

Emotional Autonomy in Relation to Family Environment: A Gender Perspective

Suninder Tung and Rupan Dhillon
Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar

This study examines the gender differences and the family environment correlates of emotional autonomy amongst males and females of middle and late adolescence. A sample of 250 males and females of age group 14 - 16½ years (middle adolescence) and 250 males and females of age group 17-21 years (late adolescence) was drawn from public schools and colleges respectively. Gender differences were found out using t-ratios. The results show significant differences in males and females on the deidealization dimension of emotional autonomy, with females capable of deidealizing the parents at an early age than the males. The mean scores are higher for females on emotional autonomy. Females report more cohesive environment and find higher moral religious emphasis in the family. The Pearson's Product Moment Correlations were calculated for studying the relationship between emotional autonomy and family environment. For females in both the age groups, the family environment dimension of cohesion, expressiveness, independence, organization etc. have significant negative correlations with emotional autonomy dimensions. Positive correlations are found with conflict and control in relation to emotional autonomy dimensions. In case of males during middle and late adolescent years, there are lesser family environment variables significantly correlating with emotional autonomy dimensions. For males the issues of cohesion are not as pervasive as in the females.

Adolescence is a transitional and developmental period in which there is redefinition and reorganisation of family relations. During this transition from childhood to adulthood, the task of development of autonomy has been considered as important. It means the ability to have a significant control over one's life, to be able to make decisions and to relinquish the dependencies on others. Crittenden (1990) has defined autonomy as "capacities for taking responsibility for one's own behaviour, making decisions regarding one's own life and maintaining supportive relationships".

According to the psychoanalytic view, the development of healthy autonomy is

encouraged through the adolescent's detachment from family ties, a process that involves relinquishing childish dependencies and becoming disillusioned with parents (Bloom 1980; Blos, 1979; Freud, 1958). Blos's (1967) neo-analytic theory of individuation states that adolescents should rely on their resources, should feel individuated and should be able to become mature and competent.

However several researchers take the above notion quite seriously and accord greater significance to relational ties, support and social commitments as a part of autonomy, the adolescents can develop their independence without needing to cut off with

their parents (Montemayor, 1983). "The adolescents must strike a balance between enmeshment with parental identifications and complete disengagement and isolation" (Lapsley et.al., 1983).

The theories outlined by Steinberg and Silverberg (1986) have brought into forefront the term "detachment" to describe emotional autonomy. The term "detachment" indicates adolescents withdrawing from the family and moving towards new attachments in wider community. It may represent not only a casting off infantile ties but a more general reluctance to rely on the parents as they maybe rejecting and unsupportive.

Contemporary researchers have tried to examine the interrelationships between aspects of autonomy (Steinberg & Silverberg, 1986), the place of emotional distance from parents in process of healthy development (Lamborn & Steinberg, 1993) and even the influence of familial and nonfamilial roles and contexts on the development of self-reliance and responsible independence (Lamborn & Steinberg 1993; Tremper & Kelly, 1987).

The adolescent's first and normative context of development is the family. Parent adolescent relationships should involve the process of striking a balance between the development of individuality and self-reliance of the adolescent on one hand and a sense of connection and parental guidance on the other. When there is an effective combination of cohesion and separation in the family, then the autonomy development of the adolescence is healthy.

Several researchers share the general hypothesis that parent adolescence interactions that encourage differentiation and also sent a message of acceptance and connection should facilitate positive outcomes

including healthy identity, perspective taking skills, ego development and self-esteem (Hauser et. al., 1984; Eccles, et al., 1991; Allison & Sabatelli, 1988). The normative task in adolescence could be the same for both boys and girls-to develop a healthy balance between autonomy and ties with parents but it is more of a challenge to disengage from the parents for the girls than it is for boys. In our culture, boys experience more conflict with their parents and are less likely to accept parental regulations as appropriate. Whereas girls are more emotionally dependent on their parents. Sexual roles and gender differences lay different paths for boys and girls in developing autonomy.

Research on gender differences in development of autonomy reveals several inconsistencies. Douvan and Adelson (1966), Coleman (1961) suggested that boys develop autonomous behaviour more rapidly than girls. On the other hand, recent literature of Steinberg & Silverberg (1986) found emotional autonomy during early adolescence to be greater among girls, with girls scoring high on self-reliance scales.

