

彰化師大輔導學報
民90年，22期，231-258頁

Measuring Early Family Experiences: The Validity and Reliability of the Chinese Family-of-Origin Scale (FOS)

Ching-jan Chang
Shih Hsin University

Yu-wei Chu
Chung Kuo Institute of Technology

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to develop an appropriate Chinese instrument for measuring early family experiences. By using a 5-step back translation procedure, the Family-of-Origin Scale (FOS) was translated into Chinese and the validity and reliability of the Chinese FOS were tested as well. Factor analyses showed that 95% of the original FOS items were grouped into the same categories as the Chinese version with Taiwan subjects. The estimate of internal consistency of the Chinese FOS by Cronbach's alpha was .9336. A split-half reliability of .9168 was obtained from the scores of the 233 research participants. It was concluded that the Chinese version of the FOS has potential value in applied research.

Key Words: back translation; family; family-of-origin; scale.

Basic Concepts of Family-of-Origin

The family-of-origin is the family in which a person has his or her beginnings physiologically, psychologically, and emotionally. The impact of these primary roots is deep and continues to play an important role in the present (Bowen, 1978; Canfield, Hovestadt, & Fenell, 1992; Hovestadt, Anderson, Pierce, Cochran, & Fine, 1985). In counseling related fields, there are more and more studies which explore the counselor's family-of-origin experience and its influences as a factor of professional growth.

Being a newer branch of psychoanalytic theory, object-relations theory (Mahler, 1968; St. Clair, 1996) stressed that once self/other patterns are established, it is assumed that they influence later interpersonal relationships. This influence occurs through a process of searching for a type of experience that comes closest to the patterning established by the early experiences. This theory provides insight into how a group member's and leader's early family experiences can cause difficulties either in staying in a group or in living in the actual world of people and relationships.

In studying personal behaviors in a family setting, Hovestadt and his colleagues (1985) developed the Family-of-Origin Scale (FOS) which was created from psychodynamic models of family functioning and provides a measure of global functioning. The FOS is described as measuring the degree to which family environments are supportive while promoting individual autonomy and intimacy. The autonomy dimension is comprised of the following five subscales: clarity of expression, responsibility, respect for others, openness to others, and acceptance of separation and loss. The intimacy dimension consists of the following subscales: range of feeling, mood and tone, conflict resolution, empathy, and trust.

Parents' behaviors are multiply determined and, if carefully studied over time, would be seen as relatively constant. O'Leary, Searight, Reuterman, and Russo (1996) examined 71 undergraduates' perceived family-of-origin health and current psychological adjustment and

indicated that the FOS scores were strongly related to current anxiety, hostility, and depression.

Early family experiences can be used as tools in supervision for training counselors. In particular, the experience of one's own family-of-origin can be used as an educational tool to facilitate counselors in training who are struggling with families or family members with whom they feel stuck or frustrated. Family-of-origin issues are often reawakened by the intensity of counselor training programs (Baldo & Softas-Nall, 1998).

The literature provided numerous accounts of how family-of-origin experience influences the counseling profession in a wide variety of areas (e.g., Buelow, Bass, & Ackerman, 1994; Guy, 1987; Johnson, Campbell, & Masters, 1992; Weinberg & Mauksch, 1991). The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 1990) especially requires marriage and family counseling educators to assist trainees in gaining family-of-origin knowledge, and related influencing factors, that can create personal blocks in professional growth.

Family Experience and Counseling Profession

Family-of-Origin and Current Family Relationship

A significantly positive relationship between family-of-origin experiences and parenthood, marital adjustment, and current family relationship has been shown by Wilcoxon and his colleagues' studies (Lane, Wilcoxon, & Cecil, 1988; Wilcoxon & Hovestadt, 1983; 1985). Either for understanding clients' issues or counselors' own backgrounds, these studies provide important information (i.e., Canfield et al., 1992; Lawson & Sivo, 1998).

Based on the emphasis of family experience, Lawson and Sivo (1998) examined the relationship among trainees' conjugal family experience, current intergenerational family relationships, and the client's perception of the therapeutic alliance. The results indicated a moderately significant relationship between conjugal family experience and trainees' reported

intergenerational intimacy with parents. Clients whose counselors had conjugal family experience reported a slightly more favorable therapeutic alliance than clients whose counselors did not have conjugal family experience. Additionally, trainees with conjugal family experience reported more current intimacy and individualization than nonconjugal trainees and felt less intimidated by their parents.

Canfield et al. (1992) asked 171 subjects (aged 24-58 years) to complete the Family-of-Origin Scale, the Healthy Family Functioning Scale, and a personal information form to investigate the relationships between family-of-origin and current family functioning. The results indicated that the perceived level of health in the family-of-origin, current family size, and socioeconomic status (SES) were predictive of perceived level of current family functioning. These findings suggested that a higher level of perceived family-of-origin experiences tended to accompany a higher level of perceived health in the current family.

Family-of-Origin and Counseling Career

Weinberg and Mauksch (1991) used a method that can assist people in identifying and examining the ways in which family-of-origin dynamics affect their lives at work involving three basic steps by asking participants (a) to describe an upsetting work-related situation, (b) to analyze their family-of-origin, and (c) to relate the work situation to their family structure and dynamics. They contended that patterns of interaction to which people become accustomed in their family-of-origin often play unacknowledged roles in their lives at work and can contribute to unwanted pressures and stress on the job.

