



# Socioeconomic Status as a Mediator in Developing Emotion Regulation Among Students in Secondary Level Education

**Sabiha Iqbal<sup>a\*</sup>, Nasreen Akhter<sup>b</sup>, Rabia Tabassum<sup>c</sup>, Aks-E-Noor<sup>d</sup>**, <sup>a</sup>Ph. D, Scholar, Assistant professor Department of Education, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, <sup>b</sup>Ph. D Supervisor, Professor of Education, Chairperson Department of Special Education, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, <sup>c</sup>Lecturer Lahore college for women university, <sup>d</sup>Associate Lecturer, Department of Special Education, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Email: <sup>a\*</sup>[sabiha.iqbal@iub.edu.pk](mailto:sabiha.iqbal@iub.edu.pk), <sup>b</sup>[nasreen.akhtar@iub.edu.pk](mailto:nasreen.akhtar@iub.edu.pk), <sup>c</sup>[great786@yahoo.com](mailto:great786@yahoo.com), <sup>d</sup>[aksenoor@gmail.com](mailto:aksenoor@gmail.com)

Socio-economic conditions of the family affect every aspect of individual's lives. Several studies exposed that the socioeconomic status of families is associated with health, cognitive and emotional development of children. SES is an important element in forecasting the skill of emotion regulation. This study was a survey research and data collected was quantitative data in the form of a questionnaire. The present study examined three trends in the socio-economic situation of families: the level of education of parents; the occupation of parents; and the monthly income of parents. The goal of the current study was to explore the effect of the SES of the family with the ability to implement the emotion regulation strategies among students. The population of the study was students (nearly 14-16 years old) of secondary schools in the district of Lahore in Punjab, Pakistan. The convenient sampling technique was utilised to select the sample of 198 students of 10<sup>th</sup> grade classed selected from ten secondary schools (5 male and 5 female) in the district of Lahore in Punjab, Pakistan. The ERQ questionnaire was used to gather data from students to determine their ability to control their emotions. Descriptive statistics and ANOVA were used to obtain the results of the study. The analysis of the current study reconnoitred that the education of mothers and fathers affects the positive emotion regulation strategies of their children but that the financial status of the family influences both positive and negative emotion regulation strategies of children. Thus, policy-makers need to concentrate these SES indicators in school curricula to bring about positive change in the personalities of students.

**Keywords:** *Emotion Regulation, Socioeconomic Status*

## Introduction

### Socioeconomic status

The concept of the socio-economic status of families is one of the most widely studied concepts in the social sciences. Several methods of measuring SES have been recommended, but the qualifications, occupations and income of parents have been used primarily in education. Research has shown that SES is closely associated with the health, cognitive and socioemotional outcomes in children (Mohamadou, 2017).

As earlier revealed in a number of studies, the concept of SES of the family mostly denotes three foremost elements. These are the income of parents, their qualifications and occupation. The education level of parents is considered an important variable of SES because it is acknowledged at the early stage of life and stays the same with the passage of time (Sirin, 2005).

The common consensus is that parents' education, income and profession represent the SES (Singh & Shankar, 2013). However, the majority of experts agreed that occupation, income and education characterise SES in a better way except of any one of these (White, 1982).

### SES and Emotion Regulation of Children

The analysis of different studies revealed that SES is considered essential in the expansion of emotion regulation skills among children. It was also confirmed through research that the children from low a SES suffered from psychological problems and antisocial behaviour as compared to those children who are from a better SES. It was also found that a low SES becomes the cause of antisocial behaviour, poor adaptive functioning and depression among adolescents (McLoyd, 1997). On the other hand, some experts did not associate poverty and emotional problems of adolescents. A research study found that 6 to 17 years old children bring up to psychiatric clinic, SES was connected with the reports of teachers and parents of hostility and misbehaviour (Kim et al., 2013; McCoy, Frick, Loney, & Ellis, 1999; Taylor, 2006). Generally, children from low SES suffers from violence, hostility and child abuse (Mohamadou, 2018).

Evidence has shown that the children who didn't have the ability to express their emotions in appropriate ways are from unsafe families like mentally disturbed parents and low SES (Bîlc, Cioară, & Miu, 2016). It was recognised that the ability to regulate emotions characterised internal and external processes which control the emotional experience according to the environmental factors to meet the demands. Emotion regulation encompass the appropriate expression of emotions (Kao, Tuladhar, Meyer, & Tarullo, 2019).



Much evidence shows that students who often face difficulties in handling the issues of their lives and don't have the ability to control over their environmental factors they raised from lower-SES (Hittner, Rim, & Haase, 2018).

Several studies have shown that high SES helps to improve emotion regulation skills among children however, low SES promotes many emotional problems like aggression, anxiety and other self-related issues among adults. Results of different studies explored the fact that financial issues increase conflict which creates hurdles in improving emotion regulation abilities among children. Such types of conflicting factors bring the families towards the negative practices of life and endorse negative emotion regulation strategies among children (Singh & Shankar, 2013).

Much empirical evidence revealed that better socioeconomic status is associated with effective emotion regulation skills. Studies also revealed that the socioeconomic status of the family is not only related to the income but also comprises the education, occupation and social status. Therefore, SES is associated with all areas of behaviour and social science comprising education, advocacy, practices and research. However, the socioeconomic status of the family influence on overall working abilities of individuals, as well as their physical and mental health. Consequently, low SES also distress our society and related to the lesser educational performance, inadequacy and poor health (APA, 2014; Eisenberg, Hofer, & Vaughan, 2007).

