

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

IDENTIFICATION OF FAMILY INTERACTION
TYPES BY THEORY-NAIVE OBSERVERS

by

Doreen Campbell-Poersch

A THESIS

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Science

Department of Family Studies

Winnipeg, Manitoba

November, 1980

IDENTIFICATION OF FAMILY INTERACTION
TYPES BY THEORY-NAIVE OBSERVERS

BY

DOREEN ELLEN CAMPBELL-POERSCH

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

© 1980

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to determine whether one kind of family interaction typology found in the family process literature sufficiently reflected socio-cultural reality so it could be readily available as a diagnostic tool and predictive instrument to family practitioners not trained in family process theory. It was hypothesized that no differences would be found between designated typologists and respondents not trained in family process theory (theory-naive observers) in their perception of interactional characteristics of families. Three family types were outlined for investigation based on three dimensions of family interaction: the family's psychological space; the amount of adaptability in the members' interaction style; and the way members interpreted the world beyond the family unit, as one aspect of the family's communication patterns. Questionnaires were completed by 172 respondents. The results show 80.2 percent of the items were answered in the direction hypothesized. Statistical analysis with lambda revealed moderate support for the hypotheses indicating theory-naive observers were able to identify family types in accord with those delineated by the family typology theorists and/or practitioners. An untested, abridged form of the questionnaire for classifying family types was developed on the basis of the results.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to the many people who provided me with the necessary support and encouragement to complete this study.

To Dr. Dale Berg, my thesis advisor and mentor, I extend my sincere thanks for countless hours of patient and vital guidance. I am indebted to Dr. Berg for inspiring this research and helping to make the venture a valuable and enjoyable learning experience. My thanks is given to my other committee members; to Dr. Emily Nett for her very thorough and helpful job of suggesting improvements and to Dr. Novia Carter for her time and friendly assistance.

I wish to gratefully acknowledge the friendliness and helpfulness of the staff and of my fellow graduate students in the Department of Family Studies.

Thanks to Phyllis Laing for her expert typing job.

To my children, Carla and Darrell, whose help and encouragement contributed to the success of this project, I say thank you. I am grateful for their support and cooperation while I pursued my academic interests over the years.

A very special thanks to my husband Neil, whose patient listening, uncomplaining assistance, and calming cheerfulness were so important in the more trying times of this study's duration.

For their constant encouragement and support, I dedicate this book to my family.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	10
Chapter	
I. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
Theoretical Concepts in Family Interaction	
Dimensions	11
Psychological Space Dimension	11
Adaptability Dimension	18
Communication Dimension	22
Typologies of Family Interaction.	26
Eight Typologies of Family Interaction.	27
Major Hypothesis	38
II. METHODOLOGY	40
Research Hypotheses	40
Conceptualization and Operationalization of Variables.	42

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter		PAGE
	Independent Variable	42
	Dependent Variable	44
	Data Collection	46
	The Research Sample	46
	The Instrument	47
	Reliability and Validity	48
	The Data Collection Procedure	49
	Presentation of Questionnaire	49
	Analysis of Data	50
	Tabulating Data.	50
	Lambda - The Statistical Test of Hypotheses . .	52
	Summary	53
III.	RESULTS	55
	Random Family Hypotheses	55
	Open Family Hypotheses.	62
	Closed Family Hypotheses	71
	Additional Findings	74
	Summary	81
IV.	DISCUSSION.	83

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter	PAGE
Random Family	84
Open Family	93
Closed Family	100
A Diagnostic Instrument	112
V. CONCLUSIONS	115
Summary of Findings	116
Limitations of the Study	119
Implications for Further Research	120
The Utility of a Typology	122
REFERENCES	124
APPENDICES	
A. Questionnaire	129
B. Letter to Participants	137
C. Purpose of the Study and Verbal Instructions to Subjects	139
D. Percentage of Responses in Modal Categories for all Items	142

LIST OF TABLES

Table	PAGE
1. Psychological Space and the Random Family	57
2. Adaptability and the Random Family	60
3. Communication and the Random Family	63
4. Psychological Space and the Open Family	65
5. Adaptability and the Open Family	68
6. Communication and the Open Family	70
7. Psychological Space and the Closed Family	72
8. Adaptability and the Closed Family	75
9. Communication and the Closed Family	77
10. Items Falling in the Opposite Direction of Hypotheses .	78
11. Summary of Results	82
12. Random Family: Modal Response Category and Lambda for Psychological Space Items	86
13. Random Family: Modal Response Category and Lambda for Adaptability Items	88
14. Random Family: Modal Response Category and Lambda for Communication Items.	91
15. Open Family: Modal Response Category and Lambda for Psychological Space Items	94
16. Open Family: Modal Response Category and Lambda for Adaptability Items	96

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table		PAGE
17.	Open Family: Modal Response Category and Lambda for Communciation Items	99
18.	Closed Family: Modal Response Category and Lambda for Psychological Space Items	101
19.	Closed Family: Modal Response Category and Lambda for Adaptability Items	106
20.	Closed Family: Modal Response Category and Lambda for Communication Items	110

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		PAGE
1.	Family Interaction Typologies	28
2.	Hypothesized Frequency of Occurrence of Interactional Behaviour for Three Family Types	51
3.	Proposed Diagnostic Instrument	113

INTRODUCTION

One kind of family theory revolves around the process of a group of people interacting with one another as a family. This genre of family theory, called "family process" theory, focuses on the way interaction among family members influences behaviour in each individual in the family. The family is viewed as a system where members' actions modify, regulate, and control other members' behaviour in a network of reciprocal causal effects (Buckley, 1967). However, events that take place outside the family have a bearing on the way members interact. Indeed, family process theory posits that the viability of the family system is dependent on the interchange of information between members and the outer environment (Kantor & Lehr, 1975; Broderick & Smith, 1979). According to family process theory then, family interaction or family process can be described as the reciprocal influence of actions among members and between the family and the outside environment. It is this aspect of the family group which will be a major focus of the present study.

Springing from the clinical setting, family process theory provided a new way of explaining pathology in individuals. Previous to family process theory, psychanalytic theory and other intrapsychic models of personality explained behaviour as a consequence of mechanisms, usually established early in life, such as the unconscious or drive states within an individual's psyche. A therapist, using the intrapsychic model in treating a disturbed person, would see the person individually in therapy

to discuss his or her fantasies, thoughts and feelings. It was believed that a person whose behaviour changed after psychotherapy must have experienced a change from within, such as gaining new understanding or effecting a shift in perception (Haley, 1967). Unlike the traditional intrapsychic models, family therapy, based on family process theory, viewed the family's style of interacting as the cause of individual pathology.

Family process theory was first introduced three decades ago when therapists began noticing the connection between pathology in an individual and the manner of interaction in the individual's family. Most of the theoretical concepts in family process theory were developed as a result of observing family members interacting in a clinical setting. The therapists, all psychiatrists, were mainly concerned with the treatment and etiology of schizophrenic patients. They noticed that hospitalized schizophrenics, cured of their illness, often suffered relapse after returning home to their families (Jackson, 1965). Furthermore, the schizophrenic's behaviour appeared quite reasonable when viewed within the family context (Haley, 1967). Working independently, the pioneer theorists began to document their findings relative to the relationship of specific patterns of family interaction to the manifestation of schizophrenia (Bateson, Jackson, Haley & Weakland, 1956; Lidz, Cornelison, Fleck, & Terry, 1957; Ackerman, 1958; Wynne, Rickoff, Day, and Hirsch, 1958; Bowen, 1960; Laing, 1964). There was general acceptance by these authors that the alleviation of problem behaviour in an individual was

contingent upon a change in the interaction in the individual's family. Hence, those therapists who accepted the basic tenets of family process theory, involved all family members in therapy, and the focus of attention shifted from the disturbed individual to the family's transactional style.

Since the concerns of the family process theorists centered around the transactions of the family members, the existing terms used to describe and explain behaviours in individuals proved inadequate for dealing with interactional processes. Out of necessity, new concepts and terms were developed to elucidate transactional behaviour. Generally speaking, this occurred through observation of family members interacting in a clinical setting.

Though there are many interaction concepts found in the literature with different terms, they can be logically discussed within three broad and general areas. These three dimensions of interaction have been the focus of investigations by researchers in the family process movement as well as other family scholars. One of the goals of the present research is to review the relevant concepts in each dimension as found in the literature.

The first interaction dimension involves the definition and use of psychological space by the family. Issues of emotional bonding and individual autonomy are subsumed under the spatial dimension. The way in which members utilize their time, gain friends, make decisions, and share interests are some of the issues that have been investigated in relation to family psychological space (Hess & Handel, 1959; Zimmerman & Cervantes, 1960; Singer & Wynne, 1965a; Gerber, 1973; Stierlin, 1974a; Kantor & Lehr,

1975; Rosenblatt & Titus, 1976; Beavers, 1977; Minuchin, Rosman, & Baker, 1978; Napier, 1978; Olson, Sprenkle, & Russel, 1979).

The second interaction dimension deals with the amount of adaptability and stability in the family system. This dimension refers to the members' ability to appropriately adjust their style of relating to one another as well as maintaining a state of continuity in their relationships to allow members a sense of security and belonging. The type of rules used in the family, the members' style of negotiation, the manner of discipline, and the rigidity of roles are a few of the ways the amount of adaptability and stability has been determined for the family (Haley, 1959; Jackson, 1965; Singer & Wynne, 1965a; Kantor & Lehr, 1975; Wertheim, 1975; Beavers, 1977; Minuchin et al, 1978; Olson et al, 1979).

The third interaction dimension delineated in the literature revolves around family communication patterns. One issue studied in this dimension is the way members send and receive messages within the family (Bateson, Haley, Jackson, & Weakland, 1956; Jackson, 1965; Laing, 1965; Singer & Wynne, 1965a; Haley, 1965; Sojit, 1971; Olson, 1972; Broderick & Pulliam-Krager, 1979). Another issue found in the communication dimension is the way families perceive and interpret the outer environment (Reiss, 1971a, 1971b; Berg, 1979).

The three categories of family interaction are quite broad and general, but the grouping of behaviours help to simplify the investigation and understanding of the way in which family members interact with one another.

The interaction dimensions are evidence of the attempt to classify interactional behaviour in families. Indeed, it appears that family process theorists have long felt that the task of classifying family interaction is a most important one (Jackson, 1965; p. 116; Olson, 1971, p. 261; Riskin & Faunce, 1972, p. 385). In the past decade researchers have been pursuing this task. Using the interaction dimensions of psychological space, adaptability, and communication, they have begun developing typologies. (Reiss, 1971b; Wertheim, 1973; Kantor & Lehr, 1975; Beavers, 1977; Minuchin et al, 1978; Olson et al, 1979; Berg, 1979; Broderick & Pulliam-Krager, 1979). Reviewing these typologies will be a further important goal of this paper.

Viable family interaction typologies would be particularly useful in simplifying the research and comprehending the myriad of inextricable and synergistic variables which operate to affect behaviour. Typologies include the specification of common variables whereby they are grouped into logical arrangements. The procedure is first to identify the variables, then classify them according to resemblances and differences. Within a typology, the variables that affect family interaction are ideally sorted out and related to each other in order to constitute models or types of family interaction patterns. Viable typologies serve to arrange the complex variables affecting family interaction into a structure that holds promise for empirical testing and the generation of etiological hypotheses. Practically speaking, typologies of this nature can be beneficial to therapists, educators, employers, and community agencies who work with families, as a

classification and diagnostic tool for planning and implementing policies programs, and treatment goals. Basically, the value of this type of classification scheme lies in its importance as a summarizing device and predictive instrument to researchers and family practitioners.

Theoretical implications of family interaction typologies can be seen in the deeper understanding of the family, both as a system and subsystem in society. Major institutions such as schools, hospitals, and various agencies in our society may prefer to interact with a certain family type because they fit in easily with their ideals and goals. On the other hand, the interaction of a different family type may initiate social change because they tend to confront the established social order. Also, interaction typologies may provide some clues as to the perpetuation of behaviours considered problematic to society such as alcoholism, mental illness, and delinquency, by taking into account the way in which the environment influences the reciprocal actions of family members.

Interaction typologies would also aid in the awareness and conceptualization of familial influences on the behavioural outcomes of children. In assessing the child's behaviour, the focus would be on the way family members interact rather than attributing behaviour primarily to inner states such as motivation or drives. This model would be of particular importance in programs and literature designed to assist parents in child rearing.

For practical use in a wide range of applications, the typological concepts and terminology should not be so esoteric that lengthy training is

required for understanding and utilization. Typological constructs, understandable to a wide range of potential users, will have greater utility because the information is shareable. Ideally, family types should be sufficiently unique so as to be meaningful as a classification system, yet present little difficulty when assigning families to the categories. One of the major concerns of the present research is to ascertain the practicality of the interaction typologies selected from the literature. The concern revolves around the meaningfulness of the interaction concepts to those people who have not been formally trained in family process theory. It can be assumed that limitations to the range of those who could utilize the typologies would occur if extensive special training were a prerequisite for their comprehension and use.

The interaction typologies selected as being relevant to this study were either developed from theory (Wertheim, 1973; Kantor & Lehr, 1975; Broderick & Pulliam-Krager, 1979; Berg, 1979) or derived from clinical observation (Reiss, 1971a; Beavers, 1977; Minuchin et al, 1978; Olson et al, 1979). These typologies share the premise that family systems can be measured on various continua in regard to the spatial dimension, system adaptability dimension, and the communication dimension. While the typologies share many similarities, there are differences which reflect the interests, goals, and discipline of the theorists. However, there is typical agreement on the behavioural outcomes of the different family types.

The interaction concepts, dimensions, and typologies mentioned thus far have been developed from clinical observation or derived

theoretically. Empirical research is now needed to validate the constructs. Any empirical investigation of family interaction necessarily involves an observer who may or may not be a family member. Methodological problems of a similar nature can arise with the use of either type of observer.

If the observer happens to be the researcher or trained assistant, as was the case in much of the theory building in the family process field, there could be the ever present danger of experimenter effect (Rosenthal, 1966). The problem comes from the fact that such investigators have a set of expectations which can influence their perceptions and data collection. This begins with choosing a theoretical framework within which the hypotheses and operational definitions are developed. As Minuchin and his colleagues (1978) note:

The investigator's point of view, or governing concept is his blue print. It determines the selection of events to be studied and also the methods to be used. Data that are significant to the governing concepts are highlighted. Other data are overshadowed or excluded. Identical observations thus yield radically different working formulations when they are organized according to different conceptual frameworks. (p. 74)

Since much of the research in the family process field has occurred in the clinical setting, observer expectancy may have had a bearing on the concepts that were developed. The problem of experimenter effect becomes more acute when the lack of empirical investigation on "normal" family interaction is taken into consideration.¹

¹Riskin and Faunce (1972, p. 378) give the following definition of normal families: "'Normal' families are not officially labelled (whether or not they feel they have problems)."

When family members in therapy report on interaction in their own family, information may also be biased by expectations. The effect of the labelling process may result in different responses from families receiving therapeutic treatment than from normal families. Further, family members may be reluctant to divulge family information to outsiders and may distort facts to make their family's behaviour appear more favorable. Moreover, a self-report would likely not be objective because of the belief system and expectations that each family has about its own members' actions and interactions (McGillicuddy-DeLisi, 1980).

While observers in family interaction research have traditionally been clinicians, trained assistants, or family members, there are other observers who have access to daily behaviour patterns in normal families. These people consist of the family's friends, neighbours, and relatives. For the most part, these observers would not be trained in a theoretical perspective regarding behaviour and would be free of the belief systems and expectations in which the family members are immersed. Furthermore, they would likely have observed family interaction as it occurs naturally because of the nature of their association with the family.

The present study recognizes research findings in family interaction might be biased through the expectancy effects of family members or theoretically trained observers and attempts to overcome this bias by using observers who are not family members and who have not been instructed in the perspectives of family process theory. It is accepted that theory-naive observers' perceptions will be affected by their background

experiences, but this new vantage point of observing the family was felt to be particularly valuable in assessing the general utility of the designated interaction typologies for use by a wide variety of practitioners who are similarly untrained in the underlying theory.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this research is to determine if one genre of family interaction typology found in the literature, sufficiently reflects reality so it can be readily used as a classification system by family practitioners. That is, given a brief list of characteristics representing different family types, will observers who are not trained in family process theory (theory-naive observer) be able to specify, in non-clinical families, the differing behaviour patterns associated with the typological dimensions of psychological space, system adaptability, and communication? To be useful in a wide range of applications and settings, family interaction typologies should reflect sociocultural reality so they can be used to predict behaviour and be readily available as a diagnostic tool without lengthy training in a theoretical perspective. The aim of the present research is to investigate whether theory-naive observers, those who are not articulate in family process theory, can identify the characteristics of different family types as readily as theory-bound observers.

Chapter 1

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature will begin with the theoretical development and research of interaction concepts. They will be discussed within three family interaction dimensions: psychological space, system adaptability, and communication patterns. Next, family interaction typologies relevant to this study will be reviewed. The chapter will conclude with the major hypothesis.

THEORETICAL CONCEPTS IN FAMILY INTERACTION DIMENSIONS

Psychological Space Dimension

The family interaction variable of psychological space refers to the emotional unity or bonding between members of a family as well as the amount of autonomy granted each member with and beyond the family unit (Kantor & Lehr, 1975).

