable to examine the child behaviors in the observational settings (Cole et al., 2004). Because of the pandemic conditions, we couldn't collect data from children, we just collected data from mothers as a self-report on child data. Therefore, future research should use observational data while examining associations among child emotion regulation, parent emotion regulation, and interparental relationship quality during preschool period.

The current study showed that interparental relationship quality dimensions had no indirect effects on child emotion regulation and lability through neither the maternal expressive suppression nor the cognitive reappraisal as emotion regulation strategies. Future research should examine the role of other factors such as family emotional environment or parent emotion socialization in this association.

Finally, emotion regulation abilities may differ according to specific emotions or situations. For instance, some children feel more difficulty while controlling their anger than their happiness (Davies et al., 2009). Thus, it might be valuable to examine the emotion regulation of children, parents' emotion regulation and the relationship of each other across different emotional situations.

5.3. Conclusion

All in all, this study investigated the contributions of interparental relationship quality and parent emotion regulation to 2- to 6 years-old children's emotion regulation from the family system model during the COVID-19 pandemic period. The findings of the present study revealing that dimensions of mother's emotion regulation and interparental relationship quality predict the child emotion regulation and lability provide evidence for the family system model defining family as a complex, integrated and a dynamic structure. Also, it is important to plan the intervention programs by considering the different dimensions of emotion regulation and interparental relationship as found in the present study that the dimensions of each variable are differently related with each other. In addition, it is important that interventions on emotion regulation should focus not only on working with child, but also on strengthening the emotion regulation of the parents and the relationship between them. While doing this, it might be valuable to focus on developing specific adaptive emotion regulation strategies such as cognitive reappraisal.

Moreover, the result of the present study related with SES suggest that especially in adversity-high samples, parents emotion regulation has valuable impacts on children's social-emotional development, thus intervention programs should focus on how to improve parents' emotional abilities such as understanding, realizing, and regulating emotions (Humphreys et al., 2022). This situation may indicate that special attention should be paid to studies to be carried out especially with low-income families. Finally, examining both the effects of parent's own characteristic and their interparental relationship quality on child's emotion regulation has a potential to contribute the COVID-19 literature that will shed light on interventions aiming to help families and their children to overcome adverse effects of this deadly, devastating pandemic.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Demographics Questionnaire

Genel Bilgi Formu

Formu dolduran Anne () Baba ()

Çocuğunuzun: Yaşı: (ay olarak) Cinsiyeti: (1) () Kız () Erkek () (2)

Anne Yaş:..... Baba Yaş:.....

Anne Eğitim Durumu:

İlkokul (1) Ortaokul (2) Lise (3) Üniversite (4) Yüksek Lisans (5) Doktora (6)

Annenin şu ana kadar almış olduğu toplam eğitim süresi: (Yıl olarak)

Baba Eğitim Durumu:

İlkokul (1) Ortaokul (2) Lise (3) Üniversite (4) Yüksek Lisans (5) Doktora (6)

Babanın şu ana kadar almış olduğu toplam eğitim süresi: (Yıl olarak)

İlişki durumunuz nedir?

Bekâr (1) Evli (2) Boşanmış (3) Ayrı (4) Tekrar evlenmiş (5) Dul (6) Birlikte yaşama (7)

Ailenin toplam aylık geliri? TL (rakam olarak belirtiniz)

Şu an evinizde toplam kaç kişi yaşamaktadır? (eşiniz çocuklarınız hepsi dâhil)

.....

Çocukların yaşları? _____

APPENDIX B

Emotion Regulation Checklist

	Neredeyse Hiçbir Zaman	Bazen	Sık Sık	Neredeyse Her Zaman
1. Neşeli bir çocuktur. (duygu düzenleme)	1	2	3	4
2. Duygu hali çok değişkendir (Çocuğun duygu durumunu tahmin etmek zordur çünkü neşeli ve mutluken kolayca üzgünleşebilir). (duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk)	1	2	3	4
3. Yetişkinlerin arkadaşça ya da sıradan (nötr) yaklaşımlarına olumlu karşılık verir. (duygu düzenleme)	1	2	3	4
4. Bir faaliyetten diğerine kolayca geçer; kızıp sinirlenmez, endişelenmez (kaygılanmaz), sıkıntı duymaz veya aşırı derecede heyecanlanmaz. Reverse (duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk)	1	2	3	4
5. Üzüntüsünü veya sıkıntısını kolayca atlatabilir (Örneğin, canını sıkan bir olay sonrasında uzun süre surat asmaz, endişeli veya üzgün durmaz). Reverse (duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk)	1	2	3	4
6. Kolaylıkla hayal kırıklığına uğrayıp sinirlenir (huysuzlaşır, öfkelenir). (duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk)	1	2	3	4
7. Yaşıtlarının arkadaşça ya da sıradan (nötr) yaklaşımlarına olumlu karşılık verir. (duygu düzenleme)	1	2	3	4
8. Öfke patlamalarına, huysuzluk nöbetlerine eğilimlidir. (duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk)	1	2	3	4
9. Hoşuna giden bir şeye ulaşmak için bekleyebilir (Örneğin şeker almak için sırasını beklemesi gerektiğinde keyfi kaçmaz veya heyecanını kontrol edebilir). Reverse (duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk)	1	2	3	4
10. Başkalarının sıkıntı hissetmesinden keyif duyar (Örneğin, biri incindiğinde veya ceza aldığı anda güler; başkalarıyla alay etmekten zevk alır). (duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk)	1	2	3	4
11. Heyecanını kontrol edebilir (Örneğin, çok hareketli oyunlarda kontrolünü kaybetmez veya uygun olmayan ortamlarda aşırı derecede heyecanlanmaz). Reverse (duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk)	1	2	3	4
12. Mızıldır ve yetişkinlerin eteğinin dibinden ayrılmaz. (duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk)	1	2	3	4

