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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between distance regulation, sex roles, sexism, and well-being in late adolescents and their parents in order to validate a feminist conceptualization of Bowen family systems theory, in which effective distance regulation is related to a balance in male and female-typed traits, or androgyny. This study aimed to evaluate three hypotheses: 1) distance regulation will be predictive of sex-typed traits; individuals who demonstrate balance of separateness and connectedness will show high levels of both male-typed and female-typed traits; sexism may mediate this relationship, 2) parent distance regulation and androgyny will be predictive of these traits in their children, based on the concept of intergenerational transmission, 3) both distance regulation and androgyny are adaptive and will predict overall well-being.

To test these hypotheses, a random sample of college students \((n = 150)\) and their parents \((n = 36)\) were asked to complete a survey that included the Family Distance Regulation Scale (FDR), Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI), and the Affect Balance Scale (ABS). The three hypotheses were tested using structural equation modeling. Results did not support hypotheses 1 and 2 and it was suggested that this is due to measurement issues, sample size, and the life
cycle stage of college students and their parents. Hypothesis 3 was partially supported, in that androgyny was related to well-being. However, female participants appeared less well than male participants and this issue is discussed in light of a feminist framework and measurement issues. Recommendations for future studies include a larger parent sample, a parent-child sample from more stable life cycle stages, and a social constructionist approach to measurement.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between family distance regulation and androgyny in order to validate a feminist conceptualization of Bowen family systems theory. Bowen family systems theory attempts to explain the intra- and interpersonal processes of human relations through the concept of differentiation. Differentiation refers to how effective one is at distance regulation, or managing the emotional distance between oneself and other members of a system. Historically, feminist scholars have critiqued Bowen’s concept of differentiation, claiming that it promotes male-typed traits, such as individuality, as ideal and female-typed traits, such as emotionality, as unhealthy. It is anticipated that a deeper understanding of how differentiation and sex-typed traits influence one another and are transmitted through families will validate a feminist Bowen theory. To reach this understanding, data on distance regulation, gender-typed traits, sexism, and well-being were collected from 150 college students and 36 of their parents. This data was analyzed using confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modeling to validate central constructs and test the hypotheses proposed later in this chapter.

This chapter begins with an introduction to the background and significance of the research problem. Next, the specific research hypotheses are presented. Finally, a brief
overview of the research design and methods will be given. For a list of key terms used in this proposal, please see Table 1.

Background and Significance

Bowen family systems theory is one of the founding theories of family therapy and one of the more systemic theories in family science. However, it is also one of the less understood and infrequently studied theories in these fields. The primary reason for this is that the main construct, differentiation, is abstract, dynamic, and multifaceted, making it difficult to measure. In this study, a new measure is piloted, the Family Distance Regulation Scale (FDR), that attempts to address the multidimensional nature of family processes. Often, family assessment measures ask an individual to rate their family as a whole. This can lead to errors in measurement, as there may be more than one logical answer, depending on which family member the respondent is thinking about (Cook & Kenny, 2004). The FDR resolves this issue by asking respondents to score one particular relationship from a specific point of view. For example, an adolescent may answer items relating to his opinion of his relationship with his mother. On another item, he may be asked about what he thinks about his father’s perspective of his relationship with his spouse, the respondent’s mother. By asking relationship-specific, multiperspective questions, the FDR can provide a clearer picture of family functioning. In this study, the FDR was tested for validity by using correlations among the scores of family members.

Distance regulation refers to how one balances separateness and connectedness with others. Bowen (1978) proposed that healthy individuals were able to retain
autonomy while fostering intimate relationships and that this ability is imparted through an intergenerational transmission process. Historically, feminist scholars have critiqued Bowen’s concept of distance regulation for valuing male-typed traits (e.g., separateness) over female-typed traits (e.g., connectedness; Bograd, 1986). Alternatively, some scholars believe that Bowen intended for a balance between these two traits and the preference for separateness (or masculinity) is a misinterpretation (Knudson-Martin, 1994). A goal of this study was to address the debate regarding the gender bias of Bowen’s distance regulation by testing it against a measure of male and female-typed traits, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

For this study, gender-typed traits were operationalized as an individual’s level of androgyny. Androgyny is a self-concept that incorporates personality traits typically associated with both men and women (Bem, 1974). The androgynous person sees himself as masculine and feminine, or able to be separate and connected. Theoretically, a person who is effective at distance regulation would also have more balance in male and female-typed traits, or be more androgynous. This study sought to confirm a relationship between distance regulation and androgyny by testing it in a sample of college students and their parents.

The goals of this study were to expand understanding of Bowen theory in relation to feminist critiques, provide evidence for the validity and non-gender bias of the FDR, and explore positive outcomes of androgyny.
Research Hypotheses

In light of the aforementioned goals, this study aimed to evaluate three hypotheses:

1) Distance regulation will be predictive of androgyny; that is, individuals who demonstrate balance of separateness and connectedness will also show high levels of both male-typed and female-typed traits. Further, individuals who are high on separateness will have more male-typed traits and those high on connectedness will have more female-typed traits.

   a. The relationship between distance regulation and androgyny may be mediated by sexism, a form of emotional reactivity.

2) Parent distance regulation and androgyny will be predictive of these traits in their children, based on the concept of intergenerational transmission.

3) Both distance regulation and androgyny are adaptive and will predict overall well-being.

Research Design and Methods

To test these hypotheses, a random sample of college students and their parents were asked to complete a survey that included the Family Distance Regulation Scale, Personal Attributes Questionnaire, the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996) and the Affect Balance Scale (ABS; Bradburn & Noll, 1969). The FDR combines connectedness and separateness items from two other validated measures, and produces separateness and connectedness scores between 3 dyads consisting of a child and two parents. Preliminary analyses of reliability show Cronbach’s alphas ranging from
.75 to .81. The PAQ measures the degree to which a person identifies with traits stereotypical of males and females. An androgyny score can be calculated from the I and E subscales. The ASI measures two types of sexism, hostile and benevolent, to account for the varied forms of sexism in contemporary society. The ABS is a 10-item scale that assesses psychological well-being and has high internal consistency with alphas over .80.

Factor analysis was used to determine the factor structure of both the FDR and PAQ. Then, structural equation modeling was used to test models of the proposed hypotheses. Results, a discussion of those results, recommendations for future research, and limitations of these study are then presented.
Chapter 2: Background and Significance

This chapter will provide a background for the historical context of research and theory regarding androgyny, as well as a conceptual framework for the current study—the purpose of which is to examine the relationship between family distance regulation and androgyny in order to validate a feminist conceptualization of Bowen family systems theory. This chapter begins with a brief overview of models of androgyny and sex role orientation. Then, the measurement of androgyny is presented and past pitfalls and limitations are discussed. The theoretical foundation for this study, Bowen family systems theory, is outlined along with its principal feminist critique. Then, a feminist perspective on Bowen theory will provide the rationale for exploring the relationship between distance regulation and androgyny in families. Finally, the feminist epistemological framework for the study will be presented.

Androgyny

The definition of androgyny has undergone many revisions over the last several decades. Introduced into modern psychological literature by Constantinople (1973), it was Sandra Bem (1974) who invigorated the study of this gender role identity and proposed it as ideal for well-being. Originally, androgyny was thought of as the center point on a bipolar scale anchored by masculinity and femininity (Bem, 1974; Spence, 1984). Later, researchers acknowledged the complexity of androgyny and began to view
it as high levels of both masculine and feminine traits while introducing a fourth category—undifferentiated (Bem, 1981; Spence, 1984). An undifferentiated gender role identity is one in which there are low levels of both masculine and feminine traits. For the purposes of this study, the following definition is appropriate: "the androgynous person can best be seen as one who can freely engage in both feminine and masculine behaviors and as one who is equally capable of both feminine and masculine tasks and does not prefer one above the other" (Woodhill & Samuels, 2004, p. 16).

Although the common definition of the androgynous person is someone who combines the virtues and adaptability of both genders, the most popular androgyny measures, the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974; Spence & Helmreich, 1978), include items that can be considered undesirable, such as being aggressive or overly emotional. Woodhill and Samuels (2003, 2004) were the first scholars to suggest two dimensions of androgyny: positive androgyny (consisting of desirable masculine and desirable feminine traits) and negative androgyny (undesirable masculine and undesirable feminine traits), although earlier studies may have explored positive and negative traits in their analyses (e.g., Shaver et al., 1996). The authors argued that all of androgyny research has looked at the relationships between a single category of androgyny and some measure of the human condition without coming to any clear consensus. They proposed a differentiation of androgyny into positive and negative subcategories as an avenue toward obtaining more conclusive and valid results in the quest to prove that androgyny is adaptive. In their own study, Woodhill and Samuels (2004) found that positively
androgynous people scored higher on measures of mental health and well-being than negatively androgynous, negatively masculine, and negatively feminine people, lending weight to their recommendation that future researchers expand on the traditional global definition of androgyny. This study tested the validity of positive and negative androgyny through a confirmatory factor analysis of responses to the PAQ (see Chapter 3).

**Measuring Androgyny**

The two most commonly used instruments in measuring androgyny or sex roles are the BSRI and the PAQ. Both are self-report measures containing adjectives that are considered stereotypical of either males or females and allow for the classification of a respondent as androgynous, masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated. However, the instruments were founded using different conceptualizations of gender and sex roles and are intended to measure different constructs. Those differences and their shared measurement issues will be discussed in the following sections.

*Bem Sex Role Inventory*. Bem (1974) originally designed the BSRI to validate gender schema theory. According to this theory, sex-typed men and women develop a strong identification with their sex that leads them to learn and use the traits, attitudes, and behaviors society attributes to their gender. Masculinity and femininity exist on a bipolar spectrum, so that those who fall in the middle are labeled androgynous and assumed to be immune to the influences of gender socialization. Those whose scores land on the opposite end of the spectrum as their biological sex are labeled cross-sex-typed. Bem (1977, 1981) believed that sex-typed persons used gender as an organizing
principle in the world and that the BSRI would measure an individual’s level of sex-typing. The success of the BSRI in measuring sex-typing has been debated (Spence, 1993), although the instrument has been used to explore other elements of gender roles and personality traits.

*Personal Attributes Questionnaire.* Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1975) challenged Bem’s original method of calculating androgyny, claiming that androgyny is not just about a balance of masculine and feminine traits, but about high levels of both. Their instrument, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence & Helmreich, 1978), separated Bem’s androgynous category into two: androgynous (scoring high on both masculine and feminine traits) and undifferentiated (scoring low on both masculine and feminine traits). The structure and scoring of the scale does not assume a bipolar or unifactorial model of gender roles. Rather, it was established under the assumption that masculinity and femininity are independent traits that vary within and between individuals (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). In addition, Spence (1993) claims that the PAQ measures only desirable traits, whereas the BSRI contains undesirable traits as well as the adjectives, masculine and feminine. The presence of only desirable traits allows the items to be factored into two latent constructs, as opposed to the multiple constructs often found in the BSRI. Further, Spence and Helmreich (1978) acknowledged early on in instrument development that they were not measuring a global notion of gender or sex roles, but rather two sets of traits that were commonly thought as belonging to men or women, agency and communion. Bakan (1966) first introduced this pair as fundamental processes that characterize all living organisms. Agency is focused on the self while
communion is focused on others; he also discussed their similarity to masculine and feminine principles. The prevalence of such balanced dualities in the social sciences will be discussed later in the chapter. Later in their work with the PAQ, Spence and Helmreich (1980) suggested that the scales should be referred to as instrumental (I) and expressive (E), rather than masculine (M) and feminine (F). Years of research had led them to conclude that the M and F scales were only related to measures of sex role behaviors and sex role attitudes when those instruments directly applied to instrumental and expressive traits. They advised other scholars against using the PAQ as a global measure of gender roles.

The PAQ will be used to measure the sex-typed traits of instrumentality and expressiveness in this study for three reasons. First, the instrument has not undergone any changes in its basic structure since it was first developed; it continues to measure a multifactorial construct and does not assume that M and F (or I and E) exist in opposition to one another. Second, the influence of Bakan (1966) in the conceptualization of I and E facilitates the application of this measure to the guiding theory of this study, Bowen (1978) family systems. The similarities between Bakan’s agency and communion and Bowen’s separateness and connectedness will be discussed later in this chapter. Finally, the authors have conducted extensive studies of the validity, reliability, and theoretical foundations of the instrument (e.g., Helmreich, Spence, & Holahan, 1979; Spence, 1984, 1985, 1993; Spence & Buckner, 2000; Spence, Helmreich, & Holahan, 1979; Spence & Helmreich, 1978, 1980) and acknowledged its limitations and advised against it being considered a global measurement of gender, which this study does not aim to do. It
should be noted that the terms, masculinity and femininity, may be used in this study in addition to instrumentality and expressiveness for the sake of simplicity. However, these terms and this instrument are being used to measure sets of traits that are both sex-typed as well as parallel to concepts belong to Bowen’s theory and are not intended to imply gender identity or a global gender schema.

