

Family of Origin Influences on Late Adolescent Romantic Relationships.

By: Benson, Mark J., Larson, Jeffrey, Wilson, Stephen M., and [Demo, David H.](#),

Benson, Mark J., Jeffrey Larson, Stephan M. Wilson, and David H. Demo. (1993). Family of origin influences on late adolescent romantic relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55, 663-672.

Made available courtesy of Wiley-Blackwell. The definitive version is available at:
<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com>

*****Reprinted with permission. No further reproduction is authorized without written permission from Wiley-Blackwell. This version of the document is not the version of record. Figures and/or pictures may be missing from this format of the document.*****

Abstract:

Using Bowenian theory as a foundation, this study examined the hypothesis that properties of close relationships are transmitted from one generation to the next. A large sample of single, never married, late adolescents (N = 977) completed measures regarding trait anxiety, family dynamics (triangulation, fusion, and control) in the family of origin, and communication patterns in romantic relationships. Multivariate regression analyses indicated that fusion and control were associated with higher anxiety. In addition, fusion and control in the family of origin were related to communication in romantic relationships of late adolescents. In accordance with Bowenian theory, anxiety mediated the effects of fusion and control in the family of origin on romantic relationships. Although triangulation in the family of origin was unrelated to anxiety, triangulation was related to aversive communication in close relationships. The findings provide partial confirmation and suggest several extensions to Bowen's theory of intergenerational transmission.

Article:

Bowenian theory (Bowen, 1978; Kerr & Bowen, 1988) has been recognized as one of the most carefully elaborated of the family systems theories (Nichols & Schwartz, 1991). Despite this acclaim, there has been remarkably scant research attention focused on Bowenian theory. Particularly absent are tests of Bowen's conceptualization of intergenerational transmission, the process whereby characteristics of the family of origin are replicated in subsequent generations.

Bowen's model of transmission can be classified as one of several theories of intergenerational transmission. These theories emphasize various mechanisms for transmission, such as genetic inheritance (DiLalla & Gottesman, 1991), social status inheritance (Glass; Bengtson, & Dunham, 1986; Simons, Whitbeck, Conger, & Chyi-In, 1991; Waite, Rindfuss, & De Tray, 1986) or psychological processes. Psychological theories explaining transmission emphasize behavioral mechanisms such as modeling, reinforcement, and generalization (Alexander, Moore, & Alexander, 1991; Gelles, 1985; Glass et al., 1986; Simons et al., 1991; Widom, 1989), or cognitive mechanisms such as expectations and cognitive schema (Benson, Arditti, Reguero de Atilas, & Smith, 1992; Glenn & Kramer, 1987).

Bowen's theory is distinct from these approaches in emphasizing emotion as the mechanism of transmission and in conceptualizing the transmission processes at both the family and individual level. The principal emotion that generates the transmission process is anxiety. According to Bowen, anxiety is a property of individuals and a property of families. Anxiety in the family and in the individual serves to regulate the amount of emotional closeness and distance within the family. If family members experience excessive emotional distance, anxiety increases due to fears of rejection and abandonment. Family members then attempt to reduce the anxiety by seeking increased togetherness. On the other hand, if family members experience excessive togetherness, anxiety increases over fears of loss of autonomy and independence. Anxiety over such excessive closeness prompts family members to extend the emotional distance from each other. Anxiety, then, is the mechanism for monitoring and managing emotional distance in the family.

In addition to this regulating function, anxiety is also the mechanism of intergenerational transmission of functional and dysfunctional family patterns. Functional or healthy families have ample tolerance for normal variations in closeness and distance, and low degrees of anxiety are sufficient to return the family to a balance between closeness and distance. In dysfunctional families, however, minor variations in closeness or distance frequently arouse anxiety. Moreover, highly intense anxiety and persistent reliance on anxiety to regulate closeness and distance result in chronic anxiety within the family. Because the state of chronic anxiety in the family is stressful, the family seeks to divert, or project, the anxiety onto one or more individuals in order to relieve family level anxiety. Individuals in the family collude in this process by integrating or incorporating the anxiety as part of themselves. To the extent that individuals incorporate or introject the anxiety, they carry the anxiety into subsequent relationships. Thus, through projection and introjection processes, anxiety is transmitted across generations.