13. Ortallığı karıştırarak çevresine zarar verebilecek enerji patlamaları ve taşkınlıklara eğilimlidir. (duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk)	1	2	3	4
14. Yetişkinlerin sınır koymalarına sinirlenir. (duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk)	1	2	3	4
15. Üzüldüğünü, kızıp öfkelenildiğini veya korktuğunu söyleyebilir. (duygu düzenleme)	1	2	3	4
16. Üzgün veya halsiz görünür. Reverse (duygu düzenleme)	1	2	3	4
17. Oyuna başkalarını katmaya çalışırken aşırı enerjik ve hareketlidir. (duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk)	1	2	3	4
18. Yüzü ifadesizdir; yüz ifadesinden duyguları anlaşılmaz. Reverse (duygu düzenleme)	1	2	3	4
19. Yaşıtlarının arkadaşça ya da sıradan (nötr) yaklaşımlarına olumsuz karşılık verir (örneğin kızgın bir ses tonuyla konuşabilir ya da ürkek davranabilir). (duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk)	1	2	3	4
Fevridir, ani tepkiler verir. (duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk)	1	2	3	4
21. Kendini başkalarının yerine koyarak onların duygularını anlar; başkaları üzgün ya da sıkıntılı olduğunda onlara ilgi gösterir. (duygu düzenleme)	1	2	3	4
22. Başkalarını rahatsız edecek veya etrafa zarar verebilecek kadar aşırı enerjik, hareketli davranır. (duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk)	1	2	3	4
23. Yaşıtları ona saldırgan davranır ya da zorla işine karışırsa, yerinde olumsuz duygular gösterir (örneğin kızgınlık, korku, öfke, sıkıntı). (duygu düzenleme)	1	2	3	4
24. Oyuna başkalarını katmaya çalışırken olumsuz duygular gösterir (örneğin, aşırı heyecan, kızgınlık, üzüntü). (duygusal değişkenlik/olumsuzluk)	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX C

Emotion Regulation Questionnaire

DDÖ: Duygusal hayatınız hakkında, özellikle duygularınızı nasıl kontrol ettiğiniz ve yönettiğinizle ilgili bazı sorular soruyoruz. Aşağıdaki sorular duygusal hayatınızın iki farklı yanını içermektedir. Bunlardan biri duygusal deneyimleriniz, ya da içinde nasıl hissettiğinizle ilgilidir. Diğer ise duygusal ifade, ya da duygularınızı konuşma, jest, mimik ve davranışlarınızla nasıl gösterdiğinizle ilgilidir. Sorulardan bazıları birbirine benzer görünse de önemli farklılıklar taşımaktadırlar. Her bir soru için lütfen aşağıdaki ölçeği kullanınız:

	Hiç Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Biraz Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Biraz Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Tamamen Katılıyorum
İçinde bulunduğum duruma göre düşünme şeklini değiştirecek duygularımı kontrol ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Olumsuz duygularımın az olmasını istersem, durumla ilgili düşünme şeklimi değiştiririm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Olumlu duygularımın fazla olmasını istediğim zaman durumla ilgili düşünme şeklimi değiştiririm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Olumlu duyguların fazla olmasını istersem (mutluluk veya eğlence) düşündüğüm şeyi değiştiririm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Olumsuz duyguların az olmasını istersem (kötü hissetme, kızgınlık gibi) düşündüğüm şeyi değiştiririm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Stresli bir durumla karşılaştığımda, bu durumu sakin kalmamı sağlayacak şekilde düşünmeye çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Duygularımı ifade etmeyerek kontrol ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Olumsuz duygular hissettiğim de onları ifade etmediğimden emin olmak isterim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Duygularımı kendime saklarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Olumlu duygular hissettiğim de onları ifade etmemeye	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

dikkat ederim.							
-------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



APPENDIX D

Dyadic Adjustment Scale

Birçok insanın ilişkilerinde anlaşmazlıkları vardır. Lütfen aşağıda verilen maddelerin her biri için siz ve eşiniz arasındaki anlaşma ve anlaşmama ölçüsünü aşağıda verilen altı düzeyden birini seçerek belirtiniz.