*Issues in Measurement.* Taylor and Hall (1982) criticized early androgyny scholars like Bem and Spence for treating androgyny as a categorical variable. Androgyny is typically measured by calculating the median scores of masculinity and femininity and then assigning respondents to one of four categories: androgynous (both M and F scores above the median), masculine (M score above the median, F below), feminine (F score above the median, M below), and undifferentiated (both M and F scores below the median). This raises questions of validity and reliability because respondents who score near the median on either M or F may only be one point away from an entirely different category. If androgyny were calculated as a continuous variable, analyses could account for greater diversity in gender role traits (Taylor & Hall, 1982). This study employed subscale scores and interaction terms to ensure that androgyny was analyzed as a continuous variable.

Another frequent question in measuring androgyny is whether masculinity and femininity are independent or mutually influenced traits. Although the bipolar view of gender roles called for the mutuality of masculinity and femininity, the notion of gender role came to be seen as multidimensional and multifactorial (Deaux & Lewis, 1984; Marsh & Byrne, 1991; Spence, 1984, 1985, 1993). That is, people possess traits that are
typical of both their own sex and the opposite sex and this may not be related to how they view themselves in terms of masculinity or femininity. Rather than measuring whether people have high levels of traits typical of both genders, researchers began to measure the level and interaction of masculinity and femininity as individual constructs (Egan & Perry, 2001). This way, the nature of cross-sex characteristics could also be measured. As Spence (1993) pointed out, even the most stereotypically masculine man will possess some female-typed qualities and will not demonstrate absolute expression of all male-typed traits. Therefore, it is important to analyze masculinity and femininity as separate constructs, rather than two ends of the same spectrum.

*The Disputed Benefits of Androgyny*

Since the development of the BSRI, research on androgyny has most often focused on its relationship to various measures of well-being. Androgynous men and women report higher self-esteem (Flaherty & Dusek, 1980; Heilbrun, 1981; Lundy & Rosenberg, 1987; Shaw, 1983; Shimonaka, Nakazato, Kawaai, & Shinichi, 1997), greater psychological well-being (Grimmell, 1998; Markstrom-Adams, 1989; O’Heron & Orlofsky, 1990; Stake, 1997; Williams & D’Alessandro, 1994), and lower levels of depression (Cheng, 1999). Androgyny is also related to relationship quality. Androgynous couples report more happiness (Antill, 1983), are more likely to have a secure attachment style (Shaver et al., 1996), and are more attractive to the opposite sex (Green & Kendrick, 1994). In two studies, androgynous individuals were preferred as partners, liked better and perceived as better adjusted (Green & Kendrick, 1994; Major, Carnevale, & Deaux, 1981).
Despite the large number of studies that show positive outcomes for androgyny, many studies report mixed results. Studies have found higher self-esteem in androgynous women but no similar benefit to men (Bem, 1977; Wulff & Steitz, 1999). Women may also benefit from androgyny in development of the ego and other mental health factors (Burchardt & Serbin, 1982; Skoe, 1995). In studies of emotional well-being and psychological adjustment, androgynous men and women had no advantage over others (Lubinski, Tellegen, & Butcher, 1981, 1983; O’Heron & Orlofsky, 1990). Still more studies show that masculine individuals, not androgynous individuals, have higher adjustment and well-being.

Several studies support a masculine model of psychological well-being. Women with higher masculinity, not necessarily androgyny, were seen as flexible, better adjusted, and more individualistic (Anderson, 1986; Jones, Chernovetz, & Hansson, 1978) and, in the former study, androgynous men were seen as rigid and conforming. Masculinity in both sexes is highly correlated with self-esteem and well-being (Antil & Cunningham, 1979, 1980; Markstrom-Adams, 1989) as well as better mental health (Kopper & Epperson, 1996). Whitley (1983) conducted a meta-analysis of studies of androgyny and concluded that it was masculinity, not androgyny, that predicted well-being. In her review of gender research, Cook (1985) also provided support for the masculine model.

Scholars have attempted to explain the negative association between femininity and well-being by examining the traits measured by sex role inventories. According to Hoffman, Powlishta, and White (2004), the traits labeled as masculine are actually measuring instrumentality (e.g., assertiveness) and those labeled as feminine are
measuring expressiveness (e.g., emotionality). It has been hypothesized that instrumental traits may buffer against stressful experiences by promoting adaptability and affect balance (Aube, Norcliffe, Craig, & Koestner, 1995) and while expressive traits may promote better interpersonal interactions, too much focus on others is related to higher levels of depression and lower perceptions of well-being (Conway, 2000). However, since expressive traits are still strongly linked to a feminine character, it is hard to separate the supposed maladaptiveness of expressive traits from the undervaluing of feminine traits, as a whole.

Many studies that link masculinity with adjustment employ global measures of self-esteem or depression, which may be biased toward masculine traits (Aube, Koestner, Hodgins, & Craig, 1994). Studies have demonstrated the lack of discriminant validity between measures of masculinity and measures of self-esteem, noting that many of the items are remarkably similar in content (Nicholls, Licht, & Pearl, 1982; Whitley, 1988). In another study, Whitley (1984) proposed that it is not just self-esteem, but that measures of anxiety, depression, and well-being are also biased toward masculine traits. He later found support for his hypothesis that these instruments are all measuring one latent personality construct (Whitley & Gridley, 1993). This study hoped to avoid the pitfalls of past research by comparing androgyny to a new construct, distance regulation, and measuring overall psychological well-being, as opposed to self-esteem.

There are additional measurement considerations when testing androgyny. Johnson et al. (2006) performed two analyses of the relationship between sex roles and well-being: one that used the categorical variables of androgyny, masculinity, femininity,
and undifferentiated and one that measured masculinity and femininity on a continuous scale. Using the categorical variables, they found that androgyny and masculinity had a stronger association with well-being than femininity and undifferentiation. Using the continuous variables, they found a positive correlation for masculinity and a negative correlation for femininity and well-being. Consequently, they recommend the use of masculinity and femininity as separate continuous variables in order to avoid minimizing the effect of femininity. Because of the conflicting arguments regarding whether it is androgyny or masculinity that is adaptive, this study will use an interaction term to equally weight the influence of masculinity and femininity.

Another major critique of these adjustment measures is that they almost exclusively rely on self-report data (Block, 1971, 1981). A more thorough understanding may be obtained from multiple sources, such as self, peers, and trained observers. Aube and her colleagues have conducted multiple studies to test the hypothesis that masculine-typed participants provide inflated responses. In one study, (Aube et al., 1995), self-reports of dyadic functioning were compared to roommates’ reports and the authors found that discrepancies in scores were related to masculine traits. That is, those reporting more masculine traits also overestimated the quality of their interpersonal relationships. In another study (Aube et al., 1994), adolescents who were high in masculinity overestimated their popularity as compared to reports from their peers and college students high in masculinity overestimated their expressive skills on an encoding task as compared to trained observers. The authors referred to this as the positivity bias, and found that it was not related to biological sex. Both men and women who were high
in masculine traits also overestimated their social functioning. They suggest that masculine traits are related to believing that one is well adjusted, rather than actually being well adjusted from other, more objective points of view. This study’s primary measure of adjustment is a multidimensional instrument that measures dyadic functioning from multiple perspectives. In light of the problems in measuring adjustment through self-reports of self-esteem, this study will collect data from parents, in addition to a measure of global psychological well-being. The next section will address extant research on androgyny and parental effects.

**Parental Effects on Androgyny**

Research regarding the parents’ effect on a child’s sex role orientation has explored a variety of explanations, including the presence of one or two parents (Brenes, Eisenberg, Helmstadter, 1985), mother’s employment outside the home (Weinraub, Jaeger, & Hoffman, 1988), parental identification, or modeling (Heilbrun, 1973), and demographic factors (Bardwell, Cochran, & Walker, 1986). This literature review will focus on the two types of parental factors that will be examined in this study: the parent’s own sex role orientation and the parent’s relationship with the child.

Spence and Helmreich (1978) found that sex typing of the parents was a large factor in the sex typing of children. Families with two androgynous parents had the highest percentage of androgynous sons and were perceived as the warmest and most supportive. They concluded that the boys exhibit the masculine traits they see in their fathers and high levels of feminine traits only if one or both parents were androgynous. Heilbrun (1978) studied the effect of parent sex-typed behaviors and filial identification
on college student’s sex role orientation and found significant relationships regarding sons’ sex roles but not daughters. Specifically, androgynous sons were more likely to report parents with nonstereotypical sex role behaviors and to identify more with their mother. Conversely, undifferentiated sons identified very strongly with their more traditional, feminine mothers. These findings were consistent with previous research conducted by Heilbrun (1973). The relationship between parental sex roles and sex typing in daughters is slightly less clear (Lombardo & Kemper, 1992). There seem to be no consistent differences between mother and father factors, but androgyny was more likely in a home with two androgynous parents, followed by one androgynous parent, and unlikely in a home with traditionally sex-typed parents. Additionally, androgynous parents have been found to be highly encouraging of achievement and self-worth in children of both sexes (Sedney, 1987; Spence & Helmreich, 1980), supporting the hypotheses that parental androgyny may lead to higher child well-being. However, a common limitation of these studies was that the information about parental behaviors was based solely on reports from the students; therefore, those scores are a representation of the student’s perception of their parents, and not the parent’s own self-identity. This study improved upon previous research by collecting data regarding parent sex roles directly from parents.

This study also collected data from children and parents regarding the nature of the relationship between the two. Specifically, the level of closeness and individuality was assessed to determine how it relates to parent sex roles and how it influences sex typing of children. Androgynous individuals have reported being raised in a warm,
supportive atmosphere by parents who were emotionally available to their children and supported achievement (Block, von der Lippe, & Block, 1973). Androgynous men have reported high levels of affection from both parents (Kelly & Worell, 1976). In another study (Orlofsky, 1979), androgynous men reported cognitive encouragement and low levels of rejection from both parents, closeness to their mothers, and high levels of warmth and involvement from their fathers. In both studies, androgynous women reported cognitive encouragement from both parents and high maternal involvement in their lives (Kelly & Worell, 1976; Orlofsky, 1979). Once again, results seem to be stronger for men than women, although there is little consensus. In one study, feminine men reported high levels of closeness with their mothers (Kelly & Worell, 1976) but low levels of closeness with both parents in another (Orlofsky, 1979). Conversely, Kelly and Worell found distant parental relationships with masculine men while Orlofsky found closer relationships. Overall, the findings regarding parental relationships and child sex-typing is ambiguous and merits further exploration. This study used Bowen family systems theory to define and measure those relationships.

Bowen Family Systems Theory

This study was guided by a feminist perspective on Bowen family systems theory. This section will introduce Bowen theory, address the feminist critiques of Bowen, and then present the concept of androgyny as a possible solution to these critiques.

Bowen (1978) defined two complementary life forces at work in human relationships: one that promoted togetherness and one concerned with individuality. Each of these forces motivates the individual to preserve the integrity of both their own
person as well as their relational systems with other people. All systems (individuals, couples, families, institutions, etc.) have the primary goal of viability, that is, the ability to survive or maintain viability (Buckley, 1967). Threats to viability provoke anxiety in the system. Threats to an individuals’ viability may include actual threats to a person’s life such as poor health, car accidents, or abuse. Threats to a couple’s viability may include emotional distance or conflict between partners, infidelity, or environmental circumstances. Threats to a family’s viability may include conflict, institutional intervention, or dissolution (through divorce, moving away, or death). Interestingly, many things considered threats to viability could also be considered symptoms, which are responses to threats. For example, a couple experiencing emotional distance as a threat to their viability might then experience infidelity as a means of pushing the couple into crisis so that they are forced to attend to the emotional distance. They might then decrease the distance and repair the relationship or increase the distance and dissolve the relationship. The nature of threats and symptoms is often cyclical and repeats over the course of the relationship, as seen in this example.