One of the central concerns of theorists and observers of family interaction is how the family defines and controls its use of space, both inside and outside the family unit. Each family determines the type and strength of boundary around the family unit that will be used to separate and protect its members from the outside world. A system boundary can be

defined as those operations and regulations which authenticate a system's territory within the larger community; which designates who shall participate in the system and what exchanges shall take place across system borders (Broderick & Smith, 1979). Physical boundaries can be accomplished through barriers, such as fences, doors or locks. Psychological barriers, such as rules, might include an understanding among family members that some ideas are not permitted inside the family boundary, enforced by censoring certain conversations, books, or television programs. The rules might also include an unspoken understanding that certain information is not to be taken outside the family boundary.

Within the interior of the family unit, the spatial concept refers to the distance between members in terms of relationships. Emotional and physical closeness can often be determined through structural design and size of the house as well as the way in which activities are organized.

Two earlier family sociologists, Hess and Handel (1959), point out that a family's prime task is to establish a pattern of separateness and connectedness between members and to establish the boundaries of the family's world of experience. They indicate that there had to be both closeness and distance between family members and that extremes of either were usually accompanied by pathological behaviour. The family also decides how close it wishes to be to the external world:

A family constitutes its own world, which is not to say that it closes itself off from everything else but that it determines what parts of the external world are admissible and how freely. . . . The outer

limits of life space for any family are fairly definite and reasonably well marked. (Hess and Handel, 1959, p. 14)

Although these authors used the case study approach with only five families, they were able to discern differences in the way families handle the spatial issue. The main value of their work still remains their pioneering investigation of the psycho-social interiors of normal families.

About the same time, Zimmerman and Cervantes, published their study, Successful American Families (1960). These sociologists like Hess and Handel, began to realize the way in which the regulation of family space affects interaction. Basically, they saw successful families as having a circle of friends and kin who shared important values with them. These "surrounding layers" of friends acted as a boundary to protect and support the family's value system and prevent disruption by opposing forces. Though it is unlikely that the authors' definition of "success" would be accepted today, their study remains important for its innovative investigation of nonpathological families.¹

A theoretical paper, authored by sociologists Rosenblatt and Titus (1976), also addresses the issue of space in the family. These writers posit that family members must negotiate and decide the optimal amount of time they would like to spend together and apart. An important factor affecting the measurement of the spatial concept in family interaction is pointed out in

¹Successful families were defined as those who: Avoided family disruption by divorce or desertion, avoided interference by the police, and kept their children in school beyond the age sixteen (Zimmerman & Cervantes, 1960).

their article; that the objective and subjective evaluation of space may be quite different. That is, family members may spend considerable time together, yet feel emotionally distant from one another. Members from another family might be quite autonomous, spending much time apart, yet enjoying strong emotional bonds.

The earlier literature, reflecting a clinical perspective, describes the way in which disturbed families handle fears about space between members. Singer and Wynne (1965a) use the term "pseudomutuality" to describe a facade situation among family members where the fear of separation and isolation is overcome through the appearance of perpetual harmony and togetherness. "Pseudohostility" is the opposite situation where fear of intimacy or closeness is handled through a surface preoccupation with conflict which serves to keep members distant. These authors also refer to a disturbed family's boundary maintenance through the concept of the "rubber fence" (Singer & Wynne, 1965a). An encompassing, flexible boundary around the family unit serves to limit autonomy and prevent members from leaving the family. These descriptive concepts enjoy popularity in the family process literature, but have yet to be empirically tested. Gerber's (1973, p. 139) study of psychological distance in the family, in which she concluded that "deviant patterns of separateness and connectedness often characterize the relationships of families in which members develop symptoms of disturbance" lends some support to these interaction concepts. On the other hand, there is the suspicion that such findings could be artifacts of the theories on which they are based as well

as the setting in which they are observed.

Napier (1978) deals with the spatial question in family interaction with a view to therapy for couples who suffer marital breakdown. This author feels a common marriage problem occurs when "one partner seeks closeness and reassurance while the other desires separateness or independence" (Napier, 1978, p. 5). The development of his "rejection-intrusion" pattern includes an etiological hypothesis based on the couples' experience in their families of origin. As is common in family process theorizing, Napier derives his theory from the works of other therapists who are all from the field of psychiatry. He reported planning empirical research to test his hypothesis (Napier, 1978, p. 12).

Kantor and Lehr (1975, p. 41) agree that a family must establish how it will regulate distance among its members and how it will develop and maintain its boundaries. They create the terms "bounding" and "linking", mechanisms which refer to the way in which families regulate their space. While the authors have obviously given much thought to the way in which families negotiate space, the main difficulty with their categories is that they are not readily amenable to research applications.

Stierlin (1974a) and Beaver (1977) have also developed constructs of family space based on psychoanalytic theory. Both are therapists and their main interest lies in using the interactional framework for treatment of disturbed families. Stierlin deals primarily with transactional modes between generations. "Binding" and "expelling" are opposite modes where parents either demand eternal dependence from their children or neglect,

reject, and push them into premature autonomy. Beavers, building on much of Stierlin's work, deals with the family interaction variable of space by using the term "closeness". He looks at the "clarity of intrasystem boundaries and the amount of sharing and intimacy" in family interaction (Beavers, 1977, p. 33).

Minuchin et al (1978) and Olson et al (1979) were interested in developing treatment goals for troubled families. Both derived their spatial concepts from clinical observation.

Minuchin and his associates (1978) focus primarily on the family's spatial interior. They discuss, as do Olson and his colleagues (1979), space between family members and subsystems through the use of the terms "enmeshment" and "disengagement", the two extreme types of relating. The enmeshed family is involved in an excessive form of proximity and intensity where boundaries between parental, spousal, and sibling subsystems are weak and easily crossed. There is a lack of privacy and family members are free to intrude upon each other's household space, thoughts, and feelings. The disengaged family has overly rigid boundaries between subsystems and individuals. Members may not respond to each others' obvious stress because of the high tolerance for individual variation in behaviour, i.e., parents may ignore signs of their child's delinquent behavior.

Summary and Discussion of Psychological Space Dimension: Generally, authors support the contention that family members must come to terms with

the way in which psychological space, that is, issues involving emotional unity, dependence, and autonomy, will be handled among members, between subsystems, and between the family unit and the outside world. The way in which the spatial issues (and other interaction issues) are decided will usually be determined by the parents, based on their experiences in their family of origin (Aldous, 1967, p. 236; Napier, 1978, p. 6; Berger & Luckmann, 1967, p. 59; Stierlin, 1974b, p. 286). The process is, however, typically unperceived by the parents. Children receive the parentally transmitted world as reality, as "the only existent and only conceivable world" (Berger & Luckmann, 1967, p. 134). Though there will be situations in families where greater closeness or greater distance prevails, the authors are united on the position that a balance of separateness and connectedness between members is desirable in family interaction.

It can be seen from the literature there is general consensus about psychological space as an important variable in family interaction. The majority of scholars who are concerned with the spatial issue in family process are from the field of psychiatry or are interested in therapeutic intervention in family therapy. It can be expected then, that family process theories, concepts, and studies emanating from that field will be influenced by psychiatric nosology and theories of psychotherapy. The major drawbacks of the psychological spatial concept are the lack of standardization of terms and the difficulties related to measurement. It appears that authors

show agreement about the importance and meaning of the space variable even though the vocabulary is disparate and empirical validation is typically lacking.

Adaptability Dimension

Adaptability in family systems can be defined as the ability of family members to adjust their style of relating when events or situations indicate that a change is needed. Equally important to the family is the issue of stability which can be seen as the continuity in relationships that allows family members a sense of security and identity.

A high degree of emotional bonding may be called for in times of crises, illness, or death and boundary maintenance may become rigid when the family faces danger from external forces. When the situation changes and the manner of relating remains the same and thus becomes inappropriate, problems arise, particularly when children are involved. Thus it is not only the ability to adapt to changing situations, but the ability to adjust transactional modes appropriately so as to maintain some equilibrium or stability in the family that is important.

The earliest family process theorists viewed family systems as actively avoiding change (Haley, 1959; Jackson, 1965; Singer & Wynne, 1965a). Jackson (1965) used the term "homeostasis" to describe families that strongly resisted change. Homeostatic mechanisms were behaviours displayed by family members (particularly a disturbed member) that served to enforce those relationship rules which operated to prevent

change in patterns of interaction. Like Jackson, Haley's (1962) view of family adaptability was based on schizophrenic members. His First Law of Relationships stated: "when an organism indicates a change in relations to another, the other will act upon the first so as to diminish and modify that change" (Haley, 1962, p. 277). Singer and Wynne (1965a) also worked with disturbed families and noticed the inability of members to change their way of relating:

There seems to be families which can delineate certain role expectations among themselves but then do not have the capacity to alter these expectations to allow for developmental changes.
(p. 198)

It seems obvious that these therapists were observing a select clientele. The disturbed families that resisted change and fit the homeostatic model were the most likely to be seen together in therapy. Troubled families that were broken and disengaged were seldom together long enough to seek therapy as a unit.

In the past decade there has been an emphasis on investigating and classifying interaction in a broad spectrum of families. The findings reveal that not all families avoid change in relationship norms, but some enjoy and actively seek these changes (Kantor & Lehr, 1975). There is an acceptance among current authors that an optimal amount of adaptability in family interaction allows for developmental change while preserving the stability of the family system.

Kantor and Lehr (1975) recognize that families have different levels of adaptability. They predicate their model on successfully functioning

families that have different "homeostatic ideals" (p. 119). When a family does not attain its ideal, the failure can lead to a "homeostatic impasse", a self-destroying pattern of interacting into which the family becomes locked.

Olson et al (1979) and Wertheim (1975) use the concepts of "morphostasis" (stability promoting) and "morphogenesis" (change promoting) in their discussion of family interaction. The compatibility of their views is illustrated in the discussion of Wertheim's adaptive family system by Olson and his colleagues:

An ideal, adaptive family system can be conceptualized as one characterized by an optimal, socio-culturally appropriate balance between...morphogenesis and...morphostasis. (Olson et al, 1979, p. 13)

These authors see the family enduring as a system, but undergoing successive changes in response to developments that originate in the family and also the environment.

Beavers (1977, p. 25) and Minuchin et al (1978, p. 57) support the same premise that a family must meet continual demands for change while maintaining the necessary minimum predictable state.

Summary and Discussion of Adaptability Dimension. The family process literature appears to be achieving consensus in its approach to system adaptability. The earliest position held by theorists was that families typically avoided any change in their manner of relating. This concept of homeostasis has come under heavy criticism (Speer, 1970) and researchers have had to review the whole question of system adaptability.

This points up some of the problems with conceptualizing adaptability and stability in family interaction. They involve the interrelated issues of normality, observer expectancy, and levels of adaptability.

There has been very little research conducted with "normal" families.¹ Studies and theories found in the literature regarding this concept have generally come from a clinical perspective; by definition this involves "abnormal" or "dysfunctional" families. Kantor and Lehr (1975) have attempted to measure system adaptability in normal families but their extremely small, non-random sample leave their findings open to question. Olson and his colleagues (1979) have just begun empirical investigation of this concept.

Another issue involved in thinking about family adaptability (as well as other family interaction issues) is that of observer expectancy (Riskin & Faunce, 1972). Observers who are trained in a given theoretical framework will perceive interaction according to the concepts they have learned in that theory (Calapinto, 1979). Furthermore, since only "abnormal" (or "troubled", "dysfunctional", or "problem") families are seen in therapy, the therapist or researcher will expect to observe "abnormal" interaction. Even when studying "normal" families, observer expectancy is evident. Riskin (1976, p. 437) notes these problems in his study of "nonlabeled" families:

¹"Normal is often defined residually - that is, it is the category of all those who remain after those officially labelled as deviant have been removed (Broderick & Pulliam-Krager, 1979).

It seems at times difficult, especially for those observers who are professionally trained, to shift from a pathology model to a nonpathology point of view. For example, we have several times got tangled up in the question of whether the parents in one family are so polite that there must be serious, neurotic hostility underneath.

Bias, introduced by theoretical training, will undoubtedly influence the concepts and terminology that emerge in subsequent family process findings.

Another weakness of the adaptability concept lies in establishing levels or standards of family functioning. How much adaptability is just enough? There is evidence that families can experience quite a dissimilar amount of adaptability and stability in their interaction and yet be considered "normal" (Kantor & Lehr, 1975).

While there is little standardization of terms, there appears to be agreement among current authors that the viability of a family can be predicated on a balance between continuity and change in interactional style. The family must be able to adjust appropriately to different conditions and situations brought about by environmental factors and developmental stages of the life cycle.

Communication Dimension

The literature reveals that one of the major concerns in the communication dimension is the way in which messages, verbal and non-verbal, are sent and received by family members. Another issue involving family communication, is the manner in which members perceive and interpret the world beyond the family boundary.

An important communication concept in the family process literature

is the "double-bind". (Bateson, Haley, Jackson, & Weakland, 1956).

Essentially the double-bind is a situation where one person gives another person two mutually exclusive commands simultaneously. Usually one message is verbal and the other non-verbal. The person receiving the conflicting messages is unable to leave the situation or challenge the order. For example, a mother may verbally ask her child to be close to her by saying, "Come here, sit by me", yet her tone of voice and facial gesture may be rejecting. The child, unable to fulfill both commands or leave the relationship, is caught in a double-bind.

The literature shows that many authors have written about situations very similar to double-bind, but they use divergent terminology. "Pseudohostility" and "pseudomutuality", two concepts introduced by Singer and Wynne (1965a) involve conflicting messages between family members. Laing's (1965) construct of "mystification" is basically a double-bind where confusing communication in the family leads to pathology, usually schizophrenia. Haley's (1967) "perverse triangle" bears resemblance to the double-bind in that the third person in the triangle receives two incongruent messages simultaneously and is unable to escape the relationship. Broderick and Pulliam-Krager's (1979) concept of "paradoxical bonding" is essentially another name for the double-bind. There is marked similarities in these concepts, though the terms differ. In addition, they have all been developed through observation of families in a clinical setting.

In reviewing the double-bind, Sojit (1971) examined meta-communication. By this term, Sojit refers to the technique of communicating

about the communication, pointing out incongruencies of the message to the sender, which is the most adequate response to the double-bind. Her findings that the double-bind situation is found in normal families as well as families with pathology other than schizophrenia leads her to comment:

It has been emphasized that the pathogenicity does not rest in isolated double-bind communicational events, but in the learned pattern of how to behave in such circumstances (Sojit, 1971, p. 73).

The results from Sojit's study point out the need for more empirical investigation of interaction concepts such as the double-bind, particularly with non-clinical families in a naturalistic setting.

The families in therapy who take part in interaction studies generally tend to be the over-involved unadaptable type. This type of family places high importance on content agreement in verbal exchange. On the other hand, in families where there is little emotional bonding between members, where relationship norms are unstable, agreement is likely to be rare and inconsequential. People from this type of family may experience more conflict because the rigid intra-system boundaries serve to keep perceptions and beliefs of members separated and distinct (Stierlin, 1974a; Minuchin et al, 1978).

Reiss, (1971a) in his study of the way members perceive the outer environment found that family members who were not emotionally close and were unstable in their relationship norms, tended to hold separate viewpoints. Results showed they did not rely on each other for information in a problem solving task. On the other hand, members from the opposite type of family, those who were overinvolved and unadaptable in their

relationship norms, usually took their cues from one another and held a common interpretation of the outer world as being hostile and threatening. Family members in the study who experienced a balance of closeness and autonomy with adaptable relationship norms, perceived the world in a similar way, as orderly and comprehensible. Reiss' investigation supported his hypothesis that communication patterns are associated with the way in which family members perceive and interpret the outer environment. However, the results of his research may have been influenced by the clinical setting in which the study was conducted.

Berg (1979) also discusses communication and the family's perception of the world. Drawing on the work of Berger and Luckman (1967) from the sociology of knowledge, as well as the family process theorists, he sees the family as a subuniverse of meanings which are interpretations of the world given to the family members through the conversational process. The focus of his theoretical model is on the congruence between the family's interpretation of the outside world as compared to the meanings embraced by the surrounding society. The family's interpretation of the "world out there" has consequences for family interaction as well as for the socialization of children and their ability to cope in the world.

In conclusion, the literature shows the issue of communication to be of prime importance to family interaction. Some families communicate in distinctly different ways from other families and also perceive and interpret the world beyond the family unit dissimilarly. There is an acceptance among

researchers and theorists as to the significance of communication as a salient factor in family interaction even though they use different terms for somewhat similar processes. Empirical research is now needed, especially with normal families, to validate the concepts found in the communication dimension of the family interaction literature.

TYPOLOGIES OF FAMILY INTERACTION

To help bring some structure to the multitude of concepts found in the family process literature, scholars in the field have been working toward the development of viable typologies. The typological framework involves the delineation of common elements or characteristics of families so they can be grouped into logical arrangements by noting the similarities and differences. This results in categories which are convenient to utilize; pure or modal types. Herein lies their strength and their weakness. The more parsimonious the types, the more difficult it is to assign cases to them. Families seldom emerge as pure types; often typological categories are not sufficient for the range of differences actually found. A desirable classification scheme is the mixed model suggested by Strauss (1973, p. 448) where individual cases are located along one or more dimensions. In this way, broad types can be defined within which the dimensions are specified.

The typologies included in this review meet three criteria: first, the typologies classified interaction patterns among all family members, not just focusing on one individual or subsystem of the family; second, they

deal with one or more of the three interaction variables found in theories (spatial issues, system adaptability, and communication patterns); and third, they include at least three types, one being a normal or nonpathogenic type. The eight typologies which meet the criteria all delineate family interaction in a similar way. There is broad agreement on the characteristics of family types offered by the typologists, but their vocabularies are dissimilar (see Figure 1). The various typologies are often reflections of the interests, goals and discipline of the theorists.

