



HAL
open science

The Impact of Developing Social Perspective-taking Skills on Emotionality in Middle and Late Childhood

Hans Bengtsson, Åsa Arvidsson

► **To cite this version:**

Hans Bengtsson, Åsa Arvidsson. The Impact of Developing Social Perspective-taking Skills on Emotionality in Middle and Late Childhood. *Social Development*, 2011, 20 (2), pp.353. 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2010.00587.x . hal-00609006

HAL Id: hal-00609006

<https://hal.science/hal-00609006>

Submitted on 17 Jul 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**The Impact of Developing Social Perspective-taking Skills
on Emotionality in Middle and Late Childhood**

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>Social Development</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | SODE-09-0151.R1 |
| Manuscript Type: | Original Manuscript |
| Keywords: | Perspective-taking, Emotion regulation, Middle childhood, Emotion |
| | |



Abstract

A sample of 209 children was followed longitudinally to examine the impact of growing perspective-taking skills on positive and negative emotionality in middle and late childhood. Perspective-taking skills were assessed through interviews. Teachers rated children's emotional reactivity and capacity to regain a neutral state following emotional arousal. Analyses of contemporaneous data revealed that more developed perspective-taking skills were associated with moderate levels of emotional reactivity. In addition, in children with high emotional reactivity, good perspective-taking skills were associated with good capacity to regain a neutral affective state following emotional arousal. Longitudinal analyses revealed that children who made gains in perspective-taking skills over a two-year-period became more moderate in negative emotional reactivity and improved their ability to down-regulate strong positive emotions. The overall findings support the notion that children use perspective-taking skills as a tool for optimal regulation of emotional responses.

Key words: Perspective taking, Emotion, Emotion regulation, Middle childhood, Late childhood.

1
2
3 The Impact of Developing Social Perspective-taking Skills on Emotionality in Middle and
4
5
6 Late Childhood

7
8 Being able to manage one's emotional experience and expression in a flexible and adaptive
9
10 manner is an essential aspect of social competence. Emotion regulation encompasses internal
11
12 and external processes involved in initiating, maintaining, and modulating the occurrence,
13
14 intensity and expression of emotion (Gross & Thompson, 2007; Thompson, 1994). An
15
16 important part of this regulation is accomplished through deployment of attention or the
17
18 inhibition or activation of behavior. Accordingly, several studies have found links between
19
20 skillful regulation of attention and behavior and various indices of social competence and
21
22 adjustment in children (see Eisenberg, Hofer, & Vaughan, 2007; Eisenberg, Smith, Sadovsky,
23
24 & Spinrad, 2004; Rothbart & Bates, 2006, for reviews). However, cognitive processes other
25
26 than attention play a role in the regulation of emotional experiences as well. Such processes
27
28 influence the interpretation of situations and feelings aroused in these situations and help in
29
30 guiding decisions, such as deliberately using behavioral or mental efforts to modulate an
31
32 emotional response (Lerner & Arsenio, 2000; Ochsner & Gross, 2005). Although it is
33
34 likely that children's emotional responses are affected by developmental changes in the
35
36 cognitive competency with which they process social cues and understand emotions, few
37
38 longitudinal studies have investigated developmental links between socio-cognitive skills and
39
40 regulatory aspects of children's emotional response (Eisenberg, Champion, & Ma, 2004). The
41
42 purpose of the present study was to address this gap in the literature by examining how social
43
44 perspective-taking skills affect emotionality in middle and late childhood. Possible cross-
45
46 sectional as well as longitudinal associations were investigated.

47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55 *Emotionality, Emotion Regulation, and Social Adjustment*

56
57 Emotionality is difficult to distinguish from its regulation (Cole, Martin, & Dennis, 2004;
58
59 Gross & Thompson, 2007). According to temperament theorists, individuals who are high in
60

1
2
3 emotionality frequently experience and/or express positive and negative emotions; these
4
5 emotions are often of high intensity and slowly return to baseline (Rothbart & Bates, 1998).
6
7 Although definitions of emotionality generally refer in this way to individual differences in
8
9 thresholds of reaction, latency, intensity and recovery time, some researchers have
10
11 conceptualized falling reactivity (rate of recovery from emotional arousal) as an aspect of
12
13 emotion regulation rather than emotionality (e.g., Rydell, Berlin, & Bohlin, 2003). However,
14
15 treating falling reactivity as an aspect of emotionality is in agreement with findings in factor
16
17 analyses showing that reactivity and falling reactivity tend to load on one factor, while
18
19 measures of attentional and behavioral regulation load on a second factor (Eisenberg et al.,
20
21 1995; Murphy, Shephard, Eisenberg, & Fabes, 2004). In the current study, we conceptualize
22
23 emotional reactivity and falling reactivity as two aspects of emotionality and we investigate
24
25 whether either of these aspects is influenced by social perspective-taking skills. This
26
27 conceptualization is consistent with the view that emotion generation involves a sequence of
28
29 processes, each of which can be modified as part of emotion regulation (Eisenberg, Fabes,
30
31 Guthrie, & Reisner, 2000; Gross & Thompson, 2007; Thompson, 1994).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Positive and negative emotionality are included in models of temperament (Evans &
40
41 Rothbart, 2009; Rothbart & Bates, 2006) and display moderate stability across time as the
42
43 child develops (Sallquist et al., 2009; Wachs, 2006). Both characteristics have been studied
44
45 extensively in relation to social adjustment. Negative emotionality tends to be negatively
46
47 related to indices of social competence (Eisenberg et al., 1993; Eisenberg, Fabes, Karbon et
48
49 al., 1996; Eisenberg et al., 1995) and positively related to internalizing symptoms and
50
51 externalizing symptoms (Eisenberg, Fabes, Guthrie et al., 1996; Eisenberg et al., 2001;
52
53 Lengua, 2003; Muris & Ollendick, 2005). The implications of children's emotionality for
54
55 social functioning, however, depend on their regulatory skills. Social adjustment benefits
56
57 from good regulation of attention and behavior, particularly in children who are very high in
58
59
60

1
2
3 negative emotional reactivity and intensity (Belsky, Friedman, & Hsieh, 2001; Diener & Kim,
4
5 2004; Eisenberg, Fabes, Guthrie et al., 1996; Eisenberg, Fabes et al., 2000; Eisenberg, Guthrie
6
7 et al., 1997; Eisenberg, Guthrie et al., 2000; Eisenberg et al., 2003; Stifter, Spinrad, &
8
9 Braungart-Ricker, 1999). In fact, when effectively regulated, negative emotions may
10
11 positively contribute to social competence by facilitating empathy and the development of
12
13 conscience (Eisenberg et al., 1998; Kochanska, 1997; Rothbart, Ahadi, & Hershey, 1994).
14
15 Very low intensity of affective response predicts poor social adjustment, particularly in
16
17 combination with low effortful control of attention and behavior (Frick & White, 2008;
18
19 Kochanska, Barry, Jimenez; Hollatz, & Woodard, 2009).
20
21
22
23

24
25 Moderate levels of positive emotionality and a happy mood have also been associated with
26
27 positive outcomes, including prosocial behavior (Eisenberg, Fabes, Murphy et al., 1996),
28
29 social adjustment (Lengua, West & Sandler, 1998) and peer popularity (Denham, McKinley,
30
31 Cochoud, & Holt, 1990). However, intense positive affect and exuberance, and problems with
32
33 down-regulation of positive affect, tend to be associated with disruptive behaviors (Eisenberg,
34
35 Fabes, Guthrie et al., 1996; Rothbart, Ahadi, & Hershey, 1994; Rydell et al., 2003). Thus,
36
37 skillful regulation of both positive and negative affect contributes to social adjustment in
38
39 children.
40
41
42

43 *Cognitive Regulation of Emotion in Middle and Late Childhood*

44

45
46 Six-year-olds are aware of the fact that emotions are internal states that can be intentionally
47
48 modified with regard to subjective experience and outward expression (Saarni, 1999).
49
50 However, during the elementary school years, there is a marked increase in children's
51
52 understanding and use of cognitive strategies for emotion regulation (Altshuler & Ruble,
53
54 1989; Band & Weisz, 1988; Losoya, Eisenberg, & Fabes, 1998; Rice, Levine, & Pizarro,
55
56 2007). Prior studies have investigated children's use of cognitive strategies to regulate
57
58 ongoing emotion during this age period, primarily in relation to coping with problems and
59
60

1
2
3 stress. Findings from this research indicate that social competence and psychological
4
5 adjustment in middle and late childhood are associated with the use of more constructive
6
7 cognitive types of coping such as problem solving, cognitive restructuring, and positive
8
9 reappraisal of the stressor (Compas, Connor, Saltzman, Thomsen, & Wadsworth, 2001;
10
11 Reijntjes, Stegge, Meerum Terwogt, & Hurkens, 2007). These findings are consistent with the
12
13 adult literature, where several studies have indicated that using cognitive reappraisal is an
14
15 effective means of moderating emotional responses (John & Gross, 2007). They are also in
16
17 line with findings from research on children's use of cognitive emotion regulation strategies
18
19 in empathy, which indicate that children with a high capacity for empathic concern and
20
21 considerate behavior tend to use cognitive reappraisal to moderate the intensity of their
22
23 empathic response (Bengtsson, 2003).
24
25
26
27
28