Some systems are able to handle threats to viability well; others are not. For example, the aforementioned couple could have started a dialogue about how their progressive emotional distancing is threatening their relationship viability or sought couple therapy instead of engaging in infidelity. One way of explaining the various reactions to threats to the viability of a relationship system is through differentiation. Differentiation is the ability to maintain one’s own autonomy while allowing the other components of the system to do the same (Kerr, 1984). Poor differentiation leads to
emotional reactivity, that is, the inability to distinguish and choose between cognitive and affective reactions in anxiety-provoking situations (Bowen, 1978). Emotional reactivity is an inability to distinguish between emotions, cognitions, and the response to the trigger. Reactivity may involve cutoff from emotions or cognitions. A couple that is cutoff from their emotions may see the infidelity as a symbol of their relationship’s lack of viability and choose to end the relationship. They may also rationalize the symptom (in this example, infidelity) and avoid working through it, dismissing it in order to maintain the relationship. A couple that is fused with their emotions may be so overwhelmed by the threat that they also end the relationship or it may push them closer to one another in an anxious attempt to save their relational system. Of course, these examples are oversimplified and contain many cycles of threats and symptoms and other possible patterns. They serve merely to illustrate the two primary modes of emotional reactivity, cutoff from or fusion with emotions (Bowen, 1978).

Bowen (1978) also described emotional reactivity on a societal level, which he called societal regression. Societies, as whole, also possess a chronic anxiety that is higher or lower during certain time periods. Higher levels of anxiety tend to “crystallize” around certain issues, such as drug culture, cults, or widespread disease (Friedman, 1991, p. 165). Bowen suggested that stereotyped sex roles created a false dichotomy and they were a way for society as a system to regulate distance and create differentiation, rather than encourage individuals to differentiate themselves (Friedman, 1991). Therefore, sexism can be conceptualized as a form of societal regression, or societal emotional reactivity. Because this study focuses on the relationships between distance regulation
and stereotypical gender roles, stereotypical beliefs about gender and gender roles may also play an important role. Consequently, this study also examined the mediating role of sexism (as emotional reactivity) between distance regulation and gender role traits.

According to Bowen’s family systems theory (1978), a primary cause of interpersonal anxiety (and, therefore, threats to viability) is the inability to comfortably manage emotional distance or closeness—or uphold “healthy” distance regulation—between people in relational systems. Distance regulation is similar to differentiation in that it is the process of being autonomous within the context of a relationship. People in relational systems are in constant dialogue with one another (not necessarily verbal) in which they fluctuate between closeness and distance. Healthy distance regulation keeps system members close but not too close- individuals retain their own identities while holding the system’s identity as well. System members who are too close may become fused with one another; this can lead to high levels of conflict, as the individuals would be highly reactive to each other’s emotions. People who are too distant can experience cutoff or loss of relationship from one another. Intimate partners may find themselves trapped in cycles of pursuit and distancing (or seeking and avoiding closeness) that can manifest in infidelity, substance use, or violence. Bowen systems theory credits distance regulation as the underlying mechanism for relational problems in systems where comfortable emotional distance cannot be established or maintained. In this study, the terms differentiation and distance regulation may be used interchangeably, as they are seen as interlocking and inseparable constructs.
As mentioned previously, an individual’s level of differentiation determines their level of emotional reactivity. Differentiation is initially determined by one's family-of-origin (Bowen, 1978). Through an intergenerational transmission process, children acquire levels of differentiation based on the levels of their caregivers in addition to experiences within their family and contexts as they grow up. It is highly likely that a child with poorly differentiated parents will also be poorly differentiated. The type of emotional reactivity can either match the parents or differ depending on other contextual factors. For example, a child with parents who are emotionally fused may grow up to replicate that style or reject it and be cut-off from his or her emotions. In addition, depending on other contextual factors, it is also possible for that child to become more or even less differentiated than his parents. The concept of intergenerational transmission is a key assumption of this study. It is hypothesized that not only differentiation, but also instrumentality and expressiveness are passed, to some degree, from parent to child.

The Feminist Critique of Bowen Family Systems Theory and a Response

The principal feminist critique of Bowen family systems theory is that the construct of differentiation of self is based in and overvalues stereotypical masculine traits (Bograd, 1986; Goldner, 1985; Lerner, 1988; Leupnitz, 1988). These theorists interpreted differentiation to mean rational thinking and separation from one’s emotions and from others, qualities typically socialized in and displayed by men. Conversely, they believed that poor differentiation was characterized by a need for intimate connectedness and emotional expressiveness, qualities that are typically associated with women. However, Bowen’s (1978; Kerr, 1984) theory identified both separateness and
togetherness as key forces driving human life and relationships. Differentiation is the balance of the two life forces and could be conceptualized as also balancing male-typed and female-typed traits. Another response to the claim that Bowen overvalued individuality takes the human life course into consideration (Silverstein, 2005). Humans are born relatively helpless and remain dependent on others for care for a very long time afterwards. Because of this long period of necessary togetherness, many people struggle to obtain a sense of separateness or individuality once they are legally and economically independent. Therefore, Bowen focused his therapeutic efforts on helping individuals achieve a separate sense of self not so that they could become cut off from others, but so they could find a balance between the two life forces.

Knudson-Martin (1994) presented the concept of differentiation as accounting for the female experience and socialization. She argued that it is important to value both the “feeling system” and the “intellectual system” and realize that reactivity is the inability to access both systems and choose between the two as needed. Anxiety stems from seeking too much togetherness or too much separateness - fusion or cut-off. Walters, Carter, Papp, and Silverstein (1988) expanded on the notion of fusion to present a gendered conceptualization. The authors suggest that fusion manifests differently according to gender socialization. Women are socialized to seek connection and may become dependent whereas men are socialized to seek distance and may become cut-off. Both positions are reactive, according to Bowen theory, but the male position receives more support from society so the female-typed fusion is more often thought of as pathological.
While the feminist critiques of Bowen family systems theory are valid, Bowenian feminists (Walters et al., 1988; Knudson-Martin, 1994; Silverstein, 2005) have demonstrated that gender can be effectively incorporated into Bowen conceptualizations. The next section introduces androgyny as a way of conceptualizing and remediating the, at once, gendered and ungendered nature of Bowen’s differentiation.

Family Distance Regulation & Androgyny

When Bem (1974) originally expounded the benefits of an androgynous gender identity, she conceptualized androgyny as a balance between masculine and feminine traits. Although she later revised this definition (Bem, 1977) to limit androgyny to high levels of masculinity and femininity and accepted a fourth category (undifferentiated), androgyny continues to be described as a balanced identity in colloquial and scholarly contexts. It is this balance, and the two dimensions comprising it, that facilitates a natural connection between androgyny and distance regulation.

Although only one study has examined distance regulation and sex roles (Bartle-Haring, 1997), there is a long history of social scientists promoting similar constructs that blend two dimensions of personality to achieve optimal functioning and well-being, such as autonomy and connectedness (Baxter, 1988), identity and intimacy (Erikson, 1968), separation-individuation and symbiosis (Mahler, Pine, & Bergman, 1975), and agency and communion (Bakan, 1966). When creating the PAQ, Spence and Helmreich (1978) reporting being particularly influenced by Bakan’s work on agency and communion. They conceptualized the essential components of masculinity and instrumentality as agency and the essential components of femininity and expressiveness as communion.
Bakan, like Bowen (1978), saw two life forces, fundamental to all living organisms, and each requiring the presence of the other in order to achieve balance. Therefore, the duality of instrumentality and expressiveness can be seen as parallel to separateness and connectedness through shared theoretical foundations with agency and communion.

Another theoretical connection between sex roles and differentiation can be found in attachment theory. Attachment styles are assigned based on scores on two scales: model of self and model of other (Bartholomew, 1990), which are hypothetically similar constructs to both separateness and connectedness, as well as masculinity/instrumentality and femininity/expressiveness, and even agency and communion. Shaver et al. (1996) conducted three studies in which they compared attachment style and sex role typologies in college students. They found that secure attachment and androgyny were similar constructs, when undesirable traits that represented power, aggression, and emotional vulnerability were removed from the analysis. The authors concluded that this “positive” form of androgyny is virtually identical to a secure attachment style: “both attachment security and androgyny are viewed as desirable, perhaps even optimal, mixtures of self-confident autonomy and healthy capacity for intimate, emotionally expressive relationships” (Shaver et al., 1996, p. 583).

In the singular study to examine distance regulation and sex roles, Bartle-Haring (1997) tested a model of adolescent identity achievement in which the influence of differentiation in the parent relationship was mediated by sex role orientation, or level of masculinity or femininity. Results suggested that for both kinds of identity formation, ideological and interpersonal, the father relationship was important. For males, a highly
differentiated paternal relationship and an endorsement of female-typed traits led to higher ideological identity achievement. For both males and females, a highly differentiated paternal relationship and high levels of both masculinity and femininity predicted interpersonal identity achievement. These findings provide evidence for the benefits of balancing separateness and connectedness as well as masculinity and femininity. The results also suggested that a differentiated family context can counteract the effect of societal sex role stereotypes, allowing men to be more connected and women to be more separate.

Based on the accepted notion that androgyny is a balance of traits, its theoretical foundations in agency and communion, and studies linking the concepts of attachment and differentiation to a balance of masculinity and femininity, this study examined the relationship between distance regulation and androgyny. Based on the concept of intergenerational transmission and evidence that parents have an effect on their child’s sex roles, this study tested the associations between parental and filial sex roles and distance regulation. Finally, based on the theoretical assumption that balance is adaptive and desirable (Bakan, 1966; Bowen, 1978); this study expands on previous research debating the psychological benefits of androgyny.

Epistemological Framework

This study was situated within a feminist epistemology and methodology. It is important to describe the framework for the study because quantitative research does not necessarily fall within the bounds of typical feminist research. However, feminist empiricists have argued for the necessity and legitimacy of quantitative research
(Jayaratne, 1983) and provided guidelines for conducting such inquiries (Griffin & Phoenix, 1994; Unger, 1979). These empiricists emphasized the importance of making women and context visible, particularly in survey research. Specifically, survey questions should not exclude the experience of women and interpretation of the data should take existing power structures into consideration.

Osmond and Thorne (1993) propose five themes that are central to feminist scholarship. First, women’s experiences of the world are considered central, normal, and valuable. Feminism is not just about women’s lives but also about how they view their lives. Therefore, feminist research can focus on men or women’s issues; that said, it seeks to elevate women’s experiences. Second, feminist research sees gender as an important organizing concept. Social science often treats gender or sex as analogous and unproblematic. Feminism highlights the social construction and exaggeration of gender from biological sex as well as the ways gender is used to unevenly distribute power. Third, a feminist perspective mandates the consideration of context when studying gender. Analysis of gender must include an analysis of macro-level variables, such as culture, history, and societal structure. It is often these larger structures that determine how gender is treated in micro-level contexts. For example, the values of the larger society often determine how women are treated in intimate relationships. Fourth, feminist family scholars object to the use of monolithic terms such as “the family.” Because humans have lived in a variety of kinship arrangements and experienced various intimate relationships over time and space, it is inadequate and possibly arrogant to assume that “the family” can be bound and defined to include only certain members, such
as biological kin. Finally, feminist scholars approach their work in an intentionally political manner, in an effort to change and improve upon the world.

This study takes these guidelines into consideration in multiple ways. First, the primary aim is to shift the interpretation of Bowen theory from one valuing male-typed traits to one that values both male and female-typed traits; therefore, the study aims to make female experiences valuable and normal. Second, societal biases were taken into consideration when selecting measurement instruments and in determining results. That is, scores are not assumed to reflect reality; rather, they reflect the constructed reality of a group of respondents in answering a value-laden question. Third, the demographics and family composition questions of the survey instrument were constructed so as to include a wide variety of life experiences, identities, and family forms. Many questions were open-ended (e.g., race and ethnicity) and respondents were allowed to identify their own family members and parents figures (rather than assuming biological mothers and fathers). Finally, many of the constructs in these study are taken as socially constructed-specifically, the notion of masculinity/femininity or positive/negative androgyny. The notion that traits are positive or negative is constructed by the society that is evaluating them. Further, sex roles are not so-named because humans are born with certain personality traits based on their biological sex. Rather, persons of a particular biological sex are socialized to exhibit and identify with certain traits or roles. It is important to note that the aim of this study is not to reinforce or reify the constructs of masculinity or femininity. Androgyny is seen as healthy because individuals must move beyond socialization to integrate more parts of themselves.
Chapter Summary

This chapter provided a history of the definition and evolution of the construct of androgyny. The relationship between androgyny and well-being as well as parental influences were discussed. Throughout the first section, the limitations of previous studies, particularly as they related to measurement issues, were examined in order to strengthen the methodology of the current study. Bowen family systems theory, its feminist critiques, and the responses to those critiques were then presented. Then, a rationale for studying the relationship between distance regulation and androgyny in families was given as the conceptual framework for this study. Finally, the feminist epistemology guiding this study was discussed.
Chapter 3: Methods

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between family distance regulation and androgyny in order to validate a feminist conceptualization of Bowen family systems theory. In order to address some of the feminist critiques of Bowen, this study aimed to evaluate the following three hypotheses:

1) Distance regulation is predictive of androgyny; that is, individuals who demonstrate balance of separateness and connectedness will also show high levels of both male-typed and female-typed traits.
   a. The relationship between distance regulation and androgyny may be mediated by sexism, a form of emotional reactivity.