Several studies suggested that the family-of-origin and early experiences may motivate individuals to pursue a career in psychotherapy (Guy, 1987). These factors focus on "the early emotional experiences of the future therapist, the characteristics of their parents and their marital relationship, intrafamily relationships, and the pattern of interactions between the future psychotherapist and other family members" (p.18).

Johnson et al. (1992) investigated the relationship between theoretical orientation and self-

早年家庭經驗的測量：中文版「原生家庭量表」的介紹及信效度考驗

perception of their own family-of-origin functioning. One hundred and twenty-seven psychologists completed the Theoretical Orientation Survey and the Family-of-Origin Scale. Stepwise multiple regression analyses revealed that perceptions of one's family-of-origin environment have a significant relation to their theoretical orientation. The most influential family-of-origin characteristics identified were range of feelings expressed, prominence of empathy, and openness to others.

Fussell and Bonney (1990) compared childhood experiences of 42 psychotherapists to investigate the influences of these experiences on the choice of psychotherapy as a career. The subjects completed the Family-of-Origin Scale, the Semantic Differential Scale, and Childhood and Biographical questionnaires. They reported a comparatively high incidence of childhood trauma and emotional deprivation. These results suggested that subjects were aware of the potential negative impact on their present lives. This pain enhanced their continuing interest in people.

Similarly, Buelow et al. (1994) compared the level of family-of-origin dysfunctioning of 73 counseling and 66 noncounseling master's degree students. The subjects were administered the Graduate Adjustment questionnaire, the Family Function Inventory (FFI), the Role Relationship Inventory (RRI), and a demographic questionnaire. These students also rated the degree of warmth and supportiveness in relationship between their parents. The results indicated that counseling graduate students had families with significantly higher dysfunction indicators than did noncounseling graduate students on most FFI and RRI subscales.

Wilcoxon, Walker, and Hovestadt (1989) investigated the relationship between family-of-origin experiences and counselor effectiveness of novice counselors. The subjects were 50 graduate students who had no prior course work or counselor experience. The students completed the Gross Ratings of Facilitative Interpersonal Functioning Scale and the Family-of-Origin Scale. The authors found that the lower degree of autonomy and intimacy in family-of-origin experiences of subjects, the higher their baseline skills in interpersonal facilitation before training. Overcoming negative family experiences may positively affect facilitation skills of

counselors in training.

Family-of-Origin and Counselor Training

In order to increase trainees' self-awareness of their family-of-origin experiences, Corsa (1991) recommended family sculpting and creation of a perceptual map of family-of-origin for training marriage and family counselors in a group setting. The sculpture consists of four roles (sculptor, facilitator, actor, and audience). Four steps are monitored by the facilitator: setting the scene, choosing the role-players, creating the sculpture, and processing the sculpture.

Using a genogram is one of the popular ways to learn about family-of-origin (Goldenberg & Goldenberg, 1996). The genogram includes all family members dating back to at least the grandparents. McGoldrick and Gerson (1985) suggested a format for creating a genogram that involves three steps: (a) mapping the family structure, (b) recording family information (e.g. demographic information such as ages, dates of birth and death, locations, occupations, and educational levels; functional information such as the medical, emotional, and behavioral functioning of different family members; and critical family events such as important transitions, relationship shifts, migrations, losses, and successes), and (c) delineating family relationships.

Baldo and Softas-Nall (1998) adapted family sculpting as a supervision intervention with family therapists in training who are struggling with families or family members with whom they feel stuck or frustrated as a result of countertransference. The use of sculpting provides a new supervision method that offers powerful training insight for family therapist trainees, which facilitate therapeutic progress with the client families.

McDaniel and Landau-Stanton (1991) proposed a Family Therapy Training Program (FTTP) at the University of Rochester. This program offers a model of training that integrates the counselor trainee's own family-of-origin work with live supervision and skills training. They designed a family-of-origin curriculum for this purpose. The authors concluded that more dialogue among trainers who focus exclusively on transgenerational issues may help leaders to improve the training of new counselors.

早年家庭經驗的測量：中文版「原生家庭量表」的介紹及信效度考驗

Kelly (1990) described a graduate counseling practicum that focuses on the Counselor's-in-training cultural family-of-origin as a strategy to increase sensitivity for understanding clients. The course meets for 16 weekly 3-hour sessions. The class requirements for the students include the following: read the current literature and relate it to their families-of-origin and to their clients; study in depth their family-of-origin and present the results of their study; rate the cultural value orientations for their and their clients' family-of-origin. The results showed that a focus on students' own cultural family-of-origin can help them to internalize their knowledge and necessary skills for working with their clients.

In a series of research studies, Lawson and his colleagues used family related variables as tools for training counselors to improve awareness of how family issues impact their counseling work. For example, they use autobiography (Lawson & Gaushell, 1988), intergenerational family characteristics (Lawson & Gaushell, 1991), and current intergenerational family relationships (Lawson, Gaushell, & Karst, 1996; Lawson, Gaushell, McCune, & McCune, 1995) to enhance counselors' personal professional development.