29 *The Present Study*

30
31 From a developmental and clinical perspective, it is essential to identify the developmental
32
33 changes in cognitive processes that make children better equipped to manage their feelings.
34
35 Cognitive regulation can be expected to follow a developmental course, such that growing
36
37 skills and capacities open up new ways to control emotional experience and expression by
38
39 changing a situation's meaning in ways that alter its emotional impact (Denham, 1998; Kopp,
40
41 1989; Saarni, 1999). In the present study, we investigated the potential effects of perspective-
42
43 taking skills, and growth in perspective-taking skills, on emotionality in middle and late
44
45 childhood. Often, the term perspective taking refers to cognitive processes which result in
46
47 knowledge about others' internal states (Eisenberg, Fabes, & Spinrad, 2006). For the purposes
48
49 of the present study, however, we adopted Selman's (1980) paradigm of perspective-taking
50
51 skills, defining perspective taking as the developing capacity to differentiate and integrate
52
53 social perspectives. Thus, we focus on cognitive skills, which not only contribute to an
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 understanding of other people's experiences, but also to an understanding of how different
4
5
6 points of view are related and coordinated with one another.
7

8 Selman and Demorest (1989) provided a detailed account of the ways in which these skills
9
10 comprise an important set of resources on which children can draw in attempting to manage
11
12 emotions in a flexible and adaptive manner. According to their account, perspective taking
13
14 operates at each cognitive step in the processing of social information. Thus, as
15
16 operationalized in their interpersonal negotiation strategies (INS) model, perspective taking
17
18 affects the way the social situation is defined and interpreted, the way alternative responses
19
20 are generated, the selection and implementation of a specific response, and the evaluation of
21
22 outcomes. The perception and control of emotion is conceptualized as an integral part of this
23
24 processing, resting on the four developmental levels of perspective coordination that are
25
26 distinguished in the model.
27
28
29
30

31 At the lowest level of perspective taking (Level 0), emotional states are experienced as
32
33 diffuse. There is no reflection on feelings as distinct entities and therefore no sense of
34
35 deliberate control over feelings. Feelings control the self rather than the reverse, and
36
37 emotional states are directly expressed in impulsive action. At Level 1, emotional states are
38
39 recognized as distinct entities of a time-limited and transitory nature. Feeling is perceived as
40
41 an objective necessity, but there is a rudimentary understanding that feelings can be controlled
42
43 and changed deliberately by acting on external events or persons perceived to be the causes.
44
45 However, there is still no understanding that feelings can be regulated mentally. At Level 2 in
46
47 the INS model, children recognize conflicting concerns within the self or between two
48
49 individuals in a given context. This allows feelings to be moderated by putting things in a
50
51 relativistic perspective. For example, the child may use mental effort to deal with a perceived
52
53 conflict between subjective perspectives by prioritizing one perspective over the other. Or the
54
55 child may deliberately modulate feelings through the use of mentalistic strategies, for example
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 using role-taking to increase empathic feelings. At Level 3, finally, a given situation may be
4
5 construed by differentiating and relating multiple aspects, allowing the emotional response to
6
7 be understood and modulated by ordering and prioritizing feelings, within the self or between
8
9 self and other, or by putting these various feelings into the perspective of a relationship or a
10
11 larger social context. The preferred mode of control at this level is proposed to be working
12
13 through one's feelings using active reflection. Within this framework, perspective-taking
14
15 ability develops throughout childhood and into adolescence, with the highest levels of
16
17 perspective taking sometimes never being reached by the individual (Selman et al., 1986). In
18
19 **reflective interviews, Level 1 emerges in the preschool years, Level 2 at about the age of 7 or**
20
21 **8, and Level 3 at about the age of 10 or 11 (Selman, 1980).**

22
23
24
25
26
27 We assessed social perspective-taking skills through individual interviews with the
28
29 children, which took place in three occasions during a two-year period (**henceforth labelled**
30
31 **T1 for Time 1, T2 for Time 2 and T3 for Time 3**). The interviews were examined,
32
33 concurrently as well as longitudinally, in relation to teacher ratings of children's dispositional
34
35 emotionality. In these analyses, emotionality was divided conceptually into two distinct but
36
37 related aspects: *Emotional reactivity*, which refers to the frequency and intensity of emotional
38
39 reactions, and *Falling reactivity*, which refers to how easily a normal affective state is
40
41 regained following a temporary state of emotional arousal. This conceptual distinction is
42
43 important to make because emotional arousal may be subjected to regulation during both of
44
45 these phases in ways that are varyingly optimal in relation to separate, socially defined
46
47 standards.
48
49
50
51

52 *Hypotheses*

53
54
55 **Children's emotionality is likely to be determined by several underlying factors, such as**
56
57 **their constitutionally based reactive tendency, social experiences, and tendency to engage in**
58
59 **automatic, or deliberately executed effortful control of emotion (Rothbart & Bates, 2006). Our**
60

1
2
3 general working assumption was that children may use perspective-taking skills to modulate
4 their emotional responses in a way that is consistent with effective and adaptive outcomes. By
5 using these skills, children may figure out when emotional expression is appropriate and how
6 to express emotion in a manner that fits with the social context. Moreover, they may use their
7 perspective-taking skills to deliberately “up”- or “down”-regulate their emotions depending
8 on their goals.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 Low to moderate emotional reactivity seems to be more optimal for social functioning than
18 are very low or high levels of reactivity (Baumeister, Zell, & Tice, 2007; Cole, Michel, & Teti,
19 1994; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1992; Eisenberg, Fabes et al., 2000; Pessoa, 2009). Therefore,
20 based on our supposition that high perspective-taking skills would contribute to adaptive
21 levels of reactivity, we hypothesized that high perspective-taking skills would be associated
22 with relatively moderate levels of emotional reactivity, whereas both very high and very low
23 levels of emotional reactivity would be associated with low levels of perspective-taking skills.
24 This means that children with frequent and strong emotional responses will lack perspective-
25 taking skills that would allow them to moderate their emotional reactivity and that children
26 with very low emotional reactivity will lack sufficient perspective-taking skills to stimulate
27 emotional responses.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 Our longitudinal design allowed us to test not only concurrent associations between
45 perspective taking and emotionality, but also whether growth in perspective-taking capacity is
46 associated with changes in emotional reactivity over time. We tested two primary longitudinal
47 hypotheses. Firstly, we examined whether high initial perspective-taking skills at T1 would
48 predict change in the direction of more moderate emotional reactivity over time (T1 – T3).
49 Thus, we examined whether perspective-taking skills at T1 were related to emotional
50 reactivity at T3 when controlling for emotional reactivity at T1. Secondly, we examined how
51 change in perspective taking over time (T1 – T3) was related to change in emotional reactivity
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 over time (T1 – T3). We anticipated that an age-related increase in the capacity to
4
5 differentiate and coordinate social perspectives would be associated with a move away from
6
7 more extreme levels of emotional reactivity toward more moderate levels.
8
9

10 Although our working assumption was that perspective taking would influence emotional
11
12 reactivity rather than the reverse, we recognized that bidirectional influences may also exist
13
14 between the two variables. Emotional reactivity may be too high, or too low, to stimulate the
15
16 use or growth of perspective-taking skills (Lemerise & Arsenio, 2000). Therefore, for control
17
18 purposes, we also examined statistically the influence of emotional reactivity at T1 on
19
20 developmental gains in perspective-taking capacity from T1 to T3.
21
22
23

24 With respect to falling reactivity, we proposed that optimal cognitive control would allow
25
26 children to down-regulate their feelings easily when needed, either on their own or with the
27
28 assistance of others. Most likely, ease of emotional down-regulation is affected primarily by
29
30 initial reactivity, i.e. it is more difficult to return to a normal state from higher levels of
31
32 emotional arousal than from lower levels. However, beyond this, we expected good cognitive
33
34 control to contribute to quick recovery. Thus, we expected to find a positive relationship
35
36 between social perspective-taking skills and falling reactivity. In addition, we predicted that
37
38 good cognitive skills would be most important for the ability to regain a neutral state in
39
40 children with high emotional reactivity. As already mentioned, several studies have indicated
41
42 that emotional intensity interacts with skillful regulation of attention and behavior (effortful
43
44 control) in predicting positive social functioning, good regulation being most important for
45
46 optimal functioning in children with strong negative emotional intensity (e.g., Eisenberg,
47
48 Fabes et al., 2000). Finally, we hypothesized that improvement over time in the ability to
49
50 regain a neutral state following emotional arousal (T1 – T3) would be predicted by good
51
52 perspective taking skills at T1 as well as by improvement in perspective taking capacity
53
54 between T1 and T3.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Method

Participants

The sample in the present longitudinal study originally consisted of 90 second graders (48 boys and 42 girls, mean age = 8.85 years, $SD = 0.33$) and 119 fourth graders (63 boys and 56 girls, mean age = 10.81, $SD = 0.30$). The children came from three socioeconomically mixed schools in southern Sweden, one situated in the country's third largest city and the other two in small communities in the province surrounding the city. All second and fourth graders at the three schools were invited to participate. To recruit the participants, permission from school principals and teachers was first obtained. Consent forms were then sent home to the parents, with only children who received parental permission and themselves agreed to participate being included in the sample (participation rate 83%).

Data were collected on three occasions (T1, T2, T3), each new data wave being separated by approximately one year. Attrition due to families moving reduced the total sample to $N = 200$ at T2 and to $N = 187$ at T3. Attrition analyses revealed that the mean levels of the study variables did not differ significantly when comparing participants who did not remain in the study to those who did.