Eight Typologies of Family Interaction

Reiss (1971b) A typology which focuses on the family's perception of the outer environment is that of Reiss (1971b). Reiss' "consensual-experience" typology is built on the premise "that each family develops its own shared and distinctive view or explanation of its environment and patterns or principles that govern its people and events" (Reiss, 1971a, p. 2). He found members in families of schizophrenics showed a great ability to utilize cues from each other, but not from the environment in a problem-solving experiment. Members in normal families utilized cues from both the family and non-family environment. Families with character disordered members could utilize cues from the environment, but not from each other.

Based on these findings, Reiss hypothesized that members of the "consensus-sensitive" type viewed the world as threatening, chaotic, and unknowable. In order to protect each other, they attended to intra-family cues more carefully. Families with a schizophrenic member fit into this type.

AUTHOR	CROSS-REFERENCE OF TYPES			
Reiss (1971b)	Consensus- Sensitive	Environment Sensitive	Interpersonal Distance-Sensitive	
Wertheim (1973)	Pseudo- Integrated	Integrated	Fairly Integrated	Non- Integrated
Kantor and Lehr (1975)	Closed	Open	Random	
Beavers (1977)	Severely Disturbed (Centripedal)	Optimal	Severely Disturbed (Centrifugal)	
Minuchin et al (1978)	Enmeshed	Engaged	Disengaged	
Berg (1979)	Opaque	Translucent	Transparent	
Broderick & Pulliam-Krager	Closed	Selective- Open	Open	
Olson et al (1979)	Rigidly Enmeshed	Structurally Connected	Flexibly Separated	Chaotically Disengaged

Figure 1: Family Interaction Typologies

Members in the "environment-sensitive" type desired to develop their knowledge and mastery of the environment through the principle of logic. Member's thoughts and precepts were helpful to this understanding and were accepted or rejected on the basis of objective accuracy. These families were able to utilize more cues because they relied on information from the environment as well as family members. This type was composed of normal families.

The "interpersonal distance-sensitive" type were those families which viewed the environment as fragmented into different areas for each member. Independence in these families was maintained by demonstrating individual mastery and decisiveness. Laws and values were unique to each member and sharing was seen as a sign of weakness. Families with a character-disordered member were seen in this type.

Reiss' clinical studies of the reciprocal relationship between individual thinking and family interaction is beset by problems similar to others using psychiatric diagnosis; namely the difficulty of assigning cases to schizophrenic, character disordered and normal categories. Although Reiss used a very small and predominantly pathological sample, he gained some empirical support for his hypothesis. His studies have not been replicated, but the problem-solving task which he developed is still being used (Steinglass, 1979; Reiss and Oliveri, 1980), and his research remains important in the family process literature.

Wertheim (1973). The focus of Wertheim's (1973) theoretically derived

typology is on the therapeutic intervention with problem families. She deals primarily with the system's adaptability and stability through the concepts of morphostasis (stability promoting) and morphogenesis (change promoting) and takes into account the family's intra-and extra-systemic communication. She outlines eight family types: two integrated (normal types), two fairly integrated (types with mild symptoms), two pseudo-integrated and two non-integrated types (types with severe problems). Wertheim sees a close comparison with her theoretical typology of family systems and the empirical results and inductive typology reported by Reiss (1971b). Though the typology suffers from some of the diagnosis problems of psychiatric nosology, the types outlined do compare with other authors who deal with similar concepts in family interaction.

Kantor and Lehr (1975). Kantor and Lehr developed their typology from observations of a small sample of normal and pathological families. Three types were classified according to the family's definition and use of space and its adaptability. The authors described the "closed type" family as the least adaptable with its high interdependence, and limited autonomy granted to the members. The "random type" family is the most adaptable and espouses independence and autonomy for its members. The "open type" family is seen as a balance between the random and closed families.

The boundary around the closed family type is distinct and clearly marked so as to ensure the "preservation of territoriality, self-protection, privacy", and to maintain the family secrets (Kantor and Lehr, 1975,

p. 120). The boundary around the random family type is indistinct and de-emphasized as each member establishes and defends his or her own territory. Personal and subsystem boundaries are just the opposite, nebulous in the closed family, but strong in the random family type. The open family type has permeable, but evident boundaries within and around the family unit.

These typologists have made a valiant attempt to measure and categorize family interaction, particularly in normal families. However, their sample of nineteen families, half of whom had members with pathology requiring hospitalization, makes the conclusions tenuous. The study, involving the use of trained participant observers living in the families' homes, yielded data in the form of observer reports, tape recordings, self-reports, interviews, and projective test results. One of the major difficulties of a study of this type is the expectancy of the observer and the observed. Family interaction changes when an outsider is present. Self-reports and interviews often give an innaccurate picture because of the family's desire to conform to expectancies. In addition, families who agree to be observed and interviewed may have different characteristics than those who refuse to take part in a study. These subtle influences will undoubtedly affect the results and conclusions about the family as an interacting group.

Beavers (1977). Beavers' typology represents the relationship between family competence and individual functioning and health. He discerns two opposite

types of dysfunctional families with either "centripedal" or "centrifugal" characteristics. Families with centripedal or centrifugal features can be classified as "severely disturbed", "borderline", "midrange", or "adequate" depending on the nature and magnitude of the pathology evident in members. The family with the best functioning or "optimal" characteristics may have centripedal/centrifugal stylistic differences, but they are scarcely noticeable because the style is modified by the blending of the two relationship patterns.

The severely disturbed, centripedal type has a rigid boundary around the family with blurred intra-system boundaries. The outer environment is perceived as frightening and threatening. The members are very cohesive in order to protect themselves against the outside world. The family's manner of relating remains static and autonomy is seldom achieved by members.

Members of the severely disturbed centrifugal type gain their gratification primarily from sources outside the family:

Parents and children look beyond the family orbit when frustrated, feeling considerable pressure to distance themselves when family conflict is great and seek peers as solace. (p. 44)

Relationship patterns within the family are unstable and children usually separate prematurely from the family by leaving home.

Using systems theory and psychoanalytic concepts, Beavers developed his typology to explain pathological behaviour and recommend treatment. His work has not yet been empirically validated.

Minuchin, Rosman and Baker (1978). These authors build their typology around the issues of space and adaptability in the family. Derived from clinical observation, three types are outlined; "enmeshed", "engaged", and "disengaged". The intra-family boundaries in the enmeshed family are blurred and differentiation between subsystems is diffused, i.e., the parental subsystem can be easily invaded by the child. Patterns of interacting are difficult to change for enmeshed family members. Transactional patterns are stubbornly and inappropriately maintained.

The disengaged family has rigid boundaries between members and subsystems. An incapacity for interdependence may prevent the activation of the family supportive system when a member is in trouble. Transactional patterns are too changeable; members lose the sense of continuity in family relationships that protects their sense of belonging.

The engaged family is seen as a healthy balance between the enmeshed and disengaged types. The members' pattern of interaction changes appropriately and there is a balance of autonomy and dependence.

The concepts and structure of Minuchin's typology were developed through his work with problem families. Though the terms are similar to those Olson (1979) uses, the typology corresponds more closely to the one put forth by Kantor and Lehr (1975).

Berg (1979). There are similarities between Reiss' (1971b) and Berg's (1979) family types in the way family members perceive or interpret the outside world. Berg's theoretically derived typology is predicated on

Kantor and Lehr's (1975) model with facets taken from the sociology of knowledge. He refers to the family system as "we" and the external environment as "they". In the "opaque" family, which is analogous to the closed-type family, the system boundary is maintained by polarizing the world into "we versus they". The family defines and explains all components of the external world to its members and the meanings are all-inclusive. Just as Reiss' consensus-sensitive family sees the world as threatening, Berg's opaque family may define the outer environment as hostile or even evil. However, the opaque family runs the risk of collapse if these meanings are challenged by the members as being incongruent with their experience of the outside world.

The "transparent" family in Berg's typology is similar to Kantor and Lehr's random-type family. This family offers little or no interpretation of the outside world to its members; there is no identity apart from the external environment. Members of this family interpret their position as "we are they". Like Reiss' interpersonal distance-sensitive type, the transparent family identifies more with the non-family environment than with the family. As Berg points out, the members will experience difficulty coping in the world because the transparent family fails to provide sufficient and necessary definitions for adequate functioning.

Berg's "translucent" family type parallels the open-type family in Kantor and Lehr's (1975) model. This family type conveys meanings about the outer world through interpretations that are reasonable and congruent with those of society. Meaning can be negotiated in the family and the

world is not seen in a rigid manner, but as "we and they". Berg concludes the translucent family would provide the most effective socialization environment for the child because definitions found in this family are sufficient and compatible with external definitions. In fact, it is this aspect of Berg's typology, the efficacy of the socialization of the child, which differs from that of Reiss, who is concerned with the way family interaction influences perceptions and cognitive functions of family members. The cross-disciplinary theorizing in Berg's typology is needed in the family process field and empirical research is now necessary to support his hypotheses.

Broderick and Pulliam-Krager (1979). This typology also deals with the effects of family interaction on the child. They draw on Reiss' (1971b) consensual-experience model and Kantor and Lehr's (1975) typology as well as reviewing the chief constructs of other theorists to arrive at three family types, "open", "selective-open", and "closed" which link family process to child outcomes. The key to their model is the presence or absence of paradoxical bonding (a double-bind situation). Through the nature of the family's boundary maintenance, the child's metaperspective is controlled and results in different behaviours that the authors delineate as "unchallenged normal", "delinquent", "achieved normal", and "schizophrenic".

The typology has not yet been empirically tested. The main weakness of Broderick and Pulliam-Krager's model is the emphasis on

pathology based on psychiatric nosology. Clinicians often disagree about the meaning of "schizophrenic" and "delinquent"; therapists frequently differ in their diagnosis of the same patient when using these categories (McNeill, 1980). The typology bears many similarities to the others discussed, but there appears to be insufficient evidence for the predicted behavioural outcomes.

Olson, Sprenkle and Russell (1979) . Olson and his colleagues have incorporated Kantor and Lehr's (1975) model in their typology which outlines two dimensions of family interaction. The "cohesion" dimension, measuring the spatial concept in family interaction, ranges from the "enmeshed" type to the "disengaged" type. The adaptability dimension has four types which range from the "chaotic" type to the "rigid" type. When the two dimensions are combined, a circumplex model emerges with sixteen types of family interaction. Developed as a tool for clinical diagnosis and specifying treatment goals for troubled families, these authors feel the types that have a balance of cohesion and adaptability are the most functional to individual and family development. Two studies were done to empirically test the circumplex model (Sprenkle & Olson, 1978; Russell, 1979). The results showed support for the theory.

To sum up thus far, eight typologies were found in the family process literature, which meet three criteria for a family interaction classification scheme. These typologies were included because: first, they classify interaction among all family members, not just focusing on one

individual or subsystem; secondly, they deal with one or more of the three interaction variables reviewed in this paper (psychological space, adaptability, and communication patterns); and thirdly, they outline at least three types, one being a normal or nonpathological type. The eight typologies were developed by: Reiss (1971b), Wertheim (1973), Kantor and Lehr (1975), Beavers (1977), Minuchin (1978), Berg (1979), Broderick and Pulliam-Krager (1979), and Olson et al (1979).

The typologists reviewed generally see two extreme types of family interaction. On one end of the scale is the family whose members exhibit the following profile: emotionally under-involved, have autonomy granted prematurely, experience an unstable style of relating, and interpret the outer environment individually and dissimilarly. On the opposite end of the scale the family profile includes members who: are emotionally over-involved, are not granted autonomy, experience a rigid and unchanging style of relating, and share a similar interpretation of the outer world as threatening and hostile. The third family type is usually designated as normal or nonpathological. It includes the following features: members have a balance of dependence and autonomy, styles of relating are flexible and change appropriately; and members agree on their interpretation of the world as orderly and understandable.

The eight typologies reviewed come from the family process literature where the majority of the typologists have a similar theoretical perspective supported by observation and research with families in a clinical setting. The issue of bias through experimenter effect in such a

setting served as a basis for the development of the major hypothesis.

The evolution of the major hypothesis is presented in the next section.

THE MAJOR HYPOTHESIS

The typologies discussed in the literature review, for the most part, have been developed through observation of families who were labelled as "abnormal", "dysfunctional", "pathologic", or other such terms. In research of this nature, the danger of experimenter effect (Rosenthal, 1966) is always present. The investigators' expectations, stemming from a theoretical viewpoint, may contribute to biased conclusions which will ultimately influence the resulting typological constructs. Furthermore, the setting in which family research is conducted may not accurately reflect socio-cultural reality (Calapinto, 1979). If the concepts are not publicly shareable, if lengthy requisite training is required for comprehension and use of the typologies, they will be of limited use to those who deal with families. However, it can be assumed that the typologies would have greater utility to a wide range of family practitioners if specified family interaction characteristics were readily identified by observers who were not trained in a theoretical perspective; i.e., theory-naive observers. To test this assumption, the major hypothesis was developed:

THERE WILL BE NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN
DESIGNATED TYPOLOGISTS AND THEORY-NAIVE
OBSERVERS IN THEIR PERCEPTION OF
INTERACTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF FAMILIES.

The research hypotheses and operationalization of family characteristics and family types will be presented in the next chapter.

Chapter II

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to ascertain if theory-naive observers could identify family interaction in accord with designated typologists found in the literature. This chapter will begin with the presentation of the research hypotheses, conceptual definitions, and operationalization of variables. The type of methodology utilized in the study follows.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Nine research hypotheses were derived from the major hypothesis. They deal with the three salient family types outlined in the typologies developed by Kantor and Lehr (1975), Reiss (1971b) and Berg (1979).

Kantor and Lehr's typology was chosen as a model for hypotheses testing of the psychological space and adaptability dimensions because it was considered by the researcher to hold the most potential for use by those who have basic skills in dealing with the family. As well, it summarizes the essence of the other typologies. Three family types are outlined by Kantor and Lehr (1975, Chapter 9), the Random type, the Open type, and Closed type.

Since Kantor and Lehr deal only with two dimensions of family interaction, psychological space and system adaptability, the typologies developed by Reiss (1971b) and Berg (1979) (discussed in the review of the literature) were used as models for testing the facet of interest in the communication dimension, namely the way in which the family perceives and interprets the world beyond the family unit. The typologies include three family types analogous to Kantor and Lehr's types.

Research hypotheses were formulated to test theory-naive observers' perception of three family interaction variables (psychological space, system adaptability, and communications patterns) for each family type.

Hypotheses related to the Random family type were:

- I. The Random family will be perceived to experience more autonomy and emotional distance between members than the Open and Closed types.
- II. Random family members will be perceived to be more adaptable in their relationship norms than the Open and Closed types.
- III. There will be more perceived differences in interpretation of the outer environment among Random family members than among Open family and Closed family members.

Hypotheses related to the Open family type were:

- IV. The Open family will be perceived to have stronger emotional bonding than the Random and Closed family and more individual autonomy than the Closed family.

- V. Open family members will be perceived to be more adaptable in their relationship norms than the Closed family and more stable than the Random family.
- VI. Open family members will be perceived to agree on their interpretation of the outer environment as orderly and understandable more than Closed and Random family members.

Hypotheses related to the Closed family type were:

- VII. Closed family members will be perceived to have less individual autonomy than the Open and Random types and less emotional bonding than the Open type.
- VIII. Closed family members will be perceived to be less adaptable in their relationship norms than the Random and Open types.
- IX. Closed family members will be perceived to agree on their interpretation of the outer environment as hostile and threatening more than the Open and Random types.

CONCEPTUALIZATION AND OPERATIONALIZATION OF VARIABLE

Independent Variable

The independent variable in this study was "family type". Three family types were selected, as conceptualized by Kantor and Lehr.

The characteristics of each family type and the way the types are related to the description of families given in the questionnaire (see Appendix A) follows:



The Random Family Type. Emotional bonding is capricious, individual autonomy is expected, relationship norms fluctuate; ambiguity and novelty are preferred. The Random family type corresponds to family "A" in the questionnaire.

The Open Family Type. Emotional bonding is authentic, individual autonomy is granted, relationship norms change appropriately and consensually; members are adaptive. The Open family type corresponds to family "B" in the questionnaire.

The Closed Family Type. Emotional bonding is expected, individual autonomy is limited, relationship norms change slowly; stability prevails. The Closed family type corresponds to family "C" in the questionnaire.

The strength of Kantor and Lehr's model lies in its departure from psychiatric nosology as a means of diagnosing family interaction. Three ideal types are applicable to "healthy" or "normal" as well as pathological family process. The characteristics the typologists consider to be salient to the evaluation of family interaction are publicly apparent. That is, it is not necessary for the researcher to analyze the meaning of the family's dreams or understand their sexual fantasies and so on. The typology is generally based on socio-culturally shared meanings of manifest behaviour. This should make it more readily available for use as a diagnostic tool and predictive instrument to family practitioners without lengthy, required training.

Dependent Variable

There were three dependent variables in this study. They were the interaction dimensions of "psychological space", "system adaptability", and one facet of the family's communication patterns, "their interpretation of the outer environment". Conceptual definitions of psychological space and system adaptability closely follow those of Olson, Bell, and Portner (1978).

"Psychological space" can be defined as the emotional unity or bonding between members as well as the amount of autonomy granted to each member within and beyond the family boundary. Important to this definition is the issue of boundaries. A boundary can be defined as the operations and regulations which designate who shall participate in the system and what exchanges shall take place across system borders.

In total there were 54 behavioural indicators used to determine the degree to which emotional bonding and individual autonomy were perceived within family types. The following questions are illustrative of the items in this dimension:

#26. Family members are encouraged to have friends of their own as well as family friends.

#32. Family members feel "its everyone for themselves".

