

Family Systems Theory: An additional insight into Japanese late adolescents/young adults' identity confusion and trait anxiety? ¹⁾

Yoshinobu Kanazawa (*Institute of Psychology, University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba 305-8572, Japan*)

This survey research is an attempt at empirically testing Murray Bowen's Family Systems Theory constructs on a sample of Japanese college students. Self-report measures of identity confusion, trait anxiety, family systems variables (cohesion, disengagement and enmeshment), and the degree of involvement with others were used. Statistical analyses of 271 completed questionnaires provided only partial support for the theoretical constructs. The individual's perceptions of involvement with, and distance from, others accounted for more variance in identity confusion and trait anxiety than that accounted for by family systems variables. Relationships between subjects' degree of involvement with others and family systems' boundaries yielded mixed results. On the other hand, cohesion was negatively related to psychological distress. Based on the results of this study, it appears that incorporating family systems issues in clinical practice is useful but of secondary importance compared with the individual's perceptions of self.

Key words: Family Systems Theory, trait anxiety, identity confusion, enmeshment, disengagement.

In recent years researchers have witnessed a growing interest in how family relationships influence the development and successful consolidation of the late adolescent/young adult identity (Lopez, 1992). Two primary foci in this body of literature are identified (Lopez & Gover, 1993): 1. Studies that emphasize parental attachment; 2. Studies that incorporate family systems perspectives. The first focus is largely based on psychodynamic theories. These theories have suggested a positive relationship between psychological as well as physical/material separation from parental ties and general life adjustment during late adolescence and early adulthood (Bloom, 1980; Bloss, 1962; Kenny & Rice, 1995). That is, the adolescent undergoes a "second" separation-individuation

process, which recapitulates earlier separation processes (Mahler, 1968), attaining a clear and stable identity. In this process the adolescent's primary task is to disengage from parental dependency and the internalized object representations formed during infancy and early childhood. The adolescent becomes a member of the larger society by leaving the symbiotic ties with the parents. There is an accumulation of late adolescent parental-attachment research suggesting a link between the late adolescent's perceptions of separation/attachment and various indices of his/her development and psychological health (e.g., Blustein, Walbridge, Friedlander, & Palladino, 1991; Kenny, 1990; Kenny & Hart, 1992; Lopez, Campbell, & Watkins, 1986, 1988).

In contrast to psychodynamic views, family systems perspectives hold that the individual's family functioning and his/her psychological health/distress are closely intertwined. The family

1) Portions of this article were presented at the 35th Annual Convention of Japanese Association for Educational Psychology in Nagoya, Japan, in October, 1993.

is a major context in which the child develops his/her identity and various aspects of psychosocial competence. As the child reaches adolescence, the family's major responsibility shifts to that of launching the child into worlds outside the family. In this process, a central issue for the family is distance regulation (Kantor & Lehr, 1975). The family system negotiates its distance from the external world, as well as distances between the subsystems, to accommodate the family's developmental stage.

In family systems theories, these "distances" are conceptualized as "boundaries." A family boundary is a dimension ranging from one extreme to another (Olson, Sprenkle, & Russell, 1979): enmeshment (a high degree of connectedness, in which family members are expected to act and think alike) and disengagement (a low degree of connectedness, where family members are highly independent and have little effect on one another). A healthy, balanced boundary regulation is characterized by cohesiveness, a boundary that is neither enmeshed nor disengaged. As a child grows, family boundaries undergo changes; when he/she reaches adolescence, family boundaries need to be more flexible so that the adolescent may be able to "leave home."

One of the family systems theories that appear to have considerable clinical utility is that of Murray Bowen (1976, 1978). According to Bowen's Family Systems Theory, the family is an emotional relationship system, referred to as an "undifferentiated family ego mass" (Bowen, 1976, 1978). In order to avoid falling victim to the emotional force of the family system and be able to separate oneself from the family system's emotionality, one would need to differentiate between emotional and intellectual functioning. The person in whom intellect and emotion are fused is ruled by emotionality and is controlled by his/her own and/or the prevailing emotional climate of the family. The person in whom emotion and intellect are differentiated is better able to choose emotional and/or intellectual reaction, rather than chosen by it.