	Her zaman anlaşırız	Hemen hemen her zaman anlaşırız	Nadiren anlaşamayız	Sıkça anlaşamayız	Hemen hemen her zaman anlaşamayız	Her zaman anlaşamayız
1-Aileyle ilgili parasal işlerin idaresi						
2- Eğlenceyle ilgili konular						
3- Dini konular						
4- Muhabbet-sevgi gösterme						
5- Arkadaşlar						
6- Cinsel yaşam						
7- Geleneksellik (doğru ve uygun davranış)						
8- Yaşam felsefesi						
9- Anne, baba ya da yakın akrabalarla ilişkiler						
10- Önemli olduğuna inanılan amaçlar, hedefler ve konular						
11- Birlikte geçirilen zaman miktarı						
12-Temel kararların alınması						

13- Ev ile ilgili görevler						
14- Boş zaman ilgi ve uğraşları						
15- Mesleki kararlar						

	Her zaman	Hemen hemen her zaman	Zaman zaman	Ara sıra	Nadiren	Hiçbir zaman
16-Ne sıklıkla boşanmayı, ayrılmayı ya da ilişkinizi bitirmeyi düşünür ya da tartışırsınız?						
17- Ne sıklıkla siz veya eşiniz kavgadan sonra evi terkeder?						
18- Ne sıklıkla eşinizle olan ilişkinizin genelde iyi gittiğini düşünürsünüz?						
19- Eşinize güvenir misiniz?						
20- Evlendiğiniz için hiç pişmanlık duyar mısınız?						
21- Ne sıklıkla eşinizle münakaşa edersiniz?						
22- Ne sıklıkla birbirinizin sinirlenmesine neden olursunuz?						

	Her gün	Hemen hemen her gün	Ara sıra	Nadiren	Hiçbir zaman
23- Eşinizi öper misiniz?					

	Hepsine	Çoğuna	Bazılarına	Çok azına	Hiçbirine
24- Siz veya eşiniz ev dışı etkinliklerinizin ne kadarına birlikte katılırsınız?					

Aşağıdaki olaylar siz ve eşiniz arasında ne sıklıkta geçer?

	Hiçbir zaman	Ayda birden az	Ayda bir veya iki defa	Haftada bir veya iki kere	Günde bir defa	Günde birden fazla
25- Teşvik edici fikir alışverişlerinde bulunmak						
26- Birlikte gülmek						
27- Bir şeyi sakince tartışmak						
28- Bir iş üzerinde birlikte çalışmak						

Eşlerin bazı zamanlar anlaştıkları, bazen anlaşamadıkları konular vardır. Eğer aşağıdaki maddeler son birkaç hafta içinde siz ve eşiniz arasında görüş farklılığı veya problem yaratıyorsa belirtiniz (Evet veya Hayır'ı işaretleyiniz)

	Evet	Hayır
29- Seks için yorgun olmak		
30- Sevgi göstermemek		

31- Aşağıda ilişkinizdeki farklı mutluluk düzeyleri gösterilmektedir. Orta noktadaki "mutlu" birçok ilişkide yaşanan mutluluk düzeyini gösterir. İlişkinizi genelde değerlendirdiğinizde mutluluk düzeyinizi en iyi şekilde belirtecek olan seçeneği lütfen işaretleyiniz.

() Aşırı mutsuz	() Oldukça mutsuz	() Az mutsuz	() Mutlu	() Oldukça mutlu	() Aşırı mutlu	() Tam anlamıyla mutlu
------------------	--------------------	---------------	-----------	-------------------	-----------------	-------------------------

32- Aşağıda belirtilen cümlelerden ilişkinizin geleceği hakkında ne hissettiğinizi en iyi şekilde tanımlayan ifadeyi lütfen işaretleyiniz.

() İlişkimin başarılı olmasını çok fazla istiyorum ve bunun için yapamayacağım hiçbir şey yoktur.

() İlişkimin başarılı olmasını çok istiyorum ve bunun için yapabileceklerimin hepsini yapacağım.

() İlişkimin başarılı olmasını çok istiyorum ve bunun için payıma düşeni yapacağım.

() İlişkimin başarılı olması güzel olurdu, fakat bunun için şu anda yaptıklarımın daha fazlasını yapamam.

() İlişkimin başarılı olması güzel olurdu, fakat bunun için şu anda yaptıklarımın daha fazlasını yapmayı reddederim.

() İlişkim asla başarılı olmayacak ve ilişkinin yürümesi için benim daha fazla yapabileceğim bir şey yok.

APPENDIX E

COVID-19 Stress Scale

1. Sağlık sorunlarınız var mı? (Örn., hipertansiyon, diyabet, kanser, astım) Evet () Hayır

() Söylemek istemiyorum ()

KOVID-19 sürecinde bu sağlık sorunlarınız nedeniyle ne kadar endişeli hissediyorsunuz?

- Hiç endişelenmiyorum
- Biraz endişeleniyorum
- Orta derecede endişeleniyorum
- Çok endişeleniyorum
- Aşırı derece endişeleniyorum

2. Size KOVID-19 teşhisi konuldu mu? Evet () Hayır ()

Bu teşhis durumu sizi ne kadar endişeli hissettiriyor?