#45. Family members have little need for friends because this family is so close.

The second dependent variable, "system adaptability", can be defined as the ability of family members to adjust their style of relating to

each other when events or situations indicate a change is needed. Family stability, an important component of this variable, can be described as the ability of family members to maintain certain relationship norms so as to give members a sense of security and belonging.

In total, there were 42 behavioural indicators used to determine the degree of adaptability perceived in family types. The kind of questions used to measure this variable were:

#17. It is difficult for this family to keep track of what family members are doing.

#34. This family has a rule for almost every possible situation.

#55. Family members encourage each other's efforts to find new ways of doing things.

A total of 15 behavioural indicators were used to determine the manner in which families were perceived to "interpret the world beyond the family boundary", one aspect of the communication dimension and the third dependent variable. Some of the questions from this dimension were:

#10. This family believes the world is a dangerous and frightening place to live.

#52. Members in this family would likely disagree among themselves what is right and wrong.

#67. This family is quite tolerant of people who have opinions and lifestyles different than theirs.

DATA COLLECTION

The Research Sample

The sample of theory-naive observers was drawn mainly from groups such as Y-neighbors, churches, and community clubs. As well, a number of friends and acquaintances took part. The sample consisted of 172 respondents; 132 females and 40 males. The age range was from 13 to 60 years with a mean age of 29 years.

The sample reflected a wide variety of people coming from occupations such as sales, farming, engineering, and homemaking, and included a few high school students. Participants lived mainly in the city of Winnipeg with some located in the rural Manitoba towns of Teulon, Beausejour, and Rosenort.

Two criteria were established for participation in the survey. First, respondents had to be 13 years of age or over. The age of 13 years was decided upon because it was felt some items on the questionnaire might be difficult for anyone younger to comprehend. Secondly, respondents could not be knowledgeable in family process theory.

A nonrandom sample was used for the study. A random sample was not considered necessary because the participants were regarded as representative of the population with which the study was concerned, that is, people not trained in family process theory.

Since the participants were aware before hand of the researcher's purpose of attending their meeting (see "Data Collection Procedure" below), all those present took part in the survey.

The Instrument

The method of collecting data was a 111-item questionnaire (see Appendix A). The questionnaire, which was modified for this study, was originally developed by Olson, Bell, and Portner (1978). Called the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES), the self-report instrument was used by Olson and his colleagues to measure the family interaction variables of psychological space and adaptability for the purpose of diagnosing marital and family systems and setting treatment goals.

The questions were revised by changing pronouns so the items would refer to a family other than the respondent's own. The 15-item Edmond's Conventionality scale was replaced with 15 questions designed to assess the family's perception of the world beyond the family boundary. These questions were developed by the investigator, based on the review of the literature.

A list of family interaction behaviours representative of the three family types outlined by Kantor and Lehr (1975) was given on the first page of the instrument. As well, demographic information regarding the respondent's sex, age category, (teens, twenties, thirties, etc.), and the number of members in each age category of the family chosen was requested on page one. Instructions in the questionnaire were only meant to supplement more detailed verbal instructions (see Appendix B).

Five response categories were offered for each question.

Participants would have to determine if the question was "always true", "most times true", "occasionally true", "seldom true", or "never true". A question mark was to be circled at the far right of the question to indicate when the respondent was guessing at the answer. The rationale for this procedure was that respondents may refrain from answering a question if they weren't absolutely sure of the answer. Since a study of this nature can only rely on perceptions, each answer was considered an educated guess. Thus, the question mark was provided to improve the efficiency of data gathering.

Reliability and Validity

The validity of the research instrument is based on findings by Olson et al (1978, p. 4). They report a high degree of clinical and empirical validity for the spatial and adaptability dimensions in FACES. Minor revisions were made to the questions for this study, but it was felt that they would not greatly affect the validity. The most that can be claimed for the validity of the communication dimension is that it has face validity. The questions were consistent with the facets of communication identified by Reiss (1971b) and Berg (1979).

Olson et al (1978, p. 2) report the internal consistency (alpha) reliability of the total scores for the adaptability and psychological space dimensions in the FACES questionnaire was high ($r = .75$ and $r = .83$) respectively. Reliability for the communication dimension is unknown.

The Data Collection Procedure

To obtain the sample for the study, letters were sent to 11 community groups asking for participants to take part in the study (see Appendix C). For participating, the group received one dollar for each questionnaire answered. Nine of the 11 groups agreed to participate. The other two groups reported scheduling difficulties as club meetings had terminated for the summer.

The researcher met with the participating groups wherever their meetings were held, in various churches, community clubs or member's homes. The questionnaires were presented and completed at this time.

Presentation of the Questionnaire

The procedure for the first few meetings was: questionnaires were handed out, participants read the descriptions on page one and verbal instructions were given (Appendix B). They were asked not to answer for their own family.¹ Also they were asked to indicate to the researcher if they had training in family theory.

The majority of the respondents answered on Family "B", the Open family type. The second type of family predominantly chosen was Family "A", the Random family type. It appeared that by the time the respondents had read the descriptions of Family "A" and Family "B", they had thought

¹If respondents had answered about their own family, they would have given a self-report and responses may have differed from those given by observers answering about a family other than their own (see Simon, 1978, p. 194; Olson, 1977)

of a family on whom to fill in the questionnaire. To keep the sample of types more even, the procedure was subsequently altered.

Instead of distributing the questionnaires first, the researcher read the descriptions aloud starting with Family "C", the Closed type, then Family "A", the Random type and finally, Family "B", the Open type. After each description had been read, participants were asked if they knew a family who would fit those characteristics. If the answer was affirmative, a questionnaire would be given to the respondent. The researcher remained to collect all completed questionnaires.

Data collection took place during the month of May, 1980.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Tabulating Data

The participant's responses to items on the questionnaire revealed their perceptions of the frequency of occurrence of interactional behaviours in family types. The hypothesized frequency of occurrence of the behavioural indicators for the three family types (previously discussed under "Dependent Variable"), was based on family interaction typologies found in the literature. They were delineated in the following way: Firstly, the hypothesized frequency of occurrence of Random family behaviours would be perceived to be greater for the Random family type (R) than for the Open (O) and Closed (C) family type, that is, $R > O, C$. Secondly, the hypothesized frequency of occurrence of Open family indicators was $O > R, C$, and for the Closed family, $C > R, O$ (Figure 2).

	Family Type	Behavioural Indicators: Items on Questionnaire	Hypothesized Frequency of Occurrence
Psychological	Random (N=18)	7, 18, 30, 32, 37, 39, 43, 49, 54, 58, 60, 66, 84, 91, 96, 98, 100, 106	$R > 0, C^1$
	Open (N=18)	1, 24, 26, 35, 41, 47, 51, 56, 62, 64, 68, 70, 73, 78, 93, 94, 102, 104	$0 > C, R$
	Closed (N=18)	3, 5, 9, 11, 13, 16, 20, 22, 28, 45, 75, 76, 80, 82, 86, 88, 109, 111	$C > 0, R$
Adaptability	Random (N=14)	4, 8, 17, 31, 40, 61, 63, 72, 77, 81, 83, 92, 105, 108	$R > 0, C$
	Open (N=14)	2, 12, 15, 23, 25, 27, 44, 46, 53, 55, 59, 69, 74, 79	$0 > R, C$
	Closed (N=14)	6, 21, 34, 36, 42, 50, 65, 87, 90, 95, 97, 99, 101, 110	$C > 0, R$
Communication	Random (N=3)	29, 52, 57	$R > 0, C$
	Open (N=4)	48, 67, 89, 103	$0 > R, C$
	Closed (N=8)	10, 14, 19, 33, 38, 71, 85, 107	$C > 0, R$

¹The Random family (R) will have a greater frequency of occurrence of the behaviour than the Open family (0) and the Closed family (C).

Figure 2: Hypothesized Frequency of Occurrence of Interactional Behaviours for Three Family Types

Respondents chose one of five response categories to indicate their perception of the frequency of occurrence of behaviour in a family. The highest frequency of occurrence was "always true" and the lowest frequency of occurrence was "never true". If the modal response category was the same for the three types, the percentage of responses in the modal category was used to decide which type was perceived to have the greatest frequency of occurrence of behavioural indicator.

Lambda - the Statistical Test of Hypotheses

Lambda, a nonparametric test, appropriate for analyses of nominal data was used to test the degree of association between the independent variable, "family type", and the dependent variables, "psychological space", "adaptability", and "communication". Once the value of the independent variable is known, the asymmetric lambda evaluates the percentage of improvement in the ability to predict the value of the dependent variable.

Respondents were provided with five response categories to indicate the perceived frequency of occurrence of behaviours in a family. In evaluating the responses, the researcher's best prediction of the perceived frequency of occurrence of a certain family behaviour would be the overall modal response category, if family type were unknown. However, once family type is known, the ability to predict the frequency of occurrence of behaviours should improve. Lambda is the value which indicates the improvement in prediction resulting from the additional

information. In this way, lambda was used to measure the strength of association between the dependent and independent variable.

Lambda varies in magnitude from 0.0 to 1.0. A perfect association would be 1.0 where all the cases in each category of the independent variable fall into only one category of the independent variable (modal category). Lambda is 0.0 when the same modal prediction is made within all categories of the independent variable (Loether and McTavish, 1974, p. 128). In the latter case, the extra information about the independent variable does not help refine the prediction of the mode of the dependent variable.

A lambda value of .100 indicates a 10% improvement in predicting the correct modal response category of an item when family type is identified. For the purposes of this study, lambda values of less than .100 were arbitrarily considered by the researcher to indicate a weak association between the dependent and independent variable. In other words, lambda values above .100 were regarded as showing an acceptable association of strength between family type and certain interactional behaviours.

SUMMARY

The sample consisted of 172 respondents. Participants were given a brief list of characteristics describing three family types. Respondents had to think of a family they knew, other than their own, who would best fit one of the descriptions, and answer an 111-item questionnaire about that family. The questionnaire was designed to measure three dimensions of

family interaction; psychological space, adaptability and communication patterns. Lambda, a statistical test of association for nominal variables was used to analyze the data.

Chapter III

RESULTS

Results for the study were obtained from the analysis of responses given by 172 responses on a questionnaire dealing with family interaction. The final tabulation of data was based on 47 respondents answering for family "A", (Random family type); 71 respondents answering for family "B" (Open family type), and 54 respondents answering for family "C" (Closed family type).

The findings will be presented according to family type. First, results will be reported for the hypotheses related to the Random family, then for the Open family, and finally for the Closed family.

RANDOM FAMILY HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis I

The Random family will be perceived to experience more autonomy and emotional distance than the Open and Closed types.

Psychological Space Dimension. Theory-naïve observers perceived issues of emotional bonding and individual autonomy in the Random family as hypothesized. Respondents answered 17 of the 18 questions used as behavioural

indicators (94.4 percent) in the direction hypothesized. Thirteen of the questions in the hypothesized direction (76.8 percent) had a lambda value above the criterion level of .100 (between .108 and .241). These were considered by the researcher to indicate an association of moderate strength between the independent variable, family type and the dependent variable, psychological space. Lambda values for the four remaining questions in the hypothesized direction (23.5 percent) were between 0.0 and .071 indicating a weak association for between the dependent and independent variable. (Table 1).

Hypothesis II

Random family members will be
perceived to be more adaptable in their
relationship norms than the Open and
Closed type.

Adaptability Dimension. Results show support for the hypothesis. All the questions in this dimension for the Random family were in the hypothesized direction. Lambda values were above the criterion level for six questions (42.9 percent), ranging between .148 and .208. The remaining eight questions (57.1 percent) had lambdas ranging between .019 and .091 (Table 2).

Table 1: Psychological Space and the Random family

Questions (N=18)	Lambda	Theory-naive Responses	Hypoth. Freq.	Agreement
84. This family has difficulty thinking of things to do as a family.	.241*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
43. Even when everyone is home, family members spend their time separately.	.184*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
49. Family members are totally on their own in developing their ideas.	.176*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
32. Family members feel its "everyone for themselves".	.150*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
60. Family members find it easier to discuss things with persons outside the family.	.145*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
66. This family doesn't do things together.	.144*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
98. It seems as if family members can never find time to be together.	.143*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES

¹Raw data can be found in Appendix D.

²This statement reads: The Random family (R) has a greater frequency of occurrence of behaviour than the Open (O) and Closed (C) families.

*Meets the criterion level for association.

Table 1: Psychological Space and the Random family - Continued

Questions	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypothesis Freq.	Agreement
7. Most personal friends are not family friends.	.139*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
58. Members find home is one of the loneliest places to be.	.136*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
18. Family members do not check with each other when making decisions.	.135*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
106. Certain individuals seem to cause most of this family's problems.	.130*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
39. Family members do not turn to each other when they need help.	.109*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
37. In this family, everyone is on their own when there is a problem to solve.	.108*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
100. Family members know very little about friends of other family members.	.071	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
96. It seems there are always people around home who are not members of the family.	.045	$0 > R, C$	$R > 0, C$	NO
91. Family members seem to avoid contact with each other when at home.	.036	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES

*Meets the criterion level for association.

Table 1: Psychological Space and the Random family - Continued

Questions	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypoth. Freq.	Agreement
54. Family members don't enter each other's area or activity.	.009	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
30. Family members are extremely independent.	.0	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES

Table 2: Adaptability and the Random family

Questions (N=14)	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypothesis Freq.	Agreement
17. It is difficult for this family to keep track of what family members are doing.	.208*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
72. It is unclear what will happen when rules are broken in this family.	.202*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
40. Members in this family find it hard to know what other family members are thinking.	.196*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
92. For no apparent reason family members seem to change their minds.	.168*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
81. Members of this family can get away with almost anything.	.165*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
83. When trying to solve problems, family members jump from one attempted solution to another without giving any of them time to work.	.148*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
8. Family members talk a lot but nothing ever gets done.	.091	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
105. Family members never know how others are going to act.	.089	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
61. There is no leadership in this family.	.088	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES

*Meets the criterion level of association.

Table 2: Adaptability and the Random family - Continued

Questions	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypothesis Freq.	Agreement?
77. Family members speak their minds without considering how it will affect others.	.084	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
108. It is hard to know what the rules are in this family because they always change.	.073	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
31. No one in this family seems to be able to keep track of what their duties are.	.038	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
4. It is hard to know who the leader is in their family.	.036	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
62. Family members are not punished or reprimanded when they do something wrong.	.019	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES

Hypothesis III

There will be more perceived differences in interpretation of the outer environment among Random family members than among Open and Closed family members.

Communication Dimension. Responses for two of the three questions in this dimension were in the direction of the hypothesis. The lambda value for one of these questions was above the .100 criterion level for acceptable strength of association between the dependent and independent variables (see Table 3).

OPEN FAMILY HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis IV

The Open family will be perceived to have stronger emotional bonding than the Random and Closed family and more individual autonomy than the Closed family.

Psychological Space Dimension. Responses for 15 of the 18 questions in this dimension (83.3 percent) were in the direction hypothesized. Lambda values were above criterion level (between .106 and .239) for seven

Table 3: Communication and the Random family

Questions (N=3)	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypoth. Freq.	Agreement?
57. Family members seem to drift from one purpose or goal to another without any plan.	.150*	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
29. Members in this family usually don't tell each other about their personal problems or worries.	.038	$R > 0, C$	$R > 0, C$	YES
52. Members in this family would likely disagree among themselves what is right and wrong.	.0	$0 > R, C$	$R > 0, C$	NO

*Meets the criterion level for association.

questions in the hypothesized direction (46.7 percent). The remainder of the questions in the direction hypothesized (53.3 percent) had lambdas between .0 and .092 (Table 4).

Hypothesis V

Open family members will be perceived to be more adaptable in their relationship norms than the Closed family and more stable than the Random family.

Table 4: Psychological Space and the Open family

Questions (N=18)	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypoth. Freq.	Agreement?
102. Members of this family share many interests.	.239*	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
24. Family members like to spend some of their free time with each other.	.232*	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
62. This family tries to plan some things during the week so they can all be together.	.183*	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
1. Members in this family are concerned with each other's welfare.	.178*	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
26. Family members are encouraged to have friends of their own as well as family friends.	.158*	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
47. Although family members have individual interests, they still participate in family activities.	.156*	$C > 0, R$	$0 > R, C$	NO
41. Family members make visitors feel at home.	.141*	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
94. This family has a balance of closeness and separateness.	.106*	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES

*Meets the criterion level for association.

Table 4: Psychological Space and the Open family - Continued

Questions	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypoth. Freq.	Agreement?
73. When the bedroom is shut, family members knock before entering.	.092	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
70. Parents agree on how to handle their children.	.037	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
78. Family members feel comfortable inviting their friends along on family activities.	.029	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
56. Family members discuss important decisions with each other but usually make their own choice.	.019	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
68. Family members enjoy doing things alone as well as together.	.018	$C > R, 0$	$0 > R, C$	NO
104. Family members are encouraged to do their own thing.	.010	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
93. They decide together on family matters and separately on personal matters.	.0	$C > R, 0$	$0 > R, C$	NO
35. The members respect each other's privacy.	.0	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
51. Family members seldom take sides against other members.	.0	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
64. In this family, members know each other's close friends.	.0	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES

Adaptability Dimension. Thirteen of the 14 questions (92.9 percent) were in the hypothesized direction. Lambda values for seven questions (53.8 percent), answered in the direction of the hypothesis, were between .102 and .249. The remaining six questions (46.2 percent) answered in the direction hypothesized, had lambdas below the criterion level, between .0 and .093 (Table 5).

Hypothesis VI

Open family members will be perceived to agree on their interpretation of the outer environment as orderly and understandable more than Closed and Random family members.