Differentiation of self is a central concept in Bowenian theory. It is a continuum that runs from low differentiation to high differentiation of self. The low end of the continuum is characterized by

emotional and intellectual fusion. An individual who is emotionally and intellectually fused is unable to separate him-/herself from the family of origin and is constantly vulnerable to any family dilemma. His/her life is dominated by emotionality. This individual is totally relationship-oriented, devoting energy to seeking love, approval, and validation. On the other hand, those at the high end of the continuum demonstrate good differentiation of self. They are capable of functioning effectively independent of their families of origin. They are able to differentiate between their thoughts and feelings. They not only maintain clear individual identity but also develop flexible relationships with others. In Bowenian theory, those who are less well differentiated are more subject to the emotionality of the family system; that is, they are more likely to be seduced by the emotions of the highly tense two-person system and "triangled in" to diffuse the tension in the two-person system.

Family systems may also be described as possessing a level of differentiation ranging on a continuum from low to high differentiation. Families that are poorly differentiated are thought to regulate interpersonal distances in such a way as to block psychological separation and autonomy of family members. In such families, members are highly reactive to one another, with the possibility of individuals losing their identity as self/other boundaries are blurred. Relatively well-differentiated families are characterized by emotional connectedness, but they also allow for a feeling of individual separateness. This permits family members to function as part of a group while maintain individual identity.

The developmental needs of the adolescent require a shift in the ways in which psychological distances in the family are regulated in order that the adolescent's identity tasks may be fulfilled. The well-differentiated family is able to readjust so that the individuation process can proceed with a minimum of stress. The poorly differentiated family resists the changes necessary to accommodate an adolescent's identity needs by blocking his/her efforts toward psychological autonomy. Such individuals may become highly emotionally reactive to the family system, and this reactivity may affect the way physical distances are regulated,

with the adolescent either becoming enmeshed in the family system (physically and psychologically dependent) or cutting themselves off from the family system.

Theoretical differences in the interpretation of psychological health/distress do not merely remain theoretical. If indeed the individual's family has an impact upon his/her psychological health, then the individual's problem is seen as a sign of a malfunctioning family, and the counselor's role would be to intervene in the family so as to change the family system itself. On the other hand, if the individual's problem is seen as residing within the individual, then the counselor would best work with the individual client, attempting to clarify his/her identity and improve upon his/her competence (e. g., coping skills).

While family systems perspectives appear to hold promise in broadening our understanding of late adolescents' psychological health/distress and developmental concerns, attempts to empirically validate these theories have only recently begun. Although useful in conceptualizing family processes in clinical practice, theoretical constructs of family systems theories have posed difficulties in terms of operational definition (Bray, Williamson, & Malone, 1984; Gurman & Kniskern, 1981).

Virtually no research has been conducted to examine the validity of Bowen's Family Systems Theory for the Japanese. The present study is an attempt to examine the degree of applicability of Family Systems Theory, a most prominent of the family systems theories, to Japanese college students. If Family Systems Theory holds true, the individual's distance from others should be closely related to the family's distance regulation. Further, closer individual distances and closer family boundaries should be related, while more inter-individual distances are linked to increased intra-family distances. Finally, these individual and family issues both ought to be related to the adolescent's psychological distress. Therefore, the following hypotheses are advanced:

(1) The family's degree of enmeshment and the individual's degree of connectedness with other people are positively correlated. Similarly, the family's degree of disengagement is correlated positively with the individual's degree of

separatedness from others.

(2) The family's degree of enmeshment and the individual's degree of connectedness with others relate positively to the individual's psychological distress, such as trait anxiety and identity confusion.

(3) The family's degree of disengagement and the individual's degree of separatedness from others relate positively to the individual's psychological distress, such as trait anxiety and identity confusion.

(4) The degree of family cohesiveness, an indicator of healthy family functioning, is negatively related to the individual's psychological distress, such as trait anxiety and identity confusion.

(5) The family's enmeshment and the individual's connectedness with others, on one hand, and the family's disengagement and the individual's excessive separatedness from others, on the other, are opposite constructs; therefore, these two sets of variables are negatively related.