There also exist cross-cultural differences in the development of autonomy. In India, parents views are generally accepted. Kakar (1978) observed that the strong ties to family continue into adulthood, with continued emotional dependence on family, particularly on mother. Indian girls spend much less time with peers as they are given less freedom of movement (Bharat, 1977). Biswas (1992) states that the traditional, affectional, religious and economic bonds that create family cohesion are weakening. "Nucleation has depleted the emotional surround of the individuals". Indian adolescents are gradually moving to achieve autonomy and reducing dependency on parents.

It is evident from the literature that researchers have devoted greater attention to the influence of familial and the gender differences in adolescent autonomy development. However despite the issues being tackled, the concept of autonomy still continues to be elusive and the inconsistencies in the literature need to be clarified. This exploratory study aims to study the inconsistent picture of the relationship of the family environment with emotional autonomy and how males and females in their middle and late adolescent years differ on emotional autonomy dimensions.

Method

Sample

Subjects are the students of public schools and colleges of Amritsar. The tests were administered on the sample of 500 adolescents were divided into two age groups and the criteria of division was the age. The age groups are 14 - 16 ½ years and 17 - 21 years and there are 250 females in the sample. The mean age of females (14 - 16 ½ years) is 15.27, females (17 - 21 years) is 18.99, and for males (14 - 16 ½ years) is 15.28 and males (17 - 21 years) is 18.91.

Tools

Emotional Autonomy Scale (Steinberg & Silverberg, 1986): This test has four dimensions as Parental deidealization, Perceives parents as people, Non dependency on parents and Individuation. Items are 20 in number and are presented in declarative statements and adolescents were asked to indicate their degree of agreement with each item on a four point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Family Environment Scale (Moos & Moos, 1986)

The various dimensions of this test are Cohesion, Expressiveness, Conflict, Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual Cultural Orientation, Active Recreational Orientation, Moral Religious Emphasis, Organization, Control. There are 90 items in all and the subject has to answer in yes or no. Scoring is based on the template provided and individual subscale scores can be obtained. The administration of the tests was done under constant supervision and the group size ranged from 15-20 subjects. The instructions were provided as based on manuals. Confidentiality of their results was promised so that authentic and reliable data could be obtained.

Results and Discussion

Means and standard deviations for the different scores are shown in the table 1 and 2. Sex differences were examined on all the test variables using t-ratio. Table 1 is indicative of the differences between males and females of 14 -16 ½ years age group. A perusal of the table suggests that deidealization is the only dimension out of the four dimensions of the Emotional Autonomy Scale on which males and females significantly differ ($t(250) = 3.76, p < 0.01$). The results indicate that mean scores of females ($M = 11.91$) are higher on the Deidealization dimension suggesting that girls deidealize earlier than the boys ($M = 10.74$). Similar findings are reported by Steinberg and Silverberg (1986). This dimension is a cognitive component of Emotional Autonomy Scale and lays stress on adolescent's relinquishing of childish perceptions of parental omnipotence rather than focusing on the detachment, rebelliousness or a negativistic view towards parents.

**Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, t-ratios of males and females
Age group 14 – 16-1/2 years (N=250) Age group 17 -21years**

Emotional Autonomy Dimensions	Males		Females		t-ratio
	M	SD	M	SD	
Deidealization	10.74	2.36	11.91	2.62	3.76**
Perceives parents as people	12.98	2.73	12.60	2.55	1.15
Non Dependency	8.99	2.41	9.47	2.26	1.71
Individuation	13.42	2.54	12.94	2.71	1.45
Total Emotional Autonomy Scores	45.97	6.40	47.02	6.83	1.25
Family Environment Dimensions					
Cohesion	6.51	1.83	7.10	1.79	2.03*
Expressiveness	4.81	1.59	4.90	1.44	0.47
Conflict	2.98	1.68	2.51	1.35	2.61**
Independence	5.59	1.50	4.70	1.73	0.52
Achievement Orientation	6.30	1.35	6.34	1.26	0.26
Intellectual Cultural Orientation	5.50	1.73	5.18	1.79	1.52
Active Recreational Orientation	4.75	1.85	4.89	2.03	0.60
Moral Religious Emphasis	6.39	1.45	6.54	1.45	1.07
Organization	6.51	1.75	5.94	1.84	2.71**
Control	4.54	1.63	3.79	1.61	3.75**

* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level

**Table 2: Means, Standard Deviations, t-ratios of males and females of age group
17-21 years (N=250)**

Emotional Autonomy Dimensions	Males		Females		t-ratio
	M	SD	M	SD	
Deidealization	11.50	2.70	12.09	2.39	1.96*
Perceives parents as people	12.78	2.73	12.82	2.40	0.125
Non Dependency	9.52	2.26	9.60	2.39	0.275
Individuation	13.66	2.32	13.23	2.46	1.48
Total Emotional Autonomy	47.57	6.09	47.73	6.37	0.20
Cohesion	6.77	1.61	7.18	1.60	2.05*
Expressiveness	4.98	1.63	5.14	1.33	0.88
Conflict	2.32	1.50	2.20	1.35	0.80
Independence	5.54	1.25	5.95	1.55	2.41*
Achievement Orientation	6.52	1.32	6.64	1.15	0.85

Intellectual Cultural Orientation	4.64	1.72	5.29	1.61	3.25**
Active Recreational Orientation	3.99	1.86	5.06	1.65	5.35**
Moral Religious Emphasis	6.34	1.66	7.01	1.33	3.72**
Organization	6.33	1.89	6.67	1.56	1.78
Control	4.13	1.62	3.81	1.70	1.60

* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level

However, further perusal of the table indicates that although it is just the dimension of deidealization on which males and females differ significantly but by simply considering the means, it can be seen that females score higher than the males on the total emotional autonomy scores and the non dependency dimension of the Emotional Autonomy Scale. The mean scores of females and males on the dimension of non-dependency are (M=9.47) and (M=8.99) respectively. The greater mean score of females than the males, is somewhat suggestive of the fact they have a feeling of self-governance and an absence of excessive dependency on parents. They try to relinquish the childish dependencies. Greenberger (1984), Greenberger & Sorenson (1974) have studied this aspect of autonomy and have used the term "psychosocial maturity" to explain a sense of control over one's life and reducing excessive dependency. The sex differences are identical to those reported by Greenberger (1982). Thus, it can be suggested that females are more oriented towards gaining self-reliance and maturity at an early age as compared to boys.

Further, though the differences are not significant, but it is seen from the table that males have scored higher on the Individuation dimension and Perceiving parents as people dimension. Male adolescents realize that parents play a different role outside their parental role too and separate from them by developing a feeling of freedom through a perceived parental lack of knowledge about them. So the males move away from the parents but towards peers and cliques.

Individuation is possibly reflecting a reactive detachment from parents.

The overall total Emotional Autonomy score again does not suggest significant differences between males (M=45.97) and females (M=47.02) but the mean scores suggest that females in middle adolescence are more autonomous. Similar conclusions were suggested by Steinberg & Silverberg (1986) that emotional autonomy during adolescence is greater among girls than boys. The sex role socialization may less likely suggest that girls would be more independent or separate from their parents than boys but the present day scenario reshapes the previous views about sex differences in adolescent development. Perhaps the women's roles are changing from issues of intimacy to the issue of autonomy. Now, there are more similarities than differences in which female and males approach identity and autonomy development. To conclude, the results are somewhat indicative of girls developing autonomous functioning earlier than boys. Previous studies have also shown similar trends (Steinberg & Silverberg, 1986; Grotevant & Thorbecke, 1982).

A further perusal of the suggests that boys and girls significantly differ on four dimensions of Family Environment scale – cohesion ($t(250)=2.03, p<.05$), conflict ($t(250)=2.61, p<.01$), organization ($t(250)=3.75, p<.01$), and control ($t(250)=5.73, p<.01$). The mean scores suggest that females score higher on the cohesion variable (M=7.10) suggesting that girls perceive their family environments as more cohesive. The mean score for the other

three dimensions suggest that boys are higher on the conflict ($M=2.98$), organization ($M=6.51$) and control dimension ($M=4.57$). Boys perceive their environments as more conflictual and more organized with set rules and procedures. Boys have stronger needs to separate themselves from their family thus find the rules and regulations imposed on them as a sign of dependency. The constant arguments with parents make them describe the home environments as conflictual. Douvan & Adelson's (1966) study is supportive of this view and it can be concluded that the boys experience more intense conflict with their parents in more areas than do girls.