Communication Dimension. The results show support for the hypothesis. All four questions in this dimension were answered in the direction of the hypothesis. Two questions had lambda values above .100 (.106 and .205) and two questions had lambdas below .100 (Table 6).

Table 5: Adaptability and the Open family

Questions (N=14)	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypothesis Freq.	Agreement?
27. Family members discuss problems and usually feel good about the solutions.	.249*	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
46. This family feels good about their ability to solve problems.	.200*	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
55. Family members encourage each other's efforts to find new ways of doing things.	.192*	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
15. Family members make the rules together.	.184*	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
44. Parents and children in this family discuss together the method of punishment.	.140*	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
23. The parents check with the children before making important decisions in this family.	.137*	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
79. Each family member has at least some say in major family decisions.	.107*	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
69. In this family, everyone shares responsibilities.	.102*	$C > 0, R$	$0 > R, C$	NO
59. In this family, it is important for everyone to express their opinion.	.093	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES

*Meets the criterion level of association.

Table 5: Adaptability and the Open family - Continued

Questions	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypothesis Freq.	Agreement?
74. If one way doesn't work in this family, they try another.	.093	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
12. Family members have some say in what is required of them.	.056	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
2. Members in this family feel free to say what's on their mind.	.040	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
25. Punishment is usually pretty fair in this family.	.0	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
53. When rules are broken, family members are treated fairly.	.0	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES

Table 6: Communication and the Open family

Questions (N=4)	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypoth. Freq.	Agreement?
103. When a family decision is being made, each member is encouraged to give an opinion.	.205*	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
89. This family believes it is important for each member to be free to do what they want.	.106*	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
48. Each member in this family feels entitled to his or her own opinion and will stick to it.	.079	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES
67. This family is quite tolerant of people who have opinions and lifestyles different than their own.	.073	$0 > R, C$	$0 > R, C$	YES

*Meets the criterion level of association.

CLOSED FAMILY HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis VII

Closed family members will be perceived to have less individual autonomy than the Open and Random types and less emotional bonding than the Open type.

Psychological Space Dimension. Respondents answered 11 of the 18 questions in the direction hypothesized (61.1 percent). Lambda values for 6 of the questions answered in the direction of the hypothesis (54.5 percent) were between .105 and .351. The remaining five questions, answered in the direction hypothesized (45.5 percent) had lambdas below the criterion level of .100 (see Table 7).

Hypothesis VIII

Closed family members will be perceived to be less adaptable in their relationship norms than the Random and Open types.

Adaptability Dimension. Of the 14 questions in this dimension, 7 were answered in the direction hypothesized (50 percent) Lambda values were above .100 for four questions answered in the direction of the hypothesis (57.1 percent, range .142 - .189). The remaining three questions answered

Table 7: Psychological Space and the Closed family

Questions (N=18)	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypoth. Freq.	Agreement?
11. This family knows where all family members are at all times.	.351*	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES
76. Family members are totally involved in each other's lives.	.205*	$0 > R, C$	$C > R, 0$	NO
28. Family members share almost all interests and hobbies with each other.	.183*	$0 > R, C$	$C > R, 0$	NO
86. It seems as if this family agrees on everything.	.167*	$0 > R, C$	$C > R, 0$	NO
82. Family members share the same friends.	.154*	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES
5. It is difficult for members to take time away from the family.	.143*	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES
75. Family members are expected to have the approval of others before making decisions.	.142*	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES
13. The parents in this family stick together.	.113*	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES
20. Family ties are more important to them than any friendship could possibly be.	.105*	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES
45. Family members have little need for friends because this family is so close.	.098	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES

*Meets the criterion level for association.

Table 7: Psychological Space and the Closed family - Continued

Questions	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypoth. Freq.	Agreement?
9. Family members feel guilty if they want to spend some time alone.	.091	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES
109. Family members find it hard to get away from each other.	.080	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES
3. They don't have spur of the moment guests at mealtime.	.068	$0 > R, C$	$C > R, 0$	NO
80. Family members feel pressured to spend most free time together.	.067	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES
16. Members in this family never seem to have any place to be alone in their house.	.0	$0 > R, C$	$C > R, 0$	NO
22. Family members often answer questions that were addressed to another person.	.0	$0 > R, C$	$C > R, 0$	NO
88. Family members know who will agree and who will disagree with them on most family matters.	.0	$R > 0, C$	$C > R, 0$	NO
111. Family members feel they have to go along with what the family decides.	.0	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES

in the hypothesized direction had lambda values between .076 and .091 (Table 8).

Hypothesis IX

Closed family members will be perceived to agree on their interpretation of the outer environment as hostile and threatening more than the Open and Closed types.

Communication Dimension. Respondents answered six of the eight questions in the direction of the hypothesis. One of the six items had a lambda above the criterion level (#33 - .109). Five items in the direction hypothesized (83.3 percent) had lambda values between .0 and .095 (Table 9).

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

In total, 22 of the 111 questions (19.9 percent) did not fall in the hypothesized direction (see Table 10). In some cases these results can be attributed to the wording of the questions. Three questions which fell in the opposite direction hypothesized are of particular interest because the wording was not ambiguous and lambda values were above the criterion level, indicating a clearer distinction of family types by the respondents. These questions are: Item 76, "Family members are totally involved in each other's lives"; item 28, "Family members share almost all interest and

Table 8: Adaptability and the Closed family

Questions (N=14)	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypoth. Freq.	Agreement?
90. There is strict punishment for breaking rules in this family.	.189*	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES
97. Certain family members order everyone else around.	.182*	$R > 0, C$	$C > R, 0$	NO
6. Members are afraid to tell the truth because of how harsh the punishment will be.	.172*	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES
42. Parents make all the important decisions in this family.	.153*	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES
36. Once this family has planned to do something, it is difficult to change it.	.146*	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES
101. Family members feel they have no say in solving problems.	.102*	$R > 0, C$	$C > R, 0$	NO
110. Family members feel the family will never change.	.092	$R > C, 0$	$C > R, 0$	NO
34. This family has a rule for almost every possible situation.	.091	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES
50. Once a task is assigned to a family member there is no chance of changing it.	.086	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES

*Meets the criterion level for association.

Table 8: Adaptability and the Closed family - Continued

Questions	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypoth. Freq.	Agreement?
99. Family members are severely punished for anything they do wrong.	.076	$C > R, 0$	$C > R, 0$	YES
87. It seems as if males and females never do the same chores in this family.	.071	$R > C, 0$	$C > R, 0$	NO
21. When this family has an argument, family members just keep to themselves.	.052	$R > C, 0$	$C > R, 0$	NO
65. This family does not discuss its problems.	.045	$R > C, 0$	$C > R, 0$	NO
95. Family members rarely say what they want.	.029	$R > C, 0$	$C > R, 0$	NO

Table 9: Communication and the Closed Family.

Questions (N=8)	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypoth. Freq.	Agreement?
38. This family tends to be judgemental and inflexible in their opinions of other people in society.	.161*	R > C, O	C > R, O	NO
33. Members of this family are not allowed to interact with people who would be a bad influence on them.	.109*	C > R, O	C > R, O	YES
19. This family tends to withdraw from interacting with others because they feel they have very little in common with most people.	.095	C > R, O	C > R, O	YES
14. This family tends to be suspicious of most people's motives.	.092	C > R, O	C > R, O	YES
107. This family has a commitment to a religious belief.	.087	O > C, R	C > R, O	NO
71. Members are loyal to each other and would not reveal family information to outsiders.	.073	C > R, O	C > R, O	YES
85. Once this family "makes up its mind", the members won't change their ideas.	.044	C > R, O	C > R, O	YES
10. This family believes the world is a dangerous and frightening place to live.	.0	C > R, O	C > R, O	YES

*Meets the criterion level for association.

Table 10: Items Falling in Opposite Direction of Hypotheses.

Questions	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypoth. Freq.
3. They don't have spur of the moment guests at mealtime.	.068	O > R, C	C > R, O
16. Members in this family never seem to have any place to be alone in their house.	.0	O > R, C	C > R, O
21. When this family has an argument, family members just keep to themselves.	.052	R > O, C	C > R, O
22. Family members often answer questions that were addressed to another person.	.0	R > O, C	C > R, O
28. Family members share almost all interests and hobbies with each other.	.183*	O > R, C	C > R, O
38. This family tends to be judgemental and inflexible in their opinions of other people in society.	.161*	R > C, O	C > R, O
47. Although family members have individual interests, they still participate in family activities.	.156*	C > R, O	O > R, C
52. Members in this family would likely disagree among themselves what is right and wrong.	.0	O > R, C	R > O, C
65. This family does not discuss its problems.	.045	R > O, C	C > R, O
68. Family members enjoy doing things alone as well as together.	.018	C > R, O	O > R, C

*Meets criterion level for association.

Table 10: Items Falling in Opposite Direction of Hypotheses - Continued

Questions	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypoth. Freq.
69. In this family everyone shares responsibilities.	.107*	C > O, R	O > R, C
76. Family members are totally involved in each other's lives.	.205*	O > R, C	C > R, O
86. It seems as if this family agrees on everything.	.167*	O > R, C	C > R, O
87. It seems as if males and females never do the same chores in this family.	.071	R > O, C	C > R, O
88. Family members know who will agree and who will disagree with them on most family matters.	.0	R > O, C	C > R, O
93. They decide together on family matters and separately on personal matters.	.0	C > R, O	O > R, C
95. Family members rarely say what they want.	.029	R > O, C	C > R, O
96. It seems there are always people around who are not members of the family.	.045	O > R, C	R > O, C
97. Certain members order everyone else around.	.182*	R > O, C	C > R, O
101. Family members feel they have no say in solving problems.	.102*	R > O, C	C > R, O

*Meets the criterion level of association.

Table 10: Items Falling in Opposite Direction of Hypotheses - Continued

Questions	Lambda	Theory-Naive Responses	Hypoth. Freq.
107. This family has a commitment to a religious belief.	.087	O > R, C	C > R, O
110. Family members feel the family will never change.	.092	R > O, C	C > R, O

*Meets the criterion level of association.

hobbies with each other; and item 86, "It seems as if this family agrees on everything". Respondents did not perceive the differences between the Closed and Open family as predicted for these questions. The results for these items could reflect the fact that not all items in the FACES questionnaire are equally good predictors of family types.

SUMMARY

The results of the study are summarized in Table 11. The results show that 89 of the 111 items (80.2 percent) were answered in the direction hypothesized. Of these questions, 52.8 percent had lambda values above the criterion level of .100. Items pertaining to the Random family were answered 94.3 percent in the direction of the hypotheses. Lambda values for 60.6 percent of these items were above the criterion level. This was the highest rate of agreement between theory-naive and theory-bound observers for the three family types. The lowest rate of agreement occurred for the Closed family type; 60 percent of the items pertaining to the Closed family were in the hypothesized direction with lambda values for 45.8 percent of these items falling above .100. In general, results show support for the hypotheses, even though lambda values were considered to be relatively low. The findings will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Table 11: Summary of Results

	% of Items in Hypothesize Direction			Total Items in Hyp. Dir.	Lambda above .100 For Items in Hypoth. Direction
	Psych. Space	Adapt.	Commun.		
Random Family Items	(N=18) 94.4%	(N=14) 100%	(N=3) 66.6%	(N=35) 94.3%	(N=33) 60.6%
Open Family Items	(N=18) 83.3%	(N=14) 92.9%	(N=4) 100%	(N=36) 88.9%	(N=32) 50.0%
Closed Family Items	(N=18) 61.1%	(N=14) 50.0%	(N=8) 75.0%	(N=40) 60.0%	(N=24) 45.8%
Total	(N=54) 79.6%	(N=42) 81.0%	(N=15) 80.0%	(N=111) 80.2%	(N=89) 52.8%

Chapter IV

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, an examination and evaluation of the results will be presented.

The data revealed that theory-naive observers were able to detect variations in family interaction in agreement with the patterns suggested by the typologies of Kantor and Lehr (1975), Reiss (1971b), and Berg (1979). A summary of results in Table 11, Chapter three shows observers judged interaction in the three family types to be in the direction hypothesized for a large percentage of the items, even though the values for the statistical test in only half of these questions were above the arbitrary criterion level.

Part of the explanation of the statistical results may lie in the nature of the test; it may also reside in the nature of the family types in question, and the mode of operationalizing their dimensions.

The types suggested are "pure" or modal types and are classified this way for simplification and purposed of clarity. In fact, family interaction is usually a blend or mixture of types with only one typical style dominating the way members interact with one another. As noted by Wertheim (1973), Beavers (1977), Minuchin et al (1978), and Olson et al (1979), families who fall into the extreme categories are the ones usually

seen in therapy. These families are either noticeably unadaptable or unstable in their relationship styles and members usually experience extreme autonomy or excessive dependence on one another. Kantor and Lehr (1975, p. 157) point out that the "consistently closed, open, or random family is much more stereotypical than typical". Therefore it is unlikely that differences would be very clear in a study of this nature, even with a clinical population. Discussion of the variable predictability of the types follows.

RANDOM FAMILY TYPE

Of the three family types, the Random family was perceived by theory-naive observers to be most similar to the pure or modal type put forth by the typologists. Random family items were answered 94.3 percent in the hypothesized direction with 60.6 percent of these items having lambdas above .100. The Random family appears to be more readily observable to outsiders than the other two types, according to Kantor and Lehr (1975, p. 134):

Features of family life that one might normally expect to find inside a family's space occur outside a random household as well. Arguments and embracings might occur in the street as well as the living room or bedroom.

The discussion of the psychological space dimension which follows, supports this assumption.

Psychological Space Dimension

The results show theory-naive observers perceived the Random

family as having weaker emotional bonding between members than the other two types and higher individual autonomy as predicted in the hypotheses. From Table 13, it can be seen that members seldom know where other family members are (item 11), seldom shared interests or friends (items 28, 82, 102), and seemed to spend little time together (items 24, 62).

Boundaries between members were perceived as strong (items 43, 66, 49), resulting in emotional separateness and distance. These findings are consistent with those of Kantor and Lehr (1975, p. 134):

Each person develops his own bounding patterns in establishing and defending his own and his family's territory . . . The random family's territorial pattern is an aggregate of individual styles.

Boundaries around the family unit tend to be weak as illustrated by observers' perceptions that members usually find it easier to discuss things with persons outside the family (item 60). Also, members seem to be less important to one another than friends beyond the family unit (items 7, 20).

Kantor and Lehr comment on the boundary maintenance of the Random family:

In general, the random family's bounding operations are aterritorial. Rather than impose limits on exit or entry, random strategies deemphasize the territorial defense of the family. Indeed, they have a tendency to extend entry and exit prerogatives broadly, not only to members, but to guests and strangers as well. (1975, p. 134).

In light of the aforementioned results, it is not surprising that the Random family members were seen as only occasionally being concerned with each other's welfare (item 1). The feeling of isolation is apparent in the observations that members usually feel "its everyone for themselves"

Table 12: Random Family: Modal Response Category and Lambda for Psychological Space Items

	Modal Category	Lambda
1. Members in this family are concerned with each other's welfare.	occas. ¹	.178*
7. Most personal friends are not family friends.	most	.139*
11. This family knows where all family members are at all times.	seldom	.351*
24. Family members like to spend some of their free time with each other.	seldom	.232*
28. Family members share almost all interests and hobbies with each other.	seldom	.183*
32. Family members feel "its everyone for themselves".	most	.150*
43. Even when everyone is home, family members spend their time separately.	most	.184*
49. Family members are totally on their own in developing their ideas.	most	.176*
58. Members find home is one of the loneliest places to be.	occas.	.136*
60. Family members find it easier to discuss things with persons outside the family.	most	.145*
62. This family tries to plan some things during the week so they can all be together.	never	.183*
66. This family doesn't do things together	most	.144*
82. Family members share the same friends.	seldom	.154*
102. Members of this family share many interests	seldom	.239*

¹The range of responses is "always true", "most times true", "occasionally true", seldom true", and "never true". The greatest frequency of occurrence for each item is "always true" and the least frequency of occurrence is "never true".

*Meets criterion level for association.

(item 32). Members were perceived to find home lonelier than members of the other two types (item 58).

Adaptability Dimension

The results reveal that the Random family type was perceived as hypothesized, having high adaptability with a tendency toward instability in relationship styles between members. Observers saw the Random family as being inconsistent and individualistic in their interaction with one another (see Table 13). The modal responses show that most of the time, Random family members found it difficult to keep track of other members (item 17). They seldom made the rules of living together (item 15) and occasionally changed their minds for no apparent reason (item 92). Respondents reported that it was usually unclear what would happen when rules were broken (item 72). Most of the time, members found it hard to know what other members were thinking (item 40). These findings agree with those of Kantor and Lehr (1975, P. 137):

Members attach, detach, commit, and shift their energies at will. As a result, the random family's energy investments are in a perennial state of flux, and constantly changing. Yesterday's commitments are today's detachment and vice versa. Tomorrow could be different again.

Members of the Random family value independent thinking and behaviour, but appear to lack the competence to negotiate their differences. Observers reported that members seldom felt good about their ability to solve problems (item 46) and seldom encouraged each other's efforts to find new ways of doing things (item 55). If rules were broken, there was seldom

Table 13: Random Family: Modal Response Category and Lambda for Adaptability Items.

