父子関係が日本人大学生の愛着と攻撃性に与える影響

The effect of the father-child relationship on attachment and aggression in Japanese college students
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本研究では、第一の目的として、父親が子に接する態度（養育態度）に焦点を当て、それが青年期の個人の特性であるIWMにどのように影響するのかを検討する。また、第二の目的として青年期の攻撃性着目し、父親の養育態度により、攻撃性の内容がどのように変化するのかを大学生122名を対象に検討した。その結果、父親と男児の間の情緒的結びつきが生じれば、男子大学生は、建設的攻撃性をより表出し、安定した内圏作業モデルを形成することがわかった。これらの結果は、人格の発達心理学的観点から検討された。
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Aim

A numbers of studies have revealed that parental interaction with their children played a significant role in child’s growth. Especially, many studies on parent-child relationship focused on mother-child interaction, in other words mother was regarded as the direct caretaker of their children for ling ages. For instance, Sugawara and Ito (2006) examined the relation between mother-parenting and self-esteem/ interpersonal anxiety in adolescent. The results showed that ejective or disciplined maternal parenting tended to promote self-esteem and interpersonal anxiety in adolescent. On the other hand, overprotective or expecting mother’s rearing tended to improve self-esteem, but less interpersonal anxiety in adolescence. From these findings, maternal rearing seemed to be linked the level of self-esteem and interpersonal anxiety in adolescence. Bowl by (1969, 1973) proposed attachment theory describing as a lasting psychological connectedness between human beings, and also suggested that the earliest bonds formed by children with their caregivers had a tremendous impact that continues throughout life. Thus, Bowl by (1973) devoted the

Concept of internal working models in relation to attachment style in which the child’s image of the self as well as the image of other people played a central role. Ainsworth (1978) yielded three distinct patterns of attachment, namely secure attachment, anxious-resistant attachment (e.g., ambivalent behavior towards the caregiver), and avoidant attachment (e.g., avoiding proximity or interaction with the caregiver). Such as Bowl by or Ainsworth, the majority of attachment studies have focused on mothers, this is because mothers tend to establish a sense of security. Hazan&Shaver(1987) researched on adult attachment, which is the same motivational system that gives rise to the close emotional bond between parents and their children is responsible for the bond that develops between adults in emotionally intimate relationships. Nowadays, many researchers have focused on analysis of multimodel attachment styles from infancy. So, IJzendoorn and Marianne (1997) pointed out that father did shape their attachment, but a lesser extent than mothers, and also father might compensate for their relative lack of influence throughout indirect channels, that is, by way of their impact on mother’s attachment and sensitivity.

Since 1970’s many of researchers initiated researches on father’s absence with detailed report of maternal/parental interaction with their children, and these studies have consistently shown that fathers spend much less time with their children than mothers do (Pleck 1987). Over the past two years, levels of father’s involvement in their family have changed particularly in economical circumstance, maternal employment, therefore fathers have come to be recognized as important contributors to the social, emotional, and cognitive development of their children (Marsiglio, Amato, Day, & Lamb, 2000) According to Lamb (1997), Paternal involvement in children’s lives is considered critical for promoting positive child outcomes
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(see Marsiglio et al., 2000, for review). Findings have particularly emphasized the father-child relationship as an influence on child well-being (Lamb, 1997). Amore positive father-child relationship has been found to contribute significantly to the emotional and intellectual well-being of children (Lamb, 1997) and paternal warmth is positively associated with indicators of subsequent well-being for adolescents, such as marital success and supportive social networks (Franz, McClelland, & Weinberger, 1991).

Research on the father-child relationship among adolescents is slowly emerging, but much still needs to be learned to determine how the quality of the father-child relationship and fathers’ parenting styles influence outcomes for this age group (Lamb, 1997). Previous research has found that paternal warmth is positively associated with indicators of subsequent well-being for adolescents, such as marital success and supportive social networks (Franz, McClelland, & Weinberger, 1991).