Measures

The Interpersonal Negotiating Strategies Interview (Schultz et al., 1989) was used to measure children's capacity to differentiate and coordinate social perspectives. The interview manual contains 12 short child vignettes or dilemmas that portray situations of interpersonal conflict with varying relationship status and familiarity of the story protagonists. Two dilemmas were selected for the present study. One of them involves a child protagonist's interaction with an unfamiliar peer:

1
2
3 “One day a new kid in class named Eric (Ann) says he’s (she’s) cold and asks Peter (Sara) to
4 lend him (her) a sweater that Peter (Sara) has but isn’t wearing. The next day when Eric (Ann)
5 returns the sweater there is a hole in it that Peter (Sara) is sure wasn’t there the day before.”
6
7

8
9
10 The other dilemma describes a child protagonist’s interaction with a familiar peer:

11
12 “Anders (Lisa) and Lars (Maria) are friends. One day at school, they are trying to decide what
13 to do on the weekend. Anders (Lisa) wants to invite the new kid in their class to see a movie
14 with them, but Lars (Maria) says he (she) doesn’t feel like having the new kid along.”
15
16
17

18
19
20 The same two dilemmas were administered at all three assessments. The dilemmas were
21 read individually to the participants and were followed by standard questions and follow-up
22 probes to assess level of perspective taking in four information-processing steps: defining the
23 problem, generating alternative strategies, selecting and implementing a specific strategy, and
24 evaluating outcomes. Children were interviewed in a quiet room at their school. Interviewers
25 were familiar with the INS model and trained by the first author in reading each dilemma,
26 administering standard questions and using good probing techniques in line with the
27 recommendations delineated in the INS interview manual. Interviews lasted about 15 minutes
28 and were audiotaped and later transcribed verbatim. The interview was part of a larger battery
29 of tests and interviews that altogether took about an hour for the child to complete.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 For each information-processing step, responses were scored according to four levels of
44 perspective-taking coordination. Briefly, at Level 0, subjective perspectives are
45 undifferentiated and there is confusion between action and feeling (e.g., “The sweater is the
46 problem; they made a hole in the sweater.”). At Level 1, subjective perspectives are clearly
47 differentiated but they are related only in a one-way, unilateral fashion, for example by
48 considering the impact of one actor on the other (e.g., “He has made the other child sad by
49 making a hole in his sweater.”). At Level 2, perspective taking is self-reflective, allowing
50 perspectives to be considered simultaneously, for example by stepping outside oneself
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 mentally and taking a second-person perspective on one's thoughts and actions (e.g., "The
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
mentally and taking a second-person perspective on one's thoughts and actions (e.g., "The
problem is that they have different opinions, they don't agree with each other."). Level 3,
finally, reflects the ability to take a third-person perspective, allowing persons and
interpersonal relations to be considered as systems where the perspective on relationships
simultaneously includes and coordinates the perspectives of self and other(s) (e.g., "None of
them wants to spoil the chance of getting to know each other better and build a long, lasting
relationship.").

Prior research has established the internal and external validity of the interview, including
structural coherence between the information-processing steps and a link between interview
responses and INS manifested in social action (Selman, Schorin, Stone, & Phelps, 1983;
Yeates, Schultz, & Selman, 1991). INS scores have been found to be lower in maltreated
children and adolescents than in their nonmaltreated peers (Burack et al., 2006), lower in
children with ADHD than in children without ADHD (Marton, Wiener, Rogers, Moore, &
Tannock, 2009), and negatively related to duration of parental affective illness (Beardslee,
Schultz, & Selman, 1987). IQ is positively related to INS scores, but INS accounts for unique
variance in social adjustment when the effect of IQ is controlled for (Beardslee, Schultz, &
Selman, 1987; Selman, Beardslee, Schultz, Krupa, & Podorefsky, 1986).

In the present study, the first author scored all the interviews blind to each participant's
previous scores. To assess interrater reliability, 30 randomly selected protocols (10 from each
data collection wave) were scored independently by both authors. They achieved 78% exact
agreement when scoring the developmental level of responses to each question ($\kappa = .65$).
As a further test of reliability, we examined participants' consistency in reasoning. Scores for
each information-processing step were (a) averaged for each dilemma and compared across
dilemmas ($\alpha = .83$) and (b) averaged for each step across dilemmas and compared across
steps ($\alpha = .92$). Because the consistency in reasoning was high, we used the average score

1
2
3 of the four steps across the two dilemmas in the subsequent analyses. Interrater reliability for
4
5 these scores was .89.
6

7
8 Emotional reactivity and the ability to return to a neutral state following emotional arousal
9
10 were assessed using the Emotion Questionnaire (Rydell et al., 2003), which was slightly
11
12 adapted so that it could be filled in by the participants' teachers instead of their parents. The
13
14 test consists of three subscales for negative emotions (anger, fear, sadness) and one for
15
16 positive emotions and exuberance, each subscale containing four emotional reactivity items
17
18 and six items assessing falling reactivity. Emotional reactivity is rated in terms of both the
19
20 frequency and the intensity of emotional reactions (e.g., The pupil often gets angry and ends
21
22 up in a bad mood; When angry or in a bad mood, the pupil reacts strongly and intensely) and
23
24 falling reactivity is measured with questions reflecting both the capacity to regain a neutral
25
26 affective state on one's own (e.g., He/She has difficulties calming down on his/her own.
27
28 [*reverse item*]) and the capacity to regain a neutral affective state with the help of others (e.g.,
29
30 It's easy for others, for instance a parent to calm him/her down). Ratings are made on Likert-
31
32 scales ranging from 1 (Does not fit at all) to 5 (Fits very well). Across the three data collection
33
34 waves, the alpha values (based on the total sample) were for negative emotionality: reactivity
35
36 (.92, .92,.93), falling reactivity (.96, .96, .96), and for positive emotionality: reactivity (.86,
37
38 .75, .82), and falling reactivity (.93, .93, .93). Previous research (Rydell et al., 2003) has
39
40 documented adequate test-retest reliability in parental ratings (.62 - .79 over a 5-week period),
41
42 construct validity for similar scales on the CBQ (Rothbart et al., 2001), and significant
43
44 correspondence between teacher ratings on an adapted version of the Emotion Questionnaire
45
46 and children's self-reports of emotion regulation.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 At T1 and T2, the same teachers filled in the Emotion Questionnaire; at T3, 30.5% of the
56
57 children had a new teacher who filled in the form. Data collection was always carried out in
58
59 spring, toward the end of the school year.
60

Results

Descriptive Analyses

Means and standard deviations for measures of perspective taking and emotionality are presented in Table 1 separately for the younger and the older cohort. Sex and age differences in perspective talking ability were explored in a mixed between-within repeated measures ANOVA with age cohort (younger, older) and sex (boys, girls) as between-subject variables and perspective taking as within-subject factor (at T1, T2, T3). There was an improvement in INS scores with time, $F(2, 180) = 16.24, p < .000$, which was moderated by age cohort, $F(2, 180) = 3.63, p < .05$. The scores increased significantly between each assessment only in the younger cohort (Grade 2 vs 3, $p < .000$, Grade 3 vs 4, $p < .05$). In the older cohort, INS scores improved more slowly and differed significantly only between 4th and 6th grade ($p < .05$). As expected, children in the older cohort performed better than children in the younger cohort ($M = 1.52, SE = 0.03$ vs $M = 1.28 SE = 0.04, F(1, 181) = 23.27, p < .000$) and girls performed better than boys, ($M = 1.48, SE = 0.04$ vs $M = 1.33 SE = 0.03, F(1, 181) = 9.39, p < .01$).

--Table 1 about here--

Children's positive emotional reactivity was significantly higher than their negative emotional reactivity (Paired samples test, T1: $t(208) = 14.11$; T2: $t(199) = 15.84$; T3: $t(186) = 11.83$; $ps < .000$). For that reason, we will present separate analyses for positive and negative emotionality throughout the paper. As shown in Table 2, children's expression of positive emotions was positively related to their expression of negative emotions. Most correlations between aspects of emotionality and perspective taking were nonsignificant.

--Table 2 about here--

Developmental gains in perspective taking (T3 minus T1) were negatively related to initial level of perspective taking at T1, younger cohort: $r(80) = -.49$; older cohort: $r(106) = -.52, ps$

1
2
3 < .000. Still, there was relatively high inter-individual consistency in INS scores across time
4
5 in both the younger cohort, $r(80) = .52$, and the older cohort, $r(106) = .54$, $ps < .000$.

6
7
8 In both cohorts, correlations between T1 emotionality and T3 emotionality were low to
9
10 moderate in size (positive emotions: reactivity, $r(80) = .28$, $p < .05$ and $r(107) = .30$, $p < .01$,
11
12 falling reactivity, $r(80) = .47$ and $r(107) = .42$, $ps < .000$, respectively, for the younger and the
13
14 older cohort; negative emotions: reactivity, $r(80) = .42$, $p < .000$ and $r(107) = .33$, $p < .001$,
15
16 falling reactivity, $r(80) = .36$, $p < .001$ and $r(107) = .18$, NS, respectively, for the younger and
17
18 the older cohort). In most cases, the same reporter provided information about emotionality at
19
20 T1 and T3. For participants who were rated by different reporters ($n = 57$), correlations across
21
22 time were still statistically significant and moderate in size (positive emotions: reactivity, $r =$
23
24 $.48$, $p < .001$, falling reactivity, $r = .47$, $p < .001$; negative emotions: reactivity, $r = .59$, $p <$
25
26 $.001$, falling reactivity, $r = .40$, $p < .01$).