Several features within the family of origin serve to heighten this projection-introjection process. One is the degree of fusion within the family. In fused families, members are so emotionally reactive that their interactions and responses are nearly automatic. A second feature that may heighten the family projection process is triangulation. Triangulation is a process by which a third party, a child for instance, becomes the focus of tension in the marital dyad. Triangulation serves to decrease anxiety within the couple relationship itself, but increases anxiety in the individual who is triangulated. A third feature that may heighten the family projection process is control. Rigid expectations and excessive control by the parents over the child's behavior serve to alleviate the anxiety in the marital dyad, but these control processes merely shift the anxiety to the child.

There has been considerable research supporting the influence of family of origin factors on the functioning of the offspring. Family enmeshment has been found to be related to self-consciousness in adolescents (Lapsley, Fitzgerald, Rice, & Jackson, 1989), eating disorders among children and adolescents (Brone & Fisher, 1988), and depression in late adolescents (Lopez, 1986). Controlling dynamics have been found to be positively associated with stress-related complaints among adults (West, Gintner, & Zarski, 1989) and negatively associated with self-esteem of adolescents (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986). Triangulation within families has been found to be related to academic difficulties in late adolescents (Lopez, 1991), substance abuse in adolescents (West, Hosie, & Zarski, 1987), and intimacy difficulties in late adolescents (West, Zarski, & Harvill, 1986).

These investigations are insufficient tests, however, of Bowen's theoretical model (1978), which asserts that anxiety is the mediator of the intergenerational transmission process. Consequently, the present research tests the mediating role of anxiety in the transmission process. According to multivariate statistical theory (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Judd & Kenny, 1981), three conditions are necessary to establish mediation. First, the independent variable must be associated with the mediating variable. Second, the mediating variable must be associated with the dependent variable. And third, the independent variable must be associated with the dependent variable before entering the mediating variable, but not after controlling for the mediating variable. To test whether anxiety mediates the influence of family of origin on subsequent relationships, these conditions are necessary: (a) the family of origin characteristics must be associated with anxiety, (b) anxiety must be associated with subsequent relationship patterns, and (c) family of origin characteristics must be associated with the subsequent relationship patterns before controlling for anxiety, but not after controlling for anxiety.

These conditions for mediation are sufficiently stringent that Baron and Kenny (1986) have argued, "A more realistic goal may be to seek mediators that significantly decrease. . . rather than eliminate, the relation between the independent and dependent variables altogether" (p. 1176). They conclude that ". . . from a theoretical perspective, a significant reduction demonstrates that a given mediator is indeed potent" (p. 1176).

There is some indirect support for the first condition that family of origin characteristics are related to anxiety in the offspring. Dysfunction in the marital dyad, for example, has been related to personal anxiety and psychological stress among adolescents (Callan & Noller, 1986; Harvey & Bray, 1991). In addition, overall

family dysfunction and family enmeshment have been associated with anxiety (Fine, 1988; Frey & Oppenheimer, 1990).

There is also some indirect support for the second proposition linking anxiety with difficulties in relationships. Anxiety about separating from the family of origin, for example, has been associated with lower social competence among college students (Kenny & Donaldson, 1991). Similarly, anxiety about self-disclosing has been found to be negatively related to relationship cohesion (Pittman, Price-Bonham, & McKenry, 1983). Anxious attachments in adulthood also have been linked to less independence (Feeney & Noller, 1990), less commitment, and less trust in relationships (Simpson, 1990).

Despite the support for these first two propositions, the critical third step in testing anxiety as a mediator has yet to be addressed. In the current research, these three propositions are tested in evaluating the role of anxiety in mediating the influence of family of origin characteristics on subsequent relationship processes.

According to Bowenian theory, relationship processes are expressed through channels of communication (Kerr & Bowen, 1978). The theory implies the possibility of two types of communication. One type has aversive properties and includes the tendency to insulate, withdraw, fight, blame, badger, or reject. A second type reflects an open communication style as expressed in the tendency toward cohesive, altruistic, and cooperative communication in relationships in which individuals "listen without reacting emotionally" (Kerr & Bowen, 1988, p. 188). Although specific terminology has varied, previous investigations of communication have identified these open and aversive communication patterns (Conger et al., 1990; Gottman, 1979; Margolin & Wampold, 1981). Bowen's theory suggests that high levels of chronic anxiety are likely to prompt aversive communication and that lower levels of anxiety foster the characteristics associated with open communication.