- Hiç endişelenmiyorum
- Biraz endişeleniyorum
- Orta derecede endişeleniyorum
- Çok endişeleniyorum
- Aşırı derece endişeleniyorum

3. Evinizde herhangi birisine KOVID-19 teşhisi konuldu mu? Evet () Hayır ()

Bu teşhis durumu sizi ne kadar endişeli hissettiriyor?

- Hiç endişelenmiyorum
- Biraz endişeleniyorum
- Orta derecede endişeleniyorum
- Çok endişeleniyorum
- Aşırı derece endişeleniyorum

4. Bir aile yakınınız için KOVID-19 teşhisi konuldu mu? Evet () Hayır ()

Bu teşhis durumu sizi ne kadar endişeli hissettiriyor?

- Hiç endişelenmiyorum
- Biraz endişeleniyorum
- Orta derecede endişeleniyorum
- Çok endişeleniyorum
- Aşırı derece endişeleniyorum

5. KOVID-19 salgını kendinizi ve ailenizi hijyen konusunda ne kadar endişeli hissettiriyor?

- Hiç endişelenmiyorum
- Biraz endişeleniyorum
- Orta derecede endişeleniyorum
- Çok endişeleniyorum
- Aşırı derece endişeleniyorum

6. KOVID-19 salgını sürecinde kendinizi ne kadar kaygılı/endişeli hissediyorsunuz?

- Hiç endişelenmiyorum
- Biraz endişeleniyorum
- Orta derecede endişeleniyorum
- Çok endişeleniyorum
- Aşırı derece endişeleniyorum

7. KOVID-19 sürecinde evinizde herhangi bir aile üyesi, virüs sebebiyle işinde değişiklik yapmak zorunda kaldı mı?
- Hayır. (Aynı işi hala aynı şekilde evden çalışarak yapmakta)
 - Kısmi olarak (Çalışmıyor ancak yaptığı iş kadarıyla ödeme yapılıyor veya daha az çalışmak zorunda)
 - Kısmi olarak (Normalden daha çok çalışmak zorunda)
 - Evet. Kesinlikle (İşini kaybetti veya işini devam ettiremiyor)
8. Evin tüm aile üyeleri düşünüldüğünde, herhangi biriniz KOVID-19 salgını dolayısıyla gelirini kaybetti mi?
- Evet. Tamamen
 - Kısmi olarak
 - Hayır

Ailenizde meydana gelen gelir eksilmesi durumu sizi ne kadar endişeli hissettiriyor?

- Hiç endişelenmiyorum
 - Biraz endişeleniyorum
 - Orta derecede endişeleniyorum
 - Çok endişeleniyorum
 - Aşırı derece endişeleniyorum
9. Aile için aldığınız KOVID-19 odaklı önlemler, aile içi diğer üyeler ile ilişkinizdeki çatışmayı artırıyor mu? Evet () hayır ()

Aile üyelerinizle yaşadığınız bu çatışmalar sizi ne kadar endişeli hissettiriyor?

- Hiç endişelenmiyorum
 - Biraz endişeleniyorum
 - Orta derecede endişeleniyorum
 - Çok endişeleniyorum
 - Aşırı derece endişeleniyorum
10. Genel olarak, KOVID-19 salgını günlük yaşamınızda nasıl bir değişiklik oluşturdu?
- Hiç değişmedi (Salgın öncesi günlük yaşamım nasılsa salgın sonrası da öyle devam ediyor)
 - Az değişti (Salgın öncesi yaptığım çok az şey salgın sonrasında değişti)
 - Orta düzeyde değişti (Salgın öncesi yaptığım bazı şeyler salgın sonrasında değişti)
 - Çoğu şey değişti (Salgın öncesi yaptığım çoğu şey salgından sonra değişti)
 - Büyük bir değişiklik (Salgın öncesi yaptığım her şey salgından sonra değişti)

REFERENCES

- Acar, I. H., Kumru, A., Arıkan, G., & Ünsal, F. Ö. (2020). Kovid-19 salgını bağlamında ebeveynlerin bireysel, ailesel ve çevresel stres faktörlerinin çocukların psikolojik sağlığı üzerindeki etkilerinin incelenmesi. TÜBİTAK Proje No: 120K387
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1969). Maternal sensitivity scales. *Power*, 6, 1379-1388.
- Adadms, E. L., Smith, D., Caccavale, L. J., & Bean, M. K. (2021). Parents are stressed! Patterns of parent stress across COVID-19. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 12, 300.
- Ahmetoglu, E., Ilhan Ildiz, G., Acar, I. H., & Encinger, A. (2018). Children's emotion regulation and attachment to parents: Parental emotion socialization as a Moderator. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 46(6), 969-984. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6795>
- Aldao, A., Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Schweizer, S. (2010). Emotion regulation strategies across psychopathology: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30, 217–237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2009.11.004>
- Are, F., & Shaffer, A. (2016). Family emotion expressiveness mediates the relations between maternal emotion regulation and child emotion regulation. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 47(5), 708-715. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-015-0605-4>
- Bariola, E., Hughes, E. K., & Gullone, E. (2012). Relationships between parent and child emotion regulation strategy use: A brief report. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 21(3), 443-448.
- Batum, P. ve Yağmurlu, B. (2007). What counts in externalizing behaviors? The contributions of emotion and behavior regulation. *Current Psychology*, 25(4), 272–294.
- Benga, O., Susa-Erdogan, G., Friedlmeier, W., Corapci, F., & Romonti, M. (2019). Maternal self-construal, maternal socialization of emotions and child emotion regulation in a