Questions	Modal Category	Lambda
15. Family members make the rules together.	seldom	.184*
17. It is difficult for this family to keep track of what family members are doing.	most	.208*
23. The parents check with the children before making important decisions in this family.	never	.137*
40. Members in this family find it hard to know what other family members are thinking.	most	.196*
42. Parents make all the important decisions in this family.	most	.153*
72. It is unclear what will happen when rules are broken in this family.	most	.202*
79. Each family member has at least some say in major family decisions.	seldom	.107*
92. For no apparent reason, family members seem to change their minds.	occas.	.168*
97. Certain family members order everyone else around.	most	.182*

*Meets criterion level for association.

strict punishment (item 90) and members were able to get away with almost anything most of the time (item 81). On the other hand, members were occasionally afraid to tell the truth for fear of harsh punishment (item 6). Kantor and Lehr (1975, p. 137) point out that individualistic styles in the Random family often result in conflict:

Routine crisis is inherent in this type's way of life. How, under such circumstances, does the random system resolve its serious crises of energy? Frequently, it doesn't. There is a strong tendency among random family members to fly apart. Another possibility is that a serious crisis may not be perceived as "serious" or even perhaps as a "crisis", in the random family, but as a continuation of day to day energy disruptions. In such a situation, the effects of the crisis will go unchecked. Often, however, one member will try to impose his own mobilizing model on the collective to hold it together.

The last sentence agrees with the observers' perceptions that, most of the time, certain members order everyone else around (item 97). Thus, while the Random type values independence, members are concerned primarily with their own individual interests and "one member may have to lose his freedom in order that another can exercise his" (Kantor and Lehr, 1975, p. 135).

Very likely, parents, who have the most authority, will be the ones to exercise their power. Questions 42, 23, and 79, support this contention. Parents, who make most of the important decisions in the family (item 42), never check with their children before making the decisions (item 24). Hence, observers felt it was seldom that each member had some say in the decision-making process in the family (item 79).

The picture which emerges relative to adaptability in the Random

family is one of inconsistent relationship patterns between family members often due to the ineffective control and discipline by the family's authority figures. These findings are in accord with the typologies described earlier in this study.

Communication Dimension

There is some evidence to support the hypothesis that Random family members will hold different interpretations of the outside world, but it is considered too weak to be conclusive. This is mainly due to the small number of questions in this dimension, with no known validity.

The items in the following discussion are found in Table 14.

Question 103 shows that observers felt that members were seldom encouraged to give an opinion in family decision making. Since the Random family has strong intra-family boundaries, this statements suggests that members' opinions would not likely be asked for because of the lack of sharing and indifference to others' ideas. Individuals in the family would have their own beliefs and interpretations of the environment; other members' views would be unimportant. Reiss' (1971a) conclusions about the "distance-sensitive" family, which parallels the Random type, are:

Distance-sensitive families regard the environment as split into unrelated and independent universes, one for each family member. Each individual acts to preserve the uniqueness of his own universe and regards the percepts and actions of others as irrelevant to his relationship with his own universe (p. 74).

Observers perceived the Random family members as drifting from one goal or purpose to another without any plan, most of the time (item 57).

Table 14: Random Family: Modal Response Category and Lambda for Communication Items.

Questions	Modal Category	Lambda
14. This family tends to be suspicious of most people's motives.	occas.	.092
19. This family tends to withdraw from interacting with others because they feel they have very little in common with most people.	occas.	.095
38. This family tends to be judgemental and inflexible in their opinions of other people in society.	most	.161*
57. Family members seem to drift from one purpose or goal to another without any plan.	most	.150*
103. When a family decision is being made, each member is encouraged to give an opinion.	seldom	.205*

*Meets criterion level for association.

Using the reference theory of Berg (1979), these findings agree with the author's position. Berg asserts that the family type analogous to the Random family, provides insufficient definitions of the outside world to its members and assures that a state of near anomie will prevail:

Time and place become the definers of what is real, right and appropriate, relative to behaviour (p. 22).

Due to the rigid intra-family boundaries, members of the Random family will likely identify more closely with different segments of society than with other family members. Goals and purposes for each member will be dictated by their affiliations at the time. As these associations change, so will the member's goals and purposes.

This assumption supports the findings in question 38. Observers saw the Random family as judgemental and inflexible in their opinions of other people in society, most of the time. While family members identify closely with segments of outer society, the world beyond the family boundary is "split into unrelated and independent universes, one for each member" (Reiss, 1971a, p. 74). The strong boundaries between each member's domain of reality would preclude an understanding and tolerance of people with viewpoints different than their own. This premise gains support from items 19 and 14 where observers perceived Random family members as occasionally being suspicious of people's motives and occasionally withdrawing from interacting with others because they feel they have little in common with most people.

This dimension shows some interesting trends but further research

is necessary to make decisive statements about the Random family's interpretation of the outer world.

THE OPEN FAMILY TYPE

Theory-naive observers answered 88.9 percent of the items pertaining to the Open type family in the direction hypothesized. Lambda values for 50 percent of these items were above the criterion level of .100. Compared to the Random type, the Open type was perceived to be less similar to the pure type proposed by the typologists. On the other hand, results were higher for the Open family than for the Closed family. These findings support Kantor and Lehr's (1975, p. 127) contention that the boundary around the Open family is evident, yet it is regulated in such a way to foster "the desire for beneficial interchange with members of the community." Due to the bounding features of the Open type, interaction would be sufficiently available for observation by outsiders as the following discussion indicates.

Psychological Space Dimension

Boundaries, both within and around the Open family are permeable and flexible (Kantor and Lehr, 1975). This is supported by observations that members were always encouraged to have friends of their own and family members always make visitors feel at home (items 41 and 7, Table 15).

As Kantor and Lehr note:

Individuals are allowed to regulate the direction and destination of their incoming and outgoing traffic as long as they do

Table 15: Open Family: Modal Responses Category and Lambda for Psychological Space Items.

Questions	Modal Category	Lambda
1. Members in this family are concerned with each other's welfare.	always	.178*
7. Most personal friends are not family friends.	seldom	.139*
24. Family members like to spend some of their free time with each other.	most	.232*
28. Family members share almost all interests and hobbies with each other.	most	.183*
32. Family members feel "its everyone for themselves."	never	.150*
41. Family members make visitors feel at home.	always	.141*
43. Even when everyone is home, family members spend their time separately.	occas.	.184*
47. Although family members have individual interest they still participate in family activities.	most	.156*
58. Members find home is one of the loneliest places to be.	never	.136*
62. This family tries to plan some things during the week so they can all be together.	most	.183*
82. Family members share the same friends.	occas.	.154*
86. It seems as if this family agrees on everything.	most	.167*
102. Members of this family share many interests.	most	.239*

*Meets criterion level for association.

not cause discomfort to other members or violate the consensus of the group (1975, p. 127).

Permeable intra-family boundaries allow for strong emotional bonds, but permit members to separate when they desire (Kantor and Lehr, 1975, p. 127). Observers supported this premise. They reported that members occasionally spent time separately, even when everyone was home (item 43).

The Open family type was seen as having the strongest emotional bonding of the three types. The members were observed to have more individual autonomy than the Closed type, but not as much as the Random type, supporting the hypothesis.

Respondents indicated they observed the warmth and caring of strong emotional bonding between members in the Open family. Members never felt "its everyone for themselves" (item 32). Home, for the Open family, was never a lonely place to be (item 58) and members were always concerned with each other's welfare (item 1).

The Open family was seen as sharing friends, hobbies and interests (items 102, 24, 62, 28, 47, 82). Though they mostly agreed on everything, occasionally members were totally on their own in developing their ideas (items 86, 43).

Adaptability Dimension

The results indicated that theory-naive observers saw the Open family type as hypothesized, having a balance of adaptability and stability in relationship norms when compared to the other two types.

From the modal responses listed in Table 16, it can be seen that the

Table 16: Open Family: Modal Response Category and Lambda for Adaptability Items.

Questions	Modal Category	Lambda
6. Members of this family are afraid to tell the truth because of how harsh the punishment will be.	never	.172*
15. Family members make the rules together.	most	.184*
17. It is difficult for this family to keep track of what family members are doing.	seldom	.208*
40. Members in this family find it hard to know what other family members are thinking.	seldom	.196*
42. Parents make all the important decisions in this family.	most	.153*
55. Family members encourage each other's efforts to find new ways of doing things.	most	.192*
72. It is unclear what will happen when rules are broken in this family.	seldom	.202*
79. Each family member has at least some say in major family decisions.	most	.107*
81. Members of this family can get away with almost anything.	seldom	.165*
90. There is strict punishment for breaking rules in this family.	occas.	.189*

*Meets criterion level for association.

Open family was perceived as seldom having difficulty keeping track of its members (item 17). Consequences were clear for rule violation and members were never afraid to tell the truth for fear of harsh punishment (items 72, 6). However, as Kantor and Lehr note, "The Open family does not give its members unlimited freedom" (1975, p. 129). Respondents reported that, occasionally there was strict punishment for breaking the rules and it was seldom that members could get away with almost anything (items 90, 81).

Of the three family types, the Open family was seen as having the best problem-solving ability. Members seldom found it hard to know what other members were thinking and usually they encouraged each other's efforts to find new ways of doing things (items 40, 55). Family members mostly made the rules together with the parents making most of the important decisions (items 15, 42). According to Kantor and Lehr (1975) family consensus is the way the Open family make plans or changes them:

Everyone is permitted to say what he or she thinks or feels about a particular subject . . . Each member has an egalitarian right to challenge and be heard within the family (p. 132).

Respondents' observations agreed with the statement, in that they felt family members usually had at least some say in major family decisions (item 79).

Communication Dimension

Results for this dimension showed that theory-naïve observers perceived the Open family characteristics to be in the directions predicted

in the hypotheses. However, lambda values were not high enough to provide conclusive evidence that the Open family members were perceived to hold similar interpretations of the outer world as being orderly and predictable.

Findings in Table 17 suggest family members were seen as being able to accept and share ideas with each other (item 103). The permeable boundaries both within and around the Open family would allow members access to one another's ideas and beliefs as well as those of the environment outside the family. Reiss' (1971a, p. 74) study showed that members of the "environment-sensitive" family (analogous to the Open type), "serve to amplify and clarify stimulation and patterning in the environment for others in the family . . . through their own exploration of the environment".

Observers saw the Open family as seldom drifting from one purpose or goal to another without any plan (item 57). This suggests members are able to cope, "to deal meaningfully with the world" in terms of realizing their life objectives (Berg, 1979, p. 20).

Members of the Open family seldom were seen as being judgemental and inflexible in their opinions of other people in society (item 38). Questions 33, 19, and 14 corroborate this perception of the Open family. Seldom were members not allowed to interact with people who would be a bad influence on them (item 33); seldom were they suspicious of people's motives (item 14) and they never withdrew from interacting with others because they felt they had little in common with most people (item 19). These observations agree with Berg's view of the translucent family (similar to the Open family):

Table 17: Open Family: Modal Response Category and Lambda for Communication Items.

Questions	Modal Category	Lambda
14. This family tends to be suspicious of most people's motives.	seldom	.092
19. This family tends to withdraw from interacting with others because they feel they have very little in common with most people.	never	.095
33. Members of this family are not allowed to interact with people who would be a bad influence on them.	seldom	.109*
38. This family tends to be judgemental and inflexible in their opinions of other people in society.	seldom	.151*
57. Family members seem to drift from one purpose or goal to another without any plan.	seldom	.150*
103. When a family decision is being made, each member is encouraged to give an opinion.	most	.205*

*Meets criterion level for association.

Definitions of reality, which are compatible with external definition, exist within this family's theme . . . The family themes are functional in that they provide the socializee with workable self definitions, world definitions and a world view which is verifiable (1979, p. 23).

Though the results are not conclusive, for this dimension, they indicate some support for the hypothesis.

THE CLOSED FAMILY TYPE

Respondents answered 60 percent of the items pertaining to the Closed type in the direction hypothesized. Of these questions, 45.8 percent had lambda values above .100. Compared to the other two types, respondents perceived the Closed type to be least similar to the pure or modal type delineated by the typologists. This result was expected because the Closed family is the most private and supervised of the three types (Kantor and Lehr, 1975, p. 120). The behaviour of family members would not be as readily available for observation to outsiders as the other family types. This assumption is supported by the results regarding the Closed family's boundary maintaining procedures, discussed in the psychological space dimension below.

Psychological Space Dimension

As predicted in the hypothesis, results revealed that the Closed family was seen as having strong emotional bonding between members with low individual autonomy (Table 18). Kantor and Lehr's research proposed that boundaries around the Closed family are strong while intra-family

Table 18: Closed Family: Modal Response Category and Lambda for Psychological Space Items.

Questions	Modal Category	Lambda
1. Members in this family are concerned with each other's welfare.	most	.178*
5. It is difficult for members to take time away from the family.	occas.	.139*
11. This family knows where all family members are at all times.	always	.351*
20. Family ties are more important to them than any friendship could possibly be.	most and always	.105*
24. Family members like to spend some of their free time with each other.	occas.	.232*
28. Family members share almost all interests and hobbies with each other.	most	.183*
49. Family members are totally on their own in developing their ideas.	seldom	.176*
58. Members find home is one of the loneliest places to be.	never	.136*
62. This family tries to plan some things during the week so they can all be together.	occas.	.183*
75. Family members are expected to have the approval of the others before making decisions.	most	.142*
76. Family members are totally involved in each other's live.	most	.205*
82. Family members share the same friends .	most	.154*
84. This family has difficulty thinking of things to do as a family .	never	.241*

*Meets criterion level for association.

boundaries are vague (1975, p. 120). Observers confirmed this by reporting that the Closed family always knew the whereabouts of the members (item 11); members were seldom on their own in developing ideas (item 49) and they usually shared the same friends (item 82). Members occasionally spent time separately even when everyone was home, but to a lesser degree than the other two types (item 43). Members were perceived to occasionally find it difficult to take time away from family (item 5) and they were usually expected to have approval of others before making decisions (item 75). Family ties were always more important than friendships (item 20).

Results show observers judged individual autonomy in the Closed family to be the lowest of the three types. While emotional bonds or feelings of closeness were clearly much higher than the Random family, they were judged to be somewhat less than the Open family. The Closed family was seen as sharing friends and interests (item 102), spending time together (items 76, 84, 62, 28) and mostly agreeing with one another (item 86), but to a slightly lesser degree than the Open family.

Given the power structure of the Closed family, the findings suggest that members are required to forego individual interests and conform to the goals designed by the family's authority figure. According to Kantor and Lehr (1975, p. 119 - 120):

Bounding, the major social space mechanism for regulating incoming and outgoing traffic, is carried out by those designated as authorities by the family . . . Individual members' traffic is prescribed. All are channeled in directions by those in authority and blocked out from targets deemed inappropriate.

It appears that togetherness or emotional bonding in the Closed family type occurs as a result of family expectations and precepts rather than by choice as in the Open type. Kantor and Lehr discuss relationship rules in the Closed family:

It is expected and natural that members share good feelings with one another. Loyalties based on blood ties are usually honored above those to friends (1975, p. 145).

It can be speculated that the modal responses to question 23, "Family members like to spend some of their free time with each other" (occasionally) and question 62, "This family tries to plan some things during the week so they can all be together" (occasionally) are the result of the observer's perceptions of the Closed family's authoritarian arrangement. The modal responses were originally anticipated to be higher for these items. However, the wording of the questions implies free choice or a conscious effort on the part of the members to spend time together. Perhaps observers perceived that, given the option, members would have preferred to spend more time apart.

The assumptions that high cohesion in the Closed family was the result of family directives rather than personal preference is supported by the results for item 1. Respondents reported the lower modal response, "most times true" for the Closed family for the statement: "Members in the family are concerned with each other's welfare", as compared to "always" for the Open family. While respondents reported home as never a lonely place for both Open and Closed types, 29 percent fewer respondents held this perception for the Closed family (item 58).

Adaptability Dimension

Results in Table 19 support predictions about the Closed family's adaptability as expressed in the hypotheses. Theory-naive observers identified low adaptability and an inflexible manner of relating when compared to the other two types.

The power structure in the Closed family clearly originates with the parent as authority figures (Kantor & Lehr, 1975, p. 120). Observers felt parents always made all the important decisions (item 40); children were not consulted (item 23). Children and parents never made the rules together (item 15), or collaborated on the method of punishment (item 44).

These observations agree with the findings of Kantor and Lehr (1975, p. 146). They comment on the power ideals of the Closed family:

The closed-type family strives for an efficacy which is stable. Toward this end, power is vertically organized . . . What feels like coercion to the open- or random-type systems feels like a natural necessity in the closed system.

Given the hierarchal power arrangement of the Closed family, it follows that observers perceived that certain family members usually order other members around (item 97). However, as was just pointed out, family members (here the reference is to the children and perhaps the wife) may not interpret directives as coercive. They may feel free to make comments and suggestions, but will ultimately take their cue and follow the lead of the family authority figure. This could explain respondents observations in question 79 and 101. Members were seen as occasionally having some say in major family decisions.

Table 19: Closed Family: Modal Responses Category and Lambda for Adaptability Items

Questions	Modal Category	Lambda
6. Members of this family are afraid to tell the truth because of how harsh the punishment will be.	most	.172*
15. Family members make the rules together.	never	.184*
17. It is difficult for this family to keep track of what family members are doing.	never	.208*
23. The parents check with the children before making important decisions in this family.	never	.137*
36. Once this family has planned to do something, it is difficult to change it.	most	.146*
42. Parents make all the important decisions in this family.	always	.153*
44. Parents and children in this family discuss together the method of punishment.	never	.140*
46. This family feels good about their ability to solve problems.	most	.200*
72. It is unclear what will happen when rules are broken in this family.	seldom	.202*
79. Each family member has at least some say in major family decisions.	occas.	.107*
81. Members in this family can get away with almost anything.	never	.165*
83. When trying to solve problems, family members jump from one attempted solution to another without giving any of them time to work.	seldom	.148*

*Meets criterion level for association.