Keller and Protinsky (1984) reported a self-management model of supervision which was developed at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The major proposition of the model is that as the supervisees come to understand how family-of-origin and family constellation patterns learned in the past are re-enacted within the therapeutic context, they can then interrupt those patterns of interaction that tend to inhibit their therapeutic effectiveness.

Family-of-Origin in Group Work

According to the psychoanalytic approach, the problems of adult living have their origin in early development. One must become aware of how certain early experiences have contributed to one's present personality (Corey, 1995). Thus, it is essential that the group leader and members understand and use historical data in their group work.

However, according to Wolf and Kutash (1986) and Yalom (1995), the repetition of past events can uselessly waste time and can inhibit progress. They suggested that talking about

events in one's childhood is not as useful as dealing with the past in relation to here-and-now interactions within the group.

The English Version of the Family-of-Origin Scale (FOS)

Through the study of personal behaviors in a family setting, Hovestadt et al. (1985) developed the Family-of-Origin Scale (FOS). This scale was created from psychodynamic models of family functioning and provides a measure of global functioning.

The instrument measures levels of perceived emotional health within the family of origin. Autonomy and intimacy are considered essential concepts for healthy families. Autonomy is defined in the scale as: (a) clarity of expression (clear thoughts and feelings), (b) responsibility (family members claim responsibility for their own actions), (c) respect for others (family members have permission to speak for themselves), (d) openness to others (family members are receptive to one another), and (e) acceptance of separation and loss (separation and loss are dealt with openly in the family). Intimacy is defined in the scales as: (a) range of feeling (family members express a wide range of feelings), (b) mood and tone (warm and positive atmosphere exists in the family), (c) conflict resolution (normal conflicts are resolved without undue stress), (d) empathy (family members are sensitive to one another), and (e) trust (family sees human nature as basically good).

Using a 5-point Likert format, the FOS is a 40-item, self-report instrument with a range of possible scores from 40-200. Norms for the FOS were established using 278 undergraduate and graduate students (Hovestadt et al., 1985). Scores in the top one-third (healthy family functioning) of the participants ranged between 160 and 198, the middle one-third (moderate family functioning) scores considered to be between 135 and 159, and the bottom one-third (dysfunctional family functioning) scored from 63 and 134. An additional study of the FOS validity was conducted by Lee, Gordon, and O'Dell (1989). Results provided a mean score of 149.36 for the control group, a mean of 114.55 for a group seeking psychotherapy, and a mean

of 117.97 for a group of former patients.

The test-retest reliability coefficient of .97 was obtained over a two-week period. The median test-retest coefficient for the 20 items of The Autonomy Scale is .77; the median test-retest coefficient for the 20 items of The Intimacy Scale is .73. In an independent study of 116 undergraduate students, a Cronbach's alpha of .75 was obtained (Hovestadt et al., 1985).

The FOS has been found to be empirical valid (Hovestadt et al., 1985). The FOS seems to effectively distinguish alcohol-distressed and non-alcohol-distressed marriages, perceived health and unhealth in the subjects' current families, and marital status (divorce or intact) of subjects' parents (Hovestadt et al., 1985). Mazer, Mangrum, Hovestadt, and Brashear (1990) examined whether the factor structure of the Family-of-Origin Scale is congruent with that proposed by the test authors. Two factor analyses based on responses from a total of 782 college students to the FOS reported similar factor structures. The researchers suggested that the FOS has potential value in applied research.

Method

This study was conducted to develop an appropriate Chinese instrument for measuring early family experiences. This section provides a description of the research process including the participants used in the study, translation of the English Family-of Origin Scale (FOS), and establishing validity and reliability of the translated version.

Participants

Student enrolled in the the National Chang-Hua University of Education and Shih Hsin University in Taiwan comprised the sample for this study. Research packets were sent to 309 participants and returned by 233 participants. The return rate of this survey study was 75%.

All subjects were volunteers who agreed to participate in this research. No incentive was offered for participation and there were no penalties for not participating. Confidentiality was ensured by having all subjects complete the questionnaire anonymously.

Establishing Validity of the Translated Version

According to Gay (1992), the "most simplistic definition of validity is that it is the degree to which a test measures what it is supposed to measure" (p. 155). As mentioned in the above sections, the original construct and face validity (Anastasi, 1996) of the original questionnaire are in good standing. To ensure the Chinese versions had the same quality, a panel of seven Taiwanese who have doctoral level, psychology or education major backgrounds in the United States assisted the researcher to do "back translation" work. This way we can increase the probability that the Chinese version was as equivalent to the English version as possible.

Specifically, there were five steps for doing the "back translation" work in this study. First, the researcher translated the questionnaire into Chinese, then gave five bilingual students both the English and Chinese versions, and then asked for their recommendations. Second, the researcher revised the Chinese version based on the recommendations. Third, after the revision the researcher translated the questionnaire back to English. Fourth, the researcher and another Taiwanese student worked together to translate from English to Chinese. Finally, to validate the Chinese version, a Taiwanese professor of the University of Northern Colorado was asked to determine the accuracy of the Chinese version questionnaire. For determining the construct validity, the author has used the factor analysis method to examine the congruence of the factor structure between each original questionnaire and its translated version (Anastasi, 1996).

Establishing Reliability of the Translated Version

Cronbach's coefficient alpha was used to determine the reliability of the above questionnaire because it is a formula that can be used for test items that are ordinal data. Since each answer was given a different weight, as in this study, Cronbach's coefficient alpha was the appropriate method for computing reliability (Anastasi, 1996).