Method

Subjects

Subjects were drawn from four colleges/universities in Japan (a private university in Tokyo, a national university in Osaka, a national university in Niigata, and a Japanese branch campus of a U.S. university located in Niigata). A total of 330 students participated in this study. Usable data were obtained from 271 students (82.1% return rate). There were 106 men and 165 women, with a mean age of 19.5 years.

Materials

Subjects were asked to respond anonymously to the following questionnaires in Japanese.

①Face Sheet

The face sheet consists of questions regarding demographic information, such as the subject's age, gender, family size, and other pertinent information.

②Sunada's Identity Confusion Questionnaire (ICQ) (Sunada, 1979)

A major task for adolescents/young adults is to establish a clear identity. The Identity Confusion Questionnaire was developed to measure the degree of identity confusion as discussed by Erikson (1968). The instrument consists of 34 three-point scales. Sunada (1979) reports a split-half reliability coefficient of .96.

③Japanese version of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) (Shimizu & Imasaka, 1981)

The original State-Trait Anxiety Inventory, one of the most widely used psychometric instruments, was developed by Spielberger and his colleagues (Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1970). The STAI consists of two scales: the Trait Anxiety scale measures long-term, characterological anxiety, while the State Anxiety scale assesses temporary, transient tension and anxiety. The Japanese college version developed by Shimizu and Imasaka (1981) reportedly is highly reliable and valid. According to these authors, Cronbach's α is .85, test-retest reliability with an 80-day interval is .80, and high correlations are found with such other anxiety inventories as the Cattell Anxiety Scale. The Trait Anxiety scale was used in this study to measure subjects' level of characterological anxiety.

④Family Functioning Scales (FFS: Bloom, 1985)

Bloom (1985) developed the Family Functioning Scales through statistical procedures using measures already available. Four commonly used self-report scales that purport to measure family functioning were subjected to a series of factor analyses and cross-validation studies. The original scales used to develop the FFS were the Family Environment Scale, the Family-Concept Q Sort, the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES), and the Family Assessment Measure. The FFS consists of 15 subscales, each including five 4-point Likert-type items. A Japanese version of the FFS was used in Watanabe's study (1989). In the present study, the original FFS was subjected to back-translation (Brislin, 1986) so that the original scales and the translated ones would be as equivalent as possible. Two bilingual (Japanese/English) persons, both with graduate education in the U. S., conducted back-translation procedures. As a result, the following Cronbach's

α values were obtained for this sample: Cohesion .84, Disengagement .64, and Enmeshment .67. These reliabilities are comparable or slightly better than those reported by Watanabe (1989). The Cohesion, Disengagement, and Enmeshment subscales, those that measure family boundaries, were used for this study.

⑤Connected Self-Separated Self (C-S) Scales (Yamamoto, 1989)

The individual's degree of involvement with and distance from other people were measured on the Connected Self-Separated Self Scales. It is widely accepted that a person has two opposite sides: interpersonal relatedness and self-definition (Guisinger & Blatt, 1994). The C-S Scales were developed to assess an individual's perceptions of the two sides of self. The C-scale consists of 19 items, and the S-scale has 12 items, all 4-point Likert-type scales. Yamamoto (1989) reports Cronbach's α values of .81 for the C-scale and .73 for the S-scale, as well as no significant relationship between the two.

Procedures

A series of surveys was conducted in Niigata, Tokyo, and Osaka, Japan, in June and July, 1991. This researcher had teaching responsibilities at the two colleges/universities in Niigata; the other schools were selected based on the researcher's personal contact with the faculty. Subjects were contacted through class by this researcher and/or psychology faculty members at the respective schools. Subjects were told of the voluntary nature of this study as well as the assurance of anonymity. Those who agreed responded to the questionnaires. This researcher distributed and collected the questionnaires in Niigata; the faculty members conducted the surveys in Tokyo and Osaka at this researcher's request.

Results

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) failed to produce a significant gender difference on the variables [$F(7,263)=1.38, p=.213$]. Thus no separate-gender analyses were performed in this study.