Research studies examined that the educational level of parents determines the SES of the family and whether it could be low or high. Therefore, a study revealed that financial status of parents, their level of education and mother's occupation perform an influential part in the development of social and emotional skills among children (Mohamed & Toran, 2018)

Many studies identified that the SES of parents has a substantial influence on the social and emotional development of children. Children raised from low SES families have poor social and emotion capabilities as compared to those children who are from a better SES. Such types of children have behavioural issues like unacceptable behaviour and emotional disturbance. Socioeconomic circumstances also influence the personality of offspring (Neubourg, Borghans, Coppens, & Jansen, 2018)

SES is a construct that précises the position of individual in society. Research studies confirmed that mental health issues among children are the consequences of social disparities. Children raised from poor SES families usually practice many emotional problems. According to different studies on social disparities and mental health of children demonstrated that poor SES becomes the cause of such issues among children and adults. Moreover, it was explored by the different studies that parental poor educational background is significantly associated with the emotional and cognitive development of children (Reiss, 2013).

On the basis of different investigations, it was concluded that socioeconomic circumstances, specifically low level income and education of parents, promotes behavioural problems among their children (Hosokawa & Katsura, 2018).

It is the most common concept that the families who have high SES can provide better services to their children in the form of goods and social connections which provide wonderful benefits to their children. On the other hand, low SES families could not provide such types of facilities as the SES families, so their children face many problems (Brooks-Gunn & Duncan, 1997).

It was documented that SES influences welfare and evolution of children, as well as their internalising and externalising. It also affects intellectual and language development of children (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002; Reise & Waller, 2009; Sedykh et al., 2013). However, the analysis also indicated that financial issues negatively influence the parent child relationship which could be dangerous for the child's development (Reise & Waller, 2009).

Hence, SES plays an essential role in the lifelong functioning of individuals, including progress, well-being, and physical and mental stability. SES is hypothesised as a combination of educational, financial and professional influences (Mohamadou, 2017). Therefore, many studies have been conducted in this area but only limited studies examined the impacts of multiple aspects of SES comprising parents education level, family income and occupation of parents. (Hosokawa & Katsura, 2017). Therefore, this study investigated the impact of the SES of families on the development of emotion regulation skill among students.

### **Objectives of study**

- 1- To recognise the grammatical construction of emotion regulation among students.
- 2- To explore the effects SES on emotion regulation of students.

### **Research Questions**

Following were the research questions of this survey:

- 1- What is the emotional expression of students belonging to different SES?
- 2- What are the effects of different variables of SES on emotion regulation of students?

### **Hypothesis**

There is significant effect of the different variables of SES on emotion regulation of students in secondary level schools.

## Material and method

The present study was a survey research and a questionnaire was used to collect the data. A questionnaire was applied to gain the data regarding the expression of emotion of students. Level of education, occupation and monthly income of parents are the important elements of SES, which were included in the current study. Population of the study was students (nearly 14-16 years old) of secondary school in district Lahore in Punjab Pakistan. The convenient sampling technique was utilised to select the sample of 198 students of 10<sup>th</sup> grade classes from ten secondary schools (5 male and 5 female) in the district of Lahore in Punjab, Pakistan.

## Research instruments

Two instruments were utilised to assess the emotion regulation of students. One was the emotion regulation questionnaire ERQ, a ten item scale intended to measure the respondents' capacity to control their emotions by applying on of two ways: (1) Cognitive Reappraisal (6 items) and (2) Expressive Suppression (4 items). Cognitive reappraisal is associated with positive emotion regulation tactics and suppression related to negative ways of emotion regulation (Gross & John, 2003). The other scale was the intercultural adjustment potential scale emotion regulation ICAPS FR, an 11 item scale by Matsumoto et al., (2006). This scale is comprised of three different personality traits: neuroticism, extroversion and conscientiousness to assess the respondents' capacity to regulate their emotions. Extroversion and conscientiousness personality traits are associated with both experience and manifestation of positive emotions of individuals but a high score in neuroticism indicates a low score in emotion regulation (Matsumoto, 2006; Terracciano et al., 2003). Participants rated each item using a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree).

Three types of main indicators of SES of a parents' level of education, occupation and monthly income were included. All these indicators were measured through demographic information.

## Validation of Instruments

The questionnaires were standardised. The validity and reliability were already known.

Table 1

| Section  | Respondents               | n    | Method of reliability estimation        | r             | Ref                     |
|----------|---------------------------|------|---|---------------|-------------------------|
| ERQ      | Chines College students   | 1163 | test-retest reliability and coefficient | 0.79 and 0.77 | Gross and John (2003)   |
| ICAPS ER | Japanese college students | 26   | test-retest                             | 0.70–0.85     | Matsumoto et al. (2006) |

## Data collection

All the data was collected by the researcher from the students selected in sample during school hours with the written permission of schools heads. Questionnaires were circulated among selected students and they were instructed regarding the objective of the study and the procedure of how to respond on the scale against each item. Therefore, all the participants returned the questionnaire after completion. After data collection, the reliability of the instruments was also measured by applying Cronbach's alpha method that was 0.646.

## Data analysis

Finally, data analysis was carried out by applying statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistic was utilised to identify the state of emotion regulation of students. The ANOVA test was used to explore the impact of SES on the expression of emotion of students.