Table 2 suggests that t-ratios for the age group of 17-21 years. A perusal of this table suggests that deidealization dimension is the only dimension of the emotional autonomy scale for which males and females significantly differ ($t(250)=1.96, p<.05$). The results are suggestive of higher mean scores for females ($M=12.09$) as compared to males ($M=11.5$). Taking only the means, females score higher on perceives parents as people dimension ($M=12.82$), non-dependency dimension ($M=9.60$) and the total emotional autonomy score ($M=47.73$). Males have high mean scores on the Individuation dimension ($M=13.66$). This pattern is almost similar to be results of 14-16 ½ years age group, the only difference being that females of 17-21 years age group score higher on the perceiving parents as people dimension in comparison to males.

The higher scores on the Deidealization dimension for females suggests greater emotional and cognitive maturity which may even help them to establish identity and relationships that are indeed separate from parents, but which maybe beneficial for their development. Contrary to the widespread stereotypes that autonomy is salient and develops more rapidly among boys than girls, girls score higher than the boys on the overall

measure of emotional autonomy.

Furthermore, it can be seen through the means of both the groups that there are modest increases in deidealization of parents, feelings of individuation and in lessened dependence on parents during adolescence. (Kaul, 1995; Steinberg & Silverberg, 1986; Frank, Pirsch and Wright, 1990). They state that new appraisals of self and of parents begin to surface as one reaches late adolescence. The only dimension which does not show an increase in males is the perceiving parents as people dimension. Being a dimension which reflects cognitive maturity, it is likely that there is a lessened cognitive maturity over these years. Earlier studies of Lamborn and Steinberg, (1993), Youniss & Smollar, (1985), Steinberg and Silverberg, (1986) have also shown that perceiving parents as people dimension develops slowly during adolescence. But the modest linear increase in the scores of females somewhat reflects greater cognitive maturity of females over males.

Though there does not exist a significant difference between males and females, it still enables us to be suggestive of the idea that females are more emotionally autonomous as compared to boys in late adolescence but they are autonomous in context of relational support and enduring parental bonds.

A further perusal of the table 2 suggests that Family Environment Scale is indicative of five dimensions on which males and females significantly differ: Cohesion ($t(250) = 2.05, p<.05$), Independence ($t(250) = 2.41, p<.05$), Intellectual Cultural Orientation ($t(250)=3.25, p<.01$), Active Recreation Orientation ($t(250)=5.35, p<.01$) and Moral Religious Emphasis ($t(250)=3.72, p<.01$). The mean scores show that females score higher than males for all these significant dimensions. Females perceive their home environments as more cohesive, expressive, encouraging decision

making, promoting intellectual, cultural and recreational orientations, and emphasizing on ethical issues. Females in late adolescence are more close and attached to their parents, especially mothers, and thus find their home environments as more cohesive, whereas boys experience intense conflict with their parents in more areas than girls do (Douvan & Adelson, 1966). Boys are more engaged in establishing independence from parental control and find home environment as restrictive. Boys think that their family environment does not give them independence.

Correlations were computed between the emotional autonomy dimensions and the different dimensions of family environment for both males and females in the middle and late adolescent years. These correlations are presented in the tables 3, 4, 5 and 6. For females in the 14-16 ½ years age group (table

3), deidealization correlates negatively with cohesion, intellectual cultural orientation and positively correlates with conflict. There is a significant negative relationship between perceiving parent as people dimension and cohesion, expressiveness and independence. The non dependency dimension of emotional autonomy correlates with cohesion, organization, intellectual cultural orientation and positively with conflict in the family. The individuation dimension of emotional autonomy again negatively correlates with cohesion, expressiveness, independence, organization in the family and negatively correlates with the dimension of conflict.