2) Parent distance regulation and androgyny is predictive of these traits in their children, based on the concept of intergenerational transmission.

3) Both distance regulation and androgyny are adaptive and predict psychological well-being.

To address these research questions, structural equation modeling (SEM; Bollen, 1989) was used to analyze the relationships between family distance regulation, sexism, androgyny, and well-being in individual and dyadic models.
Sample

A total of 150 college students participated in this study. The sample was 38.1% male, 60.4% female, and 1.4% transgender (Table 2). Students ranged in age from 18 to 58 years, with a mean of 20.88 years ($SD = 4.42$). The majority (91.3%) identified as heterosexual, 4.3% as gay/lesbian, 2.9% as bisexual/pansexual, 0.7% as asexual, and 0.7% as other. The majority of students (52.3%) were single, followed by those in a dating relationship (29.8%). Fifty-three students reported their relationship length with an average of 3.53 years ($SD = 5.51$). The ethnic distribution of the students was 68% Caucasian/White, 12.7% Asian/Indian, 6% African-American/Black, 2.7% Hispanic/Latino, and 2.7% other. When asked how many years of college they had completed, 23% were in their first year, 15% were in their second year, 24% were in their third year, 26% were in their fourth year, 6% were in their fifth year, and 6% were in their sixth year or later.

Forty-one parents, 39% male and 61% female, completed all or part of the study questionnaire. Parents ranged in age from 32 to 59 years old, with a mean age of 49.72 ($SD = 5.819$). Most (85.7%) parents were Caucasian/White, 4.8% were Asian/Indian, and 2.4% was African-American/Black. The majority of parents (71.5%) had some college, an associate’s, or a bachelor’s degree, 16.6% earned a graduate degree, and 9.5% earned a high school diploma or GED. Most (69%) reported full-time employment, 16.7% reported part-time employment, and 11.9% reported being unemployed. Only 8 parents reported an annual household income, with a range of $35,000 to $220,000 and a mean of $91,625 ($SD = $68,408.31). Most parents (59.5%) reported their relationship
status as married, 14.3% divorced, 11.9% as remarried, 4.8% as single, 4.8% as partnered, and 2.4% as separated. The average length of parent’s relationships was 24.39 years \((SD = 8.833)\). Most parents (75.6%) were in a relationship with their child’s other parental figure while their child was in high school.

Students were asked to list all of the types of family members with whom they shared a household during high school. In order to represent all types of families, students were instructed to include members from multiple households (e.g., if they shared time between the homes of divorced parents) and given the opportunity to write in types of family members not listed in the survey. These results can be seen in Table 3. While the bulk of students lived with biological mothers (90%), biological fathers (81.3%), and full siblings (63.3%), many students lived in families that extended beyond the traditional nuclear definition, including adoptive families, stepfamilies, and grandparents. Students were also asked to identify which of those family members they considered their primary parental figure, defined as “the person who provided the majority of your care, such as financial, housing, disciplinary, and emotional needs.” Most students (70.2%) identified their biological mother as their primary parent, followed by biological father (24.8%) and other parental figures (see Table 3). Students were then asked to identify, out of the remaining household members, who was their secondary parental figure. Most students (61.4%) identified their biological father, followed by biological mother (23.6%) and other parental figures. Finally, students were asked if the two people they chose as parental figures were in a committed, intimate relationship (defined as marriage or marriage-like) while they were in high school. Most students
(84.6%) reported that their parents were in a relationship at that time. No students reported parents in a same-sex relationship.

Procedure

A questionnaire was sent to 300 college students randomly selected by the University Registrar’s Office. The e-mail explained the study, its purpose and voluntary nature, and provided an individualized hyperlink to the survey. If the student chose to participate, they were asked to provide the e-mail addresses of their parents at the end of the survey. Parents were then sent a similar e-mail explaining the survey, its purpose and voluntary nature that included an individualized hyperlink to the survey in order to connect the parent survey with the corresponding student survey. The student received $20 in his or her University account if he or she chose to participate and an additional $10 for each parent who participated. Of the 300 students originally contacted, 151 began the survey and 150 completed it for a 50% response rate. Students provided a total of 74 parent e-mail addresses, 42 began the survey and 36 completed it for a 49% response rate. Although students were given the option to and some did submit both parents’ e-mail addresses, no student had two parents complete a survey. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine any differences in the study variables between students who did not provide parent email addresses, those who did but whose parents did not respond, and those whose parents did respond. There was a significant difference between groups for two variables, smomme \( F(2, 124) = 2.89, p = .059 \) and negative instrumentality \( F(2, 126) = 2.44, p = .091 \). A Tukey post-hoc test revealed that the student’s report of his mother’s perception of healthy separateness in their relationship
was higher in students that provided an email but had no parental response (4.3 ± .51, \( p = .050 \)) than in students that did not provide a parent email address (3.97 ± .77). In addition, students’ scores on the negative instrumentality subscale of the PAQ were higher for those who received a parental response (2.32 ± .79, \( p = .091 \)) than for those who provided an email but had no parental response (1.95 ± .69). There were no other statistically significant between-group differences. Because the parent sample obtained was small (\( n = 36 \)), it is difficult to hypothesize how the higher student negative instrumentality scores may have affect the dyadic sample.

Student and parents’ surveys were initially linked with names and e-mail addresses. After data collection was completed, students and parents were identified by a participant number only and any identifying information was removed from the data file. All data was kept confidential, and after collection, remained anonymous. This study was approved by the University’s Institutional Review Board.

Parent and student surveys contained questions concerning demographic information, as well as measures for androgyny, sexism, family distance regulation, and psychological well-being.

Measures

All instruments presented in this section can be found in Appendix C.

Androgyny

To assess the degree to which the adolescent identifies with traits traditionally associated with masculinity or femininity, the short version of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence & Helmreich, 1978) was administered. The short version
contains 24 pairs of adjectives or descriptive phrases that are opposite in meaning. Respondents rate themselves on a 5-point scale between the two choices. Eight questions comprise the Instrumentality scale (I), which are items rated as desirable in both genders but more typical in men than women; eight questions comprise the Expressiveness scale (E), which are items rated as desirable in both genders but more typical in women than men; eight questions comprise the I-E scale, which contains items rated as desirable in one gender or the other, that is, the typical man would fall on one end of the scale and the typical woman on the other. Psychometric analyses of the scale with multiple samples consistently revealed two factors (instrumentality and expressiveness) and alpha coefficients of .7 to .8 (Helmreich, Spence, & Wilhelm, 1981).

Student sample. In the student sample, however, alpha coefficients for the I and I/E subscales were not satisfactory, at .58 and .45, respectively. Although the alpha coefficient for the E scale was reasonable ($\alpha = .73$), it was clear that the I and I/E subscales were not salient for this sample. An exploratory factor analysis of the entire instrument, using principal axis factoring, suggested either a three or four-factor model. The first four factors explained 16%, 15%, 10%, and 6% of the variance, respectively. Solutions for three and four factors were examined using varimax rotation of the factor-loading matrix. The four-factor solution, which explained 48% of the variance, was chosen because of its alignment with the constructs of positive and negative androgyny (explained below) and the leveling off of eigen values on the scree plot after four factors. The factor-loading matrix is presented in Table 4.
Two of the scale labels used by Spence and Helmreich (1980), instrumental (I) and expressive (E), were retained because they were still applicable to the factor items. The other two factors represented undesirable and extreme traits of instrumentality and expressiveness. Items such as “very emotional” and “feelings are easily hurt” loaded onto a factor labeled negative expressive (E-). Items such as “aggressive” and “rough” loaded onto the fourth factor, labeled negative instrumental (I-). The original and the new subscales for each item are presented in Table 5. It should be noted that more items loaded onto the I factor (n = 9) than any other factor and that factor analysis revealed more items loaded onto male-typed subscales than the female-typed scales. This indicates that although the scale was designed to have equal item numbers per sex role, this analysis revealed a bias toward male-typed traits.

Internal consistency for the scales was examined using Cronbach’s alpha. The internal consistency of the instrumental, expressive, and negative instrumental scales were acceptable, with alphas of .75, .76, and .71 respectively. The alpha for negative expressive was .63, which is considered questionable. However, a confirmatory factor analysis showed that all items loaded significantly onto the factors, with a model fit of $\chi^2(246) = 437.49, p = .000, \text{CFI} = .74, \text{RMSEA} = .07$. Although these fit indices show a less than acceptable fit, they were close to acceptable ranges.

*Parent sample.* Reliability analyses were conducted with the parent sample using the four subscales created for the student samples. Alpha coefficients were good for the instrumental ($\alpha = .82$) and expressive ($\alpha = .86$) subscales and acceptable for the negative expressive scale ($\alpha = .73$). The fit for the negative instrumental scale was poor ($\alpha = .57$),
however, exploratory factor analysis and reliability analyses of two-, three-, and four-factor models revealed that a better fit could not be found. This may be due to the small sample size of parents ($n = 35$) who completed the PAQ. The four-factor model was retained in the parent sample in order to have identical subscales between the two samples.

**Interaction Term.** In order to analyze androgyny as a continuous variable, an interaction term ($I \times E$) was used. Specifically, the subscale scores for I and E were multiplied to create a variable that accounts for varying levels of both male-typed and female-typed traits. Because subscales scores (averages of the items) were used, the difference in number of items for each factor was accounted for; each scale was weighted equally. Therefore, a respondent with high scores on both I and E will have a higher interaction term than someone with a high score only on the I or E scales.

**Sexism**

The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996, 1997) will be used to assess the adolescents’ sexism. This 22-item measure contains two subscales, benevolent (BS) and hostile sexism (HS). Respondents were asked to indicate agreement with the 22 items on a scale from 0 (*disagree strongly*) to 5 (*agree strongly*). Glick and Fiske reconceptualized the construct of sexism to include subjectively positive feelings toward women that are based on stereotypes, in addition to the more traditional type of sexism that is openly hostile. The benevolent subscale also addresses three subfactors: power, heterosexuality, and gender differentiation. An example item of hostile sexism is, “Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.” An example of benevolent
sexism is, “Women should be cherished and protected by men.” The ASI is unique among measures of sexism in that it includes interpersonal examples of sexism and explores relationships between men and women, as opposed to addressing only political or legal issues. Glick and Fiske (1997) report alpha coefficients averaging from .8 to .9 and the appropriate items loading onto two clear factors (hostile and benevolent). They also found that the hostile sexism subscale correlated with other measures of sexism but that the benevolent sexism subscale seemed to measure a unique construct.

**Student sample.** In this sample, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the HS and BS subscales were .87 and .77, respectively. Alphas were improved by removing two items from the hostile subscale (“There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances,” and “Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men”) and one from the benevolent subscale, “In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.” It is possible that the complex wording of some of the items led to inconsistent responses. Additionally, an item such as, “Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men,” may be more subjective than other items because it depends on the knowledge the respondent has of the feminist movement. The new alphas were .89 for hostile and .79 for benevolent.

**Parent sample.** In the parent sample, alpha coefficients for the hostile and benevolent subscales were .81 and .70, respectively. Reliability of the hostile scale was improved to .82 by removing the item, “most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.” Four items were deleted from the benevolent scale due to item-total
correlations below .2: 1) “Women should be cherished and protected by men;” 2) “Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility;” 3) “Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives;” and 4) “Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.” The new alpha coefficient was .72, which is considered acceptable. Two of the eliminated items were from the protective paternalism subscale and two were from the gender differentiation subscale of benevolent sexism. Parent scores on the ASI were overall less reliable than the student sample, but adult scores have differed from undergraduate scores in a previous study (Glick & Fiske, 1997).

