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Abstract

Family research has been spotlighting on the well-being of child and adolescent, but the unheeded side is the effects of family on young adults who have been transiting from dependence to independence of family. This study investigated the impacts of family climates on young adults’ well-being through mediations or moderations of psychosocial maturity. Total of 202 Hong Kong participants, aged 18 to 23, were administrated a selection of scales measuring their family climate, ego strengths, self-esteem, depression and life satisfaction. Specifically, four subscales from FES, i.e. cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, and active-recreational orientation; three ego strengths resorted from PIES, i.e. ego resiliency, ascending egos and descending egos; four subscales of CASES: general self, family self, social self, and moral self; the CES-D and the SWLS scales were used. Results showed that expressiveness and active-recreational orientation were stronger predictors of well-being than did cohesion and conflict. Cohesion, expressiveness and active-recreational orientation exerted partial indirect effects through different ego strengths on indicators of psychological and subjective well-being except moral self. Cohesion and expressiveness acted as resilience factors against deficiency in ego for moral self, while conflict interact with ego strengths to produce mixed findings of family self, social self and life satisfaction. The reversed importance of family climates suggested that a probable main task for
adult is to transform the family relationship and interaction that close to the way of friendship. Empirical application of ascending egos and descending egos also brought both new perspective and critic toward Erikson’s theory of psychosocial development. These complex complementary effects of family climates and psychosocial maturity on psychological and subjective well-beings serve as rare, yet inspiring, evidence for theoretical background about family impact on adult.
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Chapter 1: Introduction and Literature Review

Family is a special psychosocial system that every member pursues individual needs and goals, and yet all functioning as a whole by multidirectional and circular impacts to maintain the homeostasis (Goldenberg & Goldenberg, 2005). This resilient equilibrium undergoes a strained period when the child of family enters adolescence and develops autonomy to attempt becoming an independent one and to take responsibility of own world (Eccles et al., 1993; Smetana, 2000; Hill & Holmbeck, 1986; Sprinthall & Collins, 1995). Nonetheless, the family influences on offspring are so profound but unapparent that, for instance, irrational beliefs or behavioral patterns can be transmitted generation by generation and formulate a vicarious cycle (Adshead & Bluglass, 2001; Kretchmar & Jacobvitz, 2002).

The influences of family on the functioning and development of individual have grounded on rich theoretical basis (Jacob, 1987). For example, John Bowlby’s (1977a) attachment theory affirms that quality of attachment between infant and caregiver would operate as internal cognitive model to shape the expectation about security and styles of later relationships (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Bowlby, 1977b). A famous family system theory which proposed by Murray Bowen views family as an emotional unit as well as a system of interrelated influences (1978). Intensive emotional connections tying family members allow their
quality of relationships and complex interactions to impact on the development of one another throughout lifetime (Kerr & Bowen, 1988). Rosenberg (1979) posited that family members act as important agents in socialization through which values, attitudes and expectancies are transmitted (Zigler & Child, 1969).

Despite of having such a proliferated theoretical background, the trend of family research is, ironically, always not referring theory as the guidance. Immediate and prolonged effects of growing up in different types of family on individual have drawn much more research interest. An extensive body of research showed that comparing with whom living in nuclear families, children in stepfather households and divorced single-parent families are generally lower in academic achievement, conduct and psychological adjustment (Amato & Keith, 1991; Hanson, McLanahan & Thomson, 1996). More same as children, adolescents that rose in stepfamilies tended to suffer in emotional well-being, and exhibit more behavioural problems and difficulties in peer relations than those in single-parent family and nuclear family (Dunn et al., 1998; Hazelton, Lancee, & O’Neil, 1998). These deteriorations of adjustment resulting from growing up in stepfamily, single-parent family and divorced family were likely to extend onto adulthood (Hetherington, 1993, 1999; Stoll, Arnaut, Fromme, & Felker-Thayer, 2005).

The general practice of researchers is to select most available and widely accepted instruments (Sabatelli & Bartle, 1995). The assessment tools in the methodology of
family researching were miscellaneous, such as the measurements of attachment style
and quality (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Parker, Tupling, & Brown, 1979),
approaches in interactions (Canary & Stafford, 1992; Canary, Stafford, Hause, &
Wallace, 1993), family satisfaction (Serewicz, Dickson, Morrison & Poole, 2007) and
time spent with family members (Sy, 2006). One limitation on these assessment tools is
that the context of family climate has not been covered fully. A more comprehensive
instrument such as Family Environment Scale (FES), which is one of the most
acknowledged and accepted self-reported questionnaire, was recommended to be used
instead (Glidden & Schoolcraft, 2007; Snyder, Cavell, Heffer, & Mangrum, 1995). FES
is developed by R. H. Moos and his colleagues who aimed at assessing family climate,
which defined as the perceived environment by each family member that they are
influenced by its characteristics (Moos, 1974; Moos & Moos, 1981). It consists of nine
subscales: cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, independence, achievement orientation,
intellectual-cultural orientation, active-recreational orientation, moral-religious
emphasis, organization and control. Administrations of FES have been massive with a
focus on sporadic well-being, including testing of maladjustment in normal population
(Gencoz & Or, 2006; Kleinman, Handal, Enos, Searight & Ross., 1989; Sandhu & Tung,
2004), assessing of at-risk individuals (Boyce et al., 1977; Kuo, Reiss, Freund &
Huffman, 2002; Pittman & Buckley, 2006; Rousey, Wild, & Blacher, 2002),
identification of dysfunctional families (Scoresby & Christensen, 1976; White, 1978),
and evaluation of clinical treatment outcomes (Bader, 1976; Bromet & Moos, 1977; Finney, Moos, & Mewborn, 1980).

1.1. Family research on Adult

No single theory is originated specifically to point out the impact of family on adult. Focus of previous family research has been mainly concentrating on children and adolescence (Maccoby, 1980). This could be expounded by the fact that psychological development during young ages is critically sensitive and subjective to the contexts of family (Greenberg, Siegel, & Leitch, 1983; Hunter & Youniss, 1982; Rutter, 1983). For example, the etiology of mental disorders in children and adolescence could be attributed to adverse family factors such as psychopathology of parents and marital conflicts (Beavers & Hampson, 1990; Goodman & Gotlib, 1999; Hudson, 2005). Child’s violent behavior and later adolescent’s delinquency are related to both the presence and quality of parental involvement (Wright & Wright 1994). Good relationships with parents are positively related to prosocial behavior and negatively related to antisocial behavior in adolescent (Ma, Shek & Cheung, 2003). Contrariwise, the increasing autonomy of young adult results in their declining reliance on parents whether in cognitive, emotional, or behavioral domains (Grotevant, 1998; Smollar & Youniss, 1985; Sprinthall & Collins, 1995; Steinberg & Silverberg, 1986). Adults have to achieve individuation from family of origin that separates their lives with parents
(Frank, Avery, & Laman, 1988). Therefore, they are rarely considered on how can be changed or shaped by family.

Although adult is always regarded as an independent and autonomy unit, there are, still, few research recruited adult as subject to investigate the possible role of family played. Serewicz and her colleagues (2007) found that in university students, the communication with family members was indicative of the qualities of family interactions, satisfaction and relationships. More importantly, this communication pattern learned from family continued to affect ninety percent of the left home adult.

Some research showed how vocational choice of adult has been affected by parental values (Beauregard, 2007; Offer & Offer, 1975). Studies from criminology revealed that recidivism of adult is related to family conditions after perpetration (Hairston, 1988; Howser & McDonald, 1982; Leclair, 1978). In addition, Siddique and D'Arcy (1984) demonstrated that perceived family stress has, surprisingly, more consistent and larger correlations with psychological adjustments than school and peer stresses in adolescents. This implies many unrealized but dominant roles of family on adults have been unrevealed such as family relationship in socialization (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Weidman, 1989). All of these evidences suggested that family exerted direct and indirect effects on adult, which have always been overlooked.

1.2. Family, Adult and Psychosocial Maturity
Adulthood is a period concerning psychosocial maturity as a function of individuation to separate from parents and start self-governance (Frank et al., 1988; Hill & Holmbeck, 1986). Greenberger and Sørensen (1974) integrated the viewpoints from psychology and sociology and defined psychosocial maturity as the capacity to deal effectively with oneself, others and the society. In this sense, plenty of studies constitute a giant picture showing that family environment is conducive to psychosocial maturity. Children who full of conflict and alienation in their relationship with parents would likely to show delinquency, substance abuse and further alienation (Bhattacharya, 1998; Catalano et al., 1992). Young adult who grow up in stepfamily have higher chances of engagement in quitting school, substance dependence, antisocial behavior and sexual risk-taking behavior (Nicholson, Fergusson, & Horwood, 1999). These deviations in behavior resulting from immature identities can be referred back to the high control in parental style (Bosma & Gerrits, 1985; Enright, Lapsley, Drivas, & Fehr, 1980; Quintana & Lapsley, 1987). Indeed, family factors, such as support of individuation, can foster identity formation in young adult (Sandhu & Tung, 2006; Willemsen & Waterman, 1991).