The internal consistency reliability of the questionnaires was obtained via the Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient to estimate the degree of association between two half parts of a scale. Thus, this study assessed the split-half reliability (Anastasi, 1996) of each scale.

Results

Factor analysis is founded on the premise that covariation among a set of variables can be interpreted by a set of factors which are fewer in number than the observed number of variables (Kim & Mueller, 1978). Factor analysis is one of the quantitative methods used to examine the construct validity of a questionnaire (Anastasi, 1996). This section describes the steps used to extract the factor complexity of the FOS. Then the internal consistency reliability and coefficient alpha (α) of each item are presented.

In the factor analyses, the following methods were used. The factors were extracted with principle component factor analysis with iterated squared multiple regression as communalities. The number of factors extracted was determined by the largest four eigenvalues in order to confirm the original scales and offer the most meaningful interpretation. Rotation was done with a varimax rotation.

Validity of the Chinese FOS

Principle Component factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted to extract the factors from the participants' data for the FOS. The same procedures utilized to identify the early family experience factors from the FOS were adopted. Because there were two main factors and five subfactors in each main factor in the original English version, as the first step to the factor analysis, items were forced into a two-factor analysis. The results indicated eigenvalues of 13.86 and 2.30, which showed that both factors are important to consider. Through a principal component analysis, it was found that for factor I (Autonomy), 15 out of 20 (75%) items were the same with the English version and 9 out of 20 (45%) items were confirmed on factor II (Intimacy) of the original FOS. In total, 60% (24 out of 40) of the original items were confirmed. This study also tested the factor structure of the Chinese FOS by using the largest ten eigenvalues in order to confirm the original factors. In this trial, 62.5% of the original items were grouped in the same categories as the Chinese version. However, it was less than acceptable for research purposes (Anastasi, 1996). The next step was to force the

factors into four.

The 4-factor analysis was done on 233 participants. Their responses on 40 items were included in the factor analyses. Of the 40 items, 20 have been categorized according to their loadings on factor I, 12 on factor II, 5 on factor III, and 3 on factor IV. The factor loadings for the items of each retained factor from the Chinese FOS along with the original FOS are shown in Table 1 to Table 6. In order to compare the similarities and differences between the Chinese FOS and the original FOS, items related to the same subscale were clustered in descending order of loading magnitude. Each of the 40 items had loading more than +0.271 on one of the four factors.

For this research purpose, factor I of the Chinese FOS was composed of factor I-1 (clarity of expression), I-3 (respect for others), I-4 (openness to others), II-1 (range of feelings), and II-4 (empathy) of the original scale; factor II was composed of factor I-2 (responsibility), II-2 (mood and tone), and II-3 (conflict resolution); factor III was composed of factor I-5 (acceptance of separation and loss); and factor IV was composed of factor II-5 (trust) in this study. As can be seen in Tables 1 to 6, 100% of factor I-1, I-3, I-4, and II-4, and 75% of II-1 of the English FOS were contained in factor I in this study; 100% of I-2, II-2, and II-3 were in factor II; 100% of I-5 was in factor III; and 100% of II-5 was in factor IV. Totally, 95% (38 out of 40) of the original items were grouped in the same categories as the translated FOS. Again, according to Anastasi (1996), a validity coefficient of .70 may be considered a satisfactory level. The construct validity of the Chinese FOS was found to be relatively high.

早年家庭經驗的測量：中文版「原生家庭量表」的介紹及信效度考驗

Table 1

Factor Loading of Chinese FOS Items on Intimacy

Factor (Factor I) and Original Categories

Item Num	Factor Loading	Original Category
19	0.812	Respect for others (I-3)
34	0.732	Clarity of expression (I-1)
15	0.664	Respect for others (I-3)
28	0.647	Respect for others (I-3)
39	0.638	Range of feeling (II-1)
37	0.631	Openness to others (I-4)
17	0.587	Empathy (II-4)
3	0.306	Trust (II-5)
1	0.546	Range of feeling (II-1)
14	0.526	Openness to others (I-4)
4	0.518	Respect for others (I-3)
32	0.489	Range of feeling (II-1)
6	0.481	Openness to others (I-4)
16	0.445	Clarity of expression (I-1)
30	0.400	Empathy (II-4)
21	0.386	Empathy (II-4)
9	0.383	Openness to others (I-4)
35	0.343	Clarity of expression (I-1)
23	0.333	
24	0.296	

Table 2

Factor Loading of Chinese FOS Items on Harmony

Factor (Factor II) and Original Categories

Item Num	Factor Loading	Original Category
2	0.757	Mood and tone (II-2)
22	0.670	Mood and tone (II-2)
7	0.648	Conflict resolution (II-3)
5	0.572	Responsibility (I-2)
38	0.543	Responsibility (I-2)
29	0.517	Mood and tone (II-2)
18	0.489	Responsibility (I-2)
40	0.469	Mood and tone (II-2)
31	0.445	Conflict resolution (II-3)
13	0.421	Conflict resolution (II-3)
27	0.369	Conflict resolution (II-3)
11	0.347	Responsibility (I-2)

Table 3

Factor Loading of Chinese FOS Items on Acceptance of Loss Factor (Factor III) and Original Categories