sample of Romanian mother-toddler dyads. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 2680.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02680>

Benzies, K. M., Harrison, M. J., & Magill-Evans, J. (1998). Impact of marital quality and parent-infant interaction on preschool behavior problems. *Public Health Nursing*, 15(1), 35-43. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1446.1998.tb00319.x>

Blair, C., & Raver, C. C. (2012). Child development in the context of adversity: Experiential canalization of brain and behavior. *American Psychologist*, 67(4), 309–318. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027493>

Bloch, L., Haase, C. M., & Levenson, R. W. (2014). Emotion regulation predicts marital satisfaction: More than a wives' tale. *Emotion*, 14(1), 130–144.

Brazendale, K., Beets, M. W., Weaver, R. G., Pate, R. R., Turner-McGrievy, G. M., Kaczynski, A. T., ... & von Hippel, P. T. (2017). Understanding differences between summer vs. school obesogenic behaviors of children: the structured days hypothesis. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 14(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-017-0555-2>

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard university press.

Calkins, S. D., Gill, K. L., Johnson, M. C., & Smith, C. L. (1999). Emotional reactivity and emotional regulation strategies as predictors of social behavior with peers during toddlerhood. *Social development*, 8(3), 310-334. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00098>

Calvano, C., Engelke, L., Di Bella, J., Kindermann, J., Renneberg, B., & Winter, S. M. (2021). Families in the COVID-19 pandemic: parental stress, parent mental health and the occurrence of adverse childhood experiences—results of a representative

survey in Germany. *European child & adolescent psychiatry*, 1-13.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-021-01739-0>

Carreras, J., Carter, A. S., Heberle, A., Forbes, D., & Gray, S. A. (2019). Emotion regulation and parent distress: Getting at the heart of sensitive parenting among parents of preschool children experiencing high sociodemographic risk. *Journal of child and family studies*, 28(11), 2953-2962. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-019-01471-z>

Cluver, L., Lachman, J. M., Sherr, L., Wessels, I., Krug, E., Rakotomalala, S., ... & McDonald, K. (2020). Parenting in a time of COVID-19. *Lancet*, 395(10231). doi: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30736-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30736-4)

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral science* (2nd Ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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(2), 317-333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2004.00673.x>

Cole, P. M., Zahn-Waxler, C., & Smith, K. D. (1994). Expressive control during a disappointment: Variations related to preschoolers' behavior problems. *Developmental Psychology*, 30(6), 835–846. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.30.6.835>

Cole, P. M., Zahn-Waxler, C., Fox, N. A., Usher, B. A., & Welsh, J. D. (1996). Individual differences in emotion regulation and behavior problems in preschool children. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 105(4), 518–529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.105.4.518>

Conger, R. D., & Elder, G. H., Jr. (Eds.), (1994). *Families in troubled times: Adapting to change in rural America*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

- Cox, M. J., & Paley, B. (2003). Understanding families as systems. *Current directions in psychological science*, 12(5), 193-196. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.01259>
- Cui, M., & Conger, R. D. (2008). Parenting behavior as mediator and moderator of the association between marital problems and adolescent maladjustment. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 18(2), 261-284. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2008.00560.x>
- Cummings, E. M., & Davies, P. T. (2002). Effects of marital conflict on children: Recent advances and emerging themes in process-oriented research. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry*, 43(1), 31-63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-7610.00003>
- Cummings, E. M., Goeke-Morey, M. C., & Papp, L. M. (2002). A family-wide model for the role of emotion in family functioning. *Marriage & Family Review*, 34(1-2), 13-34. https://doi.org/10.1300/J002v34n01_02
- Davies, P. T., & Cummings, E. M. (1994). Marital conflict and child adjustment: an emotional security hypothesis. *Psychological bulletin*, 116(3), 387.
- Davies, P. T., Hentges, R. F., Coe, J. L., Martin, M. J., Sturge-Apple, M. L., & Cummings, E. M. (2016). The multiple faces of interparental conflict: Implications for cascades of children's insecurity and externalizing problems. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 125(5), 664–678. <https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000170>
- Davies, P. T., Sturge-Apple, M. L., Cicchetti, D., Manning, L. G., & Zale, E. (2009). Children's patterns of emotional reactivity to conflict as explanatory mechanisms in links between interpartner aggression and child physiological functioning. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 50, 1384-1391. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.14697610.2009.02154.x>
- Deater-Deckard, K. (2004). *Parenting stress*. Yale University Press. <https://doi.org/10.12987/yale/9780300103939.001.0001>