Another piece of evidence justified that family impact on adult has been neglected in theoretical perspective rise from the Erikson’s (1968) life-span theory of psychosocial development. According to his epigenetic principle, Erikson proposed every individual would invariably go through a series of psychosocial stages in which particular
challenges from surrounding social contexts would become salience. Each resolution of these crises would result in development of a stronger corresponding ego strength as well as healthier psychological functioning. These eight ego strengths ascending in a sequential order during life span are: hope, will, purpose, competency, fidelity, love, care, and wisdom. His idea denoted that in the sixth crisis, the pursuit of love from individuals other than family members is the main theme faced by young adult. Maybe Erikson is right in his assertion, this point, however, deserves additional validation based on the previous notions of family impact on adult.

The investigation of family effect on ego strengths suggested by Erikson was very limited. As to our knowledge, only two studies, both done by Adams and his colleagues (2000, 2006), were conducted to clarify for this linkage in university students. One study administered cohesion, expressiveness and conflict from FES to investigate first five ego strengths of Erikson’s theory, while another administered cohesion and expressiveness to investigate fidelity only. They found that ego strengths were positively correlated with family cohesion and expressiveness, and was negatively correlated with family conflict. Nevertheless, the external validities of the results were greatly constrained due to the exclusion of love, care and wisdom in their assessments. Especially, the love strength is asserted as the main pursuit of university students, who regarded as young adults, according to Erikson. Usage of single indicator of ego strengths in their methodology also demolished the possibility for
explicit analyses. The linkage between family and Erikson’s theory is needed to be
reexamined with incorporation and more detailed analysis of eight ego strengths.

1.3. Family impact on Well-Being

A number of studies from different methodological approaches have demonstrated
that a nourishing family environment is positively related to various adjustments
(Cooper, Shaver, & Collins, 1998; Greenberg et. al., 1983; Lopez, Watkins, Manus, &
Hunton-Shoup, 1992; Soucy & Larose, 2000). In particular, the concepts of self-esteem,
depression and life satisfaction were frequently adapted for assessment to justify the
degree of well-being in family research (Lawton, 1984; Ryff, 1989). Practitioners
aiming at building empirical evidences for treatments suggested research should have a
critical sense of distinguishing psychological from subjective well-being (Joseph &
Wood, 2010). Psychological well-being is defined as the psychological resources one
possess to overcome challenge and fully functionalized, whereas subjective well-being
is defined as the overall feeling of happiness and pleasure (Ryan & Deci, 2001). As
such, self-esteem and depression could indicate psychological well-being, and life
satisfaction could indicate subjective well-being.

Self-esteem, defined as the overall evaluation toward self-worthiness, has consistent
positive relationship with family functioning (Brown, Dutton & Cook, 2001). Children
lives with inappropriate parental attitudes and behaviors tended to be impaired in
self-esteem (Lam & Mohammad, 1991; Kernis, Brown, & Brody, 2000). In normal American adolescents, family cohesion, conflict and active-recreational orientation were strongly related to self-esteem whereas family expressiveness and independence were not related statistically (Hirsch, Moos, & Reischl, 1985). Another study recruited Chinese adolescents with similar ages only yielded weaker but significant correlations. Family cohesion and conflict had moderate correlations with self-esteem, while family expressiveness, independence, active-recreational orientation and moral-religious emphasis were weakly correlated (Cheung & Lau, 1985). The fragile nature of self-esteem, that subjective to cultural difference, has verified a gap of knowledge about family and self-esteem in Chinese Society (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989). Nevertheless, not taking the multiple dimensions in self-esteem into account, the aforementioned studies only carried out superficial explorations of the family influences (Rosenberg, 1965). One of the most acknowledged theoretical premises on self-esteem is elucidated by Shavelson’s model which emphasized the hierarchy of different aspects of self underlying a so-called “self-esteem” (Shavelson, Hubner, & Stanton, 1976; Hattie, 1992; March, 1993). A general trend of research in Western and Eastern is to invest much more attention on linking the multiple facets of self-esteem and family functioning (Cheng & Watkins, 2000; Wells, 1976; Wylie, 1979).

The rationale for assessing depression as an indicator of well-being in past studies came from a conventional perspective of health psychology stating that the absence of
illness was the sign of the presence of good health. To this end, the assessment of
depression was actually the searching for the absence of chronological symptoms.

Family factors were empirically validated in the development, maintenance and relapse
of depression in children and adolescent (Brimaher et al., 2000; Ge, Best, Conger, &
Simons, 1996; Sander & McCarty, 2005). Most notably, rejection during childhood and
overwhelming parental control were somehow associated with clinical depression in
Adult (Gladstone & Parker, 2005; Parker, 1983). In terms of FES, family conflict was
positively related to depression, while family cohesion, active-recreational orientation
and moral-religious emphasis were negatively related in children and adolescent (Au,
Lau & Lee, 2009; Friedrich, Reams & Jacobs, 1982; Stark, Humphrey, Crook & Lewis,
1990); and the scores of cohesion, expressiveness and conflict were indicators of less
depression and psychosomatic complaints in adult (Holahan & Moos, 1982).

Life satisfaction is one of the main components of subjective well-being (Diener,
1984; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). Parental warmth and conflict were
determinants of subjective well-being in children, adolescents and young adults
(Cournoyer, 2000; Kagitcibasi, 1996; Leung & Leung, 1992; Love & Murdock, 2004;
Stewart et al., 1998). In a sample of Chinese adolescents, high life satisfaction was
correlated with positive parental style, low parental conflict and less family
dysfunction (Shek, 1997). Across samples of different age groups and cultures, family
has been proved as the strongest predictor of life satisfaction among various
psychosocial resources such as peer and school (Lewinsohn, Redner, & Seeley, 1991; Sepahmansour & Bayat, 2011).

Since self-esteem, depression and life satisfaction were three common measures for well-being, their instrumentations have always been taken concurrently. With no surprise, those studies generally obtained the described patterns of family influences within the samples of children (Amato & Keith, 1991; Hanson, McLanahan, & Thomson, 1996), adolescents (Burt, Cohen & Bjorck, 1988; Gutman & Eccles, 2007), and young adults (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Yamawaki, Nelson & Omori, 2011).

In fact, it is crucial to access self-esteem, depression and life satisfaction simultaneously to cover psychological and subjective well-being due to their essential distinction (Waterman, 1993). It is also desirable to include both measurements of positive psychological resources and diathesis of psychopathology in same study as a comprehensive indication of adjustment (Huebner, Gilman, & Suldo, 2007; Shek, 1989, 1993).

1.4. Proposed Conceptual Models

There are evidences declaring complicated interrelations and mixed models may exist between family influences, ego strengths and well-being. On the one hand, psychosocial maturity is conducive to well-being. Ego strength was positively related to self-esteem and purpose in life, and was negatively related to sense of hopelessness
and personal distress (Markstrom, Sabino, Turner, & Berman, 1997). On the other hand, the effects of family and psychosocial maturity may be aligned in the same direction on individual functioning. Parent’s divorce occurred in childhood can impair the relationship interaction and satisfaction of adult (Amato, 1996; McGue & Lykken, 1992). Nonetheless, a ten year longitudinal study reported that personality trait was a more significant predictor than divorce in childhood on the future relationship quality during adulthood (Burns & Dunlop, 2000). It should be noticed that only multivariate analysis was conducted in this study but not testing for mediation and moderation. This was coincident with most of the research designs of aforementioned studies which were mainly correlational and hence cannot infer, if any, mechanisms. In other words, building on the inadequate knowledge, only obscure conclusion about the interrelations could be drawn from the literature. One hypothetical possibility is that family environment can promote ego strengths, which then promotes well-being as shown in Figure 1. Another possibility is that moderation effect on family environment and well-being may be produced by ego strength as shown in Figure 2. That is, the enhancement of family climate on well-being may either through increasing of or dependent on ego strength.

Figure 1. Hypothesized model of Mediation.
1.5. The Present Study

This study was designed to investigate the family influence on young adult’s psychosocial maturity and well-being. Specifically, the interrelations among family climates, Erikson’s eight ego strengths, self-esteem, depression and life satisfaction were examined by applying FES on Chinese young adult. It is hypothesized family climate that is cohesive, expressive, low conflict and that emphasized greatly on personal growth would lead to mature ego strengths as well as positive psychological and subjective well-being. The positive relations between family climates and well-being are expected to be either mediated or moderated by ego strengths. Given that the researching of family influences on adult is relatively insufficient, it is valuable to explore, from an unheeded point of theoretical view, if there are any underlying family forces shaping the adult’s development through mediation or moderation of psychosocial maturity.
Chapter 2: Methodology

2.1. Subjects

Total of 202 Hong Kong participants, including 102 males and 99 females, were recruited in this study. To suit the definition of young adults, the ages of participants ranged from 18 to 23, with a mean of 21.4. Full-time students (76.4%) occupied greater proportion than full-time workers (22.6%) in the sample. Participants were mostly holders of bachelor degree (83.9%). Majority of them came from nuclear family (96.9%) and still living with their two biological parents (89.2%). Since many participants are living with siblings (77.7%), the most common family size is four members (50%).