Item Num	Factor Loading	Original Category
10	0.783	Acceptance of separation and loss (I-5)
36	0.759	Acceptance of separation and loss (I-5)
25	0.648	Acceptance of separation and loss (I-5)
20	0.644	Acceptance of separation and loss (I-5)
12	0.271	Range of feeling (II-1)

Table 4

Factor Loading of Chinese FOS Items on Trust Factor (Factor IV) and Original Categories

Item Num	Factor Loading	Original Category
26	0.726	Trust (II-5)
33	0.706	Trust (II-5)
8	0.534	Trust (II-5)

Table 5

FOS Item	Original Category
	Autonomy (I)
9.I found it difficult to understand what other family members said and how they felt.	Clarity of expression (I-1)
16.I often had to guess at what other family members thought or how they felt.	Clarity of expression (I-1)
24.I found it easy to understand what other family members said and how they felt.	Clarity of expression (I-1)
34.I found it easy in my family to express what I thought and how I felt.	Clarity of expression (I-1)
	Responsibility (I-2)
5.People in my family often made excuse for their mistakes.	Responsibility (I-2)
11.My parents openly admitted when they were wrong.	Responsibility (I-2)
18.My family members rarely expressed responsibility for their actions.	Responsibility (I-2)
38.In my family, people took responsibility for what they did.	Responsibility (I-2)
	Respect of others (I-3)
4.Differences of opinion in my family were discourage.	Respect of others (I-3)
15.My parents encouraged me to express my views openly.	Respect of others (I-3)
19.In my family, I felt free to express my own opinions.	Respect of others (I-3)
28.I found it difficult to express my own opinions in my family.	Respect of others (I-3)
	Openness to others (I-4)
6.My parents encouraged family members to listen to one another.	Openness to others (I-4)

早年家庭經驗的測量：中文版「原生家庭量表」的介紹及信效度考驗

Table 5 (continued)

FOS Item	Original Category
14. My family was receptive to the different ways various family members viewed life.	Openness to others (I-4)
23. The members of my family were not very receptive to one another's views.	Openness to others (I-4)
37. My parents discouraged us from expressing views different from theirs.	Openness to others (I-4)
10. We talked about our sadness when a relative or family friend died.	Acceptance of separation and loss (I-5)
20. We never talked about our grief when a relative or family friend died.	Acceptance of separation and loss (I-5)
25. If a family friend moved away, we never discussed our feelings of sadness.	Acceptance of separation and loss (I-5)
36. When someone important to us moved away, our family discussed our feelings of loss.	Acceptance of separation and loss (I-5)
1. In my family, it was normal to show both positive and negative feelings.	Intimacy (II)
12. In my family, I expressed just about any feeling I had.	Range of feelings (II-1)
32. In my family, certain feelings were not allowed to be expressed.	Range of feelings (II-1)
39. My family had an unwritten rule: Don't express your feelings.	Range of feelings (II-1)
2. The atmosphere in my family usually was unpleasant.	Range of feelings (II-1)
22. The atmosphere in my family was cold and negative.	Mood and Tone (II-2)
29. Mealtimes in my home usually were friendly	Mood and Tone (II-2)

Table 5 (continued)

FOS Item	Original Category
and pleasant.	Mood and Tone (II-2)
40.I remember my family as being warm and supportive.	Mood and Tone (II-2)
7.Conflicts in my family never got resolved.	Conflict resolution (II-3)
13.Resolving conflicts in my family was a very stressful experience.	Conflict resolution (II-3)
27.In my family, I felt that I could talk things out and settle conflicts.	Conflict resolution (II-3)
31.We usually were able to work out conflicts in my family.	Conflict resolution (II-3)
17.My attitudes and my feelings frequently were ignored or criticized in my family.	Empathy (II-4)
21.Sometimes in my family, I did not have to say anything, but I felt understood.	Empathy (II-4)
30.In my family, no one cared about the feelings of other family members.	Empathy (II-4)
35.My family members usually were sensitive to one another's feelings.	Empathy (II-4)
3.In my family, we encouraged one another to develop new friendships.	Trust (II-5)
8.My family taught me that people were basically good.	Trust (II-5)
26.In my family, I learned to be suspicious of others.	Trust (II-5)
33.My family believed that people usually took advantage of you.	Trust (II-5)

早年家庭經驗的測量：中文版「原生家庭量表」的介紹及信效度考驗

Table 6

Items Agreement Between Original and Chinese Factors of the FOS

Item Num	Original Category	Chinese Category	Agreement
19	I-3	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
34	I-1	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
15	I-3	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
28	I-3	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
39	II-1	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
37	I-4	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
17	II-4	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
3	II-5	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	X
1	II-1	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
14	I-4	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
4	I-3	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
32	II-1	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
6	I-4	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
16	I-1	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
30	II-4	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
21	II-4	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
9	I-1	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
35	II-4	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
23	I-4	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
24	I-1	I (I-1,I-3,I-4,II-1,II-4)	O
Factor II: Harmony			
2	II-2	II(I-2,II-2,II-3)	O
22	II-2	II(I-2,II-2,II-3)	O
7	II-3	II(I-2,II-2,II-3)	O
5	I-2	II(I-2,II-2,II-3)	O
38	I-2	II(I-2,II-2,II-3)	O
29	II-2	II(I-2,II-2,II-3)	O
18	I-2	II(I-2,II-2,II-3)	O
40	II-2	II(I-2,II-2,II-3)	O
31	II-3	II(I-2,II-2,II-3)	O
13	II-3	II(I-2,II-2,II-3)	O
27	II-3	II(I-2,II-2,II-3)	O
11	I-2	II(I-2,II-2,II-3)	O