27 28 29 30 31 *Regression Analyses: Relations of Perspective Taking to Emotional Reactivity*

32
33
34 It was hypothesized that good perspective-taking skills would be associated with relatively
35
36 moderate levels of emotional reactivity. In testing this hypothesis, the absolute value of each
37
38 child's centered score for emotional reactivity was used to indicate its deviation from the
39
40 average in the group (deviation in emotional reactivity, DER).

41
42
43 *Concurrent correlations.* Concurrent relations between perspective taking and DER were
44
45 examined in six hierarchical regression analyses (Table 3). Two control variables (sex and age
46
47 group) were entered in the first step and the linear effect of perspective taking was entered in
48
49 the second step. As suggested by Aiken and West (1991), we centered the predictors prior to
50
51 computing the regressions. The overall model was found to be significant in four of the six
52
53 analyses (positive emotions: $F(3, 204) = 7.57$, $p < .000$ at T1, $F(3, 194) = 2.83$, $p < .05$ at
54
55 T2, $F(3, 182) = 3.26$, $p < .05$ at T3; negative emotions: $F(3, 204) = 6.66$, $p < .000$ at T1). All
56
57
58
59
60 four analyses supported the hypothesis that high perspective-taking skills are associated with

1
2
3 moderate levels of emotional reactivity. For negative emotions, the overall model was
4
5 nonsignificant at T2, $F(3, 194) = 0.30$, NS, and T3, $F(3, 182) = 1.41$, NS. However, at T3,
6
7 although the inclusion of sex and age group at Step 1 did not contribute significantly to the
8
9 model, $F(2, 183) = 0.15$, NS, the inclusion of perspective taking at Step 2 did result in a
10
11 significant increase in R^2 , $F(1, 182) = 3.93$, $p < .05$, which again suggests the existence of a
12
13 positive relationship between perspective taking and moderate levels of emotional reactivity.
14
15
16

17 --Table 3 about here--
18

19
20 *Longitudinal findings.* Our longitudinal hypotheses were tested in two hierarchical
21
22 regression analyses with DER at T3 as the dependent variable (one for positive and one for
23
24 negative emotions). In Step 1 of the regression model, we controlled for the effects of sex, age
25
26 group and DER at T1. In Step 2 of the model, perspective taking at T1 was entered as
27
28 predictor of T3 DER. We anticipated that children with high initial perspective-taking skills at
29
30 T1 would become more moderate in emotional reactivity over time. Finally, in Step 3 we
31
32 entered perspective taking at T3 as predictor of DER at T3. This was done in order to examine
33
34 whether there was correlated change over time in perspective taking and deviation in
35
36 emotional reactivity. We anticipated that age-related increase in the capacity to differentiate
37
38 and coordinate social perspectives would be associated with a move away from more extreme
39
40 levels of emotional reactivity toward more moderate levels. For both regression analyses, the
41
42 overall model was significant (positive emotions: $F(5, 180) = 6.50$, $p < .000$; negative
43
44 emotions: $F(5, 180) = 4.04$, $p < .01$). As shown in Table 4, the analysis of positive
45
46 emotionality revealed a longitudinal effect of T1 perspective taking on DER at T3 (Step 2).
47
48
49
50
51 Relative to children with poor perspective-taking ability at T1, children with good
52
53 perspective-taking ability at T1 became more moderate in their emotional reactivity during
54
55 the following two years. Thus it seems that the effect of perspective taking on positive
56
57 emotional reactivity was established early and continued to expand during the next two years.
58
59
60

--Table 4 about here--

For negative emotionality, we found an effect of T3 perspective taking on deviation in T3 emotional reactivity when controlling for the level of both variables at T1 (Step 3). This finding indicates that gains in perspective-taking ability between T1 and T3 were associated with a move toward more moderate levels of emotional reactivity during this period.

To evaluate the alternative model, in which emotional reactivity predicted growth in perspective-taking capacity, we also examined statistically the influence of DER at T1 on developmental gains in perspective taking from T1 to T3 (controlling for sex and age group). For both negative emotions and positive emotions, these analyses revealed that DER at T1 did not predict change in perspective-taking capacity during the next two years ($ps > .05$).

Regression Analyses: Relations of Emotional Reactivity and Perspective Taking to Falling Reactivity

Concurrent correlations. We hypothesized that it would be easier for children with high perspective taking skills than for children with low perspective-taking skills to return to a neutral state after emotional arousal. Moreover, we anticipated that emotional reactivity would moderate the relation between perspective taking and falling reactivity; good perspective-taking skills may be most important for the ability to regain a neutral state in children with high emotional reactivity. Main effects and interaction effects of emotional reactivity and perspective taking on falling reactivity at T1, T2 and T3 were examined in six hierarchical regression analyses. The control variables (sex and age group) were entered in the first step; the main effects of emotional reactivity and perspective taking, respectively, were entered in the second step; and the interaction effects of emotional reactivity and perspective taking were entered in the third step (Table 5). The predictors were centered before being entered into the analyses.

--Table 5 about here--

1
2
3 The overall model was highly significant in all the six analyses (positive emotions: $F(5, 202)$
4 = 41.93 at T1, $F(5, 192) = 36.13$ at T2, $F(5, 180) = 23.06$ at T3, $ps < .000$; negative
5
6 emotions: $F(5, 202) = 49.16$ at T1, $F(5, 192) = 90.19$ at T2, $F(5, 180) = 71.94$ at T3, $ps <$
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
.000). As expected, emotional reactivity had a substantial effect on falling reactivity in all analyses. In contrast, a main effect of perspective taking on falling reactivity was found only at T1. However, there was fairly consistent support for an interaction effect of emotional reactivity and perspective taking on falling reactivity. As shown in Figure 1, perspective taking facilitated falling reactivity chiefly at higher levels of emotionality reactivity.

--Figure 1 about here--

Longitudinal findings. We examined whether change over time (T1 –T3) in the capacity to recover from emotional arousal was predicted by (a) perspective-taking skills at T1, and (b) change in perspective-taking capacity between T1 and T3. At Step 1 in these analyses of falling reactivity at T3, we controlled for the effects of sex, age group, falling reactivity at T1, and emotional reactivity at T1 and T3. At the second step, perspective taking at T1 and the term for the interaction between perspective taking and emotional reactivity at T1 were entered as predictors of falling reactivity at T3. We expected that good perspective-taking ability at T1 would predict long-term improvement in the capacity to recover from emotional arousal, particularly for children with high emotional reactivity. Finally, at the third step, perspective taking at T3 served as the predictor together with the term for the interaction between perspective taking and emotional reactivity at T3 (see Table 6). We expected that there would be an effect of perspective taking at T3 on falling reactivity at T3, even after controlling for the level of the two variables at T1.

Both overall models were highly significant, $F(9, 176) = 19.25$ and 56.08 for positive and negative emotions, respectively, $ps < .000$. Longitudinal support for the hypothesis that an increase in perspective-taking capacity is associated with an increase in the rate of recovery

1
2
3 from emotional arousal was obtained for positive emotion, such that the interaction between
4 emotional reactivity and perspective taking at T3 predicted falling reactivity at T3 even after
5 controlling for the level of these variables at T1. Thus, the association at T3 between
6 perspective taking and falling reactivity was not only due to the association established at T1.
7 Rather, the results indicate a continuing concurrent influence of perspective taking on falling
8 reactivity at T3. In contrast, and contrary to our expectations, for negative emotions, high
9 perspective-taking ability at T1, particularly in combination with high emotional reactivity,
10 predicted a negative, rather than positive, change in falling reactivity over time. Thus, the
11 longitudinal analysis of negative emotions indicated that the association between good
12 perspective-taking skills and quick recovery from emotional arousal that was established at
13 T1 became weaker, or disappeared, during the next two years.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 --Table 6 about here--
30

31 Discussion 32

33
34 The present study examined how perspective-taking ability affects emotionality during
35 middle and late childhood. It was assumed that the ability to differentiate and coordinate
36 social perspectives may affect both the initial phase of emotional reactivity and the ease with
37 which the emotional response is subsequently down-regulated. Moreover, because cognitions
38 may be used to up-regulate as well as down-regulate the intensity of an emotional response,
39 we proposed that children may employ their ability to differentiate and coordinate social
40 perspectives as a tool for optimal emotion regulation to achieve a moderate level of initial
41 reactivity and an easy subsequent return to a normal state. Overall, the findings were
42 congruent with this proposal.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 *Age-related Changes in Perspective Taking* 56

57 Consistent with theory and previous findings (Beardslee, Schultz, & Selman, 1987;
58 Selman, Beardslee, Schultz, Krupa, & Podorefsky, 1986; Yeates, Schultz, & Selman, 1991),
59
60

Perspective-taking Skills and Emotionality 20

1
2
3 perspective-taking ability increased with age and was higher in girls than in boys.
4
5
6 Improvement was stronger between the ages of 8 to 10 than between the ages of 10 to 12,
7
8 suggesting a developmental trajectory that levels off in late childhood. The average level of
9
10 perspective taking at different ages was similar to that observed in other studies (e.g., Selman
11
12 et al., 1986) with the majority of responses being at Levels 1 or 2 in Selman's INS model.
13
14
15 Thus the smaller average gains in perspective-taking scores in late childhood were not due to
16
17 a ceiling effect in the sense that they were necessitated by the scoring system. Actually, rather
18
19 few of the oldest children gave Level 3 answers, so the age period studied can be described as
20
21 a period in which Level 2 responses become increasingly predominant among most children.
22
23
24 Developmental gains were negatively related to initial level of perspective taking. Still, there
25
26 was a moderate level of inter-individual consistency in perspective-taking ability over time.
27
28