To examine these hypotheses, a sample of single late adolescents was selected for the current study. This selection was based on two advantages. First, the developmental task of establishing intimate relationships is paramount during late adolescence (Erikson, 1968). Second, the single/never-married status provides a clear test of the hypotheses, in that additional experiences in marriages or divorce during adulthood may lessen the contribution of family of origin influences.

In sum, a sample of unmarried late adolescents was used to test three hypotheses derived from Bowenian theory. We hypothesized that: (a) family of origin factors would be related to individual anxiety, (b) anxiety would be related to poor communication in close relationships, and (c) anxiety would mediate the effects of family dynamics on communication in close relationships.

METHOD

Subjects

The 977 participants for this study included 433 males (44%) and 544 females (56%). All of the participants were single/never-married and between the ages of 17 and 21 ($M = 18.8$, $SD = 1.0$). Participants were selected on the basis of their chronological age and never-married status from a larger sample. The sample was drawn from various introductory behavior science courses at four major universities.

In addition to age and gender, participants were asked for information about the marital status and annual income of their parents. Marital status was assessed with a single item that asked whether their parents were married, separated, divorced, one or both remarried, or other. Most of the participants indicated that their parents were married (82%), and this comprised the continuously married group referred to in subsequent analyses. Family income was assessed by asking participants to check the range of income that corresponded to their parents' total annual income. A broad variation in income levels was represented in the sample, with a median household income in the family of origin higher than the national average. The sample was primarily Caucasian (89%), but other groups were also represented: Asian American (5%), African-American (2%), Hispanic (2%), and others (2%).

Measures and Procedures

In addition to background information, participants were asked to respond to a series of questions designed to assess characteristics of the family of origin, anxiety in the individual, and communication in close, romantic relationships. The specific scales used to assess these constructs are described below.

Family of origin. Characteristics of the family of origin relevant to intergenerational theory were assessed with subscales from the Personal Authority in the Family System Questionnaire, Version C (PAFS-Q) (Bray, Williamson, & Malone, 1984a). The PAFS-Q was designed to operationalize aspects of intergenerational family theory (Boszormenyi-Nagy & Ulrich, 1981; Bowen, 1978; Williamson, 1981, 1982). Three subscales from the PAFS-Q that focused on family of origin characteristics were used in this study.

The first scale included eight items that assessed intergenerational triangulation. Questions on this scale involved feeling compelled to take sides, feeling caught in the middle, or feeling that more closeness with one parent would result in less closeness with the other. Other questions included parental disagreements regarding discipline or privileges and parental intervention in disagreements between the child and the other parent. The response choices ranged from (1) never to (4) very often. The internal consistency (coefficient alpha) for this scale was .78.

The second scale included eight items that assessed fusion in the family of origin. The questions on this scale asked about the parents' tendency to use double binds, embarrass their children, or try to change their children's personality. Other questions asked about doubting the genuineness of parental love, confusion over emotional interactions with parents, and worry about the parents' ability to care for themselves without the child's presence. The response choices ranged from (1) strongly disagree to (4) strongly agree, and the internal consistency was .78.

The third scale was the intergenerational intimidation scale which included eight items designed to assess degree of control exerted by parental expectations. The items asked about the frequency with which one felt the need to modify one's behavior in school, work, dating, appearance, or life style due to the pressures or expectations of the mother or father. The response choices ranged from (1) never to (4) very often, and the internal consistency was .88. The reliabilities across all three scales are nearly identical to estimates obtained in previous studies (Bray, Harvey, & Williamson, 1987; Bray, Williamson, & Malone, 1984b; Bray, Williamson, & Malone, 1986).

The validity of the PAFS-Q scales has been demonstrated in previous research through concurrent validation and factor analysis. With respect to concurrent validation, all three family of origin scales, Fusion, Control, and Triangulation, were found to be related to higher rates of both somatic symptoms and psychological problems (Bray et al., 1987). In addition, problems in marital relationships have been found to be associated with the Fusion scale (Bray et al., 1984b) and the Triangulation scale (Bray et al., 1987). Besides these associations with other constructs, factor analysis of the PAFS-Q items indicates theoretical consistency within the scales. Previous research has demonstrated that the factor loadings of the items are consistent with the theoretical design of the scales (Bray et al., 1984b). In the current study, the PAFS-Q items were subjected to a factor analysis, and three factors emerged with loadings that were consistent with the design of the scales.