Table 6 (continued)

Item Num	Original Category	Chinese Category	Agreement
Factor III: Acceptance of Loss			
10	I-5	III(I-5)	O
36	I-5	III(I-5)	O
25	I-5	III(I-5)	O
20	I-5	III(I-5)	O
12	II-1	III(I-5)	X
Factor IV: Trust			
26	II-5	IV (II-5)	O
33	II-5	IV (II-5)	O
8	II-5	IV (II-5)	O

Note. For research purposes, factor I of the Chinese FOS was composed of factor I-1 (clarity of expression), I-3 (respect for others), I-4 (openness to others), II-1 (range of feelings), and II-4 (empathy) of the original scale; factor II was composed of factor I-2 (responsibility), II-2 (mood and tone), and II-3 (conflict resolution); factor III was composed of factor I-5 (acceptance of separation and loss); and factor IV was composed of factor II-5 (trust) of the English FOS in this study.

O: Agreement; X: Disagreement

As shown in Table 1, 19 of 20 items concerning factor II (Intimacy) of the English FOS were clustered to compose factor I of the Chinese FOS. Therefore, "Intimacy" remained as the name of factor I because even the rest of the items (e.g., "My parents encouraged family members to listen to one another"; "In my family, I felt free to express my own opinions") can be viewed as intimacy related questions.

As shown in Table 2, 12 of 12 items were adopted from factor I-2 (responsibility), factor II-2 (mood and tone), and II-3 (conflict resolution) of the original FOS. Thus, this factor was named "Harmony".

Table 3 showed that 4 of the 5 items were originally from the "acceptance of separation and loss" factor. This factor was then labeled as "Acceptance of Loss".

In Table 4, all of the 3 items were included in "Trust" factor of the FOS. Hence, factor IV

早年家庭經驗的測量：中文版「原生家庭量表」的介紹及信效度考驗

was designated, ignoring one item (i.e., "In my family, I expressed just about any feeling I had"), as the "Trust" factor. Table 5 demonstrated the factor construct and individual construct items of the original FOS and Table 6 showed items agreement between English and Chinese factors of the FOS. The Chinese FOS was attached on the Appendix.

In summary, the four factors identified for the Chinese FOS, in the order of extraction, were:

- Factor I: Intimacy Factor (19 of 20 [95%] items in agreement with the assigned subscale)
- Factor II: Harmony Factor (12 of 12 [100%] items in agreement with the assigned subscale)
- Factor III: Acceptance of Loss Factor (4 of 5 [80%] items in agreement with the assigned subscale)
- Factor IV: Trust Factor (3 of 3 [100%] items in agreement with the assigned subscale)

Reliability of the Chinese FOS

The internal consistency reliability of the Chinese FOS was estimated by the degree of association between each item and the total scale. The estimates of internal consistency of the Chinese FOS by Cronbach's alphas were from .9336 to .9489 and the average alpha value of the total scale was .94. Furthermore, a split-half reliability of .9168 was obtained from the scores of the 233 research participants. In conclusion, the above scores indicate that the Chinese FOS contains acceptable internal consistency.

The confirmatory factor analysis indicated that in the Chinese FOS (95%), items were in agreement with the original U.S. made scale, which seems to indicate satisfactory validity, according to Anastasi's (1996) criterion at the level of .70. The coefficient alpha (α) and split-half correlation which were used to examine the internal consistency of the instrument showed relatively high level of reliability of the Chinese FOS. This instrument was translated into

Chinese following proper procedures and overall acceptable validity and reliability were found.

Conclusion

The mean score of the FOS of the subjects was 136.48. In comparison with norms in the United States of the FOS (Hovestadt et al., 1985), healthy family functioning ranged from 160 and 198, moderate functioning family ranged from 135 and 159, and dysfunctional family functioning ranged from 63 and 134. The Taiwanese subjects scored on the borderline between moderate and dysfunctional family functioning.

Cultural differences may explain the subjects' low FOS scores in this study. Taiwan is a place which retains an old and stable traditional Chinese culture. In the traditional Chinese culture, the parents held the authority, and set the standard of conduct for children within the family responsibility (Chao, 1994). There were many restrictions and taboos in the family. Children's needs and feelings were not directly acknowledged. In addition, individuality was not stressed in a family-oriented culture (Ho, 1986). Through the years, Taiwan society has eventually moved from the traditional Chinese culture toward the western culture. The recalled data from participants' childhood could still be highly influenced by the traditional Chinese culture.

The FOS is a self-report inventory. The data collected were subject to the weaknesses of a self-report inventory which largely depended on the degree of participant's honesty, recall, fatigue, and social desirability efforts. This study could not control for whether the intended respondent was actually the person who completed the questionnaire. This was a problem with all surveys and questionnaires not administered directly by the researcher.

