

大学院生プロジェクト型共同研究・研究成果報告書

研究代表者： 兪 幬蘭 (臨床心理研究コース)

■ 研究題目
夫婦の葛藤解決方略と家族構造に関する日韓比較
■ 研究代表者・分担者 氏名
兪 幬蘭 (臨床心理研究コース) (研究代表者)
■ 研究成果概要 (目的、実施内容、結果、今後の課題など)
<p>1. 目的</p> <p>対人葛藤とは、「ある人の行動、感情、思考の過程が、他の人の行動によって妨害される状態」であり(Kelley, 1987), 人間関係の中で頻繁に起こり, 個人と集団, 両方に影響を及ぼしている。また, 対人葛藤の中で人はどう対応するかを葛藤解決方略という。Pruitt & Rubin(1986)の二重関心モデルは, 問題解決のゴールを「他者指向性」と「自己指向性」という2つの軸に分け, 解決方略を「回避」「妥協」「譲歩」「主張」「協調」に分けた。それ以来, 数多くの研究で葛藤解決方略の個人差を知るため, 二重関心モデルが用いられている(e.g. Rubin, Pruitt, & Kim, 1994; Ruble & Thomas, 1976; Van de Vliert & Kabanoff, 1990)。</p> <p>葛藤解決方略に文化がどんな影響を及ぼしているかを調べるための文化比較研究は多くなされてきたが, 主に, 西洋の個人主義と東洋の集団主義という文化差に留まり, 東洋の国の中ではどんな文化差があるかは調べられていない(e.g. Kim & Leung, 2000; Lee & Rogan, 1991; Leung, 1988; Ting-Toomey et al., 1991; Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988; Trubisky, Ting-Toomey, & Lin, 1991)。</p> <p>本研究では, 葛藤解決方略に与える文化の影響を調べるために, 日本と韓国の中年期の女性を対象とし, 対象者が認知している家族構造に注目する。夫婦関係は, 長期間にかけて葛藤と解決が繰り返される(東海林, 2006; 2009)。また, 女性は中年期に入ると育児や家事からある程度解放され, 気持ちの余裕が生まれ, 多様な面にかけて, 葛藤と解決が繰り返される中, 葛藤が蓄積・固着されている状況に目を向けるようになるといわれている(Tursunova, 2011)。また, 相互交流パターンを通じて作用する1つのシステムである家族構造(Minuchin, 1984)は, 各国の文化に基づいたコミュニケーションが蓄積された結果物とみなすことができる。従って, 家族構造が葛藤解決方略に及ぼす影響を検討することで, 葛藤解決方略に与える文化の影響を調べることができるといえる。</p>

2. 実施内容

2014年9月～2015年1月の間,日本人(86名),韓国人(187名)の既婚女性を対象に質問紙調査を行った。対象者の年齢は36～60歳であり,結婚年数13～37年であった。質問紙は,①フェイスシート(家族構成・学歴・宗教・職業・結婚暦),②夫婦葛藤の場面(「子育てや子どもの教育」「家事の分担」「生活習慣」「互いの言動」「価値観・宗教」「経済的なこと」「夫の家族のこと」「その他」から択一)とそのときの葛藤解決方略(回避・妥協・譲歩・主張・協調から択一),③「父・母・子」の三者関係を問う ICHIGEKI 尺度 (Noguchi, Kozuka, Usami, & Wakashima, 2009; 1~10 から択一), に構成されている。分析には SPSS Ver.22 が利用された。主に, ICHIGEKI の諸変数(三者間の結びつきと勢力)を独立変数, 葛藤解決方略を従属変数とする, 多重ロジスティック回帰分析が行われた。

3. 結果

(1) 「葛藤場面」選択の割合

日本の妻による「葛藤場面」は,「子育て」(22.4%)「生活習慣」(22.1%)「言動」(20.9%)などの順であり, 韓国の妻による「葛藤場面」は,「子育て」(29.9%)「生活習慣」(26.2%)「夫の家族」(12.8%)などの順であった。

(2) 「葛藤解決方略」選択の割合

日本の妻の「葛藤解決方略」は,「協調」(50.0%)「回避」(18.6%)「譲歩」(14.0%)などの順であり, 韓国の妻の「葛藤解決方略」は「協調」(42.2%)「妥協」(15.5%)「譲歩」(15.0%)などの順であり, 同様な傾向を示した。