2.2. Instruments

A self-reported questionnaire consisted of five main parts assessing family climate, psychosocial maturity, self-esteem, depression and life satisfaction respectively, and was attached in Appendix A with the scoring keys in Appendix B.

Family Climate was assessed using Chinese Version of Family Environment Scale (FES-CV) which is developed by Philips and his colleagues in 1991. FES-CV has the same questions and organization of underlying constructs with original Real Form of FES that could be used to measure the actual social environment perceived within
family (Moos, 1974; Moos & Moos, 1981). According to the reviewed literature, only six out of nine subscales of FES-CV were selected for the purpose of this study.

Similar designs were also used by other researchers (Adams et al., 2006; Burt et al., 1988). These six selected subscales, composed of 9-items each, included cohesion, the degree of family members are supportive and committed to each other; expressiveness, how freely can family members express their feelings in a direct way; conflict, the likelihood of family members express conflict or with angry manner in daily interactions; independence, the power of family members in making own decisions that fully authorized by others; active-recreational orientation, the initiative of family members participated and enjoyed in entertaining activities; and moral-religious emphasis, the extent to which family members heavily held moral values and religious issues. It should be noticed that compared to FES, mild adjustments in wordings were made on the questions of FES-CV of independence and moral-religious emphasis in order to suit for the Chinese sample (Philips et al., 1991). These 54 items were in the format of true or false questions commenting statements that described a particular dimension of family climate perceived. There were different scoring systems for each sub-dimension. The internal consistencies as expressed in Cronbach’s alphas for cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, independence, active-recreational orientation and moral-religious emphasis were .83, .65, .70, .17, .62 and .27, respectively. Item 8 of expressiveness scale and item 3 of conflict scale were deleted to improve their
reliabilities. Independence and moral-religious emphasis were dropped out from the analysis due to their unacceptable inconsistencies.

For the measure of psychosocial maturity, the 32-items short form of The Psychosocial Inventory of Ego Strengths (PIES) was employed and translated into Chinese by authors (Markstrom, 2001; Markstrom et al., 1997, 2000). PIES was formulated to apply on adolescent and adult by carefully interpreting Erikson’s psychosocial development theory and consulting with Erikson scholars. This 32-items short form yielded similar reliability with original 64-items version that no scales had differences higher than .10 in Cronbach’s alphas (Markstrom et al., 1997). The convergent and divergent validities were also maintained consistently in two versions. Two opposite themes were assessed in each of the eight ego strengths: hope, will, purpose, competence, fidelity, love, caring and wisdom. There were 1 positively oriented item and 1 antipathic item in each theme of ego strengths that consistent with the assertion from Erikson (1985) that a balance in the continuum of ego identity is most desirable for healthy functioning individual. Scores of ego strengths were rated on a 5-point Likert scale with 1 representing does not describe me well and 5 representing describe me very well. The Cronbach’s alphas for each ego strength and their total scores were as follow: Hope (.65), Will (.55), Purpose (.63), Competence (.65), Fidelity (.53), Love (.70), Care (.72), and Wisdom (.70). Item 4 of Love scale was deleted to improve its reliability.
To measure self-esteem, the Chinese Adolescent Self-Esteem Scales (CASES) was used (Cheng, 1997, 2005). CASES was developed specifically to capture the construct of self-concept in Hong Kong adolescent, yet can also be applied to young adult. It held a hierarchical as well as multidimensional view of structure of self-esteem with a general evaluation of self and six domain-specific evaluations of the self. The evaluations of general self, family self, social self and moral self were incorporated into the questionnaires amounted to 34 items. Responses were rated on a 7-point Likert scale with 1 representing strongly disagree and 7 representing strongly agree. For the present study, the internal consistencies of general self, family self, social self and moral self were .90, .93, .88 and .89, respectively.

Depression was assessed by the Chinese version of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D; Chien & Cheng, 1985; Radloff, 1977). CES-D consisted of 20 items measuring six major symptoms of depression, which can be used for screening general population, included depressed mood, feelings of guilt and worthlessness, feelings of helplessness and hopelessness, psychomotor retardation, loss of appetite, and sleep disturbance. Responses were rated on a Likert scale indicating the frequencies of occurrences of symptoms during the past two weeks with 0 representing rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day), 1 representing some of a little of the time (1-2 days), 2 representing occasionally or a moderate amount of the time (3-4 days), and 3 representing most or all of the time (5-7 days). The total scores
ranged from 0 to 60 with high scoring represent suffering of depressive symptoms, and low scoring somehow indicated the presence of happiness since four positively worded items were reversed (Joseph, 2006). The internal consistency of this measure for the present study was .92.

The assessment of life satisfaction employed Chinese version of the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin, 1985; Shek, 1992). SWLS measures a global evaluation of life satisfaction based on cognitive judgments. This overall life satisfaction differentiated itself from the general construct of subjective well-being with elimination of positive and negative affect appraisal. 5 items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale with 1 representing *strongly disagree* and 7 representing *strongly agree*. Internal consistency for the current study was .86.

**2.3. Procedures**

The administrations of questionnaires were conducted through two different means. The first means was by distribution of questionnaires in paper. Each questionnaire was delivered directly from the researcher. The second means was by forward of website containing online survey. Content of survey was kept to be equal to the paper version. All participants were recruited in voluntary basis. At the beginning of the questionnaires, debriefings of research purpose were cited and informed consents were collected. Participants were then encouraged to answer in light of their own
understandings of the questions. All original copies of questionnaire would be
destroyed two months after completion of this paper in order to protect privacies of
participants.

**2.4. Statistical Analyses**

Prior to hypotheses testing, data reduction and data synthesis were executed to
facilitate the analyses. For the purpose of data reduction, the Erikson’s eight ego
strengths were extracted by principal component analysis and then rotated in varimax
method. As indicated in Table 1, these eight scales yielded two factors by which
Erikson’s (1968) lifespan theory predicted. The first factor loaded by Love (.77) and
Care (.88) was named as ascending egos since they represent the dominant crises
currently facing by young adult. The second factor loaded by Hope (.70), Will (.83),
Purpose (.82), Competence (.75), Fidelity (.69), and Wisdom (.78) was named as
descending egos as they were recessive ego strengths according to epigenetic principle
(Erikson, 1968, 1985). Their scores were computed by summing scores from
corresponding ego strengths and then divided by number of scales. Overall indicator of
ego resiliency was also obtained through summation of scores from all ego strengths
then divided by number of scales. The Cronbach’s alphas for ego resiliency, ascending
egos and descending egos were .90, .78 and .90 respectively. The ego resiliency,
ascending egos and descending egos would be interpreted in later sections instead of
Erikson’s eight ego strengths. Similar procedure was also employed by other researchers (Adams et al., 2006).

Table 1
Rotated Factor Loadings of Erikson’s Ego Strengths in Varimax method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Ascending Egos</th>
<th>Descending Egos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor loadings smaller than .400 were suppressed.

It was possible that if same variables were regrouped into different demographic categories, their scores would be different statistically. Several potential confounding factors were explored to guarantee data were synthesized appropriately and hence no separate analyses were required. The two different means of administration, paper questionnaire and online survey, were tested by independent t-test and found non-significant differences on all variables except depression. The group of online survey scored significantly higher on depression than the group of paper questionnaire, \( t (70) = 8.88, p < .001 \). Gender was also tested by independent t-test and found non-significant differences on all variables except family conflict. Female reported higher level of family conflict than male, \( t (199) = 2.21, p < .05 \). Age and total number
of family members were tested by regression on all variables and no significant result was found. Education and types of caregiver had not been examined due to their insufficient sample size in different subgroups. Occupation was tested on comparing student and worker, while living conditions was tested to compare groups living with and without sibling. No significant difference was obtained in these two independent t-tests. Since only the means of administration and gender had effects on testing variables, they were controlled in later regressions on depression and conflict but yielded no difference on the significant results obtained. Consequently, data was analyzed with no categorization or control of demographic variables as this was not hypothesis of the study.

The testing of mediation and moderation effects was conducted applying approaches suggested by of Barron and Kenny (1986) and Holmbeck, (1997). The hypothesized model of mediation of this study was depicted in Figure 3. There were three steps in testing these mediation effects through multiple regressions. First, various indicators of well-being were regressed on family climates to prove that the influences of predictor variables on criterion variables were existed for which can be mediated. Second, ego strengths were regressed on family climates to establish a valid linkage between mediators and predictor variables. Third, mediations were tested by hierarchical multiple regression of various well-beings on ego strengths with family climates controlled. It should be noticed that step three was executed if only the simple
Figure 3. Testing model of Simple Regressions, Mediations and Moderations.
regressions in steps one and two were significant, although some other authors argued that it is not necessary (see MacKinnon, Krull, & Lockwood, 2000). Separate analyses were conducted to test the mediation effects of ego resiliency, ascending egos and descending egos.