The English FOS translated by the researcher and administered to the college students in this study was found to have relatively high validity and reliability. Accordingly, the FOS was developed to measure early family experiences. This instrument adequately translated in Chinese and with overall high validity and reliability is now available for future research in Taiwan.

References

- Anastasi, A. (1996). *Psychological testing* (7th ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Baldo, T. D., & Softas-Nall, B. C. (1998). Family sculpting in supervision of family therapy. *Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 6, 231-234.
- Bowen, M. L. (1978). *Family therapy in clinical practice*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Buelow, G., Bass, C., & Ackerman, C. (1994). Comparing family functioning of counselors in training with the family functioning of noncounselors. *Journal of Counselor Education and Supervision*, 33, 162-174.
- Canfield, B. S., Hovestadt, A. J., & Fenell, D. L. (1992). Family-of-origin influences upon perceptions of current-family functioning. *Family Therapy*, 19, 55-60.
- Chao, B. K. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style: Understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. *Child Development*, 65, 1111-1119.
- Corey, G. (1995). *Theory and practice of group counseling* (4th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Corsa, L. (1991). Family sculpting in the training of marriage and family counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 31, 121-131.
- Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (1990). *Environmental and specialty standards for marriage and family counseling/therapy*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Fussell, F. W., & Bonney, W. C. (1990). A comparative study of childhood experiences of psychotherapy and physicists: Implications for clinical practice. *Psychotherapy*, 27, 505-512.
- Gay, L. R. (1992). *Educational research: Competences for analysis application* (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Goldenberg, I., & Goldenberg, H. (1996). *Family therapy: An overview* (4th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Guy, J. D. (1987). *The personal life of psychotherapist*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ho, D. F. (1986). Chinese patterns of socialization: A critical review. In M. H. Bond (Ed.),

- The psychology of the Chinese people* (pp. 1-37). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hovestadt, A. J., Anderson, W. T., Pierce, F. P., Cochran, S. W., & Fine, M. (1985). A Family-of-Origin Scale. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 11, 287-297.
- Johnson, M. E., Campbell, J. L., & Masters, M. A. (1992). Relationship between family-of-origin dynamics and psychologist's theoretical orientation. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 23, 119-122.
- Keller, J. F., & Protinsky, H. (1984). A self-management model or supervision. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 10, 281-288.
- Kelly, G. D. (1990). The cultural family-of-origin: A description of a training strategy. *Journal of Counselor Education and Supervision*, 30, 77-84.
- Kim, J., & Mueller, C. W. (1978). *Introduction to factor analysis: What it is and how to do it*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lane, A. R., Wilcoxon, S. A., & Cecil, J. H. (1988). Family-of-origin experiences and the transition to parenthood: Considerations for marital and family therapist. *Family Therapy*, 15, 23-29.
- Lawson, D. M., & Gaushell, H. (1988). Family autobiography: A useful method for enhancing counselors' personal development. *Journal of Counselor Education and Supervision*, 28, 62-168.
- Lawson, D. M., & Gaushell, H. (1991). Intergenerational family characteristics of counselor trainees. *Journal of Counselor Education and Supervision*, 30, 309-321.
- Lawson, D. M., Gaushell, H., & Karst, R. W. (1996). Counselor trainee self-esteem, mastery, and current intergenerational family relationships. *Clinical Supervisor*, 14, 111-121.
- Lawson, D. M., Gaushell, H., McCune, S. L., & McCune, E. D. (1995). Perception of counselor behavior and current intergenerational family relationships. *Journal of Counselor Education and Supervision*, 34, 356-368.
- Lawson, D. M., & Sivo, S. (1998). Trainees' conjugal family experience, current intergenerational family relationships, and the therapeutic alliance. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 24, 225-231.
- Lee, R. E., Gordon, N. G., & O'Dell, J. W. (1989). The validity and use of the Family-of-Origin Scale. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 15, 19-27.

早年家庭經驗的測量：中文版「原生家庭量表」的介紹及信效度考驗

- Mahler, M. S. (1968). *On human symbiosis and the vicissitudes of individuation*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Mazer, G. E., Mangrum, U. L., Hovestadt, A. J., & Brashear, R. L. (1990). Further validation of the family-of-origin scale: A factor analysis. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 16, 423-426.
- McDaniel, S. H., & Landau-Stanton, J. (1991). Family-of-origin work and family therapy skills training: Both-and. *Family Process*, 30, 459-471.
- McGoldrick, M., & Gerson, R. (1985). *Genograms in family assessment*. New York: Norton.
- O'Leary, J. A., Searight, H. R., Reuterman, N. A., & Russo, J. R. (1996). Perceived family-of-origin health and current adjustment. *Psychological Reports*, 79, 1326.
- St. Clair, M. (1996). *Object relations and self psychology: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Weinberg, R. B., & Mauksch, L. B. (1991). Examining family-of-origin influences in life at work. *Journal of marital and Family Therapy*, 17, 233-242.
- Wilcoxon, S. A., & Hovestadt, A. J. (1983). Perceived health and similarity of family-of-origin experiences as predictors of dyadic adjustment for married couples. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 9, 431-434.
- Wilcoxon, S. A., & Hovestadt, A. J. (1985). Perceived similarity of family-of-origin experiences and dyadic adjustment: A comparison across years of marriage. *Family Therapy*, 12, 165-174.
- Wilcoxon, S. A., Walker, M. R., & Hovestadt, A. J. (1989). Counselor effectiveness and family-of-origin experiences: A significant relationship? *Counseling Values*, 33, 225-229.
- Wolf, A., & Kutash, I. L. (1986). Psychoanalysis in groups. In I. L. Kutash & A. Wolf (Eds.), *Psychotherapist's casebook* (pp. 332-352). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Yalom, I. D. (1995). *The theory and practice of group psychotherapy* (4th ed.). New York: Basic Books.