(3) 「家族構造」による「葛藤解決方略」の違い

次に多重ロジスティック回帰分析を行ったところ, 有意な結果だけを述べる。ここで, 「A」 vs. 「B」は, 「B」を参照カテゴリーである。また, オッズ比 OR が 1 より大きいほど, 「B」より「A」を選択する可能性が高いことを意味する。

(3-1) 「結びつき」と「葛藤解決方略」の日韓比較

(3-1-1) 「父-母の結びつき」と「葛藤解決方略」の日韓比較

日本人妻の場合, 有意な結果が見られなかった。

韓国人妻の場合, 「父-母の結びつき」が大きいほど, 「協調」vs. 「主張」($OR=2.002, S.E.=.196, p<.001$)において, 「主張」より「協調」を選択する選択性が高い。

(3-1-2) 「母-子の結びつき」と「葛藤解決方略」の日韓比較

日本人妻の場合, 有意な結果が見られなかった。

韓国人妻の場合, 「母-子の結びつき」が大きいほど, 「主張」vs. 「譲歩」($OR=1.806, S.E.=.286, p<.05$)において, 「主張」より「譲歩」を選択する可能性が高い。

(3-1-3)「父-子の結びつき」と「葛藤解決方略」の日韓比較

日本人妻の場合、「父-子の結びつき」が大きいほど、「譲歩」vs.「回避」($OR=1.994, S.E.=.333, p<.05$)において、「回避」より「譲歩」を、「譲歩」vs.「主張」($OR=3.069, S.E.=.446, p<.05$)において、「主張」より「譲歩」を、「協調」vs.「主張」($OR=2.127, S.E.=.370, p<.05$)において、「主張」より「協調」を選択する可能性が高い。

韓国人妻の場合、「父-子の結びつき」が大きいほど、「譲歩」vs.「妥協」($OR=1.545, S.E.=.221, p<.05$)において、「妥協」より「譲歩」を選択する可能性が高い。

(3-2)「勢力」と「葛藤解決方略」の日韓比較

(3-2-1)「父の母への勢力」と「葛藤解決方略」の日韓比較

日韓両方とも、有意な結果が見られなかった。

(3-2-2)「母の父への勢力」と「葛藤解決方略」の日韓比較

日本人妻の場合、有意な結果が見られなかった。

韓国人妻の場合、「母の父への勢力」が大きいほど、「主張」vs.「譲歩」($OR=2.033, S.E.=.237, p<.01$)において、「譲歩」より「主張」を、「協調」vs.「譲歩」($OR=1.442, S.E.=.182, p<.05$)において、「譲歩」より「協調」を選択する可能性が高い。

(3-2-3)「父の子への勢力」と「葛藤解決方略」の日韓比較

日本人妻の場合、「父の子への勢力」が大きいほど、「回避」vs.「妥協」($OR=2.786, S.E.=.458, p<.05$)において、「妥協」より「回避」を、「主張」vs.「妥協」($OR=3.498, S.E.=.571, p<.05$)において、「妥協」より「主張」を、「回避」vs.「協調」($OR=1.638, S.E.=.225, p<.05$)において、「協調」より「回避」を選択する可能性が高い。

韓国人妻の場合、有意な結果が見られなかった。

(3-2-4)「子の父への勢力」と「葛藤解決方略」の日韓比較

日本人妻の場合、「子の父への勢力」が大きいほど、「妥協」vs.「回避」($OR=3.668, S.E.=.538, p<.05$)において、「回避」より「妥協」を、「妥協」vs.「譲歩」($OR=3.774, S.E.=.580, p<.05$)において、「譲歩」より「妥協」を、「妥協」vs.「協調」($OR=3.377, S.E.=.510, p<.05$)において、「協調」より「妥協」を選択する可能性が高い。

韓国人妻の場合、有意な結果が見られなかった。

(3-2-5)「母の子への勢力」と「葛藤解決方略」の日韓比較

日韓両方とも、有意な結果が見られなかった。

(3-2-6)「子の母への勢力」と「葛藤解決方略」の日韓比較

日本人妻の場合、「子の母への勢力」が大きいほど、「回避」vs.「主張」($OR=4.021, S.E.=.544, p<.05$)において、「主張」より「回避」を、「譲歩」vs.「主張」($OR=4.033, S.E.=.587, p<.05$)において、「主張」より「譲歩」を、「協調」vs.「主張」($OR=3.519, S.E.=.515, p<.05$)において、「主張」より「協調」を選択する可能性が高い。