So, firstly in this study we focused on the relationship between father’s rearing behavior and attachment style, and cleared how father’s rearing style effect on each attachment style.

The term aggression refers to a range of behaviors that can intentionally result in both physical and psychological harm to oneself, others or objects in the environment. (Obuchi, 1993), and Hata (1998). Freud (1997) defined aggression as a part of ego function to control one’s self feeling, and human basic drive. Adachi argued (2001) that aggression may be regarded as helpful function for healthy self-assertiveness/self-esteem or assumed to lead to destructive action or emotion. Therefore, Adachi pointed out that aggression had two aspects. If aggression is seen as ego function to maintain one’s feeling or oneself, the process in building up aggression would be based on the relationship among people such as parent-children. Bowlby (1969) also said that energy for human living was induced by a good experience or relationship between child-parent. From this point of view, it could be said that child learn the way of his/her emotional control following his/her parents as a model taking on the characteristics. So not only mother but also father supports their children to create emotion such as aggression. Morishita (2001) reported that if father was a loving person and not a domineering one, boys in childhood tended to be considerable or kind person, and it would be good for girls to develop their self-control. Persons (1955) pointed out that the important function of father was socialization and stabilization of children, and for that father become models of behaviors in advance of actual experience or models of emotional control such as aggression.

So secondly, we focused on aggression in adolescence, and studies on how father’s rearing style effect on aggression. In our study, aggression was classified into destructive/constructive one.

Method

Participants

122 students (50 male, 72 female) were recruited from two colleges in Hyogo prefecture in Japan.

Materials and Procedure

Father’s attitude toward their children was measured by a Questionnaire developed by Miyashita (1991). This measure consisted of 30 items (e.g., positive attitude-negative attitude, strict attitude-lenient attitude), and all items were judged on a 5-point scale (1 = negative attitude and 5 = positive attitude). By the Questionnaire of Father’s rearing attitude, there were three factors led by factor analysis: father’s supportive/acceptive attitude (Cronbach alpha varied .93), father’s equal attitude (Cronbach’s alpha = .86), and father’s domineering attitude (Cronbach’s alpha = .80). The overall Cronbach’s alpha was .87. Father’s supportive/acceptive attitude had shown that fathers positively or affectionately involved in their childrearing. Father’s equal attitude reflected father’s impartial, equal and coherent rearing style. Domineering childrearing style reflected belief in overprotection, obedience, excessive control. Toda’s questionnaire (1988) was used for the measurement of Students’ IWM. This measure consisted of 18 items comprising three types of attachment (secure, ambivalent, avoidance), and all items were judged on 4 point scales (1 = definitely false and 4 = definitely true). Thus, the Toda’s questionnaire of IWM had good internal reliability with Cronbach alpha of secure .84, Cronbach alpha of ambivalence .82, Cronbach alpha of avoidance .65, and overall .75. Further, Aggression in daily life was measured by the inventory developed by Sugano., Yoshida., and Oguma (1998). This measure consisted of 16 items comprising two types of aggression (destructive aggression, constructive aggression), and all items were rated on 4 points scales (1 = definitely false and 4 = definitely true). In terms of factor analysis on Aggression measure Cronbach alpha of destructive aggression .82, Cronbach alpha of constructive aggression .80, and Cronbach alpha of the overall .79.

Procedure:

Each student first received instruction about the study.
and was regarded to respond to complete a set of questionnaires during regular classes. The inventory took approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Results

Mean scores and SD of father’s each childrearing style in high/low group were represented in Table 1.

Table 1 Mean scores and SD of Father’s childrearing style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father’s childrearing style</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40.03</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39.68</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.47</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54.20</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Father’s childrearing style and the relation to IWM and Aggression

To examine the effects of father’s rearing behavior on their children’s IWM and aggression, a series of 2 (gender) (high/low group of father’s rearing behavior) analyses of variance (ANOVA) with IWM and aggression scores as the dependent variables were carried out (see Table 2&3).