初稿收件：民國89年09月21日
完成修正：民國90年01月04日
正式接受：民國90年03月06日

早年家庭經驗的測量：中文版「原生家庭量表」的介紹及信效度考驗

張景然

世新大學

朱玉妮

中國技術學院

摘要

本研究旨在介紹一份中文版原生家庭經驗測量工具的翻譯與信效度檢驗工作。研究者使用五個步驟的反覆翻譯 (back translation) 過程將英文版「原生家庭量表」(Family-of-Origin Scale, FOS) 翻譯成中文，調查台灣地區的有效樣本二三三名，並檢測其效度與信度。以因素分析證驗建構效度的結果指出，中文版量表的題目有95% 與英文版題目的原始因素重疊；Cronbach α 平均值達 .9336，折半信度係數則為 .9168。這些數據顯示，中文版「原生家庭量表」在樣本早年家庭經驗的研究上具有應用價值。

關鍵詞：反覆翻譯、家庭、原生家庭、量表

APPENDIX

原生家庭量表 (Family-of-Origin Scale)

作答說明：

謂原生家庭是指你大部份童年期間所處的家庭。這份問卷是用來幫助你回憶你的原生家庭經驗。

每個家庭都有他們不同的生活方式，所以，你在這份問卷上的答案也無所謂對與錯，重要的是你是否儘可能據實回答。

請閱讀下列句子，對照你記憶中的童年家庭經驗，圈選出最合適的答案號碼，並請逐題作答。

符號說明：

5 = 極符合 4 = 符合 3 = 普通 2 = 不符合 1 = 極不符合

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. 在我的家庭中，我的家人能自在地表達正面和負面的情緒。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. 我的家庭氣氛經常是不愉快的。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. 我的家人會互相鼓勵去結交朋友。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. 我的家庭不允許家人有不同意見。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. 我的家人常為他們的錯誤找藉口。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. 我的父母鼓勵家人傾聽彼此的談話。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7. 衝突在我家從來都沒有被解決過。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 8. 我的家庭對我的教導是，人性基本上是善良的。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 9. 在我的家中很難去瞭解家人的談話和感受。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 10. 當有親戚朋友去世時，我們能在家中談論悲傷的感受。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 11. 當父母做錯事時，他們會坦然在家人面前承認。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 12. 我在我的家庭中能表達我的所有情緒。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

13. 解決衝突在我家是一件很有壓迫感的事。	5	4	3	2	1
14. 我的家庭接納每個人不同的人生觀。	5	4	3	2	1
15. 我的父母鼓勵我大方地表達我的意見。	5	4	3	2	1
16. 我必須經常去猜測我家人的想法或感受。	5	4	3	2	1
17. 在我的家中我的態度和感受常常受到忽視或批評。	5	4	3	2	1
18. 我的家人很少為他們的行為負責。	5	4	3	2	1
19. 在我的家中我能夠自由自在地表達我的意見。	5	4	3	2	1
20. 當有親戚朋友去世時，我的家人從來不會談論我們悲傷的感受。	5	4	3	2	1
21. 有時我在家中不必說些什麼，家人就能夠瞭解我。	5	4	3	2	1
22. 我的家庭氣氛冷淡而缺乏溫暖。	5	4	3	2	1
23. 我的家人並不接納彼此的意見。	5	4	3	2	1
24. 在我的家中要瞭解家人的想法和感受很容易。	5	4	3	2	1
25. 當我們家庭的朋友離開了，我的家人不會去談論悲傷的感受。	5	4	3	2	1
26. 我從我的家庭中學到對別人要有戒心。	5	4	3	2	1
27. 在我的家中我能夠把事情說出來，進而解決衝突。	5	4	3	2	1
28. 我很難在我的家中表達我的意見。	5	4	3	2	1
29. 我的家庭在進餐時間總是充滿親切和愉快。	5	4	3	2	1
30. 在我的家中沒有人關心彼此內心的感受。	5	4	3	2	1
31. 我的家人都能夠合力解決衝突。	5	4	3	2	1
32. 在我的家中有些特定的感受不被容許說出來。	5	4	3	2	1
33. 我的家人認為人們總是自私自利的。	5	4	3	2	1
34. 在我的家中我很容易表達我的想法和感受。	5	4	3	2	1
35. 我的家人總是能夠敏銳地瞭解彼此的感受。	5	4	3	2	1
36. 當我的家中有重要的人離開了，我的家人會談論我們的失落感。	5	4	3	2	1
37. 我的父母不贊成我們表達不同的意見。	5	4	3	2	1
38. 我的家人會為自己的行為負責。	5	4	3	2	1
39. 我的家庭有個不成文的規定：不准表達你的情緒。	5	4	3	2	1
40. 記憶中我的家庭能夠給我溫暖與支持。	5	4	3	2	1