韓国人妻の場合、「子の母への勢力」が大きいほど、「譲歩」vs.「妥協」($OR=1.740, S.E.=.230,$

$p<.05$)において、「妥協」より「譲歩」を、「譲歩」vs.「主張」($OR=1.714, S.E.=.234, p<.05$)において、「主張」より「譲歩」を、「譲歩」vs.「協調」($OR=1.476, S.E.=.188, p<.05$)において、「協調」より「譲歩」を選択する可能性が高い。

4. 考察

家族構造が葛藤解決方略に及ぼす影響を並べると次のようである。

- (1)日本人妻だけに影響を及ぼすものは、「父の子への勢力」「子の父への勢力」である。「父の子への勢力」が大きいと「妥協」を選択する可能性が低い。一方、「子の父への勢力」が大きいと「妥協」を選択する可能性が高い。
- (2)韓国人妻だけに影響を及ぼすものは、「父-母の結びつき」「母-子の結びつき」「母の父への勢力」である。「父-母の結びつき」が大きいと「協調」を選択する可能性が高く、「母-子の結びつき」が高いと「譲歩」を選択する可能性が高い。一方、「母の父への勢力」が大きいと「譲歩」を選択する可能性が低い。
- (3)日韓両方に影響を及ぼすものは、「父-子の結びつき」「子の母への勢力」である。「父-子の結びつき」が大きいと「譲歩」を選択する可能性が高い。また、「子の母への勢力」の影響における日韓の差は大きい。日本人妻の場合、「子の母への勢力」が大きいと「主張」を選択する可能性が低い。一方、韓国人妻の場合、「子の母への勢力」が大きいと「譲歩」を選択する可能性が高い。つまり、「子の母への勢力」が大きいと認知することは、日本人妻には自己指向性を減少させ、韓国人妻には他者指向性を増加させる原因として作用する。

5. 今後の課題

本研究では、夫婦の葛藤解決方略の選択において、「子の母への勢力」がもつ意味に日本と韓国に差があることが示された。しかし、これは妻側の視点に基づいた結果であり、解決方略というものが相互作用によって成り立つコミュニケーション(藤森, 1989)のひとつであることを考えると、片側の夫の視点も含めた社会文化的文脈に基づいた検討も今後必要であろう。

Graduate Student Project Type Research Research Report

Principal Investigator : Kyungran Yu (Clinical Psychology)

■ Title
A comparative study of marital conflict resolution strategies and family structure in Japan and South Korea
■ Name of the Principal Investigator and Co-Investigator(s)
Kyungran Yu (Clinical Psychology) (Principal Investigator)
■ Outline (Research Purpose, Details, Results and Future issues, etc.)
<p>1. Objectives</p> <p>Interpersonal conflict is “the state in which the process of a person’s behavior, feelings and thoughts is hindered by the behavior of another person” (Kelley, 1987) and occurs frequently in personal relationships, affecting individuals and groups alike. The way in which people deal with interpersonal conflict is called conflict resolution strategy. Pruitt & Rubin’s (1986) dual concern model divided the goals of problem resolution into the two axes of concern for self and concern for others, and separated resolution strategies into competition, cooperation, conciliation, avoidance and yielding. Since then, the dual concern model has been widely used in research in order to find differences between individuals in their conflict resolution strategies (e.g. Rubin, Pruitt, & Kim, 1994; Ruble & Thomas, 1976; Van de Vliert & Kabanoff, 1990).</p> <p>Although many comparative cultural studies have been conducted to investigate the effect of culture on conflict resolution strategies, they mostly stop at the cultural differences of Western individualism and Eastern collectivism and there has been no research into the kind of cultural differences that exist between East Asian countries (e.g. Kim & Leung, 2000; Lee & Rogan, 1991; Leung, 1988; Ting-Toomey et al., 1991; Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988; Trubisky, Ting-Toomey, & Lin, 1991).</p> <p>This study examines the influence of culture on conflict resolution strategies by targeting middle-aged women from Japan and South Korea and focusing on the family structures that they recognize. In marital relationships, conflict and resolution are repeated over a long period (Reika, 2006; 2009). Women entering middle age start to feel more composed as they are to some extent</p>

released from child-rearing and housework and, amid repeated conflict and resolution in numerous aspects, are said to turn their attention to the situation that conflicts have built up and become fixed (Tursunova, 2011). Furthermore, the structure of the family, a system that operates by patterns of interaction (Minuchin, 1984), can be seen as the amassed result of communications based on the culture of each country. Therefore, examining the effect that family structure has on conflict resolution strategies enables us to investigate the effect of culture on conflict resolution strategies.