1. Father’s supportive/acceptive attitude and its Relation to each attachment type.

For the result of father’s supportive/acceptive attitude toward their child secure type of attachment, the main effect of Father’s supportive/acceptive rearing attitude on their child secure attachment was shown ($F(1,118)=7.13$, $p<.01$). Compared to lower group of the supportive/acceptive group, the higher group indicated significantly high scores on secure attachment. In terms of the father’s rearing style, both of the father’s way of taking care and gender displayed main effect on ambivalent attachment ($F(1,118)=5.08$, $p<.05$) ($F(1,118)=6.64$, $p<.05$). Ambivalent attachment scores in male were significantly higher than those in female. Thus, there was a main effect of gender on avoidant attachment ($F(1,118)=4.08$, $p<.05$). Male showed highly ambivalent attachment scores, compared to the scores in female.

2. Father’s equal attitude and the relation to each attachment type

ANOVA revealed the main effect of father’s equal rearing style on secure attachment ($F(1,118)=8.82$, $p<.01$). Compared to lower group of the equal group, the higher group indicated significantly high scores on secure attachment. In terms of Father’s equal rearing style, both the father’s way of taking care and gender gave the main effect on ambivalent attachment in adolescent ($F(1,118)=4.68$, $p<.05$) ($F(1,118)=8.37$, $p<.01$). Therefore, male showed highly ambivalent attachment scores, compared to the scores in female. Thus, the higher group of equal rearing style displayed significantly high scores on ambivalent attachment, compared to the lower group. With avoidant attachment, there was no effect of father’s equal rearing style.

3. Father’s dominative attitude and the relation to each attachment type

There was no significant main effect of dominative rearing style and gender on secure attachment in adolescent. With Father’s dominative attitude toward their children, there was a significant main effect of gender on ambivalent attachment ($F(1,118)=7.45$, $p<.01$). That is, scores of ambivalent attachment in male were higher than those in female. In terms of avoidant attachment, gender also showed the effects on the attachment style in adolescent ($F(1,118)=5.52$, $p<.05$). Therefore, male marked significantly higher scores than female did.

4. Father’s supportive/acceptive attitude and the relation to each aggression

The main effect of gender on destructive aggression was found out ($F(1,118)=18.30$, $p<.001$). This meant male marked significantly higher scores than female did. Also, the main effect of father’s supportive/acceptive rearing attitudes on constructive aggression was found ($F(1,118)=7.39$, $p<.01$). Compared to lower group of father’s supportive/acceptive attitude, higher group of father’s supportive-accepted attitude displayed high scores on the aggression. Thus, interaction effect of gender X father’s attitude was also found ($F(1,118)=6.96$, $p<.01$). To examine the simple main effect of gender X father’s attitude, a Bonferrino analysis was conducted. The result was showed that the significant difference between high/low group in male ($F(1,118)=13.65$, $p<.001$), and the significant gender difference in high group were found ($F(1,118)=7.91$, $p<.01$). Meanwhile, there was no significant difference between 2 groups in female.

5. Father’s equal attitude and the relation to each aggression

The findings showed that there was a main effect of
father’s rearing style and gender on destructive aggression 
($F(1,118)=4.70, p<.05$ $F(1,118)=16.9, p<.001$). It meant male marked significantly higher scores than female did on aggression scores, and compared to lower group of father’s equal attitude, higher group of father’s equal attitude displayed high scores on the aggression.

The main effect of father’s equal rearing attitudes on constructive aggression was found ($F(1,118)=7.85, p<.01$). Compared to lower group of father’s equal attitude, higher group of father’s equal attitude displayed high scores on the aggression. Thus, interaction effect of gender × father’s attitude was also found ($F(1,118)=6.84, p<.05$). To examine the simple main effect of gender × father’s attitude, a Bonferrino analysis was conducted. The result was shown that the significant gendered difference in high groups ($F(1,118)=8.18, p<.01$), and the significant group differences in male were founded ($F(1,118)=13.32, p<.01$), (see Figure 2). On the other hand, there were no significant differences between high/low groups of father’s equal attitude in female.