Intercorrelations among the scales are found in

Table 1. Identity Confusion (ICQ) correlates positively with Trait Anxiety, and each of these two scores correlates negatively with Cohesion, Connected Self, and Separated Self. A significant negative correlation is found between Enmeshment and Connected Self, whereas no significant relationship is identified between Disengagement and Separated Self. Therefore, the closer the family boundaries, the less connected the individual is with other people. On the other hand, distant and rigid family boundaries bear no relationship with the individual's perception of separatedness from others. The first hypothesis is thus not supported. Since Cohesion is negatively correlated with ICQ and Trait Anxiety, the fourth hypothesis is supported.

Multiple regression analyses with Trait Anxiety and ICQ as dependent variables, respectively, and the three family systems variables and the C-S scales as independent variables, yielded significant results (Table 2). It thus appears that taking into consideration both family systems variables and the individual's perception of him-/herself is useful in attempting to understand the individual's difficulties. It also is notable that only one of the family systems variables proved to be a significant contributor in each of the regression analyses, while both of the C-S scales were significant in the analyses.

Family Systems Theory maintains that the individual's degree of involvement with others is closely related to his/her family of origin's boundaries. To examine whether combining Enmeshment and Connected Self has any bearing upon ICQ or Trait Anxiety, multiple regression analyses were

performed (Table 3). Another set of multiple regression analyses was performed for ICQ and Trait Anxiety with Disengagement and Separated Self as predictor variables (Table 4). Contrary to the theoretical assumptions, when coupled with Connected Self, Enmeshment was unrelated to either ICQ or Trait Anxiety. Combining Disengagement and Separated Self did make a significant contribution to the variance in both ICQ and Trait Anxiety; however, Disengagement was positively related to the dependent variables yet Separated Self was negatively related. The second hypothesis is thus not supported. The third hypothesis is only partially supported.

The results of these regression analyses indicate that beta weights for the family systems variables are much smaller than those for the C-S scores. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were employed to see how much additional variance is accounted for by adding the family systems variables over and above that which is already explained by the C-S scores. When Trait Anxiety was the dependent variable, $\Delta R^2 = .03$, $\Delta F = 3.97$ ($p < .01$); for ICQ, $\Delta R^2 = .04$, $\Delta F = 5.53$ ($p < .01$). Both additions proved to be significant, yet the increase in the variance accounted for was small. It thus appears safe to say that taking into consideration both the family systems variables and the individual's self-perceived connectedness/separatedness significantly explains his/her trait anxiety and identity confusion; however, the family systems variables used in this study are less important contributors to the individual's identity confusion and trait anxiety than the individual's

Table 1 Correlations Among the Identity Confusion Questionnaire (ICQ), Trait Anxiety, Family Systems Variables, and the Connected Self-Separated Self Scales

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Range	M	SD
1 Identity Confusion	-							4-60	31.99	10.72
2 Trait Anxiety	.65***	-						19-73	47.43	9.37
3 Cohesion	-.27***	-.25***	-					5-20	14.54	3.23
4 Disengagement	.19**	.10	-.63***	-				5-20	11.25	2.60
5 Enmeshment	.15*	.08	.09	-.18**	-			5-18	9.40	2.53
6 Connected Self	-.44***	-.25***	.22***	-.12*	-.13*	-		28-67	53.52	6.73
7 Separated Self	-.33***	-.46***	.06	.02	-.03	-.07	-	17-59	28.44	4.65

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

Note. M=mean, SD=standard deviation.

Table 2 Multiple Regression Analyses of Family Systems Variables and Connected Self-Separated Self on Identity Confusion and Trait Anxiety

	ICQ	Trait Anxiety
	β	β
Cohesion	-.11	-.20**
Disengagement	.10	-.04
Enmeshment	.12*	.05
Connected Self	-.42****	-.23****
Separated Self	-.35****	-.46****
R	.61	.57
R ²	.37	.32
Adj. R ²	.36	.31
F(5, 265)	30.77****	25.21****

*p<.05, **p<.01, ****p<.0001

Table 3 Multiple Regression Analyses of Enmeshment and Connected Self on Identity Confusion and Trait Anxiety