Ego strengths treated as the moderators which varied linearly with the relationships between independent variables and dependent variables were examined by both simultaneous and hierarchical multiple regressions (Barron & Kenny, 1986; Holmbeck, 1997). The regression coefficients of family climates and ego strengths in simultaneous regressions of well-beings were not necessarily significant, and hence moderation effects were test with all possible combinations of predicator, moderator and criterion variables. Their interaction terms created after centering of each variable were assessed in hierarchical multiple regressions for moderation effects (Aiken & West, 1991; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Significant effects of moderation were interpreted by plotting the graphs with three regression lines representing different levels of moderator (Whisman & McClelland, 2005).
Chapter 3: Results

3.1. Descriptive Statistic

The means and standard deviations of all variables categorized by both genders, male and female were presented in Table 2. To understand more psychosocial maturity of Hong Kong young adults, the strengths of Erikson’s eight egos were compared using

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>13.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>11.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>13.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erikson’s Ego Strengths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>12.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>13.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>13.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>13.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>14.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>14.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>12.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resorted Ego Resiliency</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>13.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending Egos</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>14.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descending Egos</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>12.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Self</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Self</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Self</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>21.94</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>22.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>20.47</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>20.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARO= Active-recreational orientation.
ANOVA with repeated measures. Greenhouse-Geisser Epsilon was applied to adjust
the degree of freedom because the assumption of sphericity had been violated. There
was a significant differences between means of eight ego strengths, \( F(5.9, 1163.2) = 43.5, p < .001 \). Post hoc tests using Bonferroni procedure (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991)
in controlling the experimental Type I error revealed that Love and Care were
significantly higher than the other six egos \((ps < .001)\), and that Will and Wisdom were
significantly lower than the other six egos \((ps < .01)\).

### 3.2. Correlation Analyses

Table 3 was a bivariate correlations matrix of different dimensions in family climates,
eggo strengths and criteria of well-being. All of the effect sizes of Pearson coefficient
correlations were judged by suggestion of Cohen (1992). Scatter plots were generated
to all correlations so as to ensure no clear curvilinear relationships existed by visual
check of researchers.

Family climates were generally related to ego strengths and criteria of well-being. In
positive direction, while cohesion, expressiveness and active-recreational orientation
were all correlated with ego resiliency, expressiveness was also correlated to
descending egos, and active-recreational orientation was further correlated to
ascending egos as well as descending egos. Besides, cohesion, expressiveness and
active-recreational orientation were positively correlated with self esteems except
Table 3

*Bivariate Correlations Matrix of Family Climates, Ego Strengths, Self-Esteems, Depression and Life Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expressiveness</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conflict</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ARO</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ego Resiliency</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ascending Egos</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Descending Egos</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. General Self</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Family Self</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Social Self</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Moral Self</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Depression</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ARO = Active-recreational orientation; * = p < .05, ** = p < .01, two-tailed.
moral self, and life satisfaction, and were negatively correlated with depression.

Differed from the patterns of weak correlations from expressiveness and active-recreational orientation, cohesion was moderately correlated with family self, weakly correlated with life satisfaction, and very weakly correlated with general self, social self and depression. Conflict was only negatively correlated with family self in weak effect size.

Ego strengths were related to almost all criteria of well-being ranged from weak to medium effect sizes. The exceptions were that ascending egos could not correlate with life satisfaction and that descending egos could not correlate with family self. Other than that, ego resiliency, ascending egos and descending egos were positively related to all self-esteem and life satisfaction, and were negatively related to depression.

3.3. Simple Regression Analyses

As the prerequisite procedures of testing mediation, criterion variables of family climates were identified using simple regression. This was pertaining to the first and second steps suggested by Barron and Kenny (1986) and the resulting patterns were consistent to what obtained in correlation matrix. Cohesion predicted higher levels of ego resiliency, $\beta = .14, p < .05$; general self, $\beta = .15, p < .05$; family self, $\beta = .53, p < .001$; social self, $\beta = .15, p < .05$; and life satisfaction, $\beta = .28, p < .001$; and lower level of depression, $\beta = -.20, p < .01$. Higher level of expressiveness indicated higher
levels of ego resiliency, $\beta = .18$, $p < .05$; descending egos, $\beta = .08$, $p < .05$; general self, $\beta = .24$, $p < .01$; family self, $\beta = .31$, $p < .001$; social self, $\beta = .20$, $p < .01$; and life satisfaction, $\beta = .31$, $p < .001$; and lower level of depression, $\beta = -23$, $p < .001$. Conflict predicted lower level of family self, $\beta = -.38$, $p < .001$. Active-recreational orientation was a significant predictor of higher ego resiliency, $\beta = .18$, $p < .05$; ascending egos, $\beta = .17$, $p < .05$; descending egos, $\beta = .29$, $p < .001$; general self, $\beta = .28$, $p < .001$; family self, $\beta = .17$, $p < .05$; social self, $\beta = .28$, $p < .001$; and life satisfaction, $\beta = .26$, $p < .001$; and lower depression, $\beta = -21$, $p < .001$. In brief, all family climates were feasible to be tested with mediations except conflict due to its non-significant regressions of all ego strengths. Total six pathways of mediations included cohesion to ego resiliency, expressiveness to ego resiliency and descending egos, and active-recreational orientation to all three ego strengths were consequently tested.

3.4. Mediation Effects

A series of hierarchical multiple regressions based on six aforementioned pathways were conducted to search for the mediation effects of ego strengths between family climates and various well-beings. The significance of indirect effect from hypothesized mediation models were tested by Sobel’s test (1982). A complicated pattern of mediations was obtained showing that family climates influence multiple indicators of well-being through different mediators.
As shown in Table 4, effects of cohesion partially mediated through ego resiliency on general self \((z = 2.03, p < .05)\), social self \((z = 2.00, p < .05)\), and depression \((z = -2.01, p < .05)\). Since cohesion remained significant in predicting life satisfaction \((z = 1.96, p < .05)\), ego resiliency was only functioned as partial mediator. No mediation of ego resiliency existed between cohesion and family self.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>(\beta)</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting General Self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 Cohesion</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.72***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting Family Self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 Cohesion</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting Social Self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 Cohesion</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.58***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting Depression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 Cohesion</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.49***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting Life Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 Cohesion</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ER = Ego Resiliency; * = p < .05, *** = p < .001.

Table 5 presented the effects of expressiveness on social self through mediators of ego resiliency \((z = 2.43, p < .01)\) and descending egos \((z = 2.47, p < .01)\).

Expressiveness remained significant after adding partial mediators using ego resiliency on predicting general self \((z = 2.48, p < .01)\), family self \((z = 2.13, p < .05)\), depression
(z = -2.39, p < .05) and life satisfaction (z = 2.36, p < .05); and using descending ego on predicting general self (z = 2.54, p < .01), depression (z = -2.42, p < .05) and life satisfaction (z = 2.46, p < .01). No mediation of descending egos existed between expressiveness and family self.

Table 5
Hierarchical Multiple Regression testing Ego Strengths as Mediators of Expressiveness on indicators of Well-being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Mediators</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting General Self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M1)</td>
<td>Expressiveness, ER</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.71*** .55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M2)</td>
<td>Expressiveness, DE</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.67*** .49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting Family Self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M1)</td>
<td>Expressiveness, ER</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.24*** .16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M2)</td>
<td>Expressiveness, DE</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.18*** .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting Social Self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M1)</td>
<td>Expressiveness, ER</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.58*** .36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M2)</td>
<td>Expressiveness, DE</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.50*** .28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting Depression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M1)</td>
<td>Expressiveness, ER</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.48*** .28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M2)</td>
<td>Expressiveness, DE</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.48*** .28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting Life Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M1)</td>
<td>Expressiveness, ER</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.41*** .27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M2)</td>
<td>Expressiveness, DE</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.47*** .28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ER = Ego Resiliency; DE = Descending Egos; M1 = Expressiveness mediates through Ego Resiliency; M2 = Expressiveness mediates through Descending Egos; *= p<.05, **= p<.01, ***= p<.001.