*Family Distance Regulation*

The Family Distance Regulation Scale (FDR) is a new measure that was piloted in this study. The instrument comprised selected items from the Social Connectedness Scale-Revised (SCS-R; Lee, Draper, & Lee, 2001) and the healthy separation subscale of the Separation-Individuation Test of Adolescence (SITA: Levine, Green, & Millon, 1986). Both scales were reworded to represent all possible dyadic relationships between a child and two parents. Sample items from the SCS-R include: “I feel distant from my mother/father/spouse/son/daughter,” and “I am able to relate to my mother/father/spouse/son/daughter.” Sample items from the SITA healthy separation subscale include: “Even though I’m very close to my mother/father/spouse/son/daughter, I feel I can be myself,” and “While I like to get along with my mother/father/spouse/son/daughter, if I disagree with something he/she is doing, I usually feel free to say so.” The revision of the SCS-R includes 9 items and the revision of the
SITA healthy separation subscale includes 6 items. Each student participant answered the 15 items (9 connectedness and 6 separateness) for all 6 dyads, as appropriate: his relationship with his primary parental figure, his perception of his primary parental figure’s relationship with him, his relationship with his secondary parental figure, his perception of his secondary parental figure’s relationship with him, and his perception of the relationship between his parental figures (if applicable) from each of their perspectives. Each parent also answered the 15 items for 6 dyads: his relationship with the student, his perception of the student’s relationship with him, his relationship with his spouse, his perception of the his spouse’s relationship with him, and his perception of the relationship between his spouse and their child from each of their perspectives. Thus, each participant will have 6 scores for connectedness and 6 scores for separateness on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). In this study, the various subscales for student responses are coded as follows: either an “s” or a “c” for separateness or connectedness, “me,” “mom,” or “dad” depending on whose perspective the item measured, followed the same codes for the relationship being measured. For example, the subscale for the student’s perspective of his connectedness to his mother is labeled cmemom whereas his perception of his father’s perspective of the separateness between father and mother is labeled sdadmom.

These revised scales were used in a recent data collection (Bartle-Haring, Younkin, & Day, 2012) with families with 11-year-old children (n = 343). The internal consistency reliability for the connectedness scale for parents was .82 and the reliability for the separateness scale was .72, although it was only given to the children. In this
study, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to verify scale reliability and
determine the latent variables to be used in the models. First, the six subscales for
separateness and the six subscales for connectedness were factored onto two latent
variables, labeled separateness and connectedness. All items loaded significantly onto
the factors with a model fit of $\chi^2(48) = 338.108, p = .000$, NFI = .76, CFI = .78, RMSEA
= .20. In a second model, the items were factored onto three latent variables, according
to the target dyad: mother-student, father-student, and mother-father. All items again
loaded significantly onto the factors, with a model fit of $\chi^2(43) = 212.70, p = .000$, NFI =
.85, CFI = .87, RMSEA = .16. A reliability analysis of this factor structure indicated
excellent reliability, with alphas ranging from .871 to .926. Because the second model
produced a better fit, the dyadic latent variables were used when testing the hypotheses,
with the exception of the second hypothesis because parent FDR data did not fit well onto
dyadic variables. The separateness and connectedness variables were used for that
particular hypothesis, since they also loaded significantly for the students.

*Psychological Well-being*

As discussed in Chapter 2, the PAQ has often been compared to measures of self-
esteem, with varying and disputed results. It has been proposed that some constructs of
self-esteem are similar to constructs of masculinity, suggesting that self-esteem measures
are gender-biased (Whitley, 1984, 1988). In order to circumvent the debate on self-
esteem and to minimize gender bias in measurement, this study used the Affect Balance
Scale (ABS; Bradburn & Noll, 1969) to measure psychological well-being. The ABS
consists of 10 items with two subscales, positive affect (PA) and negative affect (NA).
Respondents indicate if they have experienced certain feelings over the last few weeks by choosing “yes” or “no.” A sample positive affect item is, “During the past few weeks, did you ever feel particularly excited or interested in something?” Respondents received one point for each “yes” on a positive affect item for a total possible subscale score of 5. A sample negative affect item is, “During the past few weeks, did you ever feel very lonely or remote from other people?” Respondents received one point for each “yes” on a negative affect item for a total possible subscale score of 5. The ABS has shown good to excellent internal consistency with alphas over .80 in addition to high concurrent, predictive, and construct validity (Fischer & Corcoran, 2007). Studies have also demonstrated small to non-existent gender differences in the ABS (Shmotkin, 1990; Stacey & Gatz, 1991).

Chapter Summary

This chapter began with three hypotheses that will guide this study. The sample and sampling procedures, as well as the survey instruments and their factor structures, were described. Next, results from the current study will be reported.
Chapter 4: Results

The results section will be divided into two parts. In the first section, the correlations between study variables will be discussed. In the second section, structural equation modeling will be used to test each of the hypotheses. The means and standard deviations of all variables tested in the models are presented in Table 6. All tables and figures referred to in this chapter can be found in Appendices A and B, respectively.

Correlations

In order to explore the relationships between study variables, correlations were calculated for all student variables as well as FDR and PAQ variables between parents and students. All student FDR variables were correlated at the $\alpha = .000$ level (see Table 7 for all student variable correlations). This confirms the measurement reliability using Cronbach’s alpha reported in the previous chapter.

*Study Variables From Student Perspective*

Separateness and connectedness from the students’ perspectives between the student and mother were significantly correlated with positive affect, while both connectedness variables between the student and mother were negatively correlated with negative affect, indicating that better distance regulation in the maternal relationship was related to well-being. Androgyny was also related to well-being: the interaction term was
positively correlated with positive affect and negatively correlated with negative affect. Interestingly, positive and negative affect were also correlated with one another. The instrument measured affect over the past several weeks; it is common sense that one may have good and bad feelings or moods over that period of time.

The primary research hypothesis was that distance regulation and androgyny were related. However, androgyny was only correlated with one FDR variable, the separateness of the student and father from the students’ perspective. The negative sex role categories demonstrated more relationships with the FDR variables. Perceived separateness between mother and student was positively related to both I- and E-.

Negative expressiveness was also positively correlated with perceived connectedness between mother and student and perceived separateness between father and student. Therefore, in this study, the relationship between distance regulation and sex roles can be seen more in the negative-typed traits than in the positive ones. The data also indicate that the maternal relationship has more of an effect on sex roles than the paternal relationship, which contradicts previous findings (Bartle-Haring, 1997).

The sexism variables were correlated with each other, which is normal for this instrument (Glick & Fiske, 1997). Although benevolent sexism was not correlated with any additional study variables, hostile sexism was correlated with separateness between mother and father as well as negative instrumental, which contained traits such as aggressiveness and competitiveness.
Parent and Student PAQ Variables

The correlations of parent and student PAQ variables are presented in Table 8. Parent negative instrumental scores and student levels of androgyny were negatively correlated ($p < .05$). Therefore, students were more likely to be androgynous if their parents had low levels of negative instrumental traits. There were no other significant correlations between these two sets of variables, indicating that sex roles may not be transmitted through generations.

Parent and Student FDR Variables

The correlations of parent and student FDR variables are presented in Table 9. On the whole, parent and student ratings of their relationships were not correlated. The only correlations for matching variables were the separateness and connectedness of the student to the father. Separateness was positively correlated while connectedness was negatively correlated. This indicates that parents had similar perceptions of the child’s separateness from the father, but differing views of the child’s connectedness to the father. According to the means in Table 6, students reported higher connectedness to their fathers ($t(27) = 6.743, p < .001$) and higher connectedness from their fathers to them ($t(25) = 8.090, p < .001$) than parents did. Given that the majority of the parent sample were mothers, it is possible that mothers have a different view of father-child relationships than the child has. To further this point, the parent scores for connectedness of child to father were significantly and negatively correlated with many of the student scores. However, there was a positive correlation in separateness of student from father.
The data suggest that perceptions of father relationships are multifaceted and merit further investigation.

Model Fitting and Hypotheses Evaluations

All hypotheses were tested using structural equation modeling (SEM; Bollen, 1989) in AMOS 21 (Arbuckle, 2012). SEM is a method of statistical analysis that is particularly useful for theory testing. SEM uses a system of regression-like equations to estimate the covariance of variables while allowing for measurement error, multiple indicators, and latent variables (Bollen, 1989); then these equations are solved for simultaneously. SEM was first used to confirm the factor structure of the FDR and the PAQ; these results were discussed in the previous chapter. Then, each hypothesis was fit to a model and tested, sometimes with different variables, to determine the best fit.

*Hypothesis 1: Distance Regulation Will Predict Androgyny*

To test this hypothesis, a model was fit using the student sample, as shown in Figure 1 (error terms are omitted to simplify the figure). The results of the model indicated a mediocre fit ($\chi^2 (69) = 264.884, p < .001; \text{CFI} = .87; \text{NFI} = .82; \text{RMSEA} = .12$). The model accounted for 5% of the variance of the interaction term (androgyny), 4% of I-, and 16% of E-. Two significant path estimates were found between the student-mom dyad and E- ($\beta = .439, p = .062$), as well as between gender and E- ($\beta = .302, p < .001$). In this data set, males were coded with a “1” and females with a “2”; therefore, this path indicates a relationship between a female gender and E- traits.

The relationship between the student-mom dyad and E- scores can be explained further by referring to the correlation table (7). The student’s perceptions of how
separate and connected the mother felt to the student (i.e., smomme and cmmomme) were positively and significantly correlated with negative expressive scores (separateness, $r = .178$, $p = .049$; connectedness, $r = .171$, $p = .059$). However, the students’ scores of their separateness and connectedness to their mothers were not significantly correlated with negative expressive traits. Therefore, the student’s perception of how her/his mother feels about her/him seems to be related to the development of negative expressive traits.

_Hypothesis 1a: Sexism Mediates the Relationship Between Distance Regulation and Androgyny_

A model was fit to test this secondary hypothesis and can be seen in Figure 2. The results of this model indicate a poorer fit than in Hypothesis 1 ($\chi^2 (121) = 462.351, p = .000$; CFI = .76; NFI = .71; RMSEA = .14). Further, this model explains 0% of the variance in the interaction term. Because androgyny is a key construct in this study, this model was discarded and the previous model was retained for use in Hypothesis 3.

_Hypothesis 2: Parent Traits Will Predict Student Traits_

The second hypothesis has two parts: first, parent distance regulation will predict student distance regulation and, second, parent sex roles will predict student sex roles. To test the hypothesis regarding distance regulation, a model was fit as shown in Figure 3. Separateness and connectedness are used in this model because the dyadic subscales were not reliable for the parent sample. The results of the model indicated a poor fit ($\chi^2 (71) = 234.9, p = .000$; CFI = .64; NFI = .58; RMSEA = .26). However, all path estimates in the model were significant and the model explained 56% of the variance in
student’s separateness and 43% of the variance in student’s connectedness. It is likely that small sample size \((n = 36)\) for this test reduces the reliability of an SEM analysis.

Next, a model was fit to test the intergenerational transmission of sex roles (see Figure 4). The results of the model indicated an excellent fit \((\chi^2 (3) = .953, p = ns; \text{CFI} = 1.0; \text{NFI} = .96; \text{RMSEA} = .00)\). However, none of the path estimates were significant and the model explained 12%, 2%, and 1% of the variance in the androgyny interaction term, I-, and E-, respectively. Again, the small sample size may be affecting these analyses. Further, the correlational analysis indicated that there were few relationships between parent and student sex roles except for the negative relationship between student androgyny and parental I-.

Hypothesis 3: Distance Regulation and Androgyny Will Predict Well-being

A model was fit using the dyadic distance regulation and androgyny model from Hypothesis 1 with paths to the subscales of the ABS, positive affect and negative affect (see Figure 5). The results indicate a mediocre fit \((\chi^2 (110) = 302.66, p = .000; \text{CFI} = .86; \text{NFI} = .80; \text{RMSEA} = .11)\). The model explained 5% of the variance in Positive Affect and 12% in Negative Affect. In addition to the significant path estimates from Hypothesis 1, gender was also negatively related to the androgyny interaction term \((\beta = -.155, p < .10)\), meaning that a male gender better predicted androgyny. However, an independent sample t-test showed no significant differences between male \((m = 7.86, sd = 2.85)\) and female \((m = 7.12, sd = 2.20)\) androgyny scores \((t (125) = 1.644, ns)\). Additionally, androgyny was positively related to positive affect \((\beta = .157, p < .10)\) and negatively related to negative affect \((\beta = -.261, p < .05)\). Finally, the path from E- to
negative affect was significant ($\beta = .184, p < .05$). It was hypothesized that this result could be due to similar items between the two subscales. Consequently, a reliability analysis was conducted to determine if the subscales measured the same construct.

Negative affect and E- did, in fact, load onto one factor with a Cronbach’s alpha of .70. Therefore, it was determined that the two subscales were one factor and that this explains the path between them. The results of this model are inconclusive; while there were several significant relationships, the overall model fit and path estimates were not acceptable.