## Results

Table 2 *Emotion Regulation of Students*

| Factors of ER | Cognitive reappraisal | Expressive Suppression | Neuroticism | Conscientiousness | Extroversion |
|---------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Mean          | 4.90                  | 4.86                   | 4.49        | 4.88              | 5.19         |
| S.D           | .98                   | 1.19                   | 1.28        | 1.22              | 1.31         |

Table 2 exhibits the results about reported use of emotion regulation strategies by the students during expression of their emotions. The results illustrate that the mean score of extroversion (Mean 5.19, SD 1.31) emotion regulation is higher than all other factors of ER. The mean score of cognitive reappraisal emotion regulation (Mean 4.90, SD .98) is second in the rank of order. Data reported in table 2 indicates that the mean score of conscientiousness (Mean 4.88, SD 1.22), expressive suppression (Mean 4.86, SD 1.19) and neuroticism (Mean 4.49, SD 1.28) emotion regulation strategies explain less common than cognitive reappraisal and extroversion emotion regulation among students. So, this result indicates that positive emotion regulation strategies are common as compared to negative emotion regulation strategies among students.

Table 3 *Impact of mother's occupation on emotion regulation of children*

| Factors of ER          | Father occupation | n   | Mean | ANOVA Analysis |     |             |       |         |
|------------------------|-------------------|-----|------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|---------|
|                        |                   |     |      | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | p-value |
| Cognitive reappraisal  | Business          | 1   | 5.00 | 1.958          | 4   | .490        | .495  | .739    |
|                        | G. Employee       | 21  | 4.77 | 190.739        | 193 | .988        |       |         |
|                        | S.G               | 3   | 4.22 | 192.697        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | House wife        | 170 | 4.93 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | Self-employed     | 3   | 5.05 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Expressive suppression | Business          | 1   | 3.75 | 4.923          | 4   | 1.231       | .865  | .486    |
|                        | G. Employee       | 21  | 4.51 | 274.541        | 193 | 1.422       |       |         |
|                        | S.G               | 3   | 4.50 | 279.464        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | House wife        | 170 | 4.92 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | Self-employed     | 3   | 5.00 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Neuroticism            | Business          | 1   | 3.50 | 1.696          | 4   | .424        | .251  | .909    |
|                        | G. Employee       | 21  | 4.58 | 325.741        | 193 | 1.688       |       |         |
|                        | S.G               | 3   | 4.50 | 327.437        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | House wife        | 170 | 4.48 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | Self-employed     | 3   | 4.91 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Conscientiousness      | Business          | 1   | 3.00 | 10.821         | 4   | 2.705       | 1.845 | .122    |
|                        | G. Employee       | 21  | 4.55 | 282.957        | 193 | 1.466       |       |         |
|                        | S.G               | 3   | 5.22 | 293.778        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | House wife        | 170 | 4.91 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | Self-employed     | 3   | 6.11 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Extroversion           | Business          | 1   | 4.00 | 12.529         | 4   | 3.132       | 1.844 | .122    |
|                        | G. Employee       | 21  | 4.60 | 327.920        | 193 | 1.699       |       |         |
|                        | S.G               | 3   | 4.55 | 340.449        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | House wife        | 170 | 5.27 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | Self-employed     | 3   | 5.88 |                |     |             |       |         |

Table 3 demonstrates the data regarding the impact of mother's occupation on emotion regulation of children. The data reported in table 4 discloses that the ANOVA of cognitive reappraisal ( $F=.495$ ,  $p=.739$ ), expressive suppression ( $F=.251$ ,  $p=.909$ ), neuroticism ( $F=.251$ ,  $p=.909$ ), conscientiousness ( $F=1.845$ ,  $p=.122$ ) extroversion ( $F=1.844$ ,  $p=.122$ ) emotion regulation strategies indicate an insignificant mean difference. Therefore, this analysis indicates that mother's occupations do not affect the implementation of emotion regulation strategies by the students.

Table 4 *Impact of father's occupation on emotion regulation of student*

| Factors of ER          | Father occupation | n  | Mean | ANOVA Analysis |     |             |      |         |
|------------------------|-------------------|----|------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|---------|
|                        |                   |    |      | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F    | p-value |
| Cognitive reappraisal  | Business          | 42 | 4.88 | 1.530          | 4   | .383        | .386 | .818    |
|                        | G. Employee       | 62 | 4.95 | 191.167        | 193 | .991        |      |         |
|                        | S.G               | 9  | 4.59 | 192.697        | 197 |             |      |         |
|                        | Agriculture       | 49 | 4.98 |                |     |             |      |         |
|                        | Self-employed     | 36 | 4.83 |                |     |             |      |         |
| Expressive suppression | Business          | 42 | 4.76 | 3.554          | 4   | .888        | .621 | .648    |
|                        | G. Employee       | 62 | 4.86 | 275.910        | 193 | 1.430       |      |         |
|                        | S.G               | 9  | 4.61 | 279.464        | 197 |             |      |         |
|                        | Agriculture       | 49 | 5.08 |                |     |             |      |         |
|                        | Self-employed     | 36 | 4.78 |                |     |             |      |         |
| Neuroticism            | Business          | 42 | 4.40 | 1.426          | 4   | .357        | .211 | .932    |
|                        | G. Employee       | 62 | 4.51 | 326.011        | 193 | 1.689       |      |         |
|                        | S.G               | 9  | 4.22 | 327.437        | 197 |             |      |         |
|                        | Agriculture       | 49 | 4.57 |                |     |             |      |         |
|                        | Self-employed     | 36 | 4.54 |                |     |             |      |         |
| Conscientiousness      | Business          | 42 | 4.73 | 5.785          | 4   | 1.446       | .969 | .426    |
|                        | G. Employee       | 62 | 4.79 | 287.993        | 193 | 1.492       |      |         |
|                        | S.G               | 9  | 5.29 | 293.778        | 197 |             |      |         |
|                        | Agriculture       | 49 | 5.11 |                |     |             |      |         |
|                        | Self-employed     | 36 | 4.83 |                |     |             |      |         |
| Extroversion           | Business          | 42 | 4.94 | 4.839          | 4   | 1.210       | .696 | .596    |
|                        | G. Employee       | 62 | 5.15 | 335.610        | 193 | 1.739       |      |         |
|                        | S.G               | 9  | 5.29 | 340.449        | 197 |             |      |         |
|                        | Agriculture       | 49 | 5.38 |                |     |             |      |         |
|                        | Self-employed     | 36 | 5.26 |                |     |             |      |         |