Active-recreational orientation predicted well-being through all kind of mediators as noted in Table 6. Ego resiliency partially mediated general self (z = 4.58, p < .001),
Table 6
Hierarchical Multiple Regression testing Ego Strengths as Mediators of Active-recreational orientation on indicators of Well-being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Mediators</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting General Self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M1)</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M2)</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M3)</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting Family Self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M1)</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M2)</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M3)</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting Social Self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M1)</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M2)</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M3)</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting Depression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>-2.3**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M1)</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M2)</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M3)</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting Life Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M1)</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M2)</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (M3)</td>
<td>ARO</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ARO= Active-recreational orientation; ER = Ego Resiliency; AE = Ascending Egos; DE = Descending Egos; M1 = Active-recreational orientation mediates through Ego Resiliency; M2 = Active-recreational orientation mediates through Descending Egos; M3 = Active-recreational orientation mediates through Ascending Egos; *= $p<.05$, **= $p<.01$, ***= $p<.001$.

family self ($z = 2.80, p = .01$), social self ($z = 4.34, p < .001$), depression ($z = -4.39, p < .001$) and life satisfaction ($z = 4.08, p < .001$). Ascending egos partially mediated family self ($z = 2.11, p = .03$) and acted as partial mediators of general self ($z = 1.89, p = .06$), social self ($z = 2.01, p = .04$) and depression ($z = -2.00, p = .05$). No mediation
of ascending egos existed between Active-recreational orientation and life satisfaction.

Descending egos partially mediated of general self \((z = 4.03, p < .001)\), family self \((z = 2.28, p = .02)\), depression \((z = -3.70, p < .001)\) and life satisfaction \((z = 3.70, p < .001)\); and acted as partial mediator of social self \((z = 3.70, p < .001)\). The standardized indirect effects for these partial mediations were calculated and presented in Table 7 (Shrout & Bogler, 2002).

### Table 7

**Standardized Indirect Effects (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohesion</th>
<th>Expressiveness</th>
<th>ARO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>ER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Self</td>
<td>66.7(^a)</td>
<td>50.0(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Self</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.3(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self</td>
<td>50.0(^a)</td>
<td>44.4(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>48.6(^a)</td>
<td>35.0(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>17.7(^b)</td>
<td>21.7(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. ARO = Active-recreational orientation; Mediators: ER = Ego Resiliency; AE = Ascending Egos; DE = Descending Egos; \(^a\)Predictors not remain significant in step 2; \(^b\)Predictors remain significant in step 2.*

### 3.5. Moderation Effects

Significant moderation effects on well-beings tested by interaction terms of ego strengths and family climates were presented in Table 8. Raw regression weights instead of betas were reported in the table as recommended by Whisman and McClelland (2005). The additions of interaction terms in the above models explained further total variances ranged from 1% to 5%. Amongst all family climates, only
active-recreational orientation had no pattern of interaction with ego strengths.

Table 8
Hierarchical Multiple Regression testing Ego Strengths as Moderators between Family Climates and indicators of Well-being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicting Moral Self</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion X Ego Resiliency</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.04***</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion X Ascending Egos</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion X Descending Egos</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03***</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness X Ego Resiliency</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness X Ascending Egos</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness X Descending Egos</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predicting Life Satisfaction

| Expression X Ego Resiliency                                  | .29   | .02          | -.22*    | .09  |
| Expressiveness X Descending Egos                             | .32   | .02          | -.18*    | .08  |
| Conflict X Ego Resiliency                                    | .24   | .02          | -.18*    | .08  |

Predicting Family Self

| Conflict X Ascending Egos                                    | .53   | .02          | -.04*    | .02  |

Predicting Social Self

| Conflict X Descending Egos                                    | .38   | .01          | -.02*    | .01  |

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

For all ego strengths, the relationships between cohesion and moral self varied in the same pattern. As shown in Figure 4, low level of ego strengths indicated positive relationship; mild level of ego strengths indicated no relationship; and high level of ego strengths indicated negative relationship. In overall, higher level of ego strengths predicted higher level of moral self.

Expressiveness was moderated by all ego strengths on moral self, and by ego resiliency and descending egos on life satisfaction as evident from Figure 5 and 6. The
relationships between expressiveness and moral self were also equal to what observed in cohesion and moral self across all ego strengths. There were interaction effects emerged that lack of expressiveness predicted low level of life satisfaction only when respondents also had low levels of ego resiliency and descending egos.

The patterns that conflict moderated by ego resiliency on life satisfaction, by ascending egos on family self, and by descending egos on social self were displayed in Figure 7. For individuals with mild and high levels of ego resiliency, less life satisfaction was shown when they had high conflict. Individuals with low level of life satisfaction showed low life satisfaction whether they reported high or low conflict. The negative relations between conflict and family self become much stronger in respondents with higher levels of ascending egos. In contrast, the positive relations between conflict and social self become much stronger in respondents with lower levels of ascending egos. In overall, lower level of ego strengths predicted lower level of all three outcomes.
Figure 4. Ego Resiliency, Ascending Egos, and Descending Egos as Moderators of the association between Cohesion and Moral Self.
Figure 5. Ego Resiliency, Ascending Egos, and Descending Egos as Moderators of the association between Expressiveness and Moral Self.
Figure 6. Ego Resiliency and Descending Egos as Moderators of the association between Expressiveness and Life Satisfaction.
Figure 7. Different Ego Strengths as respective Moderators of the associations between Conflict and Life Satisfaction, Family Self and Social Self.
Chapter 4: Discussion and Conclusions

This paper primarily aimed at establishing the relationships of family climates with ego strengths and well-beings in young adults. Four FES subscales-cohesion, expressiveness, conflict and active-recreational orientation, are related to three forms of ego strengths-ego resiliency, ascending egos and descending egos, which were resorted from Erikson’s (1968) eight ego strengths, and to different indicators of psychological and subjective well-beings. Apart from the direct relationships, a complex pattern of pathways between FES scores and multiple self-esteem, depression and life satisfaction is emerged that three ego strengths either provided mediations, moderations, or both types of effects at the same time.

4.1. Discussion

Opposed to some western research conducted on adolescents, this study discovered that family has a set of significant relationships on young adults, who are assumed to be much untouched in conventional wisdom (Alnajjar & Smadi, 1998; Hundert, Cassie & Johnston, 1988; Martinez, Hays & Solway, 1979; Walker, McLaughlin & Greene, 1988). Generally, family climates that cohesive, expressive, emphasized recreation and less conflictual were significantly related to greater ego strengths and better well-beings. This is consistent with study of Frank, Pirsch, and Wright (1990) that
higher relatedness and less insecurity with family members plus unlimited restriction on personal autonomy would lead to stable identity status and better adjustment.

Especially for this age group, ranged from 18 to 23 years old, of the participants, the family climates may be more robust because majority of them still expect to depend on their parent to cope with life (Frank et al., 1988).

The perception of different climates in family environment affected different aspects of ego developments in young adults. Cohesion was only conducive to ego resiliency; expressiveness was conducive to ego resiliency as well as descending egos; while active-recreational orientation was conducive to ego resiliency, ascending egos and descending egos. Conflict predicted no relationship with ego strengths. To fully elaborate the linkages, definitions of all three resorted ego strengths have to be reviewed. Ego resiliency is an aspect of personality that restores overall toughness and strength of ego acuminated from resolutions of all possible psychosocial crises at the present moment (Loevinger, 1996, 1997). Ascending egos characterized by love and care in young adults refers to the strengths acquired from current psychosocial crisis of subjects, whereas descending egos characterized by the rest of Erikson’s ego strengths refers to the residual qualities which are not valued as essential, qualities that underlying current identity of the subjects. These resorted ego strengths, thus, can be understood as total psychosocial resources, conscious and unconscious identity statuses, respectively. The ways that family climates influence corresponding products of
psychosocial maturity are indeed a demonstration of how individual’s readiness and environment interplay to determine the ascendance of ego strengths (Erikson, 1964). Multiple social-cognitive factors such as informational, normative and diffuse-avoidant styles in processing identity (Berzonsky, 1989, 1990), and achieved, moratorium, foreclosed and identity diffusion approaches to form identity (Marcia, 1966; Marcia, 1993; Waterman, 1999), were addressed as mediators between family relationships and ego development (Adams et al., 2006). By extension, a fascinating view might be that family climates influence ego strengths through different pathways of identity processing styles and identity statuses.

With reference to previous evidences, high cohesion and expressiveness within family represented adequate self-expression in a warmth social context, which is vital to identity development (Adams, Bruce, & Keating, 2000; Adams & Marshall, 1996). Active-recreational orientation, interestingly, unlike cohesion and expressiveness, was related to all aspects of ego strengths. This may point to a fact that being “friend” with family members, as demonstrated as participating in leisure activities together, becomes the main task of adult that aims at transforming the relationships with parents in a way that less intimate yet close enough. Similar behavioural tendency has been predicted by the concept of individuation of adult stressing separation of the world from parents without losing emotional connection (Frank et al., 1988; Murphy et al., 1963). As for conflict, the nonsignificant relation with ego strengths was out of
expectation. Tomlinson (1991) had argued that conflict was the major contribution of unacceptable behaviours during adolescence. Likewise, the conflict resolution in family decision making could strengthen psychosocial maturity included identity formation and ego development (Grotevant & Cooper, 1985; Hauser, Powers & Noam, 1991). One possible interpretation for the phenomenon that conflict and ego functioning as two independent variables is that for family with too less conflict, successful negotiation often occur that individual has learned to deal effectively with others. While for family with too high conflict, isolation, instead of keep fighting, occurs at family members that forced individuals depend on themselves (Moné, Macphee, Anderson, & Banning, 2011). These two circumstances located at opposite extreme of positions may foster a curvilinear, other than linear, relationship between conflict and ego strengths.