Perspective Taking and Emotional Reactivity

29
30
31 Overall, children with very high or very low reactivity tended to have less developed
32
33 perspective-taking skills than children with more moderate levels of reactivity. This outcome
34
35 supports the notion that perspective-taking skills serve to modulate reactivity to a moderate
36
37 level of intensity. However, there are other possible explanations for this finding that need to
38
39 be considered. First, there is the possibility that the association between high perspective-
40
41 taking skills and moderate levels of emotional reactivity is due to both perspective taking and
42
43 reactivity being affected by attentional processes. Good ability to focus and shift attention in a
44
45 flexible way is likely to enhance both emotion regulation and performance on social cognitive
46
47 tasks (Eisenberg et al., 1994). Indeed, effortful control of attention would seem to be integral
48
49 to emerging perspective coordination in so far as the latter requires the encoding of relatively
50
51 complex information and the ability to shift attention in a flexible way between relevant sides
52
53 of the disagreement represented in social dilemmas. Thus, more research is needed to
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 determine whether cognitive perspective taking makes a unique contribution to emotion
4
5 regulation beyond that of effortful control of attention.
6
7

8 A second possible explanation for the association between good perspective taking and
9
10 moderate emotional reactivity is that emotional reactivity has an impact on perspective taking
11
12 rather than the reverse. Previous research indicates that strong emotional responses may
13
14 interfere with cognitive activity and that absent or weak emotional responses may fail to
15
16 stimulate cognitions that are essential for effective self-regulation (Baumeister et al., 2007).
17
18 Accordingly, it is possible that very high levels of emotionality may interfere with the
19
20 development of perspective-taking ability and that very low emotional reactivity may fall
21
22 short of stimulating developmental advances in this skill. Although we cannot rule out this
23
24 account of the inverted U-shaped relationship between emotional reactivity and perspective
25
26 taking, we may at least conclude that it was not supported by our longitudinal data. More
27
28 “extreme” emotional reactivity at T1 (very high or very low) did not predict a relatively
29
30 slower development in perspective taking during the following two years. In contrast, and
31
32 more in line with the interpretation that perspective taking influences emotional reactivity,
33
34 good perspective taking skills at T1 predicted a move toward moderate positive emotional
35
36 reactions during the following two years.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 For negative emotionality as well, we obtained longitudinal support for an association
44
45 between perspective-taking skills and initial emotional reactivity. Children who made
46
47 developmental gains in perspective-taking ability over a two-year period tended to become
48
49 relatively more moderate in reactivity. This finding indicates that the influence of perspective
50
51 taking on negative emotional reactivity is not finalized in early childhood, but continues
52
53 throughout middle and late childhood.
54
55
56

57 Whereas perspective-taking skills tended to promote moderate levels of emotional
58
59 reactivity, children’s effortful control of attention and behavior seems to have a more
60

1
2
3 restraining effect on their emotional reactivity. Several studies have reported moderate,
4
5 negative correlations between emotional reactivity and effortful control processes (e.g.,
6
7 Eisenberg et al., 1993; Eisenberg, Fabes et al., 1997; Rydell et al., 2003), which is consistent
8
9 with the fact that the capacity for inhibitory control is central to definitions of effortful
10
11 control and tapped in measures of this construct (the ability to inhibit a dominant response to
12
13 perform a subdominant response; Rothbart & Bates, 1998). By contrast, in the present study,
14
15 linear correlations between perspective taking and emotional reactivity tended to be
16
17 nonsignificant, which is consistent with the suggestion that perspective-taking skills may be
18
19 effectively used to stimulate as well as to dampen emotional reactivity.
20
21
22
23

24 25 *Perspective Taking and Rate of Recovery from Emotional Arousal*

26
27 How easily children returned to baseline after being emotionally aroused was primarily
28
29 determined by their initial emotional reactivity. However, our findings indicate that
30
31 perspective-taking ability contributes to individual differences in falling reactivity, beyond
32
33 those accounted for by initial emotional reactivity. Thus, at T1, perspective taking was
34
35 positively related to falling reactivity for both positive and negative emotions. Moreover,
36
37 there was relatively consistent support for an interaction effect of perspective taking and
38
39 emotional reactivity on falling reactivity, with good skills contributing to rate of recovery
40
41 from emotional arousal mainly in highly emotional children. The latter finding is in line with
42
43 prior studies showing that skillful regulation of attention and behavior has stronger
44
45 implications for social competence in children with high emotionality than in children with
46
47 moderate or low levels of emotionality (e.g., Eisenberg, Fabes et al., 2000). It appears that the
48
49 advantages of having good cognitive resources for regulation become readily apparent mainly
50
51 when there is a great deal of emotion to control and the task can be expected to tax the child's
52
53 resources.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In children with high levels of positive emotional reactivity at T1, there was also
4
5 longitudinal support for an association between gains in perspective-taking skills and
6
7 improvement in the ability to down-regulate strong feelings. Thus, at T3, we found a positive
8
9 link between perspective-taking ability and rate of recovery from strong positive emotions,
10
11 even when controlling for earlier levels of these variables. This indicates that gains in
12
13 perspective-taking skills between T1 and T3 were associated with improvement in the
14
15 proficiency with which highly emotional children down-regulated positive emotions. We did
16
17 not find a similar result for negative emotions. Thus, in children with high initial negative
18
19 emotional reactivity relative to their peers at T1, longitudinal gains in perspective-taking
20
21 capacity did not seem to improve their ability to down-regulate negative feelings. **Rather, the**
22
23 **relation between perspective taking and the ability to down-regulate negative feelings, which**
24
25 **was established at T1, disappeared with age.** It is possible that this outcome is related to the
26
27 fact that, in general (as indicated by group averages), negative emotions were expressed at
28
29 weaker intensities than positive emotions were. Thus, according to their teachers, most
30
31 children in the present sample managed to keep their negative emotional reactivity at a
32
33 relatively low level and, hence, did not face the demanding task of having to down-regulate
34
35 frequent and strongly aroused, negative emotions. In contrast, it may be a continuing taxing
36
37 task for many children throughout childhood to down-regulate strongly aroused feelings of
38
39 joy and exuberance.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *Limitations of the Present Study*

49
50 A major limitation of the present study is that measures of children's emotionality are
51
52 restricted to the school context. **Children develop different expectations regarding**
53
54 **interpersonal responses to their emotional expressions in different social contexts and try to**
55
56 **adapt their emotional behavior accordingly (Shipman, Zeman, Nesin, & Fitzgerald, 2003).**
57
58 **This variability in emotional expression across contexts is reflected in the fact that teacher**
59
60

1
2
3 ratings of children's emotionality tend to correlate rather modestly with ratings made by the
4 children's parents (Eisenberg, Fabes et al., 2000). The present study focused on children's
5 expression of emotions in the school setting, and the role their perspective-taking skills play
6 in facilitating adaptation to this social context. In this setting, teachers can be considered to
7 be fairly reliable informants because they observe the child's behavior on multiple occasions.
8 The validity of their ratings, however, may not be equally high for all emotions. Teachers
9 typically observe children in group situations, and therefore they probably have a more valid
10 picture of children's regulation of exuberance and anger than they have of children's
11 regulation of sadness and fear (Rydell, Thorell, & Bohlin, 2007).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 For most of the participants, the same reporter provided information about emotionality at
25 all time periods. To the extent that these reporters have stable, but inaccurate, perceptions of
26 participants' emotionality, this may have inflated the estimates of interindividual consistency.
27 However, there was only low to moderate stability in the individual's standing on
28 emotionality relative to others across time in the present study, which is not a higher stability
29 than expected in theoretical models of temperament (Goldsmith et al., 1987; Rothbart &
30 Bates, 1998). Importantly, consistency was not lower for the substantial minority of children
31 who were rated by different teachers at T1 and T3. Significant correlations across time for
32 these children are important evidence of the validity of our teacher ratings.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 INS dilemmas involve a child protagonist interacting with a "significant other" who is
46 either familiar or unfamiliar to the child and who may or may not be of the same generation.
47 In the present study, dilemmas included familiar and unfamiliar peers, but no dilemma
48 involved interaction with an adult figure. Moreover, the scenarios we used depicted events
49 taking place in a school setting. These are other factors that limit the generalizability of the
50 present findings. Contextual variability in INS dilemma content influences children's level of
51 reasoning (Adalbjarnardottir & Selman, 1989; Selman, Beardslee, Schultz, Krupa, &
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Podorefsky, 1986; Yeates, Schultz, & Selman, 1991). However, although contextual
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Podorefsky, 1986; Yeates, Schultz, & Selman, 1991). However, although contextual variability may affect the average level of children's reasoning, intercorrelations between children's scores on different types of dilemmas tend to be moderate to high (Gurucharri & Selman, 1982; Yeates, Schultz, & Selman, 1991). This was the case also in the present study.

A basic assumption of the present research was that cultural standards determine how children use behavioral and cognitive skills to regulate emotion (Cole, Tamang, & Shrestha, 2006; Mesquita & Frijda, 1992). This view implies the possibility that the relation between perspective-taking skills and emotionality may be different across cultures. Accordingly, the present findings may be taken as evidence for an influence of perspective-taking skills on emotionality, but not as evidence for the universality of a fixed set of relationships between the two factors.