For females in late adolescent years (table 4) deidealization correlates negatively with cohesion, independence, intellectual cultural orientation, organization and positively with control. The perceiving parents as people

Table 3: The Coefficient of correlations between the dimensions of family environment scale and emotional autonomy scale for females of age group 14-16½ years (N=125)

Family Environment Dimensions	Emotional Autonomy Dimensions			
	Deidealization (14-16 ½) (17-21)	Perceives parents as people	Non Dependency	Individuation
Cohesion	-.18**	-.26*	-.25*	-.23*
Expressiveness	0.05	-.23*	0.05	-.30*
Conflict	.19**	0.15	.19**	.17**
Independence	-0.11	-.25*	0.14	-.20*
Achievement Orientation	-0.01	0.15	-0.05	0.09
Intellectual Cultural Orientation	-.17**	-0.1	-.23*	-0.02
Active Recreational Orientation	0.01	-0.09	-0.16	0.04
Moral Religious Orientation	-0.15	-0.13	-0.13	-0.11
Organization	-.33*	-0.13	-.17**	-.23*
Control	-0.05	0.01	-0.05	0.1

**Significant at 0.05 level ; *Significant at 0.01 level

Table 4: The Coefficient of correlations between the dimensions of family environment scale and emotional autonomy scale for females of age group 17-21 years (N=125)

Family Environment Dimensions	Emotional Autonomy Dimensions			
	Deidealization	Perceives parents as people	Non-Dependency	Individuation
Cohesion	-.26*	-.10	-.25*	-.33*
Expressiveness	-.14	.02	-.10	-.21**
Conflict	.16	-.02	-.05	.30*
Independence	-.19**	-.22*	-.01	-.21**
Achievement Orientation	-.00	-.02	-.20**	-.23*
Intellectual Cultural Orientation	-.25*	-.06	-.05	-.30*
Active Recreational Orientation	-.01	.04	.06	-.05
Moral Religious Orientation	-.04	-.15	-.16	-.17**
Organization	-.17**	-.01	.09	-.16
Control	.22*	-.05	.16	.25*

**Significant at 0.05 level ; *Significant at 0.01 level

Table 5: The Coefficient of correlations between the dimensions of family environment scale and emotional autonomy scale for males of age group 14-16½ years (N=125)

Family Environment Dimensions	Emotional Autonomy Dimensions			
	Deidealization	Perceives parents as people	Non-Dependency	Individuation
Cohesion	-.27*	-.11	-.11	-.02
Expressiveness	-.18**	-.07	-.05	-.18**
Conflict	.10	.12	.17**	-.02
Independence	.01	-.14	.03	.07
Achievement Orientation	.01	-.04	-.11	.17**
Intellectual Cultural Orientation	-.26*	-.15	-.10	-.04
Active Recreational				

Orientation	-.09	-.04	-.04	.01
Moral Religious Orientation	-.12	-.02	-.08	-.06
Organization	-.08	-.05	.00	-.05
Control	.12	.09	.11	.14

**Significant at 0.05 level ; *Significant at 0.01 level

Table 6 The Coefficient of correlations between the dimensions of family environment scale and emotional autonomy scale for males of age group 17-21 years (N=125)

Family Environment Dimensions	Emotional Autonomy Dimensions			
	Deidealization	Perceives parents as people	Non-Dependency	Individuation
Cohesion	-.04	-.09	-.06	-.30*
Expressiveness	.13	.09	.10	.03
Conflict	-.07	.16	-.04	.14
Independence	.05	.02	-.02	-.03
Achievement Orientation	.18**	.09	.06	.06
Intellectual Cultural Orientation	-.04	.06	.02	-.15
Active Recreational Orientation	-.09	-.03	-.17**	-.14
Moral Religious Orientation	.18**	-.02	-.00	-.12
Organization	-.18**	-.12	-.02	-.20**
Control	.00	.10	.12	.02

**Significant at 0.05 level ; *Significant at 0.01 level

dimension has significant negative correlations with independence. The non dependency dimension of emotional autonomy correlates negatively with cohesion and achievement orientation. The individuation dimension correlates negatively with cohesion, expressiveness, independence, achievement orientation, intellectual cultural orientation, moral religious emphasis and positively correlates with conflict and control.

The pattern of relationships is almost similar

for both the age groups of the female sample. The relationships indicate that too much cohesiveness, organization, expressiveness and intellectual orientations may not be very supportive in developing emotional autonomy. Excessive cohesiveness in the family may not be very supportive of learning independence issues.