Only in certain aspects, were family climates related directly to PWB and SWB that as same as previous studies (e.g., Burt, Cohen & Bjorck, 1988; Lewinsohn, Redner, & Seeley, 1991). Greater perceived cohesion, expressiveness and active-recreational orientation in family predicted higher self-esteem except moral self, life satisfaction, and lower depression. Contrary to research done in the past, cohesion and conflict were not emerged as the most significant indicators of psychological outcome amongst the FES subscales (Kleinman et al., 1989). Compared to expressiveness and active-recreational orientation, cohesion had stronger positive relation with family self
but weaker positive relations with general self, social self and depression; whereas conflict had negative relation with family self only. This was inconsistent with the findings in adolescents that cohesion and conflict had greater relationships with self-esteem and depression than did expressiveness and active-recreational orientation (Cheung & Lau, 1985; Stark, Humphrey, Crook & Lewis, 1990). The reversed importance of cohesion and conflict with active-recreational orientation suggest the leisure activities with family members is somehow similar to the role of “play” in child that free individual from internal and external stresses to promote personal growth (Brightbill, 1961; Csikszentmihalyi, 1975; Piaget, 1962; Vygotsky, 1967). As evidence, one study investigated old adults participating in playful activities had improved psychological well-being (Lomranz, Bergman, Eyal, Shmokin, 1988). This transformed friended alike interaction with parents, again, surmise the remaining salient impacts of cohesion and conflict on family self since adult desired to earn approval from parents just as they need it from friends (Epperson, 1964).

4.1.1. Mediation Effects

The emergence of ego strengths as mediators are embedded in the theoretical background stating that family has direct and indirect effects on well-being (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). Cohesion, expressiveness and active-recreational orientation exerted partial indirect effects through different ego
strengths on indicators of psychological and subjective well-being except moral self.

Cohesive family climate would increase ego resiliency, and hence benefit psychological well-being. This is somewhat albeit the better psychological well-being in adult experienced trauma in childhood assisted psychosocially (Punamaki, 2001); and in patient with terminal disease received supportive family environment (Christensen, Turner, Slaughter, & Holmen, 1988). Expressive interactions with family members could increase ego resiliency and descending egos, which then increased social self. The open sharing of feeling in family might provide secure base to explore and experiment in interactions with others that leading to synchronize own aspiration with societal expectation, and eventually boosted their interest in interpersonal affiliation and social confidence (Kamptner, 1998). Active-recreational orientation had much indirect effects by ego resiliency and descending egos on psychological and subjective well-being than cohesion and expressiveness. A picture about how growth and development in adult promoted by transforming into befriended interactions with family members then become clear that by depicting the mechanism as maturation in ego and unconscious identity. Transformed interaction with parents benefiting adult not merely as accomplishment of task catalyzed by individuation, but also as retracing of innate tendency of “play” in childhood (Erikson, 1950; Frank et al., 1988). Moreover, active-recreational orientation fostered family self through all three resorted ego strengths. It is likely that the mutual enjoyment of playing process, as a function of ego,
have enhanced the belonging and positive interactions between adults and their parents
(Beckwith, 1986; Clarke-Stewart, 1973; Erikson, 1950; Stern, 1974; Vandenberg, 1986).

Although in some mediation pathways, ego strengths only function as partial mediators that family climates remain significant in predicting well-being, it was generally suggested that an emotionally, linguistically and behaviourally tied family environment can foster the strengths of egos for young adult so that they become self-confident, less depressed and satisfied with life. The simultaneous growths in ego and self-esteem were regarded as the product of cohesive and expressive family environment which also value individuation to encourage both relatedness and autonomy (Allen, Hauser, Bell, & O’Connor, 1994; Grotevant & Cooper, 1983, 1986, Ryan & Lynch, 1989). Balancing independence and sense of connection with parents was especially reinforcing self-esteem (Joselson, 1980). The protection against depression by well-functioning family climates was probably achieved by the minimization of affectionless control by parents perceived in adults (Burbach, Kashani, & Rosenberg, 1989; Nomura, Wickramaratne, Warner, Mufson, & Weissman, 2002). The inflated life satisfaction was by family providing resources to pursue the priority of life task and activities, as mentioned by Erickson (1968), which gained the most satisfaction for them (Chang, McBride-Chang, Stewart, & Au, 2003); and to assist adult in interpreting life experience in a positive and coherent way that lead to
successful self-transformation of roles, thus promote greater life satisfaction through increasing ego resiliency (Pals, 2006).

On the other hand, two insignificant mediation pathways deserved extra attentions. First, cohesion and expressiveness cannot influence family self through ego resiliency. Taken the need for parental approval into account, the emotional and verbal connectedness with parents may be a very and only powerful mean that make young adult to feel being respected directly. Second, the ascending egos was not emerged out as mediator between active-recreational orientation and life satisfaction. Since being “friend” with parents, probably as the main task of adult, would not enhance young adult well-being subjectively and consciously, that explained why theoretical perspective has been neglecting the family impact on adult: The impact is simply unaware by researchers whose identities are also adults.

4.1.2. Moderation Effects

Two distinct patterns of moderation effects were generated by ego strengths between family climates and indicators of well-being. The first pattern is the effects of cohesion and expressiveness on moral self moderated by all ego strengths. For young adult with low ego strengths, the degree of moral self increases with family climates; while for young adult with high ego strengths, the degree of moral self decreases with family climates. The moral self for adults in the group of high ego was greater than the group
of low ego. This portrayed deficiency in psychosocial maturity inhibited adults to
demonstrate their capacity of own moral judgement and strength of caring, but this can
be compensated by intimacy expressed by family members, which act as resilient
factors to motivate individuals to concern for others. Adults low in ego strength would
need supportive and eliciting interactions from parents for moral development (Rutter
et al., 1976; Walker & Taylor, 1991). And adults high in ego strength have achieved
autonomous that would disagree with parent’s opinions in certain situations, therefore,
their standard of moral self cannot be predicted from the parents’ interaction or moral
reasoning as cited in literature (Dunton, 1989; Haan, Langer, & Kohlberg, 1976;
Powers, 1983; Speicher, 1985). This inconsistent relationship between family climates
and moral self also accounted for the failed mediation by ego strengths mentioned
above. The second pattern is the effects of conflict interacting with ego strengths on
well-beings. High life satisfaction predicted by less conflict was only perceived in
young adult with strong ego resiliency. The deficiency in psychosocial resources may
deteriorate the capacity to integrate life events to a positive end despite of presence of
low conflict with family (Pals, 2006). Family self had a much stronger negative
relationships with conflict in young adults with high ascending egos. Low social self
predicted by less conflict was much significant in young adult with weak descending
egos. These individuals with coherent and conscious identity are more likely to engage
in defining mutual goals with parents, which accompanies frequent arguments and
criticisms with family members but more social confidence (Kamptner, 1998; Kobak, Cole, Fleming, Ferenz-Gillies, & Gamble, 1993). The unexpected result for lowest life satisfaction and social self in groups of low ego strengths but also low conflict revealed a tendency for compromise in young adult with week coherent and unconscious identity would avoid argument and hidden in the surface phenomenon of “peace” in family (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

4.1.3. Mediation and Moderation Effects

Relationship between expressiveness and life satisfaction was both mediated and moderated by ego resiliency and descending egos. Mediation effects pointed out that family with low ego resiliency and descending egos are pathways of repressed revealing of feeling and dissatisfaction with life. However, moderation effects suggested that unexpressed adults are dissatisfied only if they also have low resiliency of ego and descending egos. This can be elaborated on one hand, unexpressed feeling and thought towards family members turn individual to be less resourceful and resilient, and hence feel less contented; on the other hand, individual with higher resiliency learnt how to manage themselves even the family members cannot behave as good communicators and generated less negative cognitive view of life. This demonstrated an example of one type of the moderated mediations (Preacher, Rucker & Hayes, 2007). Expressiveness not only promotes life satisfaction through ego strength but also
affects their relationship that low ego strengths would not necessarily lead to
dissatisfaction if people live in an expressive family climate. Of course, this
hypothetical moderation mediation has to be clarified with further investigation.