Note: n = number of respondents, df = Degree of Freedom, p-value = Significance Level,

Table 4 demonstrates the data regarding the impact of father's occupation on emotion regulation of their children. Data reported in table 3 reveals that the ANOVA of cognitive reappraisal ( $F=.386$ ,  $p=.818$ ), expressive suppression ( $F=.621$ ,  $p=.648$ ), neuroticism ( $F=.21$ ,  $p=.932$ ), conscientiousness ( $F=.969$ ,  $p=.426$ ) extroversion ( $F=.696$ ,  $p=.596$ ) and emotion regulation strategies indicate an insignificant mean difference. Therefore, this analysis indicates that father's occupations do not affect the implementation of emotion regulation strategies by the students.

Table 5 (a) *Impact of mother's qualification on emotion regulation of children*

| Factors of ER          | Mother qualification | n  | Mean | ANOVA Analysis |     |             |       |         |
|------------------------|----------------------|----|------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|---------|
|                        |                      |    |      | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | p-value |
| Cognitive reappraisal  | Illiterate           | 42 | 4.66 | 12.508         | 6   | 2.085       | 2.210 | .044    |
|                        | Under Matric         | 47 | 5.05 | 180.189        | 191 | .943        |       |         |
|                        | Matric               | 47 | 5.17 | 192.697        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | FA                   | 29 | 5.04 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | BA                   | 17 | 4.60 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | MA                   | 14 | 4.40 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | M.Phil               | 2  | 4.58 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Expressive suppression | Illiterate           | 42 | 5.06 | 8.621          | 6   | 1.437       | 1.013 | .418    |
|                        | Under Matric         | 47 | 4.91 | 270.842        | 191 | 1.418       |       |         |
|                        | Matric               | 47 | 5.00 | 279.464        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | FA                   | 29 | 4.75 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | BA                   | 17 | 4.54 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | MA                   | 14 | 4.42 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | M.Phil               | 2  | 4.12 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Neuroticism            | Illiterate           | 42 | 4.29 | 7.964          | 6   | 1.327       | .794  | .576    |
|                        | Under Matric         | 47 | 4.55 | 319.473        | 191 | 1.673       |       |         |
|                        | Matric               | 47 | 4.77 | 327.437        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | FA                   | 29 | 4.43 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | BA                   | 17 | 4.14 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | MA                   | 14 | 4.51 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | M.Phil               | 2  | 4.75 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Conscientiousness      | Illiterate           | 42 | 4.99 | 8.165          | 6   | 1.361       | .910  | .489    |
|                        | Under Matric         | 47 | 4.94 | 285.613        | 191 | 1.495       |       |         |
|                        | Matric               | 47 | 4.99 | 293.778        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | FA                   | 29 | 4.83 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | BA                   | 17 | 4.39 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | MA                   | 14 | 4.61 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | M.Phil               | 2  | 5.83 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Extroversion           | Illiterate           | 42 | 5.11 | 30.710         | 6   | 5.118       | 3.156 | .006    |
|                        | Under Matric         | 47 | 5.59 | 309.739        | 191 | 1.622       |       |         |
|                        | Matric               | 47 | 5.43 | 340.449        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | FA                   | 29 | 4.94 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | BA                   | 17 | 4.84 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | MA                   | 14 | 4.14 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | M.Phil               | 2  | 5.83 |                |     |             |       |         |

Table 5 (a) demonstrates the data about the impact of mother's qualification on emotion regulation of children. The data reported in table 5 describes that the ANOVA of cognitive reappraisal ( $F=2.210$ ,  $p=.044$ ) and extroversion ( $F=3.156$ ,  $p=.006$ ) emotion regulation strategies indicate a significant mean difference but analysis of expressive suppression ( $F=1.013$ ,  $p=.418$ ), neuroticism ( $F=.794$ ,  $p=.576$ ) and conscientiousness ( $F=.910$ ,  $p=.489$ ) emotion regulation strategies indicate an insignificant mean difference. Therefore, this analysis indicates that mother's qualification affects the cognitive reappraisal and extroversion emotion regulation strategies experienced by their children during the expression of their emotion.

An LSD test was applied to find out where the significant differences exist. The below table shows the significant mean difference between groups.

Table 5 (b) *LSD analysis regarding the levels of effect of qualification of mothers on ER of children*

| Factors of ER         |     | IL&M     | UM & BA | UM & MA  | M & BA  | M & MA   | FA & MA | IL & MA | UM & FA |
|-----------------------|-----|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|---------|---------|
| Cognitive Reappraisal | M.D | -.50355* | .56237* | .76545*  | .56237* | .76545*  | .64122* |         |         |
|                       | Sig | .016     | .042    | .010     | .042    | .010     | .044    |         |         |
| Extroversion          | M.D |          | .75261* | 1.45289* |         | 1.28977* |         | .97619* | .65322* |
|                       | Sig |          | .038    | .000     |         | .001     |         | .014    | .031    |

Note: sig = Significance Level, M.D = Mean Difference, IL = Illiterate, UM = Under Matric Only those groups were mentioned in which a significant mean difference exists.