Chapter Summary

First, correlations of the study variables were presented, indicating consistency in the FDR instrument and relationships between some of the other study variables, particularly gender, sex roles, and well-being. The parent and student FDR variables were not consistently correlated, likely due to the small sample size. Results of model fitting for each hypothesis were then presented. Hypothesis 3 received the most support with relationships between sex roles and well-being. The next chapter will discuss these results and their limitations, as well as present suggestions for future research.
Chapter 5: Summary and Discussion

This final chapter restates the research hypotheses and reviews the methodology used in the study. Then, the results of the study are summarized and discussed, in light of the theoretical framework and previous research. Finally, the limitations of the study are presented and recommendations are made for future research.

Research Hypotheses and Methods

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between family distance regulation and androgyny in order to validate a feminist conceptualization of Bowen family systems theory. Bowen family systems theory attempts to explain the intra- and interpersonal processes of human relations through the concept of distance regulation. Distance regulation is how one manages emotional closeness or separateness from others; differentiation refers to how effective or adaptive one’s abilities are. Historically, feminist scholars have critiqued Bowen’s concept of differentiation, claiming that it promotes male-typed traits, such as individuality, as ideal and female-typed traits, such as emotionality, as unhealthy. It was anticipated that a deeper understanding of how differentiation and sex-typed traits influence one another and are transmitted through families would validate a feminist Bowen theory. In light of this goal, this study aimed to evaluate three hypotheses:
1) Distance regulation will be predictive of androgyny; that is, individuals who demonstrate balance of separateness and connectedness will also show high levels of both male-typed and female-typed traits. Further, individuals who are high on separateness will have more male-typed traits and those high on connectedness will have more female-typed traits.

   a. The relationship between distance regulation and androgyny may be mediated by sexism, a form of emotional reactivity.

2) Parent distance regulation and androgyny will be predictive of these traits in their children, based on the concept of intergenerational transmission.

3) Both distance regulation and androgyny are adaptive and will predict overall well-being.

To evaluate these hypotheses, data on distance regulation, gender-typed traits, sexism, and well-being were collected from 150 college students and 36 of their parents. The data were analyzed using correlations and structural equation modeling. The following sections will review and discuss measurement issues and the results of testing each hypothesis.

Measurement

The most reliable measurement in this study was the Family Distance Regulation Scale. It produced the highest reliability statistics, high intercorrelations, and two different factor structures in the student sample. Further, the instrument showed no gender bias. Although there were few correlations between the parent and student scores, this is likely due to factors other than the measure itself. First, the parent sample was
very small; significant correlations might be found in a larger sample of intergenerational dyads. Second, the child sample in this study consisted of college students. This particular life cycle stage is often characterized by changing dynamics and boundaries in parent-child relationships. Samples of dyads in more stable life stages, such as middle childhood or middle adulthood (for the second generation) may produce more relationships between the generations in future studies. This issue is discussed further in the section for the second hypothesis.

Although sex role variables were not related to distance regulation in this study, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire functioned in some expected and some unexpected ways. Relationships within the chosen four-factor model were reasonable; negative instrumentality and negative expressiveness were negatively correlated and androgyny was not significantly correlated with either of the negative factors. However, the four-factor, positive-negative structure that did emerge from that data is contrary to Spence’s (1993) original claim that all PAQ traits were considered desirable and could be factored into two constructs, instrumentality and expressiveness. The data in this study did group along the instrumental/expressive split but could not reasonably be divided into two categories. The original dichotomous categories were not sufficient to explain the data in this study. Rather, some of the traits factored into more extreme versions of the original two. In this study, these categories were labeled as negative because the traits were deemed as undesirable when exhibited together and at high levels. However, at more moderate levels, many of these traits could be deemed desirable, such as competitiveness or the ability to devote oneself to others. Therefore, it is not easily determined whether
all of the traits on the PAQ are desirable or whether some of them are strictly undesirable. Rather, the traits appear to be dynamic, subjective, and multifaceted. Factors may be best determined on a case-by-case basis, depending on the sample of a particular study.

Historically, the Affect Balance Scale has shown good to excellent internal consistency with alphas over .80 in addition to high concurrent, predictive, and construct validity (Fischer & Corcoran, 2007). Because of this and reports of no gender bias (Shmotkin, 1990; Stacey & Gatz, 1991), the ABS was chosen to measure well-being in this study. However, gender differences were found with this sample and are discussed further in the section on Hypothesis 3. In addition, the original scoring method of the ABS was not suitable for this sample. Originally, scores for the positive and negative affect subscales were combined for one overall score. The total score was not related to any other variables in the study and had poor reliability (α = .445). Once the scores were separated into the two subscales, reliability improved and relationships were found with other study variables. According to this study, positive affect and negative affect are separate constructs. Finally, this measure was chosen in hopes that it contained very little bias and was a comprehensive assessment of well-being. That is not likely the case and one could argue that a brief questionnaire cannot account for the multifaceted and highly personal nature of well-being. Future studies might allow respondents to provide their own definition of well-being and then rate themselves according to their own construction of the phenomenon.
Hypothesis 1: Distance Regulation Will Predict Androgyny

This study did not find support for the primary hypothesis, that distance regulation and sex roles are related. In both correlations and SEM, the FDR variables were almost completely unrelated to the PAQ variables. However, the rationale behind this hypothesis may still have been supported. The idea that distance regulation and androgyny would be related was based on the assumption that the construct of distance regulation is not biased against women. According to the correlations between gender and the FDR variables (see Table 7), that assumption was confirmed. Only one FDR variable was correlated with gender but it was focused on the parental relationship and was not a very strong correlation. Although this study was not able to demonstrate a link between distance regulation and sex roles, it was able to show no relationship between gender and distance regulation, which supports a feminist conceptualization of Bowen.

In the model testing the first hypothesis, two significant paths emerged. One was a relationship between female gender and negative expressiveness. Since expressive traits are considered to be stereotypically feminine, this seems fitting. However, male gender was not significantly correlated with negative instrumentality \( (r = .047, \text{ ns}) \), which would be expected given the relationship between gender and negative expressiveness. It may be that women are more likely to endorse stereotypically masculine traits, such as competitiveness, than men are to endorse stereotypically feminine traits, such as crying easily. Therefore, there would be fewer gender differences when examining negative instrumentality than negative expressiveness because it is less socially acceptable for men to develop and then admit to extremely feminine traits.
A second significant path in this model was the relationship between the student-mother dyad and negative expressiveness. Further analysis revealed that it was the student’s perception of his mother’s separateness from and connectedness to him that were correlated with negative expressiveness. First, it is important to note that these two variables share a common dyad and not a common emotional distance. That is, the significant finding is due to the mother relationship and not with either separateness or connectedness. This is contrary to one of the major assumptions of this study: balancing separateness and connectedness is related to balancing instrumentality and expressiveness. With this finding, we see both separateness and connectedness as related to extreme expressiveness. Second, it is interesting to note that it was the maternal relationship that was significant. In a previous study, differentiation in the paternal relationship was more important in the development of sex roles and identity formation (Bartle-Haring, 1997). In this study, higher levels of perceived connectedness and healthy separation of the mother to child was correlated with negative expressive traits, such as a strong need for security or being very emotional. One could debate the “negative” label on this subscale and replace it with “extreme.” Then, it could be said that highly differentiated maternal relationships are related to a high capacity for nurturing and intimacy. Beyond this, however, conclusions cannot be drawn from the data in this study. Further investigation of these variables is needed to determine the influence of perceived maternal distance regulation on a child’s extremely expressive traits.
Hypothesis 1a: Sexism Mediates the Relationship Between Distance Regulation and Androgyny

Aside from the correlation between hostile sexism and separateness in the mother-father dyad, sexism was not related to distance regulation. Therefore, the link between sexism, as emotional reactivity, and distance regulation cannot be made in this study. Hostile sexism was related to negative instrumental traits, including: aggressive, dominant, competitive, and rough. These traits seem to have conceptual links to the notions of hostile sexism, in that they both reinforce gender differentiation and patriarchal values. Gender differentiation (Glick & Fiske, 1997) refers to the stereotypes about men and women’s traits that keep them confined to separate roles. For example, the idea that men are more competitive and dominant than women makes them more appropriate members of the work force and heads of households, whereas women who are kind or warm are not expected to succeed in such arenas and so are better suited for raising children. Therefore, it makes sense that men who would benefit the most from hostile sexist beliefs are the men who describe themselves in extremely masculine ways, such as rough or aggressive.

Hypothesis 2: Parent Traits Will Predict Student Traits

In the model where parent distance regulation predicted student distance regulation, all of the path estimates were significant but the model fit was poor. For the most part, the two sets of variables were not correlated, with the striking exception of student-father variables, which were commonly negatively correlated. Because most of the parent sample were mothers, it is possible that mothers do not have the same
perception of father relationships as their children do. Upon comparing the mean scores between the two samples, it appears that parents rated the student-father relationships lower than students did. One possible explanation for the student-father variables is the lack of secondary parent data. Not all students who had a parent complete a survey also reported a secondary parent. Since secondary parents were more often fathers, it is possible that there are some mothers in the sample who did not answer questions about another parent, thereby reducing the sample size for analysis. Another possible explanation is that college students may begin to differentiate their relationships with parents more once they are away from home. For example, while at home, a child may often interact with both parents because they live in the same house but while at college, a child may have completely separate phone calls with each parent or exchange emails with one parent at a time. This allows each dyad to distinguish their relationship from the entire family and, specifically, for the child and father to grow closer irrespective of their relationships with the mother.

Beyond the idiosyncrasies of the student-father variables, the parent and student FDR variables were not related, which contradicts one of the major assumptions of Bowen (1978) theory and one of the hypotheses of this study. However, these results may be indicative only of this study sample and should not be generalized to other populations. Specifically, this sample consists of college students and their parents. The launching of children is considered a major life cycle transition (Carter & McGoldrick, 1999) that requires the renegotiation of family roles and dynamics. Children who were once part of family routines and under the supervision of their parents are now living
apart from their families and forced to make many new decisions on their own. Parents who knew many of their children’s daily activities and enjoyed frequent interactions are now hoping for weekly phone calls and are left in the dark on many of their child’s major life happenings. Of course, these experiences are not typical of all families with a child in college, but they illustrate some of the significant changes that can occur when a child leaves for college. Families are forced to recalibrate relationships as children take on unprecedented responsibilities and independence. As this calibration occurs, parents and their children may have opposing views of how close or distant they are from one another. For example, a college student may want more healthy separateness from parents while the parents are asking for more connectedness. Therefore, a college sample may not be generalizable to other parent-child samples in more stable life cycle stages.

In the model where parent sex roles predict student sex roles, the results indicated an excellent fit but none of the path estimates were significant. This is most likely due to the small sample size, which decreases the statistical power of SEM to detect discrepancies between the observed covariance matrix and the estimated covariance matrix. In the correlations, however, there was a significant negative correlation between student’s androgyny and parent’s negative instrumentality. Students are less likely to be androgynous if parents exhibit negative instrumental traits, such as aggression or competitiveness. In addition, male gender was positively but not significantly correlated with androgyny and a significant path estimate emerged from the model testing of the third hypothesis. If many of the androgynous students in this sample were male, then the finding that androgyny is negatively correlated with parental negative instrumentality
may mean that boys have an easier time integrating and expressing both instrumental and expressive traits in a home environment where there is less negative masculine traits, such as roughness or dominance. This may support previous findings that androgynous men report high levels of affection from both parents (Kelly & Worell, 1976), which is unlikely in parents exhibiting competitive or aggressive behavior.