	ICQ	Trait Anxiety
	β	β
Enmeshment	.10	.05
Connected Self	-.43****	-.24***
R	.45	.25
R ²	.21	.06
Adj. R ²	.20	.06
F(2, 268)	34.65****	9.10***

p<.001, *p<.0001

Table 4 Multiple Regression Analyses of Disengagement and Separated Self on Identity Confusion and Trait Anxiety

	ICQ	Trait Anxiety
	β	β
Disengagement	.20***	.11*
Separated Self	-.34****	-.46****
R	.39	.47
R ²	.15	.22
Adj. R ²	.14	.22
F(2, 268)	23.39****	38.82****

*p<.05, ***p<.001, ****p<.0001

Table 5 Canonical Analysis of Connected Self/Enmeshment and ICQ/Trait Anxiety

Variable	Standardized Canonical Coefficient Root 1
Predictor variable	
Connected Self	-.95
Enmeshment	.23
Criterion variable	
Identity Confusion	1.10
Trait Anxiety	-.16
Eigenvalue	.26
R _c	.46
R _c ²	.21

Note. R_c=canonical correlation coefficient.

perceptions of his/her degree of connectedness/separatedness.

To further analyze the relationships between the family systems variables and the individual variables, two separate canonical analyses were employed (Table 5 and Table 6). When Connected Self and Enmeshment were used as predictor variables for ICQ and Trait Anxiety, the relationship between the two sets of variables was uni-dimensional, with a negative relationship between Connected Self and ICQ. A more complex relationship was found between Separated Self and Disengagement, on one hand, and ICQ and Trait Anxiety, on the other. Two canonical roots were identified in this latter case. On Root 1, Separated Self is negatively related to Trait Anxiety; on Root 2,

Table 6 Canonical Analysis of Separated Self/Disengagement and ICQ/Trait Anxiety

Variable	Standardized Canonical Coefficient Root 1	Root 2
Predictor variable		
Separated Self	-.97	-.26
Disengagement	.28	-.96
Criterion variable		
Identity Confusion	.24	-1.30
Trait Anxiety	.83	1.02
Eigenvalue	.30	.02
R _c	.48	.15
R _c ²	.23	.02

Note. R_c=canonical correlation coefficient.

Disengagement is related positively with ICQ and negatively with Trait Anxiety. Therefore, the more connected the individual feels with other people, the less confused his/her identity is. The more distant the individual feels from others, the less anxious he/she is. Rigid family boundaries may be related to the adolescent's identity confusion, yet these boundaries may also be related to less trait anxiety. The second hypothesis is again not supported. The third hypothesis, again, is partially supported.

Finally, a canonical analysis was conducted to assess the relationship between Separated Self and Disengagement, on one hand, and Connected Self and Enmeshment, on the other (Table 7). These two sets of variables were negatively related, while the relationships between the two variables in each set were positive. The fifth hypothesis is therefore supported.

Discussion

The results of the present study suggest that to consider both the individual's degree of involvement with others and the family's boundaries is useful. However, the family system's influence on the late adolescent's trait anxiety and identity confusion appears less potent than the family systems theorists advocate. In addition, the relationships between the family systems variables and the individual's perception of him-/herself are more complex than those postulated in Family Systems Theory: in some instances no significant relation-

ships were found, while some other relationships turned out to be contrary to what the theory predicts. Therefore, directly applying Family Systems Theory to the understanding of this sample of Japanese late adolescents/young adults' self-perceived identity confusion and trait anxiety may be difficult.

Firstly, the relationships between enmeshed and disengaged intrafamily boundaries and the individual's perceptions of connectedness with, and separatedness from, others were different from those proposed in Family Systems Theory. Enmeshment and Connected Self relate negatively to each other, whereas Disengagement and Separated Self bear no significant relationship. Therefore, when boundaries are too close and unclear within the family, the adolescent tends to hold difficulties establishing a close relationship with other people. On the other hand, that the family members are distant does not automatically lead to the adolescent's isolating others.