Table 5 (b) demonstrates the LSD analysis regarding the levels of qualification of mothers. LSD analysis indicates a significant mean difference between the levels of qualification of mothers. On the biases of the results reported in table.5 (b) the groups with p-values less than 0.05 indicate significant mean differences between the levels qualification of mothers. Therefore, this analysis indicates that mother's qualification influences cognitive reappraisal and extroversion emotion regulation strategies practiced by their children in different situations.

Table 6 (a) *Impact of father's qualification on emotion regulation of children*

| Factors of ER          | Father qualification | n  | Mean | ANOVA Analysis |     |             |       |         |
|------------------------|----------------------|----|------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|---------|
|                        |                      |    |      | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | p-value |
| Cognitive reappraisal  | Illiterate           | 17 | 4.75 | 14.246         | 7   | 2.035       | 2.167 | .039    |
|                        | Under Matric         | 30 | 4.86 | 178.451        | 190 | .939        |       |         |
|                        | Matric               | 54 | 4.93 | 192.697        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | FA                   | 30 | 5.28 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | BA                   | 31 | 4.75 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | MA                   | 29 | 4.74 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | MPhil                | 3  | 3.77 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | PhD                  | 4  | 5.91 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Expressive suppression | Illiterate           | 17 | 5.07 | 15.087         | 7   | 2.155       | 1.549 | .153    |
|                        | Under Matric         | 30 | 4.63 | 264.376        | 190 | 1.391       |       |         |
|                        | Matric               | 54 | 4.90 | 279.464        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | FA                   | 30 | 5.24 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | BA                   | 31 | 4.66 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | MA                   | 29 | 4.89 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | M.Phil               | 3  | 3.33 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | PhD                  | 4  | 5.06 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Neuroticism            | Illiterate           | 17 | 4.50 | 9.349          | 7   | 1.336       | .798  | .590    |
|                        | Under Matric         | 30 | 4.62 | 318.089        | 190 | 1.674       |       |         |
|                        | Matric               | 54 | 4.51 | 327.437        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | FA                   | 30 | 4.75 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | BA                   | 31 | 4.54 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | MA                   | 29 | 4.01 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | M.Phil               | 3  | 4.41 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | PhD                  | 4  | 4.56 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Conscientiousness      | Illiterate           | 17 | 5.13 | 4.633          | 7   | .662        | .435  | .879    |
|                        | Under Matric         | 30 | 5.03 | 289.145        | 190 | 1.522       |       |         |
|                        | Matric               | 54 | 4.81 | 293.778        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | FA                   | 30 | 4.87 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | BA                   | 31 | 4.84 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | MA                   | 29 | 4.93 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | M.Phil               | 3  | 4.33 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | PhD                  | 4  | 4.25 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Extroversion           | Illiterate           | 17 | 5.07 | 14.290         | 7   | 2.041       | 1.189 | .311    |
|                        | Under Matric         | 30 | 5.37 | 326.159        | 190 | 1.717       |       |         |
|                        | Matric               | 54 | 5.19 | 340.449        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | FA                   | 30 | 5.66 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | BA                   | 31 | 5.07 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | MA                   | 29 | 4.86 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | M.Phil               | 3  | 4.55 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | PhD                  | 4  | 4.58 |                |     |             |       |         |

Note: IL = Illiterate, UM = Under Matric

Table 6 (a) demonstrates the data regarding the impact of father's qualification on emotion regulation of children. The data reported in table 6 (a) reveals that the ANOVA analysis of cognitive reappraisal ( $F=2.167$ ,  $p=.039$ ) emotion regulation strategies indicate a significant mean difference but expressive suppression ( $F=1.549$ ,  $p=.153$ ), neuroticism ( $F=.798$ ,  $p=.590$ ), conscientiousness ( $F=.435$ ,  $p=.879$ ) extroversion ( $F=1.189$ ,  $p=.311$ ) emotion regulation strategies indicate an insignificant mean difference. Therefore, this analysis indicates that

qualification of fathers only affects the cognitive reappraisal emotion regulation strategies experienced by their children during the expression of their emotion.

An LSD test was applied to find out where the significant differences exist. The below table shows the significant mean difference between the groups.

Table 6 (b) *LSD analysis regarding the levels of effect of qualification of fathers on ER of children*

| Factors of ER         |     | IL & PhD  | Factors of ER | IL & PhD | Factors of ER | IL & PhD  | Factors of ER | IL & PhD  | Factors of ER |
|-----------------------|-----|-----------|---------------|----------|---------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|---------------|
| Cognitive Reappraisal | M.D | -1.16176* | -1.05000*     | 1.15741* | -.53082*      | -1.15860* | -1.17529*     | -1.17529* | 2.13889*      |
|                       | Sig | .032      | .043          | .045     | .034          | .026      | .024          | .024      | .004          |

Note: sig = Significance Level, M.D = Mean Difference, IL = Illiterate, UM = Under Matric

Only those groups were mentioned in which a significant mean difference exists.

Table 6 (b) demonstrates the LSD analysis regarding the levels of qualification of fathers. The LSD analysis indicates a mean difference between the levels of qualification of fathers. On the biases of the results reported in table 6 (b), the groups with p-values less than 0.05 indicate a significant mean difference between the levels of qualification of fathers. Therefore, this analysis indicates that qualification of fathers influences the cognitive reappraisal emotion regulation strategies practiced by their children in different situations during expression of their emotions.