Anxiety. The trait version of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) (Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1983) was used in this study to assess anxiety. The STAI has been extensively used in research and its reliability and validity have been strongly supported (Anastasi, 1988; Spielberger, 1984). In the trait version, respondents are instructed to indicate how they generally feel, rather than how they currently feel, by marking the frequency with which they experience various feelings on a four point scale ranging from (1) almost never to (4) almost always. To expedite data collection procedures, 10 of the 20 original items were randomly selected from the STAI. The items referred to having disturbing thoughts, lacking self-confidence, and having feelings of failure, burden, and worry. Reverse-scored items included making decisions easily and feeling rested, calm, happy, and

secure. The internal consistency of this abbreviated scale was .83, which is similar to previous reports of internal consistency for the 20-item version of the scale (Anastasi, 1988; Spielberger et al., 1983).

Relationship communication. A scale was constructed for this research to evaluate the quality of communication in intimate, romantic relationships. Participants were asked to consider their most intimate, romantic relationship in responding to the 15 items on the scale. Each item included a declarative statement with a 5-choice alternative which ranged from (1) never to (5) very often. A factor analysis of these 15 items revealed two factors. The six items that loaded on the first factor focused on conflict, or Aversive Communication in the relationship. Examples of items on the Aversive Communication scale included frequency of arguments or shouting matches, a tendency to nag, to sulk, or to have hurt feelings in the current intimate relationship. The remaining nine items loaded highly on the second factor. All nine of these items focused on Open Communication. These items included the ability to listen, to compliment, to be affectionate, to lift the other's spirits, to avoid keeping feelings to oneself, to express disagreement openly, to express displeasure when necessary, and to understand the partner's feelings and intentions. The scores on the items corresponding to each factor were summed to yield two scales. The internal consistencies for these scales were .79 for the Aversive Communication scale and .78 for the Open Communication scale.

RESULTS

The analyses were conducted to test whether anxiety mediates the influence of family of origin characteristics on open and aversive communication. The analyses followed the procedure recommended by Baron and Kenny (1986), who state:

To test for mediation, one should estimate the three following regression equations: first, regressing the mediator on the independent variable; second, regressing the dependent variable on the independent variable; and third, regressing the dependent variable on both the independent variable and the mediator. (p. 1177)

Family of Origin and Individual Anxiety

Following this procedure, the first step was to conduct a standard, simultaneous entry, regression analysis in which anxiety was regressed on the family of origin characteristics and the background variables. As seen in Table 1, fusion in the family of origin was strongly related to individual anxiety ($p < .0001$), even after controlling for the background variables. In addition, control in the family of origin was modestly associated with anxiety. Inspection of the background characteristics indicates that, consistent with previous research (Awaritefe & Kadiri, 1982), females scored higher than males on anxiety. Higher family income was also related to lower anxiety. There were no significant effects of age or parent marital status on anxiety scores.

Family of Origin and Communication in Romantic Relationships

The next set of analyses examined the association between characteristics of the family of origin and communication features in close, romantic relationships. In the first regression, presented in Table 2, open communication was regressed on the family of origin factors as well as the background characteristics. In this first model, fusion in the family of origin was associated with less open communication in close relationships ($p < .0001$). When anxiety was added in the second model, however, fusion was no longer associated with open communication, suggesting that anxiety mediated the effect of fusion. That is, fusion in the family of origin was related to anxiety in the individual and, in turn, anxiety was related to less open communication in close relationships. In contrast, triangulation and control were unrelated to open communication regardless of whether anxiety was omitted or included in the equation.

Table 2 also shows the findings for aversive communication regressed on the family of origin and background characteristics. In the first model, with anxiety omitted, the characteristics of triangulation, control, and fusion in the family of origin were all related to higher aversive communication ($p < .05$). When anxiety was added, as shown in the second model in Table 2, control and fusion became nonsignificant. Even with anxiety included, however, triangulation remained significantly related to aversive communication. In short, the findings were consistent with the interpretation that anxiety mediated the influence of fusion and control, but not triangulation, on aversive communication.

The influence of background variables on communication is also indicated in Table 2. Females scored higher on open communication regardless of whether anxiety was included or omitted. Non-continuously married families scored somewhat higher in open communication than continuously married families, but the effect became nonsignificant when anxiety was entered. Similarly, females scored higher on aversive communication, but the effect was nonsignificant when anxiety was entered. In addition, with anxiety entered, higher family income was associated with aversive communication.