Conclusions and Future Prospects

In summary, although the present study has several limitations and the size of the effects was often small, our longitudinal design provides relatively consistent support for the notion that developing social perspective-coordination skills contribute to children's capacity to modulate their emotions. **The findings support earlier indications that children use cognitive strategies to manage emotions during middle and late childhood (Saarni, 1999; Stegge, & Meerum Terwogt, 2007). Developing perspective-taking capacities are likely to stimulate the use of cognitive strategies such as positive reappraisal and cognitive restructuring and promote metacognitive awareness of these strategies and their effects.**

Our findings are important, not only for understanding emotion regulation in children, but also for providing new insights into the way perspective-coordination skills may influence social adjustment in a broader sense. Theoretically, there have been strong arguments and rationales for expecting perspective-taking skills to play an important role in children's and adolescents' social adjustment. However, researchers have often found weak and inconsistent

Perspective-taking Skills and Emotionality 26

1
2
3 relations between INS scores and social behavior, which suggests that an indirect, rather than
4
5 direct, path may exist between the two variables. Further investigation of the interaction
6
7 between perspective taking and emotion processes could contribute to unravelling the
8
9 processes that link perspective taking to social behavior and adjustment. For example, in
10
11 future research, it would be interesting to explore how perspective-taking skills interact with
12
13 emotionality in determining children's appraisal and coping styles (Lengua & Long 2002).
14
15 Finally, because the current study focused on expressed emotion, we do not know whether
16
17 perspective-taking skills have similar effects on children's experience of emotion. A
18
19 replication of the present study based on children's self-reports of emotional experience
20
21 would provide important information regarding the processes involved.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Adalbjarnardottir, S., & Selman, R. L. (1989). How children propose to deal with the criticism
7
8 of their teachers and classmates: Developmental and stylistic variations. *Child*
9
10 *Development, 60*, 539-550.
11
- 12 Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting*
13
14 *interactions*. Newbury Park: Sage.
15
- 16
17 Altshuler, J. L., & Ruble, D. N. (1989). Developmental changes in children's awareness of
18
19 strategies for coping with uncontrollable stress. *Child Development, 60*, 1337-1349.
20
21
- 22 Band, E., & Weisz, J. (1988). How to feel better when it feels bad: Children's perspectives on
23
24 coping with everyday stress. *Developmental Psychology, 24*, 247-253.
25
26
- 27 Baumeister, R. F., Zell, A. L., & Tice, D. M. (2007). How emotions facilitate and impair self
28
29 regulation. . In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of Emotion Regulation* (pp. 408-426). New
30
31 York: The Guilford Press.
32
33
- 34 Beardslee, W. R., Schultz, L. H., & Selman, R. L. (1987). Interpersonal negotiation strategies,
35
36 adaptive functioning, and DSM-III diagnoses in adolescent offspring of parents with
37
38 affective disorders: Implications for the development of mutuality in relationships.
39
40
41 *Developmental Psychology, 23*, 807-815.
42
- 43 Belsky, J., Friedman, S. L., & Hsieh, K. H. (2001). Testing a core emotion-regulation
44
45 prediction: Does early attentional persistence moderate the effect of infant negative
46
47 emotionality on later development? *Child Development, 72*, 123-133.
48
49
- 50 Bengtsson, H. (2003). Children's cognitive appraisal of others' distressful and
51
52 positive experiences. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 27*,
53
54 457-466.
55
56
- 57 Burack, J. A., Flanagan, T., Peled, T., Sutton, H. M., Zygmuntowicz, C., & Manly, J. T.
58
59 (2006). Social perspective-taking skills in maltreated children and adolescents.
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Developmental Psychology, 42, 207-217.

Cole, P., Martin, S., & Dennis, T. (2004). Emotion regulation as a scientific construct:

Methodological challenges and directions for child development research. *Child*

Development, 75, 317-333.

Cole, P. M., Michel, M. K., & Teti, L. O. (1994). The development of emotion regulation

and dysregulation: A clinical perspective. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child*

Development, 59 (2-3, Serial No. 240), 73-100.

Cole, P. M., Tamang, B. L., & Shrestha, S. (2006). Cultural variations in the socialization of

young children's anger and shame. *Child Development*, 77, 1237-1251.

Compas, B. E., Connor, J. K., Saltzman, H., Thomsen, A. H., & Wadsworth, M. E. (2001).

Coping with stress during childhood and adolescence: Problems, progress, and potential in

theory and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 87-127.

Denham, S. A., McKinley, M., Couchoud, E. A., & Holt, R. (1990). Emotional and

behavioral predictors of preschool peer ratings. *Child Development*, 61, 1145-1152.

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

Diener, M. L., & Kim, D.-Y. (2004). Maternal and child predictors of preschool children's

social competence. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 25, 3-24.

Eisenberg, N., Champion, C., & Ma, Y. (2004). Emotion-related regulation: An

emerging construct. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly. Special issue: The maturing of*

the human development sciences: Appraising past, present, and prospective

agendas, 50, 236-259.

Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., Spinrad, T. L., Fabes, R. A., Shepard, S. A., Reiser, M. et al.

(2001). The relations of regulation and emotionality to children's externalizing and

internalizing problem behavior. *Child Development*, 72, 1112-1134.

Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1992). Emotion, regulation, and the development of

1
2
3 social competence. In M. S. Clark (Ed.), *Review of personality and social*
4
5 *psychology: Vol. 14. Emotion and social behavior* (pp. 119-150). Newbury
6
7 Park, CA: Sage.

8
9
10 Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Bernzweiger, J., Karbon, M., Poulin, R., & Hanish, L. (1993).
11
12 The relations of emotionality and regulation to preschoolers' social skills and sociometric
13
14 status. *Child Development, 64*, 1418-1438.

15
16
17 Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Guthrie, I. K., Murphy, B. C., Maszk, P., Holmgren, R. et al.
18
19 (1996). The relations of regulation and emotionality to problem behavior in elementary
20
21 school children. *Development and Psychopathology, 8*, 141-162.

22
23
24 Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Guthrie, I. K., & Reiser, M. (2000). Dispositional emotionality
25
26 and regulation: Their role in predicting quality of social functioning. *Journal of*
27
28 *Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 136-157.

29
30
31 Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Karbon, M., Murphy, B. C., Wosinski, M., Polazzi, L. et al.
32
33 (1996). The relations of children's dispositional prosocial behavior to emotionality,
34
35 regulation, and social functioning. *Child Development, 67*, 974-992.

36
37
38 Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Murphy, B., Karbon, M., Maszk, P., Smith, M. et al. (1994). The
39
40 relations of dispositional and situational empathy-related responding. *Journal of*
41
42 *Personality and Social Psychology, 66*, 776-797.

43
44
45 Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Murphy, B., Karbon, M., Smith, M., & Maszk, P. (1996). The
46
47 relations of children's dispositional empathy-related responding to their emotionality,
48
49 regulation, and social functioning. *Developmental Psychology, 32*, 195-209.

50
51
52 Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Murphy, B., Maszk, P., Smith, M., & Karbon, M. (1995). The
53
54 role of emotionality and regulation in children's social functioning: A longitudinal study.
55
56 *Child Development, 66*, 1239-1261.

57
58
59 Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Shepard, S. A., Murphy, B. C., Jones, S., & Guthrie, I. K. (1998).
60

1
2
3 Contemporaneous and longitudinal prediction of children's sympathy from dispositional
4 regulation and emotionality. *Developmental Psychology*, 34, 910-924.

5
6
7
8 Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Shepard, S. A., Murphy, B. C., Guthrie, I. K., Jones, S. et al.
9
10 (1997). Contemporaneous and longitudinal prediction of children's social functioning from
11 regulation and emotionality. *Child Development*, 68, 642-664.

12
13
14
15 Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Spinrad, T. L. (2006). Prosocial development. In W. Damon
16 (Series Ed.) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social,*
17 *emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 646-718). New York: Wiley.

18
19
20
21 Eisenberg, N., Guthrie, I. K., Fabes, R. A., Reiser, M., Murphy, B. C., Holmgren, R. et al.
22
23 (1997). The relations of regulation and emotionality to resiliency and
24 competent social functioning in elementary school children. *Child Development*, 68, 367
25
26
27
28
29
30 383.

31
32 Eisenberg, N., Guthrie, I. K., Fabes, R. A., Shepard, S., Losoya, S., Murphy, B. et al. (2000).
33
34 Prediction of elementary school children's externalizing problem behaviors from
35 attentional and behavioral regulation and negative emotionality. *Child Development*, 71,
36
37
38
39
40 1367-1382.

41 Eisenberg, N., Hofer, C., & Vaughan, J. (2007). Effortful control and its socioemotional
42 consequences. In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of Emotion Regulation* (pp. 408-426). New
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Eisenberg, N., Valiente, C., Morris, A. S., Fabes, R. A., Cumberland, A., Reiser, M. et al.
(2003). Longitudinal relations among parental emotional expressivity, children's

1
2
3 regulation, and quality of socioemotional functioning. *Developmental Psychology*, 39, 2
4
5 19.

6
7
8 Evans, D. E., & Rothbart, M. K. (2009). A two-factor model of temperament. *Personality and*
9
10 *Individual Differences*, 47, 565-570.