Table 7 (a) *Impact of financial status on emotion regulation of children*

| Factors of ER          | Income status   | n  | Mean | ANOVA Analysis |     |             |       |         |
|------------------------|-----------------|----|------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|---------|
|                        |                 |    |      | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | p-value |
| Cognitive reappraisal  | less than 20000 | 76 | 4.95 | 17.649         | 4   | 4.412       | 4.865 | .001    |
|                        | 20000 – 40000   | 76 | 5.13 | 175.048        | 193 | .907        |       |         |
|                        | 41000 – 60000   | 40 | 4.46 | 192.697        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | 61000 – 80000   | 4  | 5.16 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | more than 81000 | 2  | 3.25 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Expressive suppression | less than 20000 | 76 | 5.00 | 15.072         | 4   | 3.768       | 2.751 | .029    |
|                        | 20000 – 40000   | 76 | 4.96 | 264.392        | 193 | 1.370       |       |         |
|                        | 41000 – 60000   | 40 | 4.49 | 279.464        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | 61000 – 80000   | 4  | 5.12 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | more than 81000 | 2  | 3.00 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Neuroticism            | less than 20000 | 76 | 4.67 | 5.195          | 4   | 1.299       | .778  | .541    |
|                        | 20000 – 40000   | 76 | 4.41 | 322.243        | 193 | 1.670       |       |         |
|                        | 41000 – 60000   | 40 | 4.36 | 327.437        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | 61000 – 80000   | 4  | 4.37 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | more than 81000 | 2  | 3.62 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Conscientiousness      | less than 20000 | 76 | 5.01 | 8.483          | 4   | 2.121       | 1.435 | .224    |
|                        | 20000 – 40000   | 76 | 4.91 | 285.295        | 193 | 1.478       |       |         |
|                        | 41000 – 60000   | 40 | 4.60 | 293.778        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | 61000 – 80000   | 4  | 5.41 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | more than 81000 | 2  | 3.66 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Extroversion           | less than 20000 | 76 | 5.45 | 21.289         | 4   | 5.322       | 3.219 | .014    |
|                        | 20000 – 40000   | 76 | 5.27 | 319.160        | 193 | 1.654       |       |         |
|                        | 41000 – 60000   | 40 | 4.57 | 340.449        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | 61000 – 80000   | 4  | 5.00 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | more than 81000 | 2  | 5.00 |                |     |             |       |         |

Table 4.5.4 (a) demonstrates the data about the impact of monthly income of family on emotion regulation of students. The ANOVA analysis of cognitive reappraisal ( $F=4.642$ ,  $p=.001$ ), expressive suppression ( $F=3.031$ ,  $p=.019$ ) and extroversion ( $F=2.826$ ,  $p=.026$ ) emotion regulation strategies experienced by the students indicates a significant mean difference. The ANOVA analysis of neuroticism ( $F=.944$ ,  $p=.439$ ), conscientiousness ( $F=1.276$ ,  $p=.281$ ) emotion regulation strategies implemented by the students indicate an insignificant mean difference. Therefore, this analysis indicates that the financial status of family affects the cognitive reappraisal, expressive suppression and extroversion emotion regulation strategies experienced by their children during the expression of their emotion. An LSD test was applied to find out where the significant mean differences exist. The below table shows the significant mean difference between the groups.

Table 7 (b) *LSD analysis regarding the levels of effect of monthly income of parents on ER of children*

| Factors of ER          |     | A & C   | A & E    | B & C   | B & E    | D & E    |
|------------------------|-----|---------|----------|---------|----------|----------|
| Cognitive Reappraisal  | M.D | .48925* | 1.70175* | .66908* | 1.88158* | 1.91667* |
|                        | Sig | .009    | .013     | .000    | .006     | .021     |
| Expressive Suppression | M.D | .51612* | 2.00987* | .47007* | 1.96382* | 2.12500* |
|                        | Sig | .025    | .017     | .041    | .020     | .037     |
| Extroversion           | M.D | .88114* |          | .70132* |          |          |
|                        | Sig | .001    |          | .006    |          |          |

Note: sig = Significance Level, M.D = Mean Difference, A= less than 20000, B = 20000 – 40000, C = 41000 – 60000, D = 61000 – 80000, E = more than 81000

Only those groups were mentioned in which a significant mean difference exists.

Table 7 (b) demonstrates the LSD analysis regarding the levels of monthly income of parents. The LSD analysis indicates a significant mean difference between the levels of monthly income of parents. On the basis of the results reported in table 7 (b) the groups with p-values less than 0.05 indicate a significant mean difference between the levels monthly income of parents. Therefore, this analysis indicates that monthly income of parents influences cognitive reappraisal, expressive suppression and extroversion emotion regulation strategies practiced by their children in different situations during expression of their emotions.

To find out the impact of SES on emotion regulation of students, a one-way ANOVA was applied to gain the results. For the estimation of labelling classes in terms of Lower middle, Middle, Lower high and High for the analysis purpose, the Visual Binning method was applied.