Anxiety as a Mediator

The findings presented above confirm the mediational role of anxiety for the fusion dimension, partially confirm its role for the control dimension, and do not support anxiety as a mediator of triangulation influences. It is evident that anxiety is a mediator of fusion from the findings that: (a) fusion was associated with anxiety (Table 1); (b) anxiety was associated with both open and aversive communication (Table 2, Second Model); and (c) fusion was associated with both open and aversive communication before entering anxiety (Table 2, First Model), but not after controlling for anxiety (Table 2, Second Model).

Similarly, it is evident that anxiety is a mediator of the effect of control on aversive communication from the findings that: (a) control was associated with anxiety (Table 1); (b) anxiety was associated with aversive communication (Table 2, Second Model); and (c) control was associated with aversive communication before entering anxiety (Table 2, First Model), but not after controlling for anxiety (Table 2, Second Model). Contrary to the hypotheses, however, anxiety did not mediate the influence of triangulation.

Subsample Tests

To examine whether the findings held for participants whose parents were separated/divorced ($n = 65$) or remarried ($n = 84$), the regressions were run for each of these groups separately. The patterns of significant findings for these two groups were identical to the pattern found for the whole sample in Table 1, with two exceptions: (a) the effect of income became nonsignificant for both groups, and (b) in the remarried group, the magnitude of the relationship between control and anxiety was reduced to statistical significance at the .09 level ($\beta = .193$, $p = .09$). The regressions for Table 2 supported the role of anxiety as a mediator of the influence of fusion on open communication in the separated/divorced group. None of the other mediational effects noted in Table 2, however, were confirmed for these two groups.

Because the sample overrepresented middle and higher income populations, analyses were conducted to determine whether findings held for more moderate income levels as well. Regressions were conducted restricting the sample to those whose annual combined family incomes were less than \$50,000 ($n = 391$) and less than \$30,000 ($n = 143$). The pattern of significant findings reported for the whole sample in Table 1 held for both income groups with two exceptions: (a) the truncated range led to income being non-significant for both groups, and (b) in the under \$30,000 group, the significance of the relationship between control and anxiety was reduced to the .06 level ($\beta = .162$, $p = .06$). For both income groups, the smaller samples altered the significance levels slightly from those presented in Table 2, but the findings showed the same pattern of anxiety operating as a mediator as found for the whole sample.

DISCUSSION

The findings from this research serve to partially confirm and extend Bowen's (1978) theory of intergenerational transmission. The findings support Bowen's contention that anxiety in the individual mediates the influence of fusion and control in the family of origin on subsequent romantic relationships. Theoretically, dysfunctional family processes result in anxiety in the individual; anxiety, in turn, influences subsequent relationships.

The clearest confirmation of Bowenian theory is found for the role of anxiety in mediating the influence of fusion in the family of origin on subsequent communication among late adolescents. These mediational findings suggest that the dynamics of fused families such as emotional dependence, lack of autonomy, and use of double

binds create anxiety in the child. Confusion over emotional interactions in fused families provides a basis for doubts and insecurities about the genuineness of relationships. The findings suggest that these insecurities broaden beyond anxiety that is focused exclusively on the family of origin. Instead, fusion in the family of origin generalizes to anxiety as a trait of the individual.

Anxiety in the individual, in turn, is related to poorer communication in subsequent relationships. Specifically, individual anxiety is related to aversive communication in romantic relationships. The self-doubts, worries, and insecurities of anxious individuals are associated with tendencies to engage in aversive interactions such as arguing, badgering, or sulking. The model presented here suggests that one mechanism for the influence of anxiety on aversive communication is the perception of threat. When the perceived threat is high, aversive communication provides a strategy for overcoming the threat through aggressive or passive-aggressive means. These aversive communication styles serve to defend against the perceived threat temporarily, even though they may invite retaliation and rejection responses that further raise anxiety. Aversive communication from the anxious partner is likely to result in emotional responses in the other partner, thereby perpetuating and escalating aversive interactional cycles (cf. Patterson, 1982).