4.2. Implications

Perhaps here is the appropriate point to reconsolidate the major implications from
the huge amount of findings. These implications contributed to the literatures of family,
Erikson’s theory and well-being. For family literature, the role of family played on
adult was well established from the aspects of personality and well-being. This study
serves as rare evidence to discover mediation and moderation factors from family to
psychological outcomes should inspire a specific theory about family impact on adult
(Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Several pieces of information could be functioned as
corner stones. The reversed importance of cohesion and conflict with
active-recreational orientation implied relationships with parents are transformed that
close to friendship. That mutual participation in leisure had recognized, although
unheeded in literature, as vital ingredient of constituting a well-functioning family in
perspectives of family researching (Curran, 1983; Stinnett, Sanders, DeFrayn, &
Parkhurst, 1982). The distinctive pattern of conflict on adult also suggested its impact
may not be obvious and more factors should be identified as moderators. As a matter of
fact, conflict is a complex concept whose nature varies depending on with whom and
about what is subject arguing (Hanson, McLanahan & Thomson, 1996; Semtana, Yau, & Hanson, 1991). Besides, the three resorted ego strengths interact with family and well-being in different combinations verified how different situational and personal mediators might exert their impact on different adjustments (Farber, Felner, & Primavera, 1985). The instrumentation of large amount of variables would help to avoid overgeneralization or oversimplification of family impact.

As enrichment of Erikson’s theory, the usage of ascending egos and descending egos as respective to eight traditional ego strengths opened a new perspective to his theory and structure of psychosocial maturity. Ascending egos and descending egos can be conceptualized as the conscious and unconscious identities consolidated from dominant and recessive ego virtues. It should be noticed that ascending egos and descending egos were computed from factor analysis, and hence they have zero correlation with each other. These products from principle component analysis, which demonstrated its effectiveness in mediating and moderating family climates and well-beings, reject Erikson’s (1968, 1985) ideas that pervious ego virtues would contribute to actualizing of later ego strengths by merging as parts of them. The relatively higher degrees of love and care, and relatively lower degrees of will and wisdom in samples were also called into questions. Society has known contributes to the ascendance of ego virtues, but it was unclear that this uneven distribution of ego strengths is a result of characteristics of Hong Kong young adult, cohort effect, or
nature of true human development (Erikson, 1964). Further, findings suggested that transforming the relationship with family as a friend in interaction might be another psychosocial crisis faced by young adult.

The fact that family and ego strengths impact on different self-esteem has provided support to Cheung (1996, 1997, 1998)'s model of self-esteem of Chinese adolescent and other analyses that demonstrating multidimensional facets of self-esteem (Hattie, 2003; Wu & Watkins, 2005). The differential linkages between family climates and self-esteem as a function of developmental trajectories from adolescence to adulthood not only confirmed the invariant structure of components but also explicated the differentiation of weights in self-conceptions (Byrne, Shavelson, & Marsh, 1992; Cheng & Watkins, 2000). Further, family climates and personal psychosocial maturity could be identified as environmental and individual risk factors that provide basis to a psychosocial system approach of family treatment for depression (McCarty & Weisz, 2007; Restifo & Bogels, 2009). This is momentous considering the association of depression with miscellaneous negative outcomes such as suicide ideation in Hong Kong adolescent (Au et al., 2009; Lee, Wong, Chow, & McBride-Chang, 2006). In addition, the similar but slightly deviations of family impact on life satisfaction with self-esteem and depression are evidence for the high convergent validity between PWB and SWB as well as their essential distinction (Joseph & Wood, 2010; Ryan & Deci, 2001).
4.3. Limitations

The findings of this paper should be interpreted with caution due to the limitations on the design. First, the sample size of this study was relatively small. Detection of significant effects in regression analysis was greatly constrained by small sample size (MacKinnon, Warsi, & Dwyer, 1995). Some scholars even argued that sample size should be estimated before data collection to ensure adequate power (Frazier, Barron & Tix, 2004). Second, the current study recruited convenience samples composed mainly of young adults who born in nuclear family and still living with parents. Thus, the results may not generalize to people growing up in stepfamily, single-parent family and divorced family that raised by different caregivers. It is normal in Hong Kong that adults not live with their parents anymore. In 2009, people aged 18 and over had around 75% moved out from home and around 33% lost their parents (Census and Statistics Department, 2010). Third, this study solely adopted a cross-sectional design to examine mediation and moderation effects. To validate cause and effect, true experiment, or, in this case, longitudinal study with advanced statistical analysis such as SEM, is recommended to be used instead (Preacher & Hayes, 2008; Rosopa & Stone-Romero, 2008). Validity of moderating effect is also questionable that one study found buffering effect of family environment on negative events and stress in cross-sectional analyzes but not in later longitudinal analyzes (Burt et al., 1988). Forth, measures in this study were all based on self-report methods. One possible outcome of this approach is that the
significant relations reported are merely the results of common method variance (Doty & Glick, 1998). Multiple indicators from different domains such as reports of FES from parents and siblings, and observation utilizing behavioral checklist could serve as ideal substitutes (Shek, 1997). In fact, investigations relied on self-report data to assess family system have been greatly criticized (Sabatelli & Bartle, 1995). Fifth, the obtaining of ascending egos and descending egos were based on factor analysis of scale scores of eight Erikson’s ego strengths. Although this procedure is built on theoretical consideration, but a more statistically appropriate way should be conducting factor analysis of all items of PIES (Costello & Osboren, 2005; DiStefano, Zhu, & Mindrila, 2009). Last, due to the cultural differences, these findings originated from Chinese society may not apply equally into Western culture. One major difference of condition between Western countries and Hong Kong is that students here may not necessarily leave home to get into university. More importantly, it is reasonable to believe that the values emphasizing on harmony and interpersonal relatedness constitute a much significant impact of family on Chinese young adult than their Western counterparts (Ho, 1986; Yang, 1981).

4.4. Future Studies

Further evidence was needed to establish the unheeded but complex linkages between family environment and adult. Based on the findings of this study, more
factors could be identified as moderated mediators or mediated moderators in the linkages. Family impact on other psychological outcomes such as delinquent behaviour is recommended to be assessed since it has consistent relations with all variables included in this study (Conger & Conger, 1994; Erikson & Roberts, 1971; McLeod, Kruttschnitt, & Dornfeld, 1994; Lau & Leung, 1992). Complete employment of FES could reveal more influences of family climates as well as their relative sizes of effects. Typology of family environments based on FES scores can be adopted as reference to classify and compare subjects (Billings & Moos, 1982; Reichertz & Frankel, 1990). Renewed and validated reliable FES in Chinese culture must be designed with clinically significant t-scores established for these applications. Also, future studies could be replicated with sample varied in bigger size, older age group and different cultures.

4.5. Conclusions

In closing, the findings are, to some extent, agreeable to Moos’s (1974) asserted framework that family climates, personal characteristics and well-beings of family members are mutually influencing each other, and to Erikson’s (1985) epigenetic principle that various forms of ego coexist with different degrees of salience at a given point of life. The highlight of complementary effects between family environment and psychosocial maturity of adult is illuminating that restated why needs of relatedness
and autonomy should both be promoted for optimal functioning (Kandel & Lesser, 1972). The essence to balance independence and emotional connection with family refers back to an old notion from psychoanalytic approach questioning the achievement of “deeper autonomy of individualism” in human being (Douvan & Adelson, 1966).
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你好！本人是香港城市大學應用社會科學系的心理學學生，現正進行一項有關家庭對青年影響的研究。旨在探討家庭環境、自我強度及心理健康的互相關係，從而了解青年人的發展。