Table 8 *Impact of SES on emotion regulation of children*

| Factors of ER          | Income status              | N   | Mean | ANOVA Analysis |     |             |       |         |
|------------------------|----------------------------|-----|------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|---------|
|                        |                            |     |      | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | p-value |
| Cognitive reappraisal  | Lower <= 10.00             | 2   | 3.83 | 5.237          | 4   | 1.309       | 1.348 | .254    |
|                        | Lower middle 11.00 - 13.75 | 17  | 5.00 | 187.460        | 193 | .971        |       |         |
|                        | Middle 13.76 - 17.50       | 101 | 5.01 | 192.697        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | Lower high 17.51 - 21.25   | 64  | 4.75 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | High 21.26+                | 14  | 4.90 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Expressive suppression | Lower                      | 2   | 4.75 | 5.318          | 4   | 1.330       | .936  | .444    |
|                        | Lower middle               | 17  | 5.30 | 274.145        | 193 | 1.420       |       |         |
|                        | Middle                     | 101 | 4.91 | 279.464        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | Lower high                 | 64  | 4.71 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | High                       | 14  | 4.71 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Neuroticism            | Lower                      | 2   | 3.87 | 3.920          | 4   | .980        | .585  | .674    |
|                        | Lower middle               | 17  | 4.47 | 323.518        | 193 | 1.676       |       |         |
|                        | Middle                     | 101 | 4.59 | 327.437        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | Lower high                 | 64  | 4.44 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | High                       | 14  | 4.12 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Conscientiousness      | Lower                      | 2   | 4.50 | 4.187          | 4   | 1.047       | .698  | .594    |
|                        | Lower middle               | 17  | 5.33 | 289.591        | 193 | 1.500       |       |         |
|                        | Middle                     | 101 | 4.85 | 293.778        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | Lower high                 | 64  | 4.82 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | High                       | 14  | 4.97 |                |     |             |       |         |
| Extroversion           | Lower                      | 2   | 4.33 | 6.911          | 4   | 1.728       | 1.000 | .409    |
|                        | Lower middle               | 17  | 5.35 | 333.538        | 193 | 1.728       |       |         |
|                        | Middle                     | 101 | 5.33 | 340.449        | 197 |             |       |         |
|                        | Lower high                 | 64  | 4.99 |                |     |             |       |         |
|                        | High                       | 14  | 5.02 |                |     |             |       |         |

Table 8 reveals the data regarding the impact of SES on emotion regulation of children. The data reported in table 8 explains that the ANOVA of cognitive reappraisal ( $F=1.348$ ,  $p=.254$ ), expressive suppression ( $F=.936$ ,  $p=.444$ ), neuroticism ( $F=.585$ ,  $p=.674$ ), conscientiousness ( $F=.698$ ,  $p=.594$ ) and extroversion ( $F=1.000$ ,  $p=.409$ ) emotion regulation strategies indicate an insignificant mean difference. Therefore, this analysis indicates that SES had no influence on the application of emotion regulation strategies by the students.

## Discussion

This study was conducted to recognise the grammatical construction of emotion regulation of students and explore the effects of SES on emotion regulation among students. The socioeconomic status of family influences overall individuals functioning as well as their physical and emotional health. On the basis of the analysis of the current study, it was found that SES is crucial in the emotional development of children. Therefore, the results indicated that positive emotion regulation strategies are common compared to negative emotion regulation strategies among students. It was also concluded that education of mothers and

fathers has an effect on the positive emotion regulation strategies of their children but financial status of family influences the implementation of both positive and negative emotion regulation strategies of children. The results of the current study match with those previous studies which explored the relationship of parental level of education and emotional problems of children. Many other studies support these results likewise, Mohamadous, (2017) found that a low physical quality home environment limits the intellectual and emotional development of children.

Another study examined that parental level of education and financial status of family were associated with the family practices and mental health functioning (i.e., social competence and behavioural problems) of children in different ways (Hosokawa & Katsura, 2017). It was also investigated by the researcher that low and high SES of family depended upon the qualification level of parents because the parents who had high level of education, had a high income and a more respectable kind of occupation (Mohamed, Satari, Yasin, & Toran, 2020).

Another study revealed that individuals with a better financial status express their emotions in a better way. Thus financial success is closely related to the implementation of emotion regulation strategies among students (Gallo & Matthews, 2003). Many empirical studies examined that better SES influenced emotion regulation skills, cognitive abilities and welfare of children (Singh & Shankar, 2013). Several studies found that socioeconomic status has an effect on the manifestation of behavioural difficulties. Likewise social inequalities influence the development of the child, for example unequal distribution of material resources could be helpful for the healthy development of a child. Moreover, researchers discovered the socioeconomic status, especially poor financial status of family and low level of education of mothers became the cause of behavioural issues (Hosokawa & Katsura, 2018). Another study found that socioeconomic status was found to be a forecaster of mental health of adults (Power, 2002; Rahkonen, Lahelma, & Huuhka, 1997). It was also explored that maternal compulsory education is significantly associated with externalised and behavioural problems of children (Hosokawa & Katsura, 2018). Regarding the influence of parental level of education, it was examined that those with a lower level of parental success in education have the highest in the behavioural development of their children (Huisman et al., 2010).

## **Conclusions**

The analysis of the current study explored that the qualification of mothers influences the cognitive reappraisal and extroversion emotion regulation strategies experienced by their children during the expression of their emotion. Likewise, the qualification of fathers also affects the cognitive reappraisal emotion regulation strategies implemented by their children during the manifestation of their emotion. Therefore, regarding the financial status of family, the analysis explored that the financial status of family affects the cognitive reappraisal, expressive suppression and extroversion emotion regulation strategies practiced by the children. Hence qualification of fathers and mothers were associated with effective emotion



---

regulation strategies of children but financial status of family had an impact on both positive and negative way of expression of the student. The present study altogether investigated that SES plays an essential part in the development of emotion regulation skills among children.

### **Recommendations**

Future studies can discover the implication of results in more practical fields. Analysis of this study confirms the importance of emotion regulation skills in student's lives and its relationship with the socioeconomic status of family. This study will support the policy makers so, there is a need to focus these important aspects in school curricula to bring positive change among the personality of students. A questionnaire was used to collect data in the current study therefore, for the further studies observation and case study methods can be the best option to get more reliable data.