6. Father’s dominative attitude and the relation to each aggression

There was a main effect of gender on destructive aggression ($F(1,118)=17.21, p<.001$), and indicated destructive aggression scores in male were significantly higher than those in female. In terms of constructive aggression, there was no main effect and interaction.

Table 2 Mean and SD of Father’s Childrearing style (supportive/acceptive, equal and dominative) for secure, ambivalent and avoidant attachment.

Table 3 Mean and SD of Father’s Childrearing style (supportive/acceptive, equal and dominative attitude) for constructive and destructive aggression.

Discussion

Some findings, in terms of the relation between father’s rearing styles and attachment styles, were founded out. Firstly, it could be said that father’s supportive or equal rearing style support to make a secure attachment in male group in college students and also the father’s rearing style affect on their interpersonal relationship. According to the results, it could be interpreted that male group might tend to have more stable internal working model.
and friendly relationship if their fathers value father-child relationship treating their children acceptably. Thus, in terms of secure attachment, male group showed more highly scores than female did, and from this point of view, there might be some influence by father as a same-sex parent. Secondly, it was shown that father’s supportive or equal rearing behavior also influenced on ambivalent interpersonal relationship in male group in college students. In this case, we have not found some reason for the results, so it is necessary for us to analyze samples again or consider increase in the number of sample size.

Thirdly, it was found that father’s domimative attitude related to ambivalent or avoidant attachment in male group. Kubo (2000) reported that boys who rarely had a praise or acceptable experience by their fathers in childhood tended to be nervous about getting along with people or scared of making interpersonal relationship. That is, boys who are taken care by domimative fathers feel scared or trouble to make a good relation with their fathers and the father-child relation promote interpersonal anxiety in adolescence.

Next, we discuss about the relation between father’s rearing behavior and aggression.

The results showed there was an interaction effect of gender × father’s acceptable or equal rearing behavior on constructive aggression. Those findings indicated that fathers who had a supportive/accretive rearing style or equal rearing style seemed to improve their child constructive aggression. Freud (1975) supported a hypothesis of identification, which states that the child adopts the characteristics of the same-sex parent and begins to associate themselves with and copy the behavior of significant others. Also, Freud (1975) suggests that this process involves the development of the child’s superego (our moral guide in life - the moral component of personality) which is done by incorporating characteristics of the parent’s superegos into the child’s own. So, for instance, a young male child will begin to take on characteristics of the father (act more like his father than his mother in the sense of being a male) and will develop a superego that has similarities to the moral values and guidelines by which the parents live their lives. Freud (1975) also implies that identification is more than the modeling of another’s beliefs, attitudes, and rules of conduct, and it means the sharing of another’s state of mind, more than the copying of another’s behavior. Additionally, Kohlberg (1966) supports the theory that the child spontaneously develops sex-appropriate values and standards, once the child constructs a stable gender identity. This follows from the child’s natural tendency to value positively objects and activities that represent his gender identity because his gender identity is part of himself (Kohlberg 1966). Here, the significant point is that the final step in his theory (Kohlberg 1966) asserts long-term modeling relationship generally breed emotional-affection attachment, which in return leads to identification proper. Adachi (2001) also reported that male showed high scores in passive or constructive aggression only when their level of approach-avoidance or target aspiration marked low. That is, making stable or good relation not only with parents but also others (friends so on) could play a rule in leading to passive or constructive aggression.

Considering these theories, it could be said that males are influenced by father’s supportive/acceptation attitude or equal attitude more than females, this is because children adopts the characteristics of the same-sex parent and begins to associate themselves with and copy the behavior of significant others. Thus, it is seemed that children create emotional bonding (Kohlberg 1966) with same gender person (father), once they recognize their gender. At the same time, child follow their model due to gain their approvals or to be near the model. In other words, more fathers deal with their children acceptably or honestly more children tend to create strong emotional bond with their father, and they internalize father’s value or activities, so children tend to build up constructive aggression and secure IWM (or stable relationship with others).
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