2. Content of implementation

Between September 2014 and January 2015, I conducted a questionnaire survey on 86 Japanese and 187 South Korean married women. The subjects were aged between 36 and 60 years and had been married for 13 to 37 years. The questionnaire was composed of (1) a face sheet (family composition, education, religion, employment, marriage history), (2) areas of marital conflict (choosing one from “children and their education,” “division of housework,” “daily habits,” “one another’s speech and behavior,” “values and religion,” “finances,” “husband’s family,” and “other”) and conflict resolution strategies at such times (choosing one from avoidance, conciliation, yielding, competition and cooperation) and (3) the ICHIGEKI scale regarding three-way relationships between father, mother and children (Noguchi, Kozuka, Usami, & Wakashima, 2009; choosing one from 1 to 10). For analysis, I used SPSS Ver.22. I mainly performed multiple logistic regression analyses taking ICHIGEKI variables (relationships and power between three people) as independent variables and conflict resolution strategies as dependent variables.

3. Results

(1) Selection ratio of conflict areas

The conflict areas most selected by Japanese wives were, in sequence, children (24.4%), daily habits (22.1%), and speech and behavior (20.9%) while those of their South Korean counterparts were children (29.9%), daily habits (26.2%) and husband’s family (12.8%).

(2) Selection ratio of conflict resolution strategies

The conflict resolution strategies most selected by Japanese wives were cooperation (50.0%), avoidance (18.6%), and yielding (14.0%) while those of the South Korean wives were cooperation (42.2%), conciliation (15.5%), and yielding(15.0%), etc. Both groups demonstrated similar patterns.

(3) Differences in conflict resolution strategies depending on family structure

Next, I performed multiple logistic regression analyses, only the significant results of which I will mention. Here, where two choices A vs. B are shown, B is the reference category. The greater the odds ratio *OR* is than 1, the higher the possibility is that A will be chosen over B.

(3-1) Relationship and conflict resolution strategy, Japan-South Korea comparison

(3-1-1) Father-mother relationship and conflict resolution strategy, Japan-South Korea comparison

No significant result was found among Japanese wives.

In the case of South Korean wives, the bigger “father-mother relationship” was, the higher the selectivity was of cooperation over competition in cooperation vs. competition ($OR=2.002$, $S.E.=.196$, $p<.001$).

(3-1-2) Mother-children relationship and conflict resolution strategy, Japan-South Korea comparison

No significant result was seen among Japanese wives.

In the case of South Korean wives, the bigger “mother-children relationship” was, the greater the possibility was that yielding would be chosen over competition in competition vs. yielding ($OR=1.806$, $S.E.=.286$, $p<.05$).

(3-1-3) Father-children relationship and conflict resolution strategy, Japan-South Korea comparison

In the case of Japanese wives, the bigger “father-children relationship” was, the greater the possibility was that yielding would be chosen over avoidance in yielding vs. avoidance ($OR=1.994$, $S.E.=.333$, $p<.05$), yielding would be chosen over competition in yielding vs. competition ($OR=3.069$, $S.E.=.446$, $p<.05$), and cooperation would be chosen over competition in cooperation vs. competition ($OR=2.127$, $S.E.=.370$, $p<.05$).

In the case of South Korean wives, the bigger “father-children relationship” was, the greater the possibility was that yielding would be chosen over conciliation in yielding vs. conciliation ($OR=1.545$, $S.E.=.221$, $p<.05$).

(3-2) Power and conflict resolution strategy, Japan-South Korea comparison

(3-2-1) Father’s power over mother and conflict resolution strategy, Japan-South Korea comparison

No significant result was found among Japanese or South Korean cases.