- Denham, S. A., & Burton, R. (2003). Assessing emotional and social competence during preschool years. In *Social and emotional prevention and intervention programming for preschoolers* (pp. 183-207). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Denham, S. A., Mitchell-Copeland, J., Strandberg, K., Auerbach, S., & Blair, K. (1998). Parental contributions to preschoolers' emotional competence: Direct and indirect effects. *Motivation and Emotion*, 21(1), 65–86.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024426431247>
- Diener, M. L., & Kim, D. (2004). Maternal and child predictors of preschool children's social competence. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 25, 3–24.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2003.11.006>
- Dix, T. (1991). The affective organization of parenting: Adaptive and maladaptive processes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110(1), 3–25. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.110.1.3>
- Eisenberg, N., Zhou, Q., Spinrad, T. L., Valiente, C., Fabes, R. A., & Liew, J. (2005). Relations among positive parenting, children's effortful control, and externalizing problems: A three-wave longitudinal study. *Child Development*, 76, 1055-1071.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00897.x>
- Fauber, R., Forehand, R., Thomas, A. M., & Wierson, M. (1990). A mediational model of the impact of marital conflict on adolescent adjustment in intact and divorced families: The role of disrupted parenting. *Child Development*, 61, 1112–1123.
- Fıfıloğlu, H., & Demir, A. (2000). Applicability of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale for measurement of marital quality with Turkish couples. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 16(3), 214.
- Fiese, B. H., Celano, M. E., Deater-Deckard, K. E., Jouriles, E. N., & Whisman, M. A. (Eds.). (2019). *APA handbook of contemporary family psychology: Foundations, methods, and*

contemporary issues across the lifespan (Vol. 1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0000099-000>

Fosco, G. M., & Grych, J. H. (2013). Capturing the family context of emotion regulation: A family systems model comparison approach. *Journal of Family Issues*, 34(4), 557-578. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X12445889>

Gallegos, M. I., Murphy, S. E., Benner, A. D., Jacobvitz, D. B., & Hazen, N. L. (2017). Marital, parental, and whole-family predictors of toddlers' emotion regulation: The role of parental emotional withdrawal. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 31(3), 294–303. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000245>

Garber, J., & Dodge, K. A. (Eds.). (1991). *The development of emotion regulation and dysregulation*. Cambridge University Press.

Goldberg, W. A., & Easterbrooks, M. (1984). Role of marital quality in toddler development. *Developmental psychology*, 20(3).

Gross, J. J. (2013). Emotion regulation: Taking stock and moving forward. *Emotion*, 13(3), 359–365. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032135>

Gross, J. J. (2014). Emotion regulation: Conceptual and empirical foundations. In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of emotion regulation* (pp. 3–20). The Guilford Press.

Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 85(2), 348. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.348>

Gross, J. J., & Thompson, R. A. (2007). Emotion regulation: Conceptual foundations. *Handbook of Emotion Regulation*, (pp. 3-24). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Gülseven, Z., Kumru, A., Carlo, G., Palermo, F., Selcuk, B., & Sayıl, M. (2018). The mediational roles of harsh and responsive parenting in the longitudinal relations between socioeconomic status and Turkish children's emotional

- development. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 42(6), 563-573.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025418783279>
- Haase, C. M. (2014). Emotion regulation in intimate relationships. *Society for the Study of Behavioral Development*, 1(65), 17-21.
- Hajal, N. J., & Paley, B. (2020). Parental emotion and emotion regulation: A critical target of study for research and intervention to promote child emotion socialization. *Developmental Psychology*, 56(3), 403–417. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000864>
- Halberstadt, A. G., & Eaton, K. L. (2002). A meta-analysis of family expressiveness and children's emotion expressiveness and understanding. *Marriage & Family Review*, 34(1-2), 35-62. https://doi.org/10.1300/J002v34n01_03
- Havighurst, S. S. (2003). *Shaping emotional competence in preschoolers with behaviour problems* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Hayes, A. F. (2012). PROCESS: A versatile computational tool for observed variable mediation, moderation, and conditional process modeling [White paper]. Retrieved from <http://www.afhayes.com/public/process2012.pdf>
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis a regression-based approach*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Highlander, A., Zachary, C., Jenkins, K., Loiselle, R., McCall, M., Youngstrom, J., ... & Jones, D. J. (2021). Clinical Presentation and Treatment of Early-Onset Behavior Disorders: The Role of Parent Emotion Regulation, Emotion Socialization, and Family Income. *Behavior Modification*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/01454455211036001>
- Humphreys, K. L., King, L. S., Guyon-Harris, K. L., & Zeanah, C. H. (2022). Caregiver regulation: A modifiable target promoting resilience to early adverse

experiences. *Psychological trauma: theory, research, practice, and policy*.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tra0001111>