For the males in the age group of 14-16 ½ years (table 5), the deidealization dimension correlates negatively with cohesion, express-

iveness and intellectual cultural orientations. For males in 17-21 years age group (table 6), deidealization correlates negatively with achievement orientation, moral religious emphasis and organization. The non dependency dimension correlates positively with the conflict dimension in the 14-16 ½ years age group and also correlates negatively with active recreational orientation for the males in 17-21 years age group. There is a significant negative correlation of individuation with expressiveness and positive correlations with achievement orientation, and for the age group of 17-21 years, it correlates negatively with cohesion and organization.

Cohesion is a familiar variable which is significantly relating to all the emotional autonomy scores for females and cohesion is only significantly related to deidealization and individual in males. Contrary to our perception that a highly organized and a cohesive family environment may help the adolescent to get emotional autonomy, in females cohesion has shown a negative relationship with emotional autonomy. The relationship patterns suggest that cohesiveness in the family may leave little ground for adolescents to deidealize their parents, perceive parents as people and individuate from them. Probably cohesiveness and excessive organization in the family, the adolescent's experiences with active exploration of independence issues is curtailed somewhat and will not help the adolescent to come out of the protective and the dependent environments of the family. The circumplex model by Olson (1986) also suggests that it is the moderate levels of cohesiveness which provides the most appropriate environment for adolescent development and not the highly cohesive environment. He has suggested a curvilinear relationship. Excessive cohesion in the family probably limits the adolescents to experience and test themselves in different spheres. At this stage, they want to get more self focused and do not want to incorporate the views of others into their orientations. They

do not want the family environment to be such that it limits and makes them to be less outward oriented.

Further, it is even seen that a conflicting environment in the family is probably making the female adolescents to ponder and understand the autonomy issues (deidealization, non dependency and individuation) in the early adolescent years. Excessive directionality by the parents may develop a tendency in adolescent to develop their attitude and preferences apart from their parents. Greater controls and conflicts in the family may somewhat increase the disagreements between the parents and the adolescents due to which they have the need to focus more on the emotional autonomy issues.

The achievement orientation of the family activities, the competitive framework which is provided by the family environment significantly helps the males in their late adolescent years to deidealize their parents. The achievement orientation may help them to be more assertive and adequate which is expressed in their deidealizing the parents. For the males, the issues of interpersonal connectedness are not as important as achievement orientations.

Taken, together, the results suggest that the family environment correlates of emotional autonomy are not highly similar for males and females. For both the groups within the girls sample is a general similarity in the pattern of relationships between emotional autonomy dimensions and the family environment dimensions. A highly cohesive and organized family environment with greater emphasis on the religious and ethical issues does not help the females to understand and think of becoming more emotionally autonomous individuals whereas the conflicting environment or an excessive power exercised in the family environment may make the females to show greater concern for emotional autonomy issues. It is interesting to note that for males, in both the middle and late adolescent years,

there are lesser family environment variables significantly correlating with emotional autonomy dimensions than the females. For males, the issues of inter personal connectedness may be important in their earlier adolescent years but in their later years the issues of achievement orientations become more important. For males, the intellectual and achievement oriented framework provided within the family is helpful for building up emotional autonomy. The socialization is different for males and females in that males are encouraged to be more assertive and autonomous while females are rewarded for passivity and dependence. But despite this encouragement, the males have not shown to be more emotionally autonomous than females in the present study.

At this point one might assume that a social desirability bias is exhibited, with females presenting themselves in a more autonomous manner than males. Another assumption which may explain the gender difference, that earlier it may have been true that the females concerns were predominantly related to intimacy issues, but now with their changed roles, their concerns are not simply of the intimacy issues but probably even to the autonomy issues. The greater emotional autonomy in females is an expression of the desire to be independent but at the same time she is simply not ready to leave the secure environment of the home. The female is in a double bind situation. She is so entwined in the familial relationships that she feels breaking through those networks may not be very easy for her. The effect of the relationship network is so pervasive on her that it becomes difficult for her to move beyond that situation.

It is pertinent to point out that the present results should be viewed not as definitive but tentative and providing a basis for future study in the causal relationship between the family environment variables and emotional autonomy along with other moderator

variables. Future systematic approach may help in clearing some of the anomalies related with emotional autonomy. Multiple correlations were computed for the sample. Males of 14-16½ years age group had the maximum variance of .379 explained by the family environment variables, and in case of males of 17-21 years age group, the maximum variance explained is .397.

A perusal of the female sample multiple correlations indicated the maximum variance of .450 for 14-16½ years and in the case of females of 17-21 years, the maximum variance is .481.