Whereas high anxiety is related to aversive communication, low anxiety is associated with greater open communication in relationships. Low anxiety minimizes perceived threat and provides an environment that allows for risk without fear of retaliation. When the perception of potential threat is low, individuals are able to communicate openly, listen authentically, and express disagreements openly without fear of disapproval or rebuff.

To the extent that the partner poses a genuine threat through verbal abuse, physical violence, or proneness to terminate the relationship, anxiety may be warranted. If the environment presents a genuine threat, the anxiety serves an adaptive function by predisposing the individual to respond to the threatening environment. Anxiety in response to the danger prompts defensive responses such as suppressing open communication and utilizing aversive communication. If the anxiety is primarily a remnant of family of origin dynamics, however, bringing the anxiety into subsequent relationships can be counterproductive.

As for the control dimension, the mediational hypotheses are only partially confirmed. The mediational hypothesis pertaining to the influence of control on open communication is not supported, but anxiety is shown to mediate the influence of control in the family of origin on aversive communication. Controlling dynamics in the family of origin are related to higher levels of anxiety. The model presented here suggests that the excessive expectations in controlling families raise fears about falling to meet expectations, particularly fears of disciplinary consequences or love withdrawal if expectations are not met. Controlling dynamics also promote intimidating views about the world. If these expectations and views are internalized, the result is a generalized apprehension across situations. Such internalization also prompts additional anxiety about failing to meet personal expectations. According to the findings presented here, the relationship between control in the family of origin and anxiety in the individual is particularly important because anxiety mediates the influence of control on aversive communication. Thus anxiety is the mechanism that translates the projection processes within the family to the individual. The individual introjects anxiety that is generated by control dynamics, and the introjected anxiety, in turn, predisposes one to aversive communication. As mentioned above, aversive communication provides a tactic for surmounting the perceived risks through contentious or truculent behavior.

The lack of relationship between control in the family of origin and open communication in subsequent relationships indicates that other factors contribute to the process. Clearly, control in the family does not preempt the development of open communication in future relationships. Families in which control is mixed with warmth, for example, may provide for the development of open communication in subsequent relationships.

Whereas the hypotheses regarding fusion and control are confirmed, the hypothesis for triangulation is not supported. Triangulation failed to show indirect effects through anxiety as a mediator. Instead, triangulation exhibited a direct effect on aversive communication. Because anxiety is not a mediational mechanism, other

feelings experienced by the individual may help to explain the relationship between triangulation and aversive communication.

Several questions remain regarding the tests of hypotheses in this current research. First, the findings presented here are drawn from late adolescents and, as individuals acquire additional relationship experiences, it is plausible that the influence of the family of origin may decrease. Future research that examines the contributions of anxiety across the adult lifespan could ascertain whether the relative contributions of the family of origin decrease or become more salient as a function of marital or parental roles. Second, future research on noncollege-bound individuals could evaluate the generalizability of the findings in this study. Although the income subsample tests suggested generalizability across income levels, the generalizability across educational levels remains unanswered. A third issue for future research is refining the measurement of the intricate constructs assessed in this study. In particular, the links between a general dimension of function (versus dysfunction) and specific family of origin dimensions awaits future research. Answers to these questions should lead toward increasingly precise explanations of the components of the intergenerational transmission process.

This study provides an empirical test of a central tenet of Bowenian theory. The findings suggest that Bowen's model depicting anxiety as a mediator in intergenerational transmission is most accurately applied to fusion dynamics and least accurate for triangulation. The findings also support the potential value of assessing anxiety in family therapy and clinical research. By evaluating anxiety in the current relationship and the family of origin, productive transmission dynamics can be fostered and nonproductive ones can be interrupted. For both theoretical and clinical reasons, then, insight about emotional mechanisms serves to broaden the knowledge base beyond cognitive and behavioral approaches and to advance a more complete understanding of processes within families and across generations.

NOTE

The authors wish to thank Jane Keppel-Benson, Howard Protinsky, and Kim Shimoda for their reviews of earlier drafts of this manuscript. This research was supported by grants from the Supplemental Grants Program at Virginia Tech and the Women's Research Institute at Brigham Young University.