Hypothesis 3: Distance Regulation and Androgyny Will Predict Well-being

In the final model, there were no new findings in regard to the distance regulation variables. However, gender, sex roles, and well-being produced more interesting results. First, the path from gender to androgyny was significant, indicating that male gender was associated with higher levels of androgyny. However, the path was significant at the .10 level and had a small effect size. Further investigation revealed a similar correlation between gender and androgyny—significant at the .10 level and a small magnitude. An independent sample t-test then revealed that the mean androgyny scores were not significantly different between males and females. These contradictory results may indicate that the males in this sample were slightly more androgynous than the females, but the statistics are not strong enough to be conclusive. Future studies with larger samples may be useful in confirming these tentative results. If the male college students were more androgynous than the females in this sample, this would challenge evidence as well as the common assumption that it is more acceptable and prevalent for women to adopt masculine traits than for men to adopt feminine traits (Spence & Buckner, 2000; Woodhill & Samuels, 2004). It would be interesting to see more studies that investigated whether men were becoming just as or more androgynous than women.
Second, this model validated previous studies in that androgyny was related to psychological well-being. Specifically, androgyny was positively associated with positive affect and negatively associated with negative affect in both correlational and SEM analyses. Theoretically, androgynous people are less restricted in the range of behaviors available to them and can respond to a variety of situations, making them more adaptive and better at coping (Bem, 1975). However, the existing research base on whether androgyny is adaptive contains mixed findings. Many studies, like this one, demonstrate higher psychological well-being in androgynous persons (Grimmell, 1998; Markstrom-Adams, 1989; O’Heron & Orlofsky, 1990; Stake, 1997; Williams & D’Alessandro, 1994) while others show no advantages to androgyny (Lubinski, Tellegen, & Butcher, 1981, 1983; O’Heron & Orlofsky, 1990). However, it is important to note that the latter group of studies is slightly older than the former, and all are over fifteen years old; generational effects must be considered when interpreting these results. For example, it is possible that androgyny has evolved as being advantageous because it has evolved into being socially acceptable, and even desirable. This study contributes to the former group of studies, although the magnitude or effect size of the findings are not large, so the results should be interpreted critically and in light of opposing research.

In addition to the relationship between female gender and negative expressiveness, this model also presented a relationship between negative expressiveness and the negative affect subscale of the ABS. Combined with the finding that males might be more likely to be androgynous and androgyny was linked to well-being, females appeared less “well” than males in this study. The notion that males appeared healthier in
psychological studies, particularly those focused on sex roles and self-esteem, has been explored in other studies (Aube, Koestner, Hodgins, & Craig, 1994; Nicholls, Licht, & Pearl, 1982; Whitley, 1988). Measures of self-esteem, anxiety, depression, and well-being may contain a positivity bias toward masculine traits (Whitley, 1984) and indeed have been found to load onto one latent construct (Whitley & Gridley, 1993). Similarly, this study found a negativity bias for female participants. Negative expressiveness and negative affect were found to load onto one construct, which one would assume is a negative personality component. However, through a feminist and social constructionist lens, the value of these traits and behaviors must be reevaluated. Well-being measures often define poor well-being as feeling lonely, being affected by criticism, or reporting depressive symptoms. It is possible that women are more likely to have these feelings or symptoms if they are socialized with more expressive traits. Further, women may be more likely than men to report such feelings because it is less socially acceptable for men to be adversely affected by relationships. However, these traits and experiences are socially defined as negative in a patriarchal society. If the experiences of women are considered central and worthy (Osmond & Thorne, 1993), then valuing close relationships is normal and feeling badly when those relationships are under duress is a normal response. Therefore, the construct of negative affect and the labeling of the negative expressive scale in this very study exhibit a negativity bias against women and should be reconsidered in light of a feminist and social constructionist epistemology.
Limitations

While the sample is largely representative of the university population from which it was drawn, that population is somewhat homogenous and so the variation in sample demographics will not allow for comparisons between populations, such as between White and non-White respondents and between heterosexual and non-heterosexual respondents. That being said, the fact that the sample is representative of the population indicates that demographic factors may not have influenced response bias.

However, it is possible than another type of response bias exists. Students were informed that this study was about family relationships and they would have the opportunity to provide their parents’ contact information in order to solicit their participation. Students with more positive perceptions of their family may be more likely to participate in such a study and students who felt anxiety about asking their parents to participate (although not required) may have decided not to take the survey as well. Further, parents who received invitations to participate may have declined due to negative feelings about their family relationships, particularly their relationship with their child. Therefore, the sample may be biased toward participants who have a positive view of their family relationships, which could have caused the distribution of the FDR responses to be skewed.

Finally, although it was a goal of this study to collect and analyze triadic data, no student had two parents complete a questionnaire. Additionally, students provided a lower number of parent e-mails than expected and parents responded at far lower rates than hoped. Therefore, the dyadic analyses were not very strong and provided almost no
findings. In order to conduct this study again, more second-generation participants would need to be recruited in order to get access to more parents. Additionally, higher compensation for parent surveys may have increased responses.

Conclusions and Clinical Implications

The results of this study could not support the first two hypotheses, regarding distance regulation and intergenerational transmission, but did provide some support for the third hypothesis, that androgyny was adaptive. Although the measure for distance regulation was the most reliable, there were few relationships between distance regulation and other variables. This may be due to issues with the other measures, with the sample, or with the original hypothesis that separateness and connectedness are related to instrumentality and expressiveness. However, the theoretical grounding for this study still holds merit as no relationship between distance regulation and gender was found, indicating no gender bias in the measurement of that construct.

Gender, sex roles, and well-being were related in multiple ways, most of which produced an unfavorable picture of women. The biases of the instruments used were questioned and the results were explored using feminism and social constructionism. Although androgyny was related to well-being, the study of dimensions of gender and gender roles is complicated and should be approached with a critical mind. Assumptions about health, wellness, and normalcy should be analyzed and even inverted. These assumptions should especially be questioned in clinical work, when female clients may be pathologized for prioritizing relationships and feeling distressed when those relationships are threatened. Through self-reflexive work, clinicians can try to avoid
applying male-typed definitions of wellness to clients who have been socialized with expressive traits.

Although this study did not empirically validate a feminist conceptualization of Bowen, it is hoped that the second chapter provided a thorough account of how such a theory is possible. The lack of a consistent relationship between distance regulation and sex roles may indicate a lack of gender bias in the measure itself and possibly suggest that Bowen family systems concepts can be used free of gender bias, regardless of others’ interpretations of Bowen’s constructs as being male-biased. Since the measure of distance regulation appeared to lack gender bias, and given the findings described in chapter two, this author and other scholars can continue to tackle the dilemma of how to make foundational theories applicable and palatable to contemporary populations. It is proposed that more studies that expand and validate systemic theories will validate the field of family therapy and family science.

Further, the results of this study emphasize the importance of considering socialization and social construction of gender when working with clients. In particular, female-typed clients may feel that they should be more individualistic and, in fact, some clinicians may support this. Biases about gender-typed traits and gender roles should be considered, and the experiences of women should be considered as important as the experiences of men. When conceptualizing cases using Bowen family systems theory, it is also important to consider how the socialization of gender affects emotional reactivity and distance regulation. In this current society, men are more likely to cut off from others and women are more likely to fuse with others, simply because of the roles they
are taught to play in relationships from a very young age. In order to employ a feminist Bowen theory, it is crucial to use a social constructionist lens to understand the effects of society on how men and women display their levels of differentiation and emotional reactivity.
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Appendix A: Tables
Table 1. Key Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Androgyny</td>
<td>The state of possessing both masculine and feminine-typed personality traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut-off</td>
<td>Separation from emotions or others in an attempt to avoid the anxiety of closeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Ability to be separate and connected, to maintain autonomy while belonging to a system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance regulation</td>
<td>Managing the emotional distance between oneself and another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional distance</td>
<td>A reaction to intense closeness, may involve external or internal mechanisms that create space between two members of a system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional reactivity</td>
<td>Inability to distinguish and choose between cognitive and affective reactions when anxiety increases; automatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family emotional process</td>
<td>The level of anxiety in a family and the mechanisms used to manage that anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>Possessing traits deemed by society as appropriate for women, such as caring for others, expressing emotion, being gentle or submissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusion</td>
<td>Being bound to one or another’s emotions, unable to separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/sex roles</td>
<td>Attributes considered appropriate for and typical of members of each sex; reinforced by societal feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/sex role orientation</td>
<td>The degree to which one is androgynous, masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated, determined by the number of masculine or feminine-typed traits one possesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuality</td>
<td>Drive for self-preservation and self-determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>force/Separateness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter/multigenerational</td>
<td>The process of perpetuating differentiation across generations; children often have similar levels as parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transmission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>Possessing traits deemed by society as appropriate for men, such as assertiveness, competitiveness, and self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptoms/Threats</td>
<td>Processes or events that serve to increase or attempt to decrease anxiety; both pose a risk to viability, symptoms attempt to relieve that risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>A set of interconnected parts that form a complex whole that operates by a certain set of rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togetherness</td>
<td>Human tendency to group together and strive for sameness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>force/Connectedness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viability</td>
<td>Maintaining feasibility or life, continuing to exist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Parents&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual/Pansexual</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asexual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Indian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American/Black</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnered</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarried</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> n = 150. <sup>b</sup> n = 41
Table 3. Family Members While Students Were in High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lived in Household&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Primary Parental Figure</th>
<th>Secondary Parental Figure&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Mother</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Father</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepmother</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepfather</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoptive Mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoptive Father</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandmother</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandfather</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Sibling</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step/half Sibling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Sibling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>10 students (7.1%) reported no secondary parental figure.

Note. Dashes = 0.
Table 4. Varimax Rotation of the PAQ for Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldly</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent to others’ approval</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes decisions easily</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never gives up easily</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confident</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels superior</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stands up well under pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful to others</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of feelings of others</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of others</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm in relations with others</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitable in a crisis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to devote self to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings easily hurt</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cries easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong need for security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Only loadings of .30 and above are shown.
Table 5. Subscale Items for the Personal Attributes Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Subscales</th>
<th>Subscales Used in this Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>I/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>I/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitable in a crisis(^a)</td>
<td>I/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to devote self to others</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough(^a)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful to others</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldly</td>
<td>I/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent to others’ approval(^a)</td>
<td>I/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings easily hurt</td>
<td>I/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of feelings of others</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes decisions easily</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never gives up easily</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cries easily</td>
<td>I/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confident</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels superior</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of others</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm in relations with others</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong need for security</td>
<td>I/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stands up well under pressure</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Item was recoded from raw scores to obtain a positive correlation with new subscale.
### Table 6. Means (Standard Deviations) of Variables in the Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male Students $(n = 53)$</th>
<th>Female Students $(n = 85)$</th>
<th>Parents $(n = 36)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive affect</td>
<td>3.94 (1.19)</td>
<td>3.96 (1.12)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affect</td>
<td>2.15 (1.65)*</td>
<td>2.68 (1.47)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile sexism</td>
<td>2.45 (1.05)</td>
<td>2.26 (0.90)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent sexism</td>
<td>2.26 (0.74)</td>
<td>2.28 (0.79)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgyny</td>
<td>7.86 (2.85)</td>
<td>7.12 (2.20)</td>
<td>7.66 (2.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Instrumental</td>
<td>2.13 (0.75)</td>
<td>2.06 (0.73)</td>
<td>2.09 (0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Expressive</td>
<td>2.11 (0.68)**</td>
<td>2.58 (0.68)</td>
<td>2.38 (0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness of child to mother</td>
<td>3.87 (0.70)</td>
<td>4.02 (0.69)</td>
<td>3.97 (0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(smemom)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness of mother to child</td>
<td>4.08 (0.63)</td>
<td>4.13 (0.69)</td>
<td>4.05 (0.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(smomme)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness of child to mother</td>
<td>4.19 (0.68)</td>
<td>4.17 (0.86)</td>
<td>2.74 (0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cmemom)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness of mother to child</td>
<td>4.18 (0.72)</td>
<td>4.12 (0.86)</td>
<td>2.73 (0.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cmomme)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness of child to father</td>
<td>3.88 (0.62)</td>
<td>3.80 (0.89)</td>
<td>3.72 (0.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(smedad)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness of father to child</td>
<td>3.91 (0.63)</td>
<td>3.92 (0.77)</td>
<td>3.85 (0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sdadme)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness of child to father</td>
<td>3.97 (0.86)</td>
<td>3.89 (0.99)</td>
<td>2.72 (0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cmedad)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness of father to child</td>
<td>3.87 (0.83)</td>
<td>4.02 (0.77)</td>
<td>2.77 (0.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cdadme)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness of mother to father</td>
<td>4.14 (0.74)</td>
<td>3.95 (0.86)</td>
<td>3.88 (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(smomdad)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Variable</td>
<td>Male Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Female Mean (SD)</td>
<td>p-Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness of father to mother (sdadmom)</td>
<td>4.04 (0.65)</td>
<td>3.98 (0.95)</td>
<td>3.92 (0.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness of mother to father (cmomdad)</td>
<td>4.08 (0.84)*</td>
<td>3.71 (1.14)</td>
<td>2.80 (0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness of father to mother (cdadmom)</td>
<td>4.12 (0.74)</td>
<td>3.88 (0.98)</td>
<td>2.71 (0.39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

注释：独立样本t-检验用于所有研究变量的性别。所有性别间差异均标记为男性学生列中的星号。

*p < .10. ***p < .01.
Table 7. Correlations of Study Variables for Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Positive Affect</th>
<th>Negative Affect</th>
<th>Hostile Sexism</th>
<th>Benevolent Sexism</th>
<th>Androgyny</th>
<th>Negative Instrumental</th>
<th>Negative Expressive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Pos. Aff.</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Neg. Aff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.167*</td>
<td>.186**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) HS</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) BS</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.539***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) I x E</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>.165*</td>
<td>-.262***</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) I-</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.326***</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)E-</td>
<td>.322***</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.198**</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) smemom</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.200**</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) smomme</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.171*</td>
<td>.178**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) cmemom</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.182**</td>
<td>-.198**</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) cmomme</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.166*</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.171*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) smedad</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.185**</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) sdadme</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.159*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 150. Table 7 continues on the next page.
Table 7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cmedad</th>
<th>cdadme</th>
<th>smomdad</th>
<th>sdadmom</th>
<th>cmomdad</th>
<th>cdadmom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.312**</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-.173*</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n = 150$. Table 7 continues on the next page.