Kalpidou, M. D., Power, T. G., Cherry, K. E., & Gottfried, N. W. (2004). Regulation of emotion and behavior among 3-and 5-year-olds. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 131(2), 159-178. <https://doi.org/10.3200/GENP.131.2.159-180>

Kao, K., Tuladhar, C. T., & Tarullo, A. R. (2020). Parental and family-level sociocontextual correlates of emergent emotion regulation: Implications for early social competence. *Journal of child and family studies*, 29(6), 1630-1641.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-020-01706-4>

Kerig, P. K. (1996). Assessing the links between interparental conflict and child adjustment: The conflicts and problem-solving scales. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 10(4), 454–473. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.10.4.454>

Kerr, M. L., Rasmussen, H. F., Smiley, P. A., Buttitta, K. V., & Borelli, J. L. (2021). The development of toddlers' emotion regulation within the family system: Associations with observed parent-child synchrony and interparental relationship satisfaction. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 57, 215-227.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2021.06.004>

Kim, B. R., Teti, D. M., & Cole, P. M. (2012). Mothers' affect dysregulation, depressive symptoms, and emotional availability during mother–infant interaction. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 33(5), 469-476. <https://doi.org/10.1002/imhj.21326>

Kirby, J. S., & Baucom, D. H. (2007). Treating emotion dysregulation in a couples context: A pilot study of a couples skills group intervention. *Journal of marital and family therapy*, 33(3), 375-391. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2007.00037.x>

Kline, R. B. (2010). *Principles and practices of structural equation modelling* (3rd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

- Kopp, C. B. (1989). Regulation of distress and negative emotions: A developmental view. *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 343–354. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.25.3.343>
- Lai, J. (2020). *Parent difficulties in emotion regulation: Associations with parent emotion socialization and child emotion regulation* (Order No. 28152345). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2555979545).
- Lemerise, E. A., & Dodge, K. A. (1993). The development of anger and hostile interactions. In M. Lewis, & J. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotion* (pp. 537–546). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Lindblom, J., Vänskä, M., Flykt, M., Tolvanen, A., Tiitinen, A., Tulppala, M., & Punamäki, R.-L. (2017). From early family systems to internalizing symptoms: The role of emotion regulation and peer relations. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 31(3), 316–326. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000260>
- López-Pérez, B., & Pacella, D. (2021). Interpersonal emotion regulation in children: Age, gender, and cross-cultural differences using a serious game. *Emotion*, 21(1), 17–27. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000690>
- MacKinnon, D. P., Fairchild, A. J., & Fritz, M. S. (2007). Mediation analysis. *Annual review of psychology*, 58, 593–614. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085542>
- Melim, B., Matias, M., Ferreira, T., & Matos, P. M. (2019). Parent's and Children's Emotion Regulation and the Work–Family Interface. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 81(5), 1110–1125. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12597>
- Milojevich, H. M., Machlin, L., & Sheridan, M. A. (2020). Early adversity and children's emotion regulation: Differential roles of parent emotion regulation and adversity exposure. *Development and Psychopathology*, 32(5), 1788–1798. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579420001273>.

Minuchin P. 1988. Relationships within the family: a systems perspective on development.

See Hinde & Stevenson-Hinde 1988, pp. 7–26

Morelli, M., Graziano, F., Chirumbolo, A., Baiocco, R., Longobardi, E., Trumello, C., ... &

Cattelino, E. (2022). Parental Mediation of COVID-19 News and Children's Emotion Regulation during Lockdown. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 1-13.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-022-02266-5>

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. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2007.00389.x>

Muraven, M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle? *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 247–259.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.2.247>.

Özgüle, E. T. U., & Sümer, N. (2017). Ergenlikte duygu düzenleme ve psikolojik uyum: duygu düzenleme ölçeğinin türkçe uyarlaması. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 20(40), 1-18.

Pallant, J. (2016). Survival manual. *A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS*, 4.

Penela, E. C., Walker, O. L., Degnan, K. A., Fox, N. A., & Henderson, H. A. (2015). Early behavioral inhibition and emotion regulation: Pathways toward social competence in middle childhood. *Child Development*, 86(4), 1227-1240.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12384>

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments & Computers*, 36(4), 717–731. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03206553>

Premo, J. E., & Kiel, E. J. (2014). The effect of toddler emotion regulation on maternal emotion socialization: Moderation by toddler gender. *Emotion*, 14(4), 782–793. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036684>