From the above multiple correlations it can be said that since the variance explained by the family environment variables is not that high, therefore other variables are there which contribute towards achieving of emotional autonomy. The little difference in the multiple correlations for both the groups suggestive of a higher influence of family environment for girls and lesser for boys because the variance explained in both the groups is not very high. It would be interesting to study other variables apart from family environment.

References

- Allison, M. & Sabatelli, R. (1988). Differentiation and individual as mediators of identity and intimacy in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 3, 1-16.
- Bharat, S. (1977). Family socialization of the Indian Child. *Trends in Social Science Research*, 4, 201-216.
- Biswas, P. C. (1992). Perception of parental behaviour and adolescent's frustration. *Indian Journal of Social Work*, 4, 669-678.
- Bloom, M.V. (1980). Adolescent – parent separation, New York: Gardner.
- Blos, P. (1967). The second individuation process. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 22, 162-186.
- Blos, P. (1979). *The adolescent passage*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Coleman, J. (1961). *The adolescents society*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

- Crittenden, P.M. (1990). Toward a concept of autonomy in adolescents with disability. *Children's Health Care*, 19, 162-168.
- Douvan, E. & Adelson, J. (1966). *The adolescent experience*. New York: Wiley.
- Eccels, J., Buchanan, C., Fuligini, A., Midgley, C., & Yee, D. (1991). Control versus autonomy during adolescence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 47, 53-68.
- Frank, S.J., Pirsch, L.A., and Wright, V.C. (1990). Late adolescents' perceptions of their relationships with their parents: Relationships among deidealization, autonomy, relatedness, and insecurity and implications for adolescent adjustment and ego identity status. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 19, 571-588.
- Freud, A. (1958). Adolescence. *psychanalytic study of the child*. 13, 255-278.
- Greenberger, E & Sorenson, A. (1974). Toward a concept of psychosocial maturity. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 3, 329-358.
- Greenberger, E. (1982). Education and acquisition of psychosocial maturity. In. D. McClelland (Ed.), *The development of social maturity*, 155-189. New York: Irvington.
- Greenberger, E. (1984). Defining psychosocial maturity in adolescence. In. P. Kaoly & J. Steffen (Eds.), *Adolescent Behaviour Disorders: Foundations and Contemporary Concerns*, 54-81. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Grotevant, H., & Thorbecke, W. (1982). Sex differences in styles of occupational identity formation in late adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 18, 396-405.
- Hauser, S., Noam, G., Jacobson, A., Weiss, B., & Follansbee, D. (1984). Familial contexts of adolescent ego development. *Child Development*, 55, 195-213.
- Kakar, S. (1978). *The Inner World: A Psychoanalytic study of childhood and society in India*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kaul, S. (1995). Emotional autonomy redux: Revisiting Ryan and Lynch. *Child Development*, 64, 231-245.
- Lapsley, D.K., Rice, K.G., & Shadid, G.E. (1983). Psychological separation and adjustment to college. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 36, 286-294.
- Lamborn, S.D., and Steinberg, L. (1993). Emotional autonomy redux: Revisiting Ryan and Lynch. *Child Development*, 64, 483-499.
- Montemayor, R. (1983). Parents and adolescents in conflict: All of the families some of the time and some families most of the time. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 3, 83-103.
- Moos, R.H. & Moos, B.S. (1986). *Manual for Family Environment Scale*, Consulting Psychologists Press Inc, Palo Alto, California.
- Olson, D.H. (1986), Circumplex model 7 : Validation studies and FACES 3, *Family Process*, 25, 337-352.
- Steinberg, L. & Silverberg, S. (1986). The vicissitudes of autonomy in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 57, 841-851.
- Tremper, C., & Kelley, M. (1987). The mental health rationale for policies fostering minors' autonomy. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 10, 111-127.
- Youniss, J. & Smollar, J. (1985). *Adolescent relations with mothers, fathers and friends*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press.

Received: October 3, 2005

Accepted :June 28, 2006

Suninder Tung, PhD is presently Professor in the Department of Psychology, G.N.D.U, Amritsar, Punjab.

Rupan Dhillon, PhD is a Lecturer in the Department of Psychology, G.N.D.U., Amritsar, Punjab.