*aMale = 1. Female = 2.

*p < .10. **p <.05. ***p <.01.
Table 7 (continued)

Correlations of Study Variables for Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>smemom</th>
<th>smomme</th>
<th>cmemom</th>
<th>cmomme</th>
<th>smedad</th>
<th>sdadme</th>
<th>cmedad</th>
<th>cdadme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>.675***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>.765***</td>
<td>.497***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>.601***</td>
<td>.546***</td>
<td>.708***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>.613***</td>
<td>.498***</td>
<td>.576***</td>
<td>.410***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>.513***</td>
<td>.629***</td>
<td>.425***</td>
<td>.452***</td>
<td>.692***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>.586***</td>
<td>.457***</td>
<td>.694***</td>
<td>.517***</td>
<td>.786***</td>
<td>.639***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>.557***</td>
<td>.475***</td>
<td>.616***</td>
<td>.676***</td>
<td>.653***</td>
<td>.660***</td>
<td>.835***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>.583***</td>
<td>.649***</td>
<td>.515***</td>
<td>.465***</td>
<td>.561***</td>
<td>.597***</td>
<td>.578***</td>
<td>.552***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>.558***</td>
<td>.604***</td>
<td>.508***</td>
<td>.530***</td>
<td>.493***</td>
<td>.715***</td>
<td>.537***</td>
<td>.553***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>.418***</td>
<td>.390***</td>
<td>.485***</td>
<td>.603***</td>
<td>.466***</td>
<td>.503***</td>
<td>.593***</td>
<td>.626***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>.502***</td>
<td>.466***</td>
<td>.559***</td>
<td>.666***</td>
<td>.429***</td>
<td>.537***</td>
<td>.607***</td>
<td>.687***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 7 continues on the next page.

*p < .10. **p < .05. ***p < .001.
Table 7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>smomdad</th>
<th>sdadmom</th>
<th>cmomdad</th>
<th>cdadmom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9)  
(10) 
(11) 
(12) 
(13) 
(14) 
(15) 
(16) 
(17) - 
(18) .776*** -
(19) .747*** .705*** -
(20) .715*** .713*** .906*** -

*p < .10. **p < .05. ***p < .001.
Table 8. Correlations of PAQ Variables for Students and Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Androgyne (I x E)</th>
<th>Negative Instrumental (I-)</th>
<th>Negative Expressive (E-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I x E)</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I-)</td>
<td>-.339**</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E-)</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 42.*

**p < .05.
Table 9. Correlations of FDR Variables for Students and Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>smemom (1)</th>
<th>smomm (2)</th>
<th>cmemom (3)</th>
<th>cmomme (4)</th>
<th>smedad (5)</th>
<th>sdadme (6)</th>
<th>cmedad (7)</th>
<th>cdadme (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>.043\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.040\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>-.232</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.176\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.380\textsuperscript{***}</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.445\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>-.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>-.487\textsuperscript{***}</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>.035\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>-.261</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.378\textsuperscript{***}</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.374\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.133\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>.342\textsuperscript{*}</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>-.461\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>-.307</td>
<td>-.477\textsuperscript{***}</td>
<td>-.291</td>
<td>-.557\textsuperscript{***}</td>
<td>-.330</td>
<td>-.538\textsuperscript{***}</td>
<td>-.521\textsuperscript{***}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>-.220</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>-.279</td>
<td>-.055\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.333\textsuperscript{*}</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.245</td>
<td>-.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>-.261</td>
<td>-.243</td>
<td>-.273</td>
<td>-.248</td>
<td>-.329</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.414\textsuperscript{*}</td>
<td>-.447\textsuperscript{*}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Variables are matched by perspective, or order of dyads. For example, the student variable, smemom, is paired with parent variable, schildmom. Table 9 continues on the next page.

\textsuperscript{a}Indicates the correlation of the parent and students’ scores on the same variable.

\textsuperscript{*}p < .05. **p < .010.
Table 9 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>smomdad</th>
<th>sdadmom</th>
<th>cmomdad</th>
<th>cdadmom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>-.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td>-.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>-.421**</td>
<td>-.429**</td>
<td>-.475**</td>
<td>-.496**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>-.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>.134⁴</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.219⁴</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>-.186⁴</td>
<td>-.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.024⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates the correlation of the parent and students’ scores on the same variable.

* p < .05. ** p < .010.
Appendix B: Figures
Figure 1. Model of Hypothesis 1: Dyadic Distance Regulation Predicts Sex Roles in Student Sample

Note. Model fit: $\chi^2 (69) = 264.884, p < .001$; CFI = .87; NFI = .82; RMSEA = .12. Nonsignificant paths are represented by dashed lines. All exogenous variables were correlated.

*p < .10; ***p < .001.
Figure 2. Model of Hypothesis 1a: Sexism Mediates the Relationship Between Distance Regulation and Sex Roles in Student Sample

Note. Model fit: $\chi^2 (121) = 462.351, p = .000$; CFI = .76; NFI = .71; RMSEA = .14. Nonsignificant paths are represented by dashed lines. All exogenous variables were correlated.

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .001.
Figure 3. Model of Hypothesis 2: Parent Distance Regulation Predicts Student Distance Regulation

Note. Model fit: $\chi^2(71) = 234.9, p = .000$; CFI = .64; NFI = .58; RMSEA = .26. All exogenous variables were correlated.

*p < .10; **p < .05.
Figure 4. Model of Hypothesis 2: Parent Sex Roles Predict Student Sex Roles

Note. Model fit: $\chi^2 (3) = .953, p = ns; CFI = 1.0; NFI = .96; RMSEA = .00$. Nonsignificant paths are represented by dashed lines. All exogenous variables were correlated.
Figure 5. Model of Hypothesis 3: Distance Regulation and Sex Roles Predict Well-being in Student Sample

Note. Model fit: \( \chi^2 (110) = 302.66, p = .000; \text{CFI} = .86; \text{NFI} = .80; \text{RMSEA} = .11. \) Nonsignificant paths are represented by dashed lines. All exogenous variables were correlated.

\*p < .10; \**p < .05; \***p < .001.
Appendix C: Measures
Personal Attributes Questionnaire

Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of a pair of characteristics, with the letters A-E in between. For example:

Not at all Artistic A.....B.....C.....D.....E Very Artistic

Each pair describes contradictory characteristics—such as very artistic and not at all artistic.

The letters form a scale between the two extremes. You are to choose a letter that describes where you fall on the scale. For example, if you think you have no artistic ability, you would choose A. If you think you are pretty good, you might choose D. If you are only medium, you might choose C, and so forth.

A B C D E
1. Not at all aggressive Very aggressive
2. Not at all independent Very independent
3. Not at all emotional Very emotional
4. Very submissive Very dominant
5. Not at all excitable in a major crisis Very excitable in a major crisis
6. Very passive Very active
7. Not at all able to devote self completely Able to devote self completely to
8. Very rough Very gentle
9. Not at all helpful to others Very helpful to others
10. Not at all competitive Very competitive
11. Very home oriented Very worldly
12. Not at all kind Very kind
13. Indifferent to others approval Highly needful of others approval
14. Feelings not easily hurt Feelings easily hurt
15. Not at all aware of feelings of others Very aware of feelings of others
16. Can make decisions easily Has difficulty making decisions
17. Gives up very easily Never gives up easily
18. Never cries Cries very easily
19. Not at all self-confident Very self-confident
20. Feels very inferior Feels superior
21. Not at all understanding of others Very understanding of others
22. Very cold in relations with others Very warm in relations with others
23. Very little need for security Very strong need for security
24. Goes to pieces under pressure Stands up well under pressure
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

Instructions: Below are a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.
2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."
3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.
4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.
5. Women are too easily offended.
6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.
7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.
8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.
9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.
10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.
11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.
12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.
13. Men are complete without women.
14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.
15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.
16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.
17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.
18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.
19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.
20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.
21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.
22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

SCORING:
REVERSE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS: 3, 6, 7, 13, 18, 21
HOSTILE SEXISM (HS) SCORE = Mean (2,4,5,7,10,11,14,15,16,18,21)
BENEVOLENT SEXISM (BS) SCORE = Mean (1,3,6,8,9,12,13,17,19,20,22)
Protective Paternalism = 3, 9, 17, 20
Complementary Gender Differentiation = 8, 19, 22
Heterosexual Intimacy = 1, 6, 12, 13
OVERALL AMBIVALENT SEXISM SCORE = Mean (HS, BS)
Affect Balance Scale

Instructions: We are interested in the way people are feeling these days. Please choose “yes” or “no” for each item.

During the past few weeks, did you ever feel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Particularly excited or interested in something?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. So restless that you couldn’t sit long in a chair?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proud because someone complimented you on something you had done?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Very lonely or remote from other people?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pleased about having accomplished something?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bored?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. On top of the world?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Depressed or very unhappy?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. That things were going your way?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Upset because someone criticized you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positive affect score=1+3+5+7+9
Negative affect score=2+4+6+8+10
Family Distance Regulation Scale

**Instructions:** We would like you to think about your relationship with your two parents (the two parental figures you have the most contact with now). We would also like you to think about the relationship between your two parents when you complete the items below. You will notice that the items repeat. We are interested in your perspective on the relationships in your family. When thinking about the items use the following scale to say how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

**Scale:**

- 1 = strongly agree
- 2 = generally agree
- 3 = slightly agree
- 4 = generally disagree
- 5 = strongly disagree

Please think about your current relationship with your mother. We would like you to answer these questions honestly and openly. If a statement has more than one part, please indicate your agreement with the statement as a whole.

1. Even though I’m very close to my mother, I feel I can be myself.
2. I feel so comfortable with my mother that I can tell her anything.
3. My mother and I have some common interests and some differences.
4. I am comfortable with some degree of conflict with my mother.
5. Although I’m like my mother in some ways we’re also different from each other in other ways.
6. While I like to get along with my mother, if I disagree with something she is doing, I usually feel free to say so.
7. I feel distant from my mother. (reverse scored)
8. I don’t feel related to my mother most of the time. (reverse scored)
9. I feel like an outsider with my mother. (reversed scored)
10. I feel close to my mother.
11. Even around my mother, I don’t feel that I really belong. (reverse scored)
12. I am able to relate to my mother.
13. I feel understood by my mother.
14. I see my mother as friendly and approachable.
15. I have little sense of togetherness with my mother. (reverse scored)
Now think about how your mother might answer these questions when thinking about her current relationship with you. If a statement has more than one part, please indicate your agreement with the statement as a whole.

1. Even though your mother is very close to you, she feels she can be herself.
2. Your mother feels so comfortable with you that she can tell you anything.
3. Your mother believes that she and you have some common interests and some differences.
4. Your mother is comfortable with some degree of conflict with you.
5. Although your mother sees herself as like you in some ways, she also sees that you are different from each other in other ways.
6. While your mother likes to get along with you, if she disagrees with something you are doing, she usually feels free to say so.
7. Your mother would say she feels distant from you. (reverse scored)
8. Your mother would say that she does not feel related to you most of the time. (reverse scored)
9. Your mother would say that she feels like an outsider with you. (reversed scored)
10. Your mother would say that she feels close to you.
11. Your mother would say that even around you, she doesn’t feel that she really belongs. (reverse scored)
12. Your mother would say that she is able to relate to you.
13. Your mother would say that she feels understood by you.
14. Your mother would say that she sees you as friendly and approachable.
15. Your mother would say that she has little sense of togetherness with you. (reverse scored)

Healthy Separateness items: 1-6

Connectedness items: 7-15