Secondly, the relationships between the family system and the individual's perceived identity confusion and trait anxiety proved to be far more complex than those discussed in Family Systems Theory. Rigid and distant family boundaries are indeed related to the individual's identity confusion and trait anxiety. However, the more aware the late adolescent is of his/her separatedness from others, the less confused and anxious he/she is. Similarly, the more aware the individual is of his/her connectedness with others, again, the less confused and anxious he/she is. Family cohesion is also related to the young adult's decreased identity confusion and lowered anxiety. On the other hand, the family members' being too closely intertwined with one another does not seem to exert a large impact upon the late adolescent's confused identity or anxiety.

These results suggest that balanced family boundaries may be related to the late adolescent's/young adult's positive view towards self but that enmeshed family boundaries are not necessarily impactful upon the individual's identity problems or characterological anxiety. On the other hand, when the adolescent/young adult views the family as being too distant and disengaged, he/she is also likely to view him-/herself negatively.

Table 7 Canonical Analysis of Connected Self/Enmeshment and Separated Self/Disengagement

Variable	Standardized Canonical Coefficient Root 1
Predictor variable	
Separated Self	-.26
Disengagement	-.96
Criterion variable	
Connected Self	.67
Enmeshment	.83
Eigenvalue	.06
R_c	.25
R_c^2	.06

Note. R_c =canonical correlation coefficient.

His/her increased awareness of him-/herself as espousing the opposite sides is related to decreased anxiety and confusion about him-/herself. This particular result is in general agreement with that of a previous study using the C-S Scales on Japanese college students (Nishikawa, 1993). Acceptance of the polar opposites of self thus appears to be related to better psychological functioning among Japanese late adolescents/young adults. Yet another result, seemingly paradoxical, is that distant family boundaries are related to increased identity confusion and decreased trait anxiety.

The individual's awareness of connectedness with others and closer family boundaries are negatively related to the individual's awareness of separatedness from others and distant family boundaries. This result is consistent with theoretical assumptions in Family Systems Theory. Thus, these two sets of constructs indeed appear to be polar opposites.

Overall, while incorporating family systems issues into the understanding of the Japanese adolescent's/young adult's anxiety and unclear self-identity is fruitful, the individual's perception of self as a separate and related being appears to be of more importance than his/her family's boundary issues. A clinical implication of the results of this study is that exploration of the client's perception of him-/herself and his/her relationships with others ought to be primary, whereas considering family systems issues be secondary and adjunct.

That the constructs of Family Systems Theory, as operationalized in this study, were only partially supported raises many questions that need to be answered in future research. A first issue involves possible cultural differences in family functioning and family structure. Cross-cultural studies indicate that family interaction patterns, family values, and cultural norms regarding family functioning vary considerably depending on the families' cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds (Fisek, 1991; Hsu, Tseng, Ashton, McDermott, & Char, 1985; McDermott, Robillard, Char, Hsu, Tseng, & Ashton, 1983; Morris, 1990). The theory may not be valid in Japanese culture.

A second issue is related to the theory itself. Family Systems Theory's development was based on Bowen's clinical observations of psychiatric

patients, schizophrenic patients in particular, and their families. This theory has received little empirical validation in the literature. The theory may be applicable to clinical samples but not to nonclinical adolescents and families. Alternatively, how the researcher operationalizes the theoretical constructs, rather than the theory itself, may be at issue. Lack of precision in the constructs of family systems theories and concomitant difficulties with operational definitions of them have long plagued the family literature (Doherty & Hovander, 1990).