11
12 Frick, P. J., & White, S. F. (2008). Research review: The importance of callous-unemotional
13
14 traits for developmental models of aggressive and antisocial behavior. *Journal of Child*
15
16 *Psychology and Psychiatry*, 49, 359-375.

17
18 Goldsmith, H. H., Buss, A. H., Plomin, R., Rothbart, M. K., Thomas, A., Chess, S. et al.
19
20 (1987). Roundtable: What is temperament? Four approaches. *Child Development*, 58, 505
21
22 -529.

23
24
25
26 Gross, J. J., & Thompson, R. A. (2007). Emotion regulation: Conceptual foundations. In J. J.
27
28 Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of Emotion Regulation* (pp. 3-24). New York: The Guilford Press.

29
30 Gurucharri, C., & Selman, R. L. (1982). The development of interpersonal understanding
31
32 during childhood, preadolescence, and adolescence: A longitudinal follow-up study. *Child*
33
34 *Development*, 53, 924-927.

35
36
37 John, O. P. & Gross, J. J. (2007). Individual differences in emotion regulation. In J. J.
38
39 Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of Emotion Regulation* (pp. 351-372). New York: The Guilford
40
41 Press.

42
43
44 Kochanska, G. (1997). Multiple pathways to conscience for children with different
45
46 temperaments: From toddlerhood to age five. *Developmental Psychology*, 33, 228-240.

47
48
49 Kochanska, G., Barry, R. A., Jimenez, N. B., Hollatz, A. L., & Woodard, J. (2009). Guilt and
50
51 effortful control: Two mechanisms that prevent disruptive developmental trajectories.
52
53 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 322-333.

54
55
56 Kopp, C. B. (1989). Regulation of distress and negative emotion: A developmental review.
57
58
59
60 *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 343-354.

- 1
2
3 Lemerise, E. A., & Arsenio, W. F. (2000). An integrated model of emotion processes and
4
5 cognition in social information processing. *Child Development, 71*, 107-118.
6
7
8 Lengua, L. L. (2003). Associations among emotionality, self-regulation, adjustment problems,
9
10 and positive adjustment in middle childhood. *Journal of Applied Developmental*
11
12 *Psychology, 24*, 595-618.
13
14
15 Lengua, L. J., & Long, A. C. (2002). The contribution of emotionality and self-regulation in
16
17 the appraisal-coping process: Tests of direct and moderating effects. *Journal of Applied*
18
19 *Developmental Psychology, 23*, 471-493.
20
21
22 Lengua, L. J., West, S. G., & Sandler, I. N. (1998). Temperament as a predictor of
23
24 symptomatology in children.: Addressing contamination of measures. *Child Development,*
25
26 *69*, 164-181.
27
28
29 Losoya, S., Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1998). Developmental issues in the study of
30
31 coping. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 22*, 287-313.
32
33
34 Marton, I., Wiener, J., Rogers, M., Moore, C., & Tannock, R. (2009). Empathy and social
35
36 perspective taking in children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of*
37
38 *Abnormal Child Psychology, 37*, 107-118.
39
40
41 Mesquita, B., & Frijda, N. H. (1992). Cultural variations in emotions: A review.
42
43 *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 179-204.
44
45
46 Muris, P., & Ollendick, T. H. (2005). The role of temperament in the etiology of child
47
48 psychopathology. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 8*, 271-289.
49
50
51 Murphy, B. C., Shephard, S. A., Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (2004). Concurrent and across
52
53 time prediction of young adolescents' social functioning: The role of emotionality and
54
55 regulation. *Social Development, 13*, 56-86.
56
57
58 Ochsner, K. N., Gross, J. J. (2005). The cognitive control of emotion. *TRENDS in Cognitive*
59
60 *Sciences, 9*, 242-249.

- 1
2
3 Pessoa, L. (2009). How do emotion and motivation direct executive control? *TRENDS in*
4
5 *Cognitive Sciences*, 13, 160-166.
6
7
8 Reijntjes, A., Stegge, H., Meerum Terwogt, M., & Hurkens, E. (2007). Children's depressive
9
10 symptoms and their regulation of negative affect in response to vignette depicted emotion
11
12 eliciting events. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 31, 49-58.
13
14
15 Rice, J. A., Levine, L. J., & Pizarro, D. A. (2007). "Just stop thinking about it": Effects of
16
17 emotional disengagement on children's memory for educational material. *Emotion*, 7, 812
18
19 823.
20
21
22 Rothbart, M. K., Ahadi, S. A., Hershey, K. L., & Fisher, P. (2001). Investigations of
23
24 temperament from three to seven years: The Children's Behavior Questionnaire. *Child*
25
26 *Development*, 72, 1394-1408.
27
28
29 Rothbart, M. K., Ahadi, S. A., & Hershey, K. L. (1994). Temperament and social behavior in
30
31 childhood. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 40 (1), 21-39.
32
33
34 Rothbart, M. K., & Bates, J. E. (1998). Temperament. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & N.
35
36 Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and*
37
38 *personality development* (5th ed., pp. 105-176). New York: Wiley.
39
40
41 Rothbart, M. K., & Bates, J. E. (2006). Temperament. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & N.
42
43 Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and*
44
45 *personality development* (6th ed., pp. 99-166). New York: Wiley.
46
47
48 Rydell, A.-M., Berlin, L., & Bohlin, G. (2003). Emotionality, emotion regulation, and
49
50 adaptation among 5- to 8-year old children. *Emotion*, 3, 30-47.
51
52
53 Rydell, A.-M., Thorell, L. B., & Bohlin, G. (2007). Emotion regulation in relation to social
54
55 competence: An investigation of child self reports. *European Journal of Developmental*
56
57 *Psychology*, 4, 293 – 313.
58
59
60 Saarni, C. (1999). *The development of emotional competence*. New York: Guilford Press.

- 1
2
3 Sallquist, J. V., Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T. L., Reiser, M., Hofer, C., Zhou, Q. et al. (2009).
4
5 Positive and negative emotionality: Trajectories across six years and relations with social
6
7 competence. *Emotion*, 9, 15-28.
8
9
10 Schultz, L. H., Yeates, K. O., & Selman, R. L. (1989). *The Interpersonal Negotiation*
11
12 *Strategies Interview Manual*. Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University, Cambridge,
13
14 Mass.
15
16
17 Selman, R.L. (1980). *The growth of interpersonal understanding*. New York:
18
19 Academic Press.
20
21
22 Selman, R. L., Beardslee, W., Schultz, L. H., Krupa, M., & Podorefsky, D. (1986).
23
24 Assessing adolescent interpersonal negotiation strategies: Toward the integration of
25
26 functional and structural models. *Developmental Psychology*, 22, 450-459.
27
28
29 Selman, R. L., & Demorest, A. P. (1986). Putting thoughts and feelings into perspective: A
30
31 developmental view on how children deal with interpersonal disequilibrium In D. J.
32
33 Bearison & H. Zimiles (Eds.), *Thought and emotion: developmental perspectives* (pp. 93
34
35 128). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
36
37
38 Selman, R. L., Schorin, M. Z., Stone, C., & Phelps, E. (1983). A naturalistic study of
39
40 children's social understanding. *Developmental psychology*, 19(1), 83-102.
41
42
43 Shipman, K. L., Zeman, J., Nesin, A. E., & Fitzgerald, M. (2003). Children's strategies for
44
45 displaying anger and sadness: What works with whom? *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 49, 100
46
47 122.
48
49
50 Stegge, H., & Meerum Terwogt, M. (2007). Awareness and regulation of emotion in
51
52 typical and atypical development. In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of Emotion Regulation*
53
54 (pp. 269-286). New York: The Guilford Press.
55
56
57 Stifter, C. A., Spinrad, T. L., & Braungart-Rieker, J. M. (1999). Toward a developmental
58
59 model of child compliance: The role of emotion regulation in infancy. *Child Development*,
60

1
2
3 70, 21-32.
4

5 Thompson, R. A. (1994). Emotional regulation: A theme in search of definition. In N. A. Fox
6 (Ed.), *The development of emotion regulation: Biological and behavioral considerations.*
7
8
9
10 *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 59 (2-3, Serial
11
12 No. 240), 25-52.
13
14

15 Wachs, T. D. (2006). The nature, etiology and consequences of individual differences in
16
17 temperament. In T. LeMonda & L. Balter, (Eds.), *Child psychology: A Handbook of*
18
19 *contemporary issues* (2nd ed., pp. 27-52). New York: Garland.
20
21

22 Yeates, K. O., Schultz, L. H., & Selman, R. L. (1991). The development of interpersonal
23
24 negotiation strategies in thought and action: A social-cognitive link to behavioral
25
26 adjustment and social status. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 37(3), 369-405.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Perspective-taking Skills and Emotionality 36

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Study Variables at T1, T2 and T3

| Measure | Younger cohort | | | Older cohort | | |
|------------------------|-----------------|------|-----------|------------------|------|-----------|
| | <i>N</i> | Mean | <i>SD</i> | <i>N</i> | Mean | <i>SD</i> |
| Perspective taking | | | | | | |
| T1 | 90 | 1.11 | 0.36 | 118 ^a | 1.47 | 0.45 |
| T2 | 84 ^b | 1.29 | 0.38 | 115 | 1.52 | 0.44 |
| T3 | 80 | 1.38 | 0.36 | 106 ^a | 1.56 | 0.44 |
| Negative emotionality: | | | | | | |
| T1 Reactivity | 90 | 2.20 | 0.90 | 119 | 2.16 | 0.67 |
| T1 Falling reactivity | 90 | 4.04 | 0.83 | 119 | 3.99 | 0.69 |
| T2 Reactivity | 85 | 2.39 | 0.62 | 115 | 1.87 | 0.61 |
| T2 Falling reactivity | 85 | 3.90 | 0.56 | 115 | 4.26 | 0.53 |
| T3 Reactivity | 80 | 2.12 | 0.69 | 107 | 1.99 | 0.66 |
| T3 Falling reactivity | 80 | 4.06 | 0.54 | 107 | 4.20 | 0.57 |
| Positive emotionality: | | | | | | |
| T1 Reactivity | 90 | 2.67 | 1.00 | 119 | 3.07 | 0.78 |
| T1 Falling reactivity | 90 | 3.99 | 0.87 | 119 | 4.01 | 0.79 |
| T2 Reactivity | 85 | 2.88 | 0.68 | 115 | 2.91 | 0.65 |
| T2 Falling reactivity | 85 | 3.88 | 0.65 | 115 | 4.06 | 0.65 |
| T3 Reactivity | 80 | 2.56 | 0.80 | 107 | 2.88 | 0.73 |
| T3 Falling reactivity | 80 | 4.05 | 0.62 | 107 | 4.06 | 0.65 |

^aMissing data for one child who was too silent to carry through the interview. ^bMissing data for one child due to technical problems.