## REFERENCES

- APA. (2014). Children, youth, families and socioeconomic status. Retrieved from American Psychological Association: <http://www.apa.org/pi/ses/resources/publications/factsheet-cyf.aspx>.
- Bîlc, M., Cioară, M., & Miu, A. C. (2016). *Childhood socioeconomic status and emotion regulation difficulties*. Paper presented at the 6th International Conference on Emotions, Well-being and Health.
- Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. *Annual review of psychology*, 53(1), 371-399.
- Brooks-Gunn, J., & Duncan, G. J. (1997). The effects of poverty on children. *The future of children*, 55-71.
- de Neubourg, E., Borghans, L., Coppens, K., & Jansen, M. (2018). Explaining children's life outcomes: parental socioeconomic status, intelligence and neurocognitive factors in a dynamic life cycle model. *Child indicators research*, 11(5), 1495-1513.
- Eisenberg, N., Hofer, C., & Vaughan, J. (2007). Effortful control and its socioemotional consequences. *Handbook of emotion regulation*, 2, 287-288.
- Gallo, L. C., & Matthews, K. A. (2003). Understanding the association between socioeconomic status and physical health: do negative emotions play a role? *Psychological bulletin*, 129(1), 10.
- Hittner, E. F., Rim, K. L., & Haase, C. M. (2018). Socioeconomic status as a moderator of the link between reappraisal and anxiety: Laboratory-based and longitudinal evidence. *Emotion*.
- Hosokawa, R., & Katsura, T. (2017). A longitudinal study of socioeconomic status, family processes, and child adjustment from preschool until early elementary school: the role of social competence. *Child and adolescent psychiatry and mental health*, 11(1), 62.
- Hosokawa, R., & Katsura, T. (2018a). Effect of socioeconomic status on behavioral problems from preschool to early elementary school—A Japanese longitudinal study. *PloS one*, 13(5).
- Hosokawa, R., & Katsura, T. (2018b). Effect of socioeconomic status on behavioral problems from preschool to early elementary school—A Japanese longitudinal study. *PloS one*, 13(5), e0197961.
- Huisman, M., Araya, R., Lawlor, D. A., Ormel, J., Verhulst, F. C., & Oldehinkel, A. J. (2010). Cognitive ability, parental socioeconomic position and internalising and externalising problems in adolescence: findings from two European cohort studies. *European journal of epidemiology*, 25(8), 569-580.
- Kao, K., Tuladhar, C. T., Meyer, J. S., & Tarullo, A. R. (2019). Emotion regulation moderates the association between parent and child hair cortisol concentrations. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 61(7), 1064-1078.



- Kim, D., Perteau, G., Trapnell, C., Pimentel, H., Kelley, R., & Salzberg, S. L. (2013). TopHat2: accurate alignment of transcriptomes in the presence of insertions, deletions and gene fusions. *Genome biology*, 14(4), R36.
- McCoy, M. G., Frick, P. J., Loney, B. R., & Ellis, M. L. (1999). The potential mediating role of parenting practices in the development of conduct problems in a clinic-referred sample. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 8(4), 477-494.
- McLoyd, V. C. (1997). The impact of poverty and low socioeconomic status on the socioemotional functioning of African-American children and adolescents: Mediating effects. *Social and emotional adjustment and family relations in ethnic minority families*, 7, 34.
- Mohamadou, G. Children Development and Socioeconomic Status of Parents: An Analysis of Families in the Far North Region of Cameroon.
- Mohamed, S., & Toran, H. (2018). Family Socioeconomic Status and Social-emotional Development among Young Children in Malaysia. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 18(3), 122-128.
- Mohamed, S., Satari, N., Yasin, M. H. M., & Toran, H. (2020). *Malaysian Early Childhood Educators' Perceptions Regarding Children's Social-Emotional Development*. Paper presented at the 3rd International Conference on Learning Innovation and Quality Education (ICLIQE 2019).
- Pettigrew, E. J. (2009). A Study of the Impact of Socioeconomic Status on Student Achievement in a Rural East Tennessee School System.
- Power, C. (2002). Childhood adversity still matters for adult health outcomes. *The Lancet*, 360(9346), 1619-1620.
- Rahkonen, O., Lahelma, E., & Huuhka, M. (1997). Past or present? Childhood living conditions and current socioeconomic status as determinants of adult health. *Social science & medicine*, 44(3), 327-336.
- Reise, S. P., & Waller, N. G. (2009). Item response theory and clinical measurement. *Annual review of clinical psychology*, 5, 27-48.
- Reiss, F. (2013). Socioeconomic inequalities and mental health problems in children and adolescents: a systematic review. *Social science & medicine*, 90, 24-31.
- Sedykh, A., Fourches, D., Duan, J., Hucke, O., Garneau, M., Zhu, H., . . . Tropsha, A. (2013). Human intestinal transporter database: QSAR modeling and virtual profiling of drug uptake, efflux and interactions. *Pharmaceutical research*, 30(4), 996-1007.
- Singh, S., & Shankar, B. (2013). Socio-economic status of family as a factor of emotion regulation and well-being. *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing*, 4(8), 1521.
- Sirin, S. R. (2005). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research. *Review of educational research*, 75(3), 417-453.
- Taylor, S. (2006). Narrative as construction and discursive resource. *Narrative inquiry*, 16(1), 94-102.
- White, K. R. (1982). The relation between socioeconomic status and academic achievement. *Psychological bulletin*, 91(3), 461.