TABLE 1. REGRESSIONS OF ANXIETY ON FAMILY OF ORIGIN AND BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Legend for Chart:			
A - Independent variables			
B - r			
C - Beta			
D - (B)			
A	B	C	D
Family of origin factors			
Triangulation	.245[e]	.038	(.043)
Control	.239 [e]	.059	(.085)[c]
Fusion	.404[e]	.305	(.347)[e]
Background characteristics			
Age	.007	.294	(.060)
Gender[a]	.173[e]	1.591	(.162)[e]
Family income	-.103[d]	-.360	(-.078)[c]
Parent marital status [b]	-.034	-.751	(-.059)
R squared (adjusted)	--	.210	(.202)[e]
Note: Unstandardized beta (beta) listed first, standardized beta (B) in parentheses.			
a Dummy coded with males = 0, females = 1.			
b Dummy coded with continuously married = 0, other = 1.			
c p < .05. d p < .01. e p < .001.			

TABLE 2. REGRESSIONS OF OPEN AND AVERSIVE COMMUNICATION ON FAMILY OF ORIGIN FACTORS, INDIVIDUAL ANXIETY, AND BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

Legend for Chart:

A - Independent Variables

B - Open Communication: First Model: Beta

C - Open Communication: First Model: (B)

D - Open Communication: Second Model: Beta

E - Open Communication: Second Model: (B)

F - Aversive Communication: First Model: Beta

G - Aversive Communication: First Model: (B)

H - Aversive Communication: Second Model: Beta

I - Aversive Communication: Second Model: (B)

A	B	C	D	E
	F	G	H	I
Family of origin factors				
Triangulation	-.065	(-.079)	-.055	(-.067)
	.063	(.094)[c]	.056	(.083)[c]
Control	-.015	(-.022)	.000	(.001)
	.047	(.090)[c]	.036	(.068)
Fusion	-.139	(-.168)[e]	-.060	(-.072)
	.089	(.134)[d]	.029	(.044)
Individual anxiety	--	--	-.260	(-.276)[e]
	--	--	.196	(.259)[e]
Background characteristics				
Age	-.032	(-.007)	.044	(.010)
	.216	(.058)	.158	(.043)
Gender[a]	1.543	(.166)[e]	1.957	(.211)[e]
	.624	(.084)[c]	.312	(.042)
Family income	.098	(.023)	.004	(.000)
	.171	(.049)	.242	(.070)[c]
Parental marital status[b]	.847	(.070)[c]	.651	(.054)
	.508	(.053)	.655	(.068)
R squared (adjusted)	.080	(.072)[e]	.141	(.131)[e]
	.077	(.068)[e]	.130	(.120)[e]

Note: Unstandardized beta (beta) listed first, standardized beta (B) in parentheses.

a Dummy coded with males = 0, females = 1.

b Dummy coded with continuously married = 0, other = 1.

c $p < .05$. d $p < .01$. e $p < .001$.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, P.C., Moore, S., & Alexander, E. R. (1991). Intergenerational transmission of violence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 657-667.
- Anastasi, A. (1988). *Psychological testing*. New York: Macmillan.
- Awaritefe, A., & Kadiri, A. U. (1982). The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory and sex. *Physiology and Behavior*, 29, 211-213.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and situational considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.