(3-2-2) Mother’s power over father and conflict resolution strategy, Japan-South Korea

comparison

No significant result was found among Japanese wives.

In the case of South Korean wives, the bigger “mother’s power over father” was, the greater the possibility was that competition would be chosen over yielding in competition vs. yielding ($OR=2.033$, $S.E.=.237$, $p<.01$) and cooperation would be chosen over yielding in cooperation vs. yielding ($OR=1.442$, $S.E.=.182$, $p<.05$).

(3-2-3) Father’s power over children and conflict resolution strategy, Japan-South Korea comparison

In the case of Japanese wives, the bigger “father’s power over children” was, the greater the possibility was that avoidance would be chosen over conciliation in avoidance vs. conciliation ($OR=2.786$, $S.E.=.458$, $p<.05$), competition would be chosen over conciliation in competition vs. conciliation ($OR=3.498$, $S.E.=.571$, $p<.05$), and avoidance would be chosen over cooperation in avoidance vs. cooperation ($OR=1.638$, $S.E.=.225$, $p<.05$).

No significant result was found among South Korean wives.

(3-2-4) Children’s power over father and conflict resolution strategy, Japan-South Korea comparison

In the case of Japanese wives, the bigger “children’s power over father” was, the greater the possibility was that conciliation would be chosen over avoidance in conciliation vs. avoidance ($OR=3.668$, $S.E.=.538$, $p<.05$), conciliation would be chosen over yielding in conciliation vs. yielding ($OR=3.774$, $S.E.=.580$, $p<.05$), and conciliation would be chosen over cooperation in conciliation vs. cooperation ($OR=3.377$, $S.E.=.510$, $p<.05$).

No significant result was found among South Korean wives.

(3-2-5) Mother’s power over children and conflict resolution strategy, Japan-South Korea comparison

No significant result was found among Japanese or South Korean cases.

(3-2-6) Children’s power over mother and conflict resolution strategy, Japan-South Korea comparison

In the case of Japanese wives, the bigger “children’s power over mother” was, the greater the possibility was that avoidance would be chosen over competition in avoidance vs. competition ($OR=4.021$, $S.E.=.544$, $p<.05$), yielding would be chosen over competition in yielding vs. competition ($OR=4.033$, $S.E.=.587$, $p<.05$), and cooperation would be chosen over competition in cooperation vs. competition ($OR=3.519$, $S.E.=.515$, $p<.05$).

In the case of South Korean wives, the bigger “children’s power over mother” was, the greater the possibility was that yielding would be chosen over conciliation in yielding vs. conciliation ($OR=1.740$, $S.E.=.230$, $p<.05$), over competition in yielding vs. competition ($OR=1.714$, $S.E.=.234$, $p<.05$), and over cooperation in yielding vs. cooperation ($OR=1.476$, $S.E.=.188$, $p<.05$).

4. Conclusions

The following can be said about the influence of family structure on conflict resolution strategy.

(1) What influences Japanese wives only are “father’s power over children” and “children’s power over father.” When “father’s power over children” is large, wives are unlikely to choose “conciliation.” On the other hand, when “children’s power over father” is large, wives are likely to choose “conciliation.”

(2) What influences South Korean wives only are “father-mother relationship,” “mother-children relationship,” and “mother’s power over father.” Wives are likely to choose “cooperation” when “father-mother relationship” is large, and likely to choose “yielding” when “mother-children relationship” is large. On the other hand, they are unlikely to choose “yielding” when “mother’s power over father” is large.

(3) What influences both Japanese and South Korean wives are “father-children relationship” and “children’s power over mother.” When “father-children relationship” is big, there is a high possibility that wives will select “yielding.” Also, there is a significant difference between the two countries in the impact of “children’s power over mother.” When “children’s power over mother” is big, there is less chance that Japanese wives will select “competition” but more chance that South Korean wives will select “yielding.” In other words, recognition that “children’s power over mother” is large causes a decrease in self-orientedness in Japanese wives and an increase in other-orientedness in South Korean wives.

5. Future challenges

This study shows that there is a difference between the married couples of Japan and South Korea in the significance of “children’s power over mother” in their selection of conflict resolution strategies. This result, however, is based on the perspective of wives, and since resolution strategies are a form of communication made up of interaction (Fujimori, 1989),

socio-cultural context-based studies are needed in future that include the perspective of husbands.