- Preuss, H., Capito, K., van Eickels, R. L., Zemp, M., & Kolar, D. R. (2021). Cognitive reappraisal and self-compassion as emotion regulation strategies for parents during COVID-19: An online randomized controlled trial. *Internet interventions*, 24, 100388. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.invent.2021.100388>
- Prime, H., Wade, M., & Browne, D. T. (2020). Risk and resilience in family well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic. *American Psychologist*, 75(5), 631–643. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000660>
- Qian, Y., Chen, F., & Yuan, C. (2020). The effect of co-parenting on children's emotion regulation under fathers' perception: A moderated mediation model of family functioning and marital satisfaction. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 119, 105501. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105501>
- Ramsden, S., & Hubbard, J. (2002). Family expressiveness and parental emotion coaching: Their role in children's emotion regulation and aggression. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 30, 657–667.
- Restubog, S. L. D., Ocampo, A. C. G., & Wang, L. (2020). Taking control amidst the chaos: Emotion regulation during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 119, 103440. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103440>
- Rick, J. L., Falconier, M. K., & Wittenborn, A. K. (2017). Emotion regulation dimensions and relationship satisfaction in clinical couples. *Personal Relationships*, 24(4), 790-803. <https://doi.org/10.1111/perc.12213>
- Romero, E., López-Romero, L., Domínguez-Álvarez, B., Villar, P., & Gómez-Fraguela, J. A. (2020). Testing the effects of COVID-19 confinement in Spanish children: The role of parents' distress, emotional problems and specific parenting. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 17(19), 6975. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17196975>

- Rutherford, H. J., Wallace, N. S., Laurent, H. K., & Mayes, L. C. (2015). Emotion regulation in parenthood. *Developmental Review*, 36, 1-14.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2014.12.008>
- Salters-Pedneault, K., Steenkamp, M., & Litz, B. T. (2010). Suppression. In A. M. Kring & D. M. Sloan (Eds.), *Emotion regulation and psychopathology: A transdiagnostic approach to etiology and treatment* (pp. 137–156). The Guilford Press.
- Schermerhorn, A. C., Cummings, E. M., DeCarlo, C. A., & Davies, P. T. (2007). Children's influence in the marital relationship. *Journal of Family psychology*, 21(2), 259.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.21.2.259>
- Schoemann, A. M., Boulton, A. J., & Short, S. D. (2017). Determining power and sample size for simple and complex mediation models. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 8(4), 379-386. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617715068>
- Shields, A., & Cicchetti, D. (1997). Emotion regulation among school-age children: The development and validation of a new criterion Q-sort scale. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(6), 906–916. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.33.6.906>
- Silk, J. S., Shaw, D. S., Skuban, E. M., Oland, A. A., & Kovacs, M. (2006). Emotion regulation strategies in offspring of childhood-onset depressed mothers. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 47(1), 69-78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2005.01440.x>
- Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 15-28.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/350547>
- Spinelli, M., Lionetti, F., Pastore, M., & Fasolo, M. (2020). Parents' stress and children's psychological problems in families facing the COVID-19 outbreak in Italy. *Frontiers in psychology*, 11, 1713. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01713>

Spinelli, M., Lionetti, F., Setti, A., & Fasolo, M. (2021). Parenting stress during the COVID-19 outbreak: Socioeconomic and environmental risk factors and implications for children emotion regulation. *Family process*, 60(2), 639-653.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12601>

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). Using multivariate statistics: International edition. *Pearson*, 2012, 1.

Taubman–Ben-Ari, O., Ben-Yaakov, O., & Chasson, M. (2021). Parenting stress among new parents before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Child abuse & neglect*, 117, 105080. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2021.105080>

Thompson, R. A. (1994). Emotion regulation: A theme in search of definition. In N. A. Fox (Ed.), *The Development of Emotion Regulation: Behavioral and Biological Considerations* (Vol. 59, pp. 25–52). Chicago, IL: Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development.

Thompson, R. A. (2011). Emotion and emotion regulation: Two sides of the developing coin. *Emotion Review*, 3(1), 53-61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073910380969>

Thompson, R. A., & Meyer, S. (2007). Socialization of emotion regulation in the family. In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of Emotion Regulation* (pp. 249–268). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Ursu, A., & Turliuc, M. N. (2020). Do emotion recognition and emotion regulation predict dyadic adjustment? The moderating role of relationship length. *Journal of Psychological & Educational Research*, 28(1).

van Eldik, W. M., de Haan, A. D., Parry, L. Q., Davies, P. T., Luijk, M. P., Arends, L. R., & Prinzie, P. (2020). The interparental relationship: Meta-analytic associations with children's maladjustment and responses to interparental conflict. *Psychological Bulletin*, 146(7), 553.

Velotti, P., Balzarotti, S., Tagliabue, S., English, T., Zavattini, G. C., & Gross, J. J. (2016).

Emotional suppression in early marriage: Actor, partner, and similarity effects on marital quality. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 33(3), 277–

302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407515574466>

Werner, K., & Gross, J. J. (2010). Emotion regulation and psychopathology: A conceptual

framework. In A. M. Kring & D. M. Sloan (Eds.), *Emotion regulation and*

psychopathology: A transdiagnostic approach to etiology and treatment (pp. 13–37).

The Guilford Press.

Yagmurlu, B., & Altan, O. (2010). Maternal socialization and child temperament as predictors

of emotion regulation in Turkish preschoolers. *Infant and Child Development: An International Journal of Research and Practice*, 19(3), 275-296.

Yurtsever, G. (2004). Emotional Regulation Strategies and Negotiation. *Psychological*

Reports, 95(3), 780–786. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.95.3.780-786>