Table 2

Intercorrelations Among Measures at T1, T2 and T3

| Measures of social functioning | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--------------------------------|------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| T1 | | | | | |
| 1. Perspective taking | - | .12 | .00 | .12 | -.03 |
| 2. NE Reactivity | -.13 | - | -.81*** | .77*** | -.75*** |
| 3. NE Falling reactivity | .22* | -.62*** | - | -.62*** | .82*** |
| 4. PE Reactivity | -.12 | .49*** | -.39*** | - | -.83*** |
| 5. PE Falling reactivity | .23* | -.50*** | .84*** | -.54*** | - |
| T2 | | | | | |
| 1. Perspective taking | - | .11 | -.04 | .16 | -.02 |
| 2. NE Reactivity | -.04 | - | -.84*** | .55*** | -.69*** |
| 3. NE Falling reactivity | -.02 | -.79*** | - | -.43*** | .79*** |
| 4. PE Reactivity | .05 | .36*** | -.37*** | - | -.69*** |
| 5. PE Falling reactivity | .04 | -.39*** | .54*** | -.65*** | - |
| T3 | | | | | |
| 1. Perspective taking | - | .20 | -.19 | .24* | -.14 |
| 2. NE Reactivity | .03 | - | -.90*** | .82*** | -.78*** |
| 3. NE Falling reactivity | .01 | -.75*** | - | -.77*** | .81*** |
| 4. PE Reactivity | .01 | .05 | -.09 | - | -.81*** |
| 5. PE Falling reactivity | .18 | -.39*** | .72*** | -.41*** | - |

Note. NE = negative emotionality, PE = positive emotionality. The younger cohort's correlations are above the diagonal, and the older cohort's below.

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

Perspective-taking Skills and Emotionality 38

Table 3

Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Perspective taking Predicting Deviation in Emotional Reactivity at T1, T2 and T3

| Predictor | T1 | | | T2 | | | T3 | | |
|---|--------------|------------|---------|--------------|------------|---------|--------------|------------|---------|
| | ΔR^2 | B (SE) | β | ΔR^2 | B (SE) | β | ΔR^2 | B (SE) | β |
| <i>Deviation in Positive Emotional Reactivity</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | .06*** | | | .01 | | | .02 | | |
| Age | | -.14 (.04) | -.22** | | -.03 (.05) | -.04 | | -.02 (.05) | -.04 |
| Sex | | -.17 (.09) | -.13 | | -.11 (.09) | -.09 | | -.17 (.09) | -.14 |
| Step 2 | .04** | | | .03** | | | .03* | | |
| PT | | -.04 (.01) | -.21** | | -.04 (.01) | -.19** | | -.04 (.01) | -.19* |
| <i>Deviation in Negative Emotional Reactivity</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | .06** | | | .00 | | | .00 | | |
| Age | | -.14 (.04) | -.24*** | | .02 (.03) | .04 | | -.00 (.04) | -.00 |
| Sex | | .02 (.08) | .02 | | -.02 (.06) | -.03 | | -.05 (.09) | -.04 |
| Step 2 | .03** | | | .00 | | | .02* | | |
| PT | | -.03 (.01) | -.19** | | -.01 (.01) | -.05 | | -.03 (.01) | -.15* |

Note. PT = perspective taking.

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

Table 4

*Prediction of T3 Deviation in Emotional Reactivity from T1 and T3 Perspective-taking Skills
While Controlling for T1 Deviation in Emotional Reactivity*

| Predictor | DER at T3 | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|------------|---------|-------------------|------------|---------|
| | positive emotions | | | negative emotions | | |
| | ΔR^2 | B (SE) | β | ΔR^2 | B (SE) | β |
| Step 1 | .11*** | | | .08** | | |
| Control variables ^a | | | | | | |
| Step 2 | .04** | | | .01 | | |
| PT at T1 | | -.04 (.01) | -.22** | | -.00 (.01) | -.01 |
| Step 3 | .00 | | | .02* | | |
| PT at T3 | | -.01 (.02) | -.06 | | -.03 (.02) | -.18* |

Note. DER = the absolute value of each child's centered score for emotional reactivity.

^aControl variables included age, sex, DER at T1.

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

Table 5

Regression Analyses: Relations of Perspective Coordination and Emotional Reactivity to Falling Reactivity at T1, T2 and T3

| Predictor | T1 | | | T2 | | | T3 | | |
|---|--------------|------------|---------|--------------|------------|---------|--------------|------------|---------|
| | ΔR^2 | B (SE) | β | ΔR^2 | B (SE) | β | ΔR^2 | B (SE) | β |
| <i>Falling reactivity for positive emotions</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | .48*** | | | .49*** | | | .35*** | | |
| Age | | .14 (.04) | .17** | | .10 (.03) | .15** | | .08 (.04) | .13* |
| Sex | | .06 (.08) | .04 | | .19 (.07) | .15** | | .12 (.08) | .09 |
| ER | | -.64 (.05) | -.71*** | | -.66 (.05) | -.67*** | | -.50 (.05) | -.60*** |
| Step 2 | .01* | | | .00 | | | .01 | | |
| PT | | .03 (.01) | .13* | | .01 (.01) | .06 | | .02 (.01) | .11 |
| Step 3 | .02** | | | .00 | | | .03** | | |
| PT X ER | | .04 (.01) | .15** | | .02 (.02) | .06 | | .04 (.02) | .18** |
| <i>Falling reactivity for negative emotions</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | .53*** | | | .69*** | | | .67*** | | |
| Age | | -.04 (.04) | -.05 | | -.01 (.03) | -.01 | | .02 (.03) | .04 |
| Sex | | .08 (.07) | .06 | | -.03 (.05) | -.03 | | .05 (.05) | .04 |
| ER | | -.71 (.05) | -.73*** | | -.72 (.04) | -.83*** | | -.68 (.04) | -.81*** |

(Continued)

(Table 5 continued)

| Predictor | T1 | | | T2 | | | T3 | | |
|-----------|--------------|-----------|---------|--------------|------------|---------|--------------|------------|---------|
| | ΔR^2 | B (SE) | β | ΔR^2 | B (SE) | β | ΔR^2 | B (SE) | β |
| Step 2 | .01* | | | .00 | | | .00 | | |
| PT | | .02 (.01) | .11* | | -.00 (.01) | -.01 | | .00 (.01) | .01 |
| Step 3 | .01* | | | .01** | | | .00 | | |
| PT X ER | | .03 (.01) | .12* | | .03 (.01) | .11** | | -.01 (.01) | -.03 |

Note. PT = perspective taking, ER = Emotional Reactivity.

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

Table 6

Prediction of T3 Falling Reactivity from T1 and T3 Perspective-taking Skills While Controlling for T1 Falling Reactivity and Emotional Reactivity at T1 and T3

| Predictor | Falling reactivity at T3 | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|---------|-------------------|-------------|---------|
| | positive emotions | | | negative emotions | | |
| | ΔR^2 | B (SE) | β | ΔR^2 | B (SE) | β |
| Step 1 | .47*** | | | .72*** | | |
| Control variables ^a | | | | | | |
| Step 2 | .01 | | | .02** | | |
| Pt at T1 | | .00 (.01) | -.00 | | -.01 (.01) | -.09* |
| PT X ER at T1 | | -.02 (.01) | -.08 | | -.03 (.01) | -.12** |
| Step 3 | .03* | | | .00 | | |
| PT at T3 | | .02 (.01) | .09 | | .00 (.01) | .01 |
| PT X ER at T3 | | .04 (.02) | .15* | | -.02 (.019) | -.06 |

Note. PT = perspective taking, ER = Emotional Reactivity.

^aControl variables included age, sex, ER at T1, ER at T3, falling reactivity at T1.

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

Figure Caption


Figure 1. A graphical presentation of the statistically significant interactions of (a) positive emotional reactivity and perspective taking in relation to falling reactivity at T1 and T3, and (b) negative emotional reactivity and perspective taking in relation to falling reactivity at T1 and T2.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Perspective-taking Skills and Emotionality 44

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


Positive Emotions at T1



Positive Emotions at T3



Negative Emotions at T1



Negative Emotions at T2