- Benson, M. J., Arditto, J., Reguero de Atilas, J. T., & Smith, S. (1992). Intergenerational transmission: Attributions in relationships with parents and intimate others. *Journal of Family Issues*, 13, 450-464.
- Boszormenyi-Nagy, I., & Ulrich, D. N. (1981). Contextual family therapy. In A. S. Gurman & D. P. Kniskern (Eds.), *Handbook of family therapy* (pp. 156-186). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Bowen, M. (1978). *Family therapy in clinical practice*. New York: Aronson.
- Bray, J. H., Harvey, D. M., & Williamson, D. S. (1987). Intergenerational family relationships: An evaluation of theory and measurement. *Psychotherapy*, 24, 516-528.
- Bray, J. H., Williamson, D. S., & Malone, P. E. (1984a). *Personal Authority in the Family System Questionnaire manual*. Houston, TX: Houston Family Institute.
- Bray, J. H., Williamson, D. S., & Malone, P. E. (1984b). Personal authority in the family system: Development of questionnaire to measure personal authority in intergenerational family processes. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 10, 167-178.
- Bray, J. H., Williamson, D. S., & Malone, P. E. (1986). An evaluation of an intergenerational consultation process to increase personal authority in the family system. *Family Process*, 25, 423-436.
- Brone, R. J., & Fisher, C. B. (1988). Determinants of adolescent obesity: A comparison with anorexia nervosa. *Adolescence*, 23, 155-169.
- Callan, V. J., & Noller, P. (1986). Perceptions of communicative relationships in families with adolescents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 813-820.
- Conger, R. D., Elder, G. H., Lorenz, F. O., Conger, K. J., Simons, R. L., Whitbeck, L. B., Huck, S., & Melby, J. N. (1990). Linking economic hardship to marital quality and instability. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 643-656.
- DiLalla, L. F., & Gottesman, I. I. (1991). Biological and genetic contributors to violence: Widom's untold tale. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109, 125-129.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 281-291.
- Fine, M. (1988). The relationship of perceived health in the family of origin to levels of state and trait anxiety. *Family Therapy*, 15, 51-57.
- Frey, J., & Oppenheimer, K. (1990). Family dynamics and anxiety disorders: A clinical investigation. *Family Systems Medicine*, 8, 28-37.
- Gecas, V., & Schwalbe, M. L. (1986). Parental behavior and adolescent self-esteem. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 37-46.
- Gelles, R. J. (1985). Family violence. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 11, 347-367.
- Glass, J., Bengtson, V. L., & Dunham, C. C. (1986). Attitude similarity in three generation families: Socialization, status inheritance, or reciprocal influence? *American Sociological Review*, 51, 685-698.
- Glenn, N. D., & Kramer, K. B. (1987). The marriages and divorces of the children of divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49, 811-825.
- Gottman, J. M. (1979). *Marital interaction: Experimental investigations*. New York: Academic Press.
- Harvey, D. M., & Bray, J. H. (1991). Evaluation of an intergenerational theory of personal development: Family process determinants of psychological and health distress. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 4, 298-325.
- Judd, C. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1981). *Estimating the effects of social interventions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kenny, D. A., & Donaldson, G. A. (1991). Contributions of parental attachment and family structure to the social and psychological functioning of first-year college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38, 479-486.
- Kerr, M., & Bowen, M. (1988). *Family evaluation*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Lapsley, D. K., Fitzgerald, D. P., Rice, K. G., & Jackson, S. (1989). Separation-individuation and the "new look" at the imaginary audience and personal fable: A test of an integrative model. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 4, 483-505.

- Lopez, F. G. (1986). Family structure and depression: Implications for the counseling of depressed college students. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 64, 508-511.
- Lopez, F. G. (1991). Patterns of family conflict and their relation to college student adjustment. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 69, 257-260.
- Margolin, G., & Wampold, B. E. (1981). Sequential analysis of conflict and accord in distressed and nondistressed marital partners. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 49, 554-567.
- Nichols, M.P., & Schwartz, R. C. (1991). *Family therapy: Concepts and methods* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Patterson, G. R. (1982). *Coercive family process*. Eugene, OR: Castalia Press.
- Pittman, J. F., Price-Bonham, S., & McKenry, P. C. (1983). Marital cohesion: A path model. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45, 521-531.
- Simons, R. L., Whitbeck, L. B., Conger, R. D., & Chyi-In, W. (1991). Intergenerational transmission of harsh parenting. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, 159-171.
- Simpson, J. A. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 971-980.
- Spielberger, C. D. (1984). *State-Trait Anxiety Inventory: A comprehensive bibliography*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., & Lushene, R. (1983). *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI)*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Waite, L. J., Rindfuss, R. R., & De Tray, D. (1986). Mothers' expectations for children's schooling in Malaysia. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 527-535.
- West, J. D., Gintner, G. G., & Zarski, J. J. (1989). Associations among family systems dimensions and stress. *Family Therapy*, 16, 121-132.
- West, J. D., Hosie, T. W., & Zarski, J. J. (1987). Family dynamics and substance abuse: A preliminary study. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 65, 487-490.
- West, J. D., Zarski, J. J., & Harvill, R. (1986). The influence of the family triangle on intimacy. *American Mental Health Counselors Association Journal*, 8, 166-174.
- Widom, C. S. (1989). Does violence beget violence? A critical examination of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106, 3-28.
- Williamson, D. S. (1981). Personal authority via termination of the intergenerational hierarchical boundary: A "new" stage in the family life cycle. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 7, 441-452.
- Williamson, D. S. (1982). Personal authority in family experience via termination of the intergenerational hierarchical boundary: Part III--Personal authority defined, and the power of play in the process of change. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 8, 309-323.