Observers reported that consequences were clear for breaking the rules in the Closed family (item 72). Members could never get away with almost anything (item 81); strict punishment was usually given for breaking rules (item 90). Furthermore, respondents felt that members were usually afraid to tell the truth because of how harsh the punishment would be (item 6). These findings concur with those of Kantor and Lehr's (1975, p. 122):

The closed family gives shape to its energy investments by means of family-wide discipline -- a set of disciplinary measure to which the entire family is subject . . . Family authorities in the closed family develop a budget for detailing the pattern of energy flow in the family. This budget prescribes how family members are to obtain and use their energies. Individual deviation from this budget is not tolerated.

Efficient, steadfast organization was evident in observations of the Closed family. They usually felt good about their ability to solve problems (item 46) and they never had difficulties keeping track of their members (item 17). Members seldom jumped from one attempted solution to another without giving any of them time to work (item 83). They seldom changed their minds for no apparent reason (item 92) and once something was planned it was usually difficult to change it (item 36).

This picture of the Closed family's adaptability is consistent with the one presented by Kantor and Lehr (1975):

Time limits are set according to the clock. There is a metaphorical "family clock" to which all "individual clocks" are expected to conform. Deviation from schedule is viewed as disruptive and is punishable . . . That events occur on time, and tasks get done on time, is a matter of urgency and necessity for the closed family (p. 121).

The results for this dimension show support for the hypothesis that the Closed family has less adaptability than the other two types. Though some of the results were not entirely clear, they nonetheless indicate trends in the hypothesized direction.

Communication Dimension

Results for this dimension show the items were answered in the direction hypothesized for the Closed family. The findings are not conclusive because too few items had lambda values above the designated criterion of .100.

Results from table 20 show that members were seldom encouraged to give an opinion in family decision making (item 103). In the Closed family, individual opinion is not valued because the family's goals are usually decided by the parents. Encouraging each individual to give an opinion would be considered unnecessary and perhaps undesirable. Reiss (1971b) reports his findings on the consensus-sensitive family (analogous to the Closed-type):

In this kind of family there is a joint perception that the analysis and solution of the problem are simply a means to maintain a close and uninterrupted agreement at all times. Even transient dissent is not tolerated . . . Each individual's personal experience with the externally-given problem and its cues is not fully expressed in the family nor fully developed by the individual on his own (p. 6).

Observers supported this premise in their responses to item 89 when they reported that the Closed family seldom believed it was important for each member to be free to do what they want.

The Closed family was seen as usually being judgemental and

inflexible in their opinions of other people in society (item 38). Moreover, observers judged the Closed family as always forbidding their members to interact with people who would be a bad influence on them (item 33).

These results suggest that the Closed family does not share concepts and beliefs commonly found in society. There appears to be a fear that unacceptable and threatening ideas may invade and influence the family's behaviour. Berg (1979) posits that the Closed family's interpretation of the outer environment serves to assist boundary maintaining procedures by reinterpreting information considered to be deleterious to their goals:

For most Closed families, boundary maintenance is problematic, since interfaces with the world outside are an intrinsic part of living in the world. Since boundary maintenance is extremely difficult, if not impossible; other means must be developed to "keep out" as it were, the influences of meanings external to the world.

The interpretive component of family themes can function to further maintain the desired boundaries . . . By defining the world "out there" as being evil (corrupt, of the devil, fallen, etc.) it is hoped that all of the counter meanings can be difused (pp 14-15).

Given the Closed family's penchant for a stable identity and suspicious attitude of the outer environment, it is unlikely that members would stray from goals prescribed by the family's theme.

Though the results are not conclusive, they indicate some support for the hypothesis that Closed family members will interpret the outer environment similarly, as being hostile and threatening.

A DIAGNOSTIC INSTRUMENT

A shorter version of the FACES questionnaire was devised using only those items that had statistically different results for the three types and appear to be good indicators of the differences in family interaction. Employing those items that fell in the hypothesized direction, had lambda values above the criterion level, and were worded in an unambiguous way, a diagnostic instrument of 20 items was constructed (see Figure 3).

Nine items each from the psychological space and adaptability dimensions, and two items from the communication dimension were used. The questions are meant to be answered using a three point scale: "mostly true", "occasionally true", and "mostly not true". The responses were assigned values which produce a range of scores from zero to forty. A high score (28 - 40) indicates family interaction similar to the Closed family type. A middle range score (13 - 27) indicates Open type family interaction. A low score (0 - 12) would be indicative of family interaction similar to the Random type. The questions are to be arranged randomly if presented in an interview or answered as a self-report.

The instrument should be useful to clinicians and researchers as a diagnostic tool in determining family interaction type. Considering that the items utilized in the instrument were sensitive to differences in family interaction in a non-clinical population, perceived by untrained observers, they should be effective predictors with a clinical sample.

Psychological Space (N = 9)	Mostly True	Occas. True	Mostly Not True
11. This family knows where all family members are at all times.	2	1	0*
24. Family members like to spend some of their free time with each other.	1	2	0
49. Family members are totally on their own in developing their ideas.	0	1	2
62. This family tries to plan some things during the week so they can all be together.	1	2	0
66. This family doesn't do things together.	0	1	2
75. Family members are expected to have the approval of others before making a decision.	2	1	0
82. Family members share the same friends.	2	1	0
102. Members of this family share many interests.	1	2	0
<u>Adaptability</u> (N = 9)			
6. Members of this family are afraid to tell the truth because of how harsh the punishment will be.	2	0	1
15. Family members make the rules together.	1	2	0
17. It is difficult for this family to keep track of what family members are doing.	0	1	2
36. Once this family has planned to do something it is difficult to change it.	2	1	0
*Random = 0, Open = 1, Closed = 2			

Figure 3: Proposed Diagnostic Instrument

	Mostly True	Occas. True	Mostly Not True
46. This family feels good about their ability to solve problems.	1	2	0
55. Family members encourage each other's efforts to find new ways of doing things.	1	0	2
72. It is unclear what will happen when rules are broken in this family.	0	2	1
81. Members of this family can get away with almost anything.	0	1	2
90. There is strict punishment for breaking the rules in this family.	2	0	1

Communication (N = 2)

33. Members of this family are not allowed to interact with people who would be a bad influence on them.	2	1	0
103. When a family decision is being made each member is encouraged to give an opinion.	1	2	0

Figure 3: Continued

Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS

This study was designed to investigate whether theory-naive observers, those who were not articulate in family process theory, could identify characteristics of different family types as readily as theory-wise observers. The purpose of the research was to determine if one genre of family interaction typologies found in the literature had utility, beyond family theorists or those versed in such theories. That is, could the designated typologies be useful as classification schemes to family practitioners without lengthy and specialized training in a theoretical perspective?

The rationale behind the study was based on the belief that a prevalent, standardized interpretation of behaviour would increase the utility of the typology through reliability in prediction. When a classification scheme can be construed divergently and/or is not amenable to empirical testing for lack of publicly apparent characteristics, it loses strength and credibility as a diagnostic and predictive instrument.

The typologies of Kantor and Lehr (1975), Reiss (1971b), and Berg (1979) dealt with the interaction variables of psychological space, system adaptability and one facet of communication, the way in which families

interpret the world beyond the family unit. Three stereotypic family types were delineated based on Kantor and Lehr's typology, the Random, Open and Closed types. It was hypothesized that theory-naive observers would identify the characteristics of the three family types in accord with the typologies.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Results show moderate support of the hypotheses. While 80.2 percent of the questions were answered in the direction of the hypotheses, the statistical test indicated perceived differences in types were not clear-cut. Hypotheses regarding the adaptability and psychological space dimensions received substantial support. Results for the communication dimension, while showing evident trends, were not conclusive. In general, theory-naive observers were able to identify characteristics of the three designated family types in accord with the typologies selected from the literature.

The Random family emerged as quite distinct when compared to the other two types. Members of the Random type were seen as being quite distant from one another, both physically and emotionally. They were inconsistent and changeable in their interaction patterns. The members' sense of belonging and identity appeared to be jeopardized by the family's high adaptability, weak family boundaries and high individual autonomy.

The Open and Closed family members were seen as being very close, both physically and emotionally. The results indicate very subtle

differences between the Closed and Open types in their emotional bonding. The Open family was perceived to be cohesive by choice whereas family expectations and precepts appeared to be the impetus behind the Closed family's togetherness.

The palpable difference observed by respondents in the three types was the degree of individual autonomy. Open family members experienced much more individual autonomy than Closed family members but less than members of the Random type family.

Though autonomy and dependence are issues found in the psychological space dimension, they are closely associated with concepts found in the adaptability dimension such as discipline, control, rules, roles and negotiation (Olson et al, 1979). The results suggest that the autonomy of Closed type members were perceived to be restricted by rigid rules, designed by the family's authority figure whereas the democratic nature of the Open type assured members more individual autonomy. In general, the typologists reviewed in Chapter I report a close relationship between the degree of members' autonomy and the degree of adaptability in family interaction. The findings of this study are in agreement with those in the literature, that a high degree of individual autonomy is usually associated with a high degree of adaptability in the family's relationship norms.

Generally, the findings from the psychological space and adaptability dimensions show close agreement with those presented by Kantor and Lehr (1975) whose typology best conveys the essence of the

other typologies.

The communication dimension showed some trends, but respondents' predictions of the modal response category of most items were not improved appreciably by knowing the family type indicating that the questions may not have been able to distinguish between the types. The results showed that observers perceived similarities between the Closed and Random families in their interpretations of the outside world. Both these types were seen as being suspicious and untrusting of elements in the outer world.

Boundary maintaining procedures suggest reasons for the results. The strong boundaries erected by the Closed family indicate a common fear by members of interacting with elements outside the family. Weak boundaries around the Random family allow members free interaction with the outer world but strong intra-family boundaries preclude a common interpretation of the outer environment. Individual identification with separate segments of society suggest that Random family members may feel a sense of isolation and lack of trust of different environmental constituents. Building on Reiss' (1971b) earlier work, Reiss and Oliveri (1980) found families of the Random and Closed type tend to feel victimized and blame outside forces because they lacked a sense of mastery over their environment. They felt that their future was in the hands of fate.

In opposition to the Closed and Random types, observers perceived the Open family as interpreting the world outside the family as predictable and non-threatening. Results show members of the Open family tend to agree on most matters which suggest they would hold a common interpretation

of the outer world. These findings support Berg's (1979) hypothesis about this family type, that the Open family's constructed reality is compatible with the majority of societal meanings. Reiss and Oliver (1980, p. 436) also found that the activities of this type of family clearly reflected "an ordered and comprehensive grasp on the family's role in the community".

The results of this study agree with the constructs of the eight typologies discussed in Chapter I. Though the typology used for this study included only three types, it is quite possible to make finer distinctions and include more types as Wertheim, (1973), Beavers (1977) and Olson et al (1979) did. Even Kantor and Lehr (1975, p. 151) allow for types which might not manifest the usual relationship between the degree of adaptability and individual autonomy ("flowed typal variety"). They admit these types are rare and usually emerge in specific circumstances of serious crisis. Ideally, a typology should have sufficient types so it is not too difficult to assign cases to them and yet have few enough categories so they are manageable for diagnostic purposes. It appears that three types are minimum for viability and convenience in assessing family interaction.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

One of the methodological limitations of this study was that the questions in the communication dimension, created for the instrument, had no known validity aside from face validity. The issue of validity for these items was further confounded by their being few in number. However, if the validity of the questions had been previously established, their limited

number would have been of less consequence. An item analysis to eliminate those items which were not discriminating could have been carried out.

A further methodological problem might be one of circularity in the method of obtaining data. The descriptions of the family types were similar to some of the items used to measure family interaction which raises the question of whether observers were merely responding to stimulus cues. Since respondents were concentrating on a specific family, it was hoped the stimulus questions would be secondary in their minds. However, the possibility of some circularity in the method must be recognized.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study has revealed some areas that could possibly benefit from further research.

It is interesting to speculate what effect social class might have on perceived family types. A study to determine the incidence of a particular type across social class might prove beneficial to those interested in family research.

A methodology is needed that would result in more refined measures of family interaction. Separating those items on which respondents were obviously guessing from those which they felt to be true, should yield clearer data.

As well, a more sensitive instrument for gauging family interaction is needed. The diagnostic instrument found in chapter IV indicates an

initial attempt at developing a viable questionnaire which now must be clinically tested. Items should be added which are good indicators of the three dimensions as they are conceptualized in the typologies. This is particularly true for the communication dimension.

To assess the utility of the shortened questionnaire, a comparison of theory-naive and theory-sophisticated observers of the same family could be made. This would evaluate the level of agreement of perception of family interaction between the two groups.

Three interaction dimensions are dealt with in the typologies pertinent to this study. Further research on the nature of the individual dimensions and the way they interrelate may help to make the typologies more useful as a diagnostic and predictive instrument. Some of the issues that can be investigated are: In what way are the dimensions different and how are they related to each other? Are three dimensions sufficient when evaluating family interaction?

An effort must be made to establish measures of family functioning, particularly in the psychological space and adaptability dimensions. In other words, how much autonomy, dependence, closeness or distance is the right amount for optimal functioning of families and individuals? How much is too little? Presently the levels are often decided by the presence or absence of pathology.

The question of levels of family functioning brings to light another area of research which has been largely neglected in the family process

literature, namely, investigation of "normal" families. Empirical knowledge of successful family functioning should provide further understanding of many interaction concepts, particularly those based on pathology.

Results from the study indicate families interpret the outer environment in divergent manner. Reiss and Oliveri (1980, p. 433) have revealed that each family has a rich and ordered set of beliefs about the external world which "seem sensibly connected to the ways families actually respond to and interact with their social world". Further investigation of this component of family communication would yield valuable information about the way families fit into the wider culture and what effect this has on the socialization outcomes of children.

A task that remains for typologists is to agree on the standardization of vocabulary for interaction concepts. Presently the divergent terminology used for similar issues often results in confusion and is slowing the development of an effective typology for explaining and assessing family interaction.

THE UTILITY OF A TYPOLOGY

The findings of this study indicate that the family interaction typologies chosen from the literature show promise as a viable theoretical framework for summarizing and predicting behaviour.

Theory-naive observers showed agreement in their identification of family types with those delineated in the literature. The main strength of the typological framework specified in this study is that the concepts are

are based on socio-culturally shared meanings of manifest behaviour. Hence the typologies are amenable to empirical investigation. Unlike psychiatric nosology which has concepts that are unstandardized and subject to variable interpretation, family interaction concepts are publicly shareable and can be empirically tested.

The main utility of the particular typology investigated in this study can best be seen in its availability as a diagnostic tool and predictive instrument for therapists, educators, employers and community workers who deal with families. Lengthy requisite training in a theoretical perspective is not indicated in order to utilize the typology for the purposes of evaluating family interaction.

The family interaction typologies of interest to this study have all been developed in the past decade. The research in this area, including this study, suggests that further empirical investigation would be a worthwhile endeavour for those who seek to understand and describe fundamental human behaviour.

LIST OF REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, N. The psychodynamics of family life, New York: Basic Books 1958.
- Aldous, J. Intergenerational visiting patterns: Variations in boundary maintenance as an explanation. Family Process, 1967, 6, 235 - 251.
- Bateson, G., Jackson, D., Haley, J., & Weakland, J. Toward a theory of schizophrenia. Behavioural Science, 1956, 1, 251 - 264.
- Beavers, R. Psychotherapy and growth: A family system perspective. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1977.
- Berg, D. Reality construction at the family/society interface: The internalization of family themes and values. Unpublished paper, University of Manitoba, August, 1979.
- Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. The social construction of reality. New York: Anchor Books, 1967.
- Bowen, M. A family concept of schizophrenia. In D. Jackson (Ed.), Etiology of schizophrenia. New York: Basic Book, 1960.
- Broderick, C. Beyond the five conceptual frameworks: A decade of development in family theory. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1971, 33, 139 - 159.
- Broderick, C. & Pulliam-Krager, H. Family process and child outcomes. In W. Burr, R. Hill, F. Nye, & I. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary theories about the family. New York: The Free Press, 1979, 104 - 614.
- Broderick, C. & Smith, J. The general systems approach to the family. In W. Burr, R. Hill, F. Nye, & I. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary theories about the family. New York: The Free Press, 1979, 112 - 129.
- Buckley, W. Sociology and modern systems theory. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1967.
- Colapinto, J. The relative value of empirical evidence. Family Process, 1979, 18, 427 - 441.
- Gerber, G. Psychological distance in the family as schematized by families of normal, disturbed, and learning-problem children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 40, 139 - 147.