One of the problems with this study is its complete reliance on the students' self-report responses. While the validity of this type of data on the individual's trait anxiety and identity confusion is well-established in the psychometric literature, using responses from one family member in order to describe the entire family system is a topic of considerable debate (Fisher, Kokes, Ransom, Phillips, & Rudd, 1985; Grotevant, 1989). It has been pointed out in the literature that within-family agreement on family assessment measures is generally low (Feldman, Wentzel, & Gehring, 1989; Sawyer, Sarris, Baghurst, Cross, & Kalucy, 1988) and that insiders and outsiders produce different data on a family (Hampson, Beavers, & Hulgus, 1989). Collecting valid data on families has been a major challenge for family researchers. Collecting data from other family members may have produced entirely different results. Future research may well explore other means of data collection. For instance, employing observational rating scales rather than paper-and-pencil measures is a viable alternative (Carlson & Grotevant, 1987). Another alternative is to assess family component dyads separately, since noteworthy differences exist between family subsystems on such important family systems variables as cohesion and adaptability (Cole & Jordan, 1989). A still other possibility may be to use other self-report scales (e.g., Bray, Williamson, & Malone, 1984; Hovestadt, Anderson, Piercy, Cochran, & Fine, 1985) to examine if alternative operational definitions of family systems constructs would prove useful. Finally, employing divergent methods of family assessment, such as both a card sort procedure and a paper-and-pencil questionnaire, may give us a broader spectrum of data (Sigafos, Reiss, Rich, & Douglas, 1985).

Needless to say, using other samples is also necessary in future research to see if indeed the results in this study would hold.

Incorporating family systems issues into individual counseling, or individual issues into family therapy, is advocated by some clinicians (Hiraki, 1996; Wachtel & Wachtel, 1986). Although clinically and intuitively appealing, based on the present study, such an integration seems more complicated than these authors assume.

References

- Bloom, B. L. 1985 A factor analysis of self-report measures of family functioning. *Family Process*, **24**, 225-239.
- Bloom, M. V. 1980 *Adolescent parental separation*. New York: Gardner Press.
- Blos, P. 1962 *On adolescence: A psychoanalytic interpretation*. New York: Free Press.
- Blustein, D. L., Walbridge, M. M., Friedlander, M. L., & Palladino, D. E. 1991 Contributions of psychological separation and parental attachment to the career development process. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, **38**, 39-50.
- Bowen, M. 1976 Theory in the practice of psychotherapy. In P. J. Guerin (Ed.), *Family therapy: Theory and practice*. New York: Gardner Press. Pp. 42-90.
- Bowen, M. 1978 *Family therapy in clinical practice*. New York: Aronson.
- Bray, J. H., Williamson, D. S., & Malone, P. E. 1984 Personal authority in the family system: Development of a questionnaire to measure personal authority in intergenerational family processes. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, **10**, 167-178.
- Brislin, R. W. 1986 The wording and translation of research instruments. In W. J. Lonner & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Field methods in cross-cultural research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. Pp. 137-164.
- Carlson, C. I., & Grotevant, H. D. 1987 A comparative review of family rating scales: Guidelines for clinicians and researchers. *Journal of Family Psychology*, **1**, 23-47.
- Cole, D. A., & Jordan, A. E. 1989 Assessment of cohesion and adaptability in component family dyads: A question of convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, **36**, 456-463.
- Doherty, W. J., & Hovander, D. 1990 Why don't family measures of cohesion and control behave the way they're supposed to? *American Journal of Family Therapy*, **18**, 5-18.
- Erikson, E. H. 1968 *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Feldman, S. S., Wentzel, K. R., & Gehring, T. M. 1989 A comparison of the views of mothers, fathers, and pre-adolescents about family cohesion and power. *Journal of Family Psychology*, **3**, 39-60.
- Fisek, G. O. 1991 A cross-cultural examination of proximity and hierarchy as dimensions of family structure. *Family Process*, **30**, 121-133.
- Fisher, L., Kokes, R. F., Ransom, D. C., Phillips, S. L., & Rudd, P. 1985 Alternative strategies for creating "relational" family data. *Family Process*, **24**, 213-224.
- Grotevant, H. D. (Ed.) 1989 Special issue: Current issues in the assessment of marital and family systems. *Journal of Family Psychology*, **3**, 101-228 [whole issue No. 2].
- Guisinger, S., & Blatt, S. J. 1994 Individuality and relatedness: Evolution of a fundamental dialectic. *American Psychologist*, **49**, 104-111.
- Gurman, A. S., & Kniskern, D. P. (Eds.) 1981 *Handbook of family therapy*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Hampson, R. B., Beavers, W. R., & Hulgus, Y. F. 1989 Insiders' and outsiders' views of family: The assessment of family competence and style. *Journal of Family Psychology*, **3**, 118-136.
- Hiraki, N. 1996 Integrating individual and family counseling. *Japanese Journal of Counseling Science*, **29**, 68-76.
- Hovestadt, A. J., Anderson, W. T., Piercy, F. P., Cochran, S. W., & Fine, M. 1985 A family-of-origin scale. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, **11**, 287-297.
- Hsu, J., Tseng, W.-S., Ashton, G., McDermott, J. F., Jr., & Char, W. 1985 Family interaction patterns among Japanese-American and Caucasian families in Hawaii. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, **142**, 577-581.
- Kantor, D., & Lehr, W. 1975 *Inside the family: Toward a theory of family process*. San Francisco:

- Jossey-Bass.
- Kenny, M. E. 1990 College seniors' perceptions of parental attachments: The value and stability of family ties. *Journal of College Student Development*, **31**, 39-46.
- Kenny, M. E., & Hart, K. 1992 Relationship between parental attachment and eating disorders in an inpatient and a college sample. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, **39**, 521-526.
- Kenny, M. E., & Rice, K. G. 1995 Attachment to parents and adjustment in late adolescent college students: Current status, applications, and future considerations. *The Counseling Psychologist*, **23**, 433-456.
- Lopez, F. G. 1992 Family dynamics and late adolescent identity development. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology*. 2nd ed. New York: Wiley. Pp. 251-283.
- Lopez, F. G., Campbell, V. L., & Watkins, C. E., Jr. 1986 Depression, psychological separation, and college adjustment: An investigation of sex differences. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, **33**, 52-56.
- Lopez, F. G., Campbell, V. L., & Watkins, C. E., Jr. 1988 Family structure, psychological separation, and college adjustment: A canonical analysis and cross-validation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, **35**, 402-409.
- Lopez, F. G., & Gover, M. R. 1993 Self-report measures of parent-adolescent attachment and separation-individuation: A selective review. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, **71**, 560-569.
- Mahler, M. S. 1968 *On human symbiosis and the vicissitudes of individuation*. New York: International Universities Press.
- McDermott, J. F., Jr., Robillard, A. B., Char, W. F., Hsu, J., Tseng, W-S., & Ashton, G. C. 1983 Reexamining the concept of adolescence: Differences between adolescent boys and girls in the context of their families. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, **140**, 1318-1322.
- Morris, T. M. 1990 Culturally sensitive family assessment: An evaluation of the Family Assessment Device used with Hawaiian-American and Japanese-American families. *Family Process*, **29**, 105-116.
- Nishikawa, R. 1993 A study of the two phases of self in university students: Relation to ego identity and self esteem. *Student Counseling Journal*, **14**, 1-10.
- Olson, D. H., Sprenkle, D. H., & Russell, C. S. 1979 Circumplex Model of marital and family systems: I. Cohesion and adaptability dimensions, family types, and clinical applications. *Family Process*, **18**, 3-28.
- Sawyer, M. G., Sarris, A., Baghurst, P. A., Cross, D. G., & Kalucy, R. S. 1988 Family Assessment Device: Reports from mothers, fathers, and adolescents in community and clinic families. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, **14**, 287-296.
- Shimizu, H., & Imasaka, K. 1981 The development of a Japanese version (college version) of State-Trait Anxiety Inventory. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology*, **29**, 348-353.
- Sigafoos, A., Reiss, D., Rich, J., & Douglas, E. 1985 Pragmatics in the measurement of family functioning: An interpretive framework for methodology. *Family Process*, **24**, 189-203.
- Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., & Lushene, R. E. 1970 *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Self-Evaluation Questionnaire)*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Sunada, R. 1979 A study on ego identity related to self-concepts. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology*, **27**, 215-220.
- Wachtel, E. F., & Wachtel, P. L. 1986 *Family dynamics in individual psychotherapy: A guide to clinical strategies*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Watanabe, S. 1989 The relationship between family functioning and ego identity status: Concerning independence in the adolescence. *Japanese Journal of Family Psychology*, **3**, 85-95.
- Yamamoto, R. 1989 A study on both sides of its own self: An investigation of developmental trends from adolescence to adulthood and sex differences. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology*, **37**, 302-311.