本研究的對象為18-23歲的青年，採用問卷調查的方式。問卷填寫只屬自願性質，拒絕作答及中途退出將不會對閣下對成任何的損失。

此研究所得資料會絕對保密，並只作學術研究用途。問卷數據將會一併統計分析，並不會識別任何個別參與者。

如對此項研究有任何疑問，歡迎電郵黃先生(Wilson)___@student.cityu. edu.hk 查詢。謝謝！

聲明：本人已經閱讀及明白上述關於研究的目的和細則的資料，並願意參與此項研究。

簽名：______________________  日期：______________________
第一部份：以下是非題用以理解你對自身家庭的看法。請根據你所長大、與你共同食宿的家庭，判斷句子是否符合實際情況。如果難以判斷，您應該按多數家庭成員的表現或者經常出現的情況作答，再無法確定就按自己的估計回答。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>句子</th>
<th>是</th>
<th>否</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 我們家庭成員都總是互相給予最大的幫助和支持。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 在家裡我們感到很無聊。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 家庭成員願意花很大的精力做家裡的事。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 在我們家裡有一種和諧一致的氣氛。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 家裡有事時很少有人自願去做。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 家庭成員都總是衷心地互相支持。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 我們家的集體精神很少。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 家庭成員彼此之間都一直合得來。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 家庭的每個成員都一直得到充分的關心。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 家庭成員總是把自己的感情藏在心裡，不向其他家庭成員透露。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 在家裡我們想說什麼就可以說什麼。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 在家中訴苦很容易使家人厭煩。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 家中每一個人都可以訴說自己的困難和煩惱。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 家庭成員經常公開地表達相互之間的感情。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 如果在家裡說出對家事的不滿，會有人覺得不舒服。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 我們家裡可以公開地討論家裡的經濟問題。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 家庭成員之間講話時都很注意避免傷害對方的感情。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 我們家經常自發地討論家人很敏感的問題。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 家中經常吵架。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 家庭成員彼此之間很少公開發怒。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 有時家庭成員發怒時摔東西。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 家庭成員之間極少發脾氣。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 家庭成員之間常互相責備和批評。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. 家庭成員有時互相打架。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. 家庭成員的意見產生分歧時，我們都一直迴避它，以保持和氣。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. 家庭成員常彼此想勝過對方。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. 家人有矛盾時，有時會大聲爭吵。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. 在家中我們很少自己獨自活動。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. 我們都非常鼓勵家裏人具有獨立精神。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. 家庭成員都獨立思考問題。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. 我們家的每個成員的出入是完全自由的。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. 家庭成員做事時很少考慮家裡其他人的意見。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. 家庭成員都依賴家人的幫助去解決他們遇到的困難。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. 家庭成員希望家裏人獨立解決問題。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. 如果家庭成員經常獨自活動，會傷害家裡其他人的感情。</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. 在我們家確實鼓勵成員都自由活動。
37. 大多數週末和晚上家庭成員都是在家中度過，而不外出參加社交和娛樂活動。
38. 家庭成員常外出到朋友家去玩並在一起吃飯。
39. 家中沒人參加各種體育活動。
40. 我們常看電影或體育比賽、外出郊遊等。
41. 我們家每個人都對一些娛樂活動特別感興趣。
42. 家庭成員除工作學習外，不常進行娛樂活動。
43. 家庭成員有時按個人愛好或興趣參加娛樂性學習。
44. 家庭成員常在業餘時間參加家庭以外的社交活動。
45. 我們娛樂活動的方式是看電視、聽廣播而不是外出活動。
46. 我們都認為不管有多大困難，子女應該首先滿足老人的各種需求。
47. 家庭成員都認為做事應順應社會風氣。
48. 家庭成員在生活上經常幫助周圍的老年人和殘疾人。
49. 我們認為行賄受賄是一種可以接受的現象。
50. 我們認為無論怎麼樣，晚輩都應該接受長輩的勸導。
51. 家庭成員都自願維護公共環境衛生。
52. 家庭成員都認為要死守道德教條去辦事。
53. 我們認為無論怎麼樣，離婚是不道德的。
54. 我們認為提高家裡的生活水平比嚴守道德標準還要重要。

第二部份：請以數字表達你對句子的看法，以選出最合適你的描述。1表示完全不能代表我，而5表示很能代表我。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>句子</th>
<th>完全不能代表我</th>
<th>很能代表我</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 不管事情有多壞，我有信心它們會變好。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 當我感到非常沮喪時，我不相信事情會變好。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 當事情不如我所願時，我會提醒自己生命中那些正面的事情。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 當事情無法如我所願般解決時，會讓我想要逃避所有事情。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 在很多方面，我的未來都在我掌控之下。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 我覺得我無法掌控我的生活。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 對於不是自己最大興趣的事，我通常能夠抵抗不去做。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>编号</td>
<td>句子</td>
<td>选项</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>我发现自己很容易便分心，就算我真的需要去完成那样的工作。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>当我想到我的未来，我清楚看到自己的人生方向。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>我真的不知道自己想要什么生活。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>虽然有时候我会害怕失败，但对於我想做的事情还是会尝试去做。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>恐惧令我未能去勤奋自己多的那个目标。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>我有优点能确保自己有效处理某些情况。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>我真的不知道我有什么优点或技能可以去贡献社会。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>我参与很多不同活动让我可以使用不同的技能及能力。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>即使我有机会去做可能擅长的事情，通常我都未能开始。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>我不会假装自己为另一个人。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>我并不真的确定自己的信念是什麼。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>当我承诺自己去做某事，我都会坚持去做。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>我对于在生命中接受一个特定的目的或角色感到困难。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>我曾爱上除家人以外的人。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>我不认为我真的爱上过家上以外的人。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>我和朋友相信我们可以有意见分歧，而仍然是朋友。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>当我与某人处于亲密关系时，我倾向忽略自己的兴趣及目标。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>当我知道某人处于困难时间，我真的会为他感到忧虑。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>除了最要好的朋友及家人，我不会关心其他人的需要。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>当我看到他人有需要，我会尽我所能去帮助。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>我没有时间去管他人的问题。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>我觉得自己一直以来处理生活的方式不错。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>当我反省过往，我感到悲伤和内疚。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>我不害怕未来将有什么来临。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>我害怕将来可能发生的事。</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>句子</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 大致來說，我的生活很符合我的理想。</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 我對我生活的現況真是滿意極了。</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 我對我生活完全滿意。</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 我已得到我所想要的，生命中的重要東西。</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 假如我可以重新來過，再活一次，我也不會做任何修改。</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 我覺得我有些優點</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 我信任自己</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 我有充足的自信心</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 很多時候我覺得自己無用</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 我覺得我是個失敗者</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 我沒有甚麼值得自豪</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 很多時候我懷疑自己的才幹</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 總括來說我對自己頗滿意</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 我很容易與人熟絡</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 我有很多朋友</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 我很容易與人溝通</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 我的朋友喜歡和我交談</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 我與其他人合得來</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 我缺少受人歡迎的性格</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 我難於表達自己</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 我不擅於與人溝通</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 很多朋友喜歡與我來往</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 我頗受同學的歡迎</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. 我樂於助人</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. 我樂於為人服務</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. 我心地善良</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. 別人不信任我</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. 我富責任感</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. 誠實是我的優點</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. 我懂得為別人著想</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. 我以真誠待人</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. 我的父母經常無緣無故責備我</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33. 我聽從父母的話
34. 我尊敬我的父母
35. 我喜歡和家人在一起
36. 我孝順父母
37. 我的家人不尊重我
38. 我在我父母眼中，我是個好孩子
39. 我在家中我沒有地位

第四部份：以下將問及你的生活感覺。請根據過去一週的情形，以選出最合適你的描述。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>過去一週出現的天數</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1天以下 (極少)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 原來不介意的事，最近竟然會困擾我</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 我的胃口不好，不想吃東西</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 即使有親友幫忙，我還是無法拋開煩惱</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 我覺得我和別人一樣好</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 我做事時無法集中精神</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 我覺得悶悶不樂</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 我做任何事都覺得費力</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 我對未來充滿希望</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 我認為我的人生是失敗的</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 我覺得恐懼</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 我睡得不安寧</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 我是快樂的</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 我比平日不愛講話</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 我覺得寂寞</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 人們是不友善的</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 我享受生活的樂趣</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 我曾經痛哭</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 我覺得悲傷</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 我覺得別人不喜歡我</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 我缺乏幹勁</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
第五部份：請填寫以下個人背景資料，以選出最合適答案，可選擇多項。
1. 性別：□男 □女
2. 年齡：____歲
3. 學歷：□小學 □中學 □副學士/專上 □大學 □大學以上 □未曾接受正規教育
4. 就職狀況：□學生 □在職 □自僱 □無業 □其他：__________
5. 撫養者身份：□親生父母 □其一是後父 □其一是後母 □外/祖父 □外/祖母 □其他親戚 □其他情況：__________
6. 家中成員數目：撫養者____個，兄弟姐妹____個
7. 居住情況：□仍與撫養者同住 □獨居，時間______年
□與□配偶□兄弟姐妹□親戚□朋友同住，時間______年
□住於與他人合租單位，時間______年 □住於學生宿舍，時間______年 □其他情況：__________

問卷完，多謝閣下的寶貴時間！
Appendix B

Scoring Keys

Cohesion: Part I - 1, 2*, 3, 4, 5*, 6, 7*, 8, 9
Expressiveness: Part I – 10*, 11, 12*, 13, 14, 15*, 16, 17*, 18
Conflict: Part I - 19, 20*, 21, 22*, 23, 24, 25*, 26, 27,
Active-recreational orientation: Part I – 37*, 38, 39*, 40, 41, 42*, 43, 44, 45*
Moral-religious emphasis: Part I – 46, 47*, 48, 49*, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54*
Hope: Part II – 1, 2*, 3, 4*
Will: Part II – 5, 6*, 7, 8*
Purpose: Part II – 9, 10*, 11, 12*
Competence: Part II – 13, 14*, 15, 16*
Fidelity: Part II – 17, 18*, 19, 20*
Love: Part II – 21, 22*, 23*, 24
Care: Part II – 25, 26*, 27*, 28
Wisdom: Part II – 29, 30*, 31, 32
Life Satisfaction: Part III – 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
General self: Part III – 6, 7, 8, 9*, 10*, 11*, 12*, 13
Social self: Part III – 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19*, 20*, 21*, 22, 23
Family self: Part III – 24, 25, 26, 27*, 28, 29, 30, 31
Moral self: Part III – 32*, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37*, 38, 39*
Depression: Part IV – 1, 2, 3, 4*, 5, 6, 7, 8*, 9, 10, 11, 12*, 13, 14, 15, 16*, 17, 18, 19, 20

Note. *= reverse coded