- Haley, J. The family of schizophrenic: A model system. Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases, 1959, 129, 357 - 374.
- Haley, J. Family experiments: A new type of experimentation. Family Process, 1962, 1, 1962, 265 - 293.
- Haley, J. Toward a theory of pathological systems. In G. Zuk & I. Bosormenyi-Nagy (Eds.), Family therapy and disturbed families. Palo Alto: Science and Behaviour Books, 1967, 11 - 27.
- Hess, R. & Handel, G. Family worlds: A psychosocial approach to family life. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- Jackson, D. The study of the family. Family Process, 1965, 4, 1 - 20.
- Kantor, D. & Lehr, W. Inside the family. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.
- Laing, R. Sanity, madness and the family: Family of schizophrenics. London: Tavistock Publications, 1964.
- Laing, R. Mystification, confusion, and conflict. In I. Bosormenyi-Nagy and J. Framo (Eds.), Intensive family therapy. New York: Springer, 1965.
- Lidz, T., Cornelison, A., Fleck, S., & Terry, D. The interfamilial environment of schizophrenic patients II: Marital schism and marital skew, American Journal of Psychiatry, 1957, 114, 241 - 248.
- Loether, H. & McTavish, D. Descriptive statistics for sociologists: An introduction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974.
- McGillicuddy-DeLisi, A. The role of parental beliefs in the family as a system of mutual influences. Family Relations, 1980, 29, 317 - 323.
- McNeill, M. Pollen lives in constant fear: Psychologist. The Winnipeg Tribune, February 9, 1980, p.4.
- Minuchin, S., Rosman, B., & Baker, L. Psychosomatic families. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Napier, A. The rejection-intrusion pattern: A central family dynamic. Journal of Marriage and Family Counselling, 1978, 4, 5 - 12.
- Olson, D. Marital and family therapy: Integrative review and critique. In C. Broderick (Ed.), A decade of research and action: 1960 - 1969. Minnesota National Council of Family Relations, 1971, 253 - 277.

- Olson, D. Empirically unbinding the double-bind: Review of research and conceptual reformulations. Family Process, 1972, 11, 69 - 74.
- Olson, D. Insiders and outsiders views of relationships: Research studies. In G. Levinger & H. Raush (Eds.), Close Relationships. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1977.
- Olson, D., Bell, R., & Portner, J. Family adaptability and cohesion evaluation scales. University of Minnesota, 1978.
- Olson, D., Sprenkle, D., & Russell, C. Circumplex model of marital and family systems I: Cohesion and adaptability dimensions, family types and clinical applications. Family Process, 1979, 18, 2 - 28.
- Reiss, D., Varieties of consensual experience I: A theory for relating family interaction to individual thinking. Family Process, 1971, 10, 1 - 35. (a)
- Reiss, D. Varieties of consensual experience III: Contrasts between families of normals, delinquents, and schizophrenics. Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases, 1971, 152, 73 - 95. (b)
- Reiss, D., & Oliveri, M. Family paradigm and family coping: A proposal for linking the family's intrinsic adaptive capacities to its response to stress. Family Relations, 1980, 29, 431 - 444.
- Riskin, J. "Nonlabeled" family interaction: Preliminary report on a prospective study. Family Process, 1976, 15, 433 - 439.
- Riskin, J. & Faunce, E. An evaluative review of family interaction research. Family Process, 1972, 11, 365 - 455.
- Rosenblatt, P. & Titus, S. Together and apart in the family. Humanitas, 1976, 12, 367 - 380.
- Rosenthal, R., Experimenter effects in behavioural research. New York: Appleton, 1966.
- Russel, C. Circumplex model of marital and family systems III; Empirical evaluations with families. Family Process, 1979, 29 - 45.
- Simon, J. Basic research methods in social science (2nd ed.). New York: Random House, 1978.
- Singer, M. & Wynne, L. Thought disorders and family relations of schizophrenics III. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1965, 12, 187 - 200. (a)

- Singer, M. & Wynne, L. Thought disorders and family relations of schizophrenics IV. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1965, 12, 201 - 212. (b)
- Sojit, C. The double-bind hypothesis and the parents of schizophrenics. Family Process, 1971, 10, 53 - 75.
- Speer, D. Family systems: Morphostasis and morphogenesis or "Is homeostasis enough". Family Process, 1970, 9, 259 - 278.
- Sprenkle, D. & Olson, D. Circumplex model of marital systems: An empirical study of clinic and non-clinic couples. Journal of Marriage and Family Counselling, 1978, 4, 59 - 74.
- Steinglass, P. The alcoholic family in the interaction laboratory. The Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases, 1979, 167, 428 - 436.
- Stierlin, H. Separating parents and adolescents. New York: Quadrangle, 1974. (a)
- Stierlin, H. Family theory: An introduction. In A. Burton (Ed.), Operational theories of personality. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1974, 278 - 307. (b)
- Strauss, J. Diagnostic models and the nature of psychiatric disorders. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1973, 29, 445 - 449.
- Wertheim, E. Family unit therapy and the science and typology of family systems. Family Process, 1973, 12, 361 - 376.
- Wertheim, E. The science and typology of family systems II: Further theoretical and practical considerations. Family Process, 1975, 14, 285 - 309.
- Wynne, L. & Singer, M. Thought disorder and family relations of schizophrenics II. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1963, 9, 199 - 206.
- Wynne, L., Rickoff, I., Day, J., & Hirsch, S. Pseudomutuality in the family life of schizophrenics. Psychiatry, 1958, 21, 241 - 248.
- Zimmerman, C. & Cervantes, L. Successful American families. New York: Pageant Press, 1960.

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

- The family makes elaborate plans but they are seldom carried out.
- Conversation between members is usually limited.
- There is usually no set time for meals or bedtime.
- Family members have their own interests and friends, and don't often do things together as a family.
- Members tend to have difficulties agreeing on a solution to a problem.
- Arguments between members are quite frequent.
- Children aren't usually punished for doing something wrong, but run the risk of severe punishment if their parents are in a bad mood.
- Members often don't know where other family members are.

FAMILY B

- This family enjoys entertaining or visiting friends together.
- People feel free to drop by their house without formal invitation.
- Family members have individual interests and hobbies.
- Members are welcome to bring their friends home.
- Members feel free to discuss any subject.
- Everyone's opinion is considered in making a decision with the parents making the final decision.
- Once plans are made, it is not difficult to change them if circumstances warrant it.
- Despite their busy schedule, members find time during the week to take part in some activity together.

FAMILY C

- Discipline is rigidly enforced in this family.
- People seldom drop by the house without invitation.
- Open affection is not encouraged among family members but is reserved for the proper time and place.
- There are a number of activities and places that are considered improper for family members.
- This family keeps to itself because other people don't have much in common with them.
- Duties and responsibilities are taken very seriously in this family.
- Daily activities, such as mealtime, bedtime, and chores happen exactly on time.

1. PLEASE PUT A CIRCLE AROUND THE FAMILY YOU HAVE CHOSEN. A B C

2. Number of members in each age category of the family you have chosen:

0 - 5 years _____

5 - 10 years _____

10 - 20 years _____

20 years and over _____

Two parents _____

One parent _____

Instructions

Circle the answer which you think is true for each question. If you are unsure of the answer, make the best guess and also circle the question mark. Be sure to answer all the questions by circling one of the answers.

A - always M - most times O - occasionally S - seldom N - never ? - guess

Example

Manitoba receives heavy snowfall from May to September. A M O S N ?

1. Members in this family are concerned with each other's welfare. A M O S N ?
2. Members in this family feel free to say what's on their mind. A M O S N ?
3. They don't have spur of the moment guests at mealtime. A M O S N ?
4. It is hard to know who the leader is in their family. A M O S N ?
5. It is difficult for members to take time away from the family. A M O S N ?
6. Members of this family are afraid to tell the truth because of how harsh the punishment will be. A M O S N ?
7. Most personal friends are not family friends. A M O S N ?
8. Family members talk a lot but nothing ever gets done. A M O S N ?
9. Family members feel guilty if they want to spend some time alone. A M O S N ?
10. This family believes the world is a dangerous and frightening place to live. A M O S N ?
11. This family knows where all family members are at all times. A M O S N ?
12. Family members have some say in what is required of them. A M O S N ?
13. The parents in this family stick together. A M O S N ?
14. This family tends to be suspicious of most people's motives. A M O S N ?
15. Family members make the rules together. A M O S N ?

A - always M - most times O - occasionally S - seldom N - never ? - guess

-
- | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|
| 16. Members in this family never seem to have any place to be alone in their house. | A M O S N | ? |
| 17. It is difficult for this family to keep track of what family members are doing. | A M O S N | ? |
| 18. Family members do not check with each other when making decisions. | A M O S N | ? |
| 19. This family tends to withdraw from interacting with others because they feel they have very little in common with most people. | A M O S N | ? |
| 20. Family ties are more important to them than any friendship could possibly be. | A M O S N | ? |
| 21. When this family has an argument, family members just keep to themselves. | A M O S N | ? |
| 22. Family members often answer questions that were addressed to another person. | A M O S N | ? |
| 23. The parents check with the children before making important decisions in this family. | A M O S N | ? |
| 24. Family members like to spend some of their free time with each other. | A M O S N | ? |
| 25. Punishment is usually pretty fair in this family. | A M O S N | ? |
| 26. Family members are encouraged to have friends of their own as well as family friends. | A M O S N | ? |
| 27. Family members discuss problems and usually feel good about the solutions. | A M O S N | ? |
| 28. Family members share almost all interests and hobbies with each other. | A M O S N | ? |
| 29. Members in this family usually don't tell each other about their personal problems and worries. | A M O S N | ? |
| 30. Family members are extremely independent. | A M O S N | ? |
| 31. No one in this family seems to be able to keep track of what their duties are. | A M O S N | ? |
| 32. Family members feel "its everyone for themselves". | A M O S N | ? |
| 33. Members of this family are not allowed to interact with people who would be a bad influence on them. | A M O S N | ? |
| 34. This family has a rule for almost every possible situation. | A M O S N | ? |
| 35. The members respect each other's privacy. | A M O S N | ? |

A - always M - most times O - occasionally S - seldom N - never ? - guess

-
36. Once this family has planned to do something, it is difficult to change it. A M O S N ?
37. In this family, everyone is on their own when there is a problem to solve. A M O S N ?
38. This family tends to be judgmental and unflexible in their opinions of other people in society. A M O S N ?
39. Family members do not turn to each other when they need help. A M O S N ?
40. Members in this family find it hard to know what other family members are thinking. A M O S N ?
41. Family members make visitors feel at home. A M O S N ?
42. Parents make all the important decisions in this family. A M O S N ?
43. Even when everyone is home, family members spend their time separately. A M O S N ?
44. Parents and children in this family discuss together the method of punishment. A M O S N ?
45. Family members have little need for friends because this family is so close. A M O S N ?
46. This family feels good about their ability to solve problems. A M O S N ?
47. Although family members have individual interests they still participate in family activities. A M O S N ?
48. Each member in this family feels entitled to his or her own opinion and will stick to it. A M O S N ?
49. Family members are totally on their own in developing their ideas. A M O S N ?
50. Once a task is assigned to a family member, there is no chance of changing it. A M O S N ?
51. Family members seldom take sides against other members. A M O S N ?
52. Members in this family would likely disagree among themselves what is right and wrong. A M O S N ?
53. When rules are broken, family members are treated fairly. A M O S N ?
54. Family members don't enter each other's area or activity. A M O S N ?
55. Family members encourage each other's efforts to find new ways of doing things. A M O S N ?

A - always M - most times O - occasionally S - seldom N - never ? - guess

56. Family members discuss important decision with each other, but usually make their own choice.A M O S N ?
57. Family members seem to drift from one purpose or goal to another without any plan. A M O S N ?
58. Members find home is one of the loneliest places to be. A M O S N ?
59. In this family, it is important for everyone to express their opinion. A M O S N ?
60. Family members find it easier to discuss things with persons outside the family. A M O S N ?
61. There is no leadership in this family. A M O S N ?
62. This family tries to plan some things during the week so they can all be together. A M O S N ?
63. Family members are not punished or reprimanded when they do something wrong. A M O S N ?
64. In this family, members know each other's close friends. A M O S N ?
65. This family does not discuss its problems. A M O S N ?
66. This family doesn't do things together. A M O S N ?
67. This family is quite tolerant of people who have opinions and lifestyles different than theirs. A M O S N ?
68. Family members enjoy doing things alone as well as together. A M O S N ?
69. In this family, everyone shares responsibilities. A M O S N ?
70. Parents agree on how to handle their children. A M O S N ?
71. Members are loyal to each other and would not reveal family information to outsiders. A M O S N ?
72. It is unclear what will happen when rules are broken in this family. A M O S N ?
73. When a bedroom is shut, family members knock before entering. A M O S N ?
74. If one way doesn't work in this family, they try another. A M O S N ?
75. Family members are expected to have the approval of others before making decisions. A M O S N ?

A - always M - most times O - occasionally S - seldom N - never ? - guess

-
76. Family members are totally involved in each other's lives. A M O S N ?
77. Family members speak their mind without considering how it will affect others. A M O S N ?
78. Family members feel comfortable inviting their friends along on family activities. A M O S N ?
79. Each family member has at least some say in major family decisions. A M O S N ?
80. Family members feel pressured to spend most free time together. A M O S N ?
81. Members of this family can get away with almost anything. A M O S N ?
82. Family members share the same friends. A M O S N ?
83. When trying to solve problems, family members jump from one attempted solution to another without giving any of them time to work. A M O S N ?
84. This family has difficulty thinking of things to do as a family. A M O S N ?
85. Once this family "makes up its mind", the members won't change their ideas. A M O S N ?
86. It seems as if this family agrees on everything. A M O S N ?
87. It seems as if males and females never do the same chores in the family. A M O S N ?
88. Family members know who will agree and who will disagree with them on most family matters. A M O S N ?
89. This family believes it is important for each member to be free to do what they want. A M O S N ?
90. There is strict punishment for breaking rules in this family. A M O S N ?
91. Family members seem to avoid contact with each other when at home. A M O S N ?
92. For no apparent reason, family members seem to change their minds. A M O S N ?
93. They decide together on family matters and separately on personal matters. A M O S N ?
94. This family has a balance of closeness and separateness. A M O S N ?
95. Family members rarely say what they want. A M O S N ?

A - always M - most times O - occasionally S - seldom N - never ? - guess

96. It seems there are always people around home who are not members of the family. A M O S N ?
97. Certain family members order everyone else around. A M O S N ?
98. It seems as if family members can never find time to be together. A M O S N ?
99. Family members are severely punished for anything they do wrong. A M O S N ?
100. Family members know very little about friends of other family members. A M O S N ?
101. Family members feel they have no say in solving problems. A M O S N ?
102. Members of this family share many interests. A M O S N ?
103. When a family decision is being made, each member is encouraged to give an opinion. A M O S N ?
104. Family members are encouraged to do their own thing. A M O S N ?
105. Family members never know how others are going to act. A M O S N ?
106. Certain individuals seem to cause most of this family's problems. A M O S N ?
107. This family has a commitment to a religious belief. A M O S N ?
108. It is hard to know what the rules are in this family because they always change. A M O S N ?
109. Family members find it hard to get away from each other. A M O S N ?
110. Family members feel that the family will never change. A M O S N ?
111. Family members feel they have to go along with what the family decides to do. A M O S N ?

APPENDIX B
LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

My field of study is the family. I am interested in finding out as much as I can about the way family members interact with one another. I think that in some families, the members interact with one another quite differently than in other families. The purpose of having the questionnaires filled out is to see if my assumptions are correct.

A brief description of three different families will be given. Each person who takes part will think of a family they know that fits one of the descriptions provided and then answer a questionnaire about interaction in that family. The family in mind can be friends, neighbors, or relatives and they can live anywhere.

The questionnaire is completely anonymous: no names are required either of the family being described or of the persons completing the questionnaire.

I will hand out the questionnaires and then wait until they are completed. They take about twenty minutes to complete. The questions are quite simple to answer. Questions deal mainly with communication, discipline, and daily activities of the family. There are no questions of a personal nature.

One dollar (\$1.00) will be donated for each questionnaire answered. Participants should be thirteen years and over.

Thank you.

Doreen Campbell-Poersch

APPENDIX C

PURPOSE OF STUDY AND VERBAL
INSTRUCTIONS TO SUBJECTS

My field of study is the family. I am interested in finding out as much as I can about the way family members interact with one another. I think that in some families, the members interact with one another quite differently than in other families. The purpose of having you fill out the questionnaire is to see if my assumptions are correct.

There are three different descriptions of families on the top page of your questionnaire. Please read the descriptions and think of a family you know that might fit one of them. Not all the items in the description will be true for the family; just choose one description that best describes the family you are thinking about. The family can be friends, relatives, or neighbors. They can live anywhere, in Winnipeg, Brandon, Vancouver, or elsewhere. The better you know the family, the easier it will be to answer the questionnaire. The questionnaire is anonymous so please do not write your name or the family's name on it.

On the first page of the questionnaire there is a place to indicate which family description you have chosen and the number of people in the family. Please do not forget to fill in that information.

You will notice on the right hand side of the questionnaire, there are five letters and a question mark. At the top of each page an explanation of the letters is given (review answers for the group). You will circle the letter that you think is correct for each question. If you are unsure about the answer, just make the best estimate and circle the letters that you think might be right. If you are guessing at an answer, circle the letter and also

circle the question mark. Be sure to answer all questions by circling a letter you think might be correct.

Are there any questions?

APPENDIX D

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES IN MODAL
CATEGORIES FOR ALL ITEMS

Questions	N = 47	N = 71	N = 54
	%Random	% Open	%Closed
1. Members in this family are concerned with each other's welfare.	44.7 occas. ¹	61.4 always	44.4 most
2. Members in this family feel free to say what's on their mind.	34.0 occas.	64.8 most	27.8 most
3. They don't have spur of the moment guests at mealtime.	31.9 occas.	60.0 occas.	33.3 seldom
4. It is hard to know who the leader is in their family	25.5 most	32.4 never	57.4 never
5. It is difficult for members to take time away from the family.	44.7 never	33.8 seldom	35.2 occas.
6. Members of this family are afraid to tell the truth because of how harsh the punishment will be.	27.7 occas.	46.5 never	35.8 most
7. Most personal friends are not family friends.	53.2 most	41.4 seldom	33.3 seldom
8. Family members talk a lot but nothing ever gets done.	36.2 most	49.3 seldom	37.0 seldom
9. Family members feel guilty if they want to spend some time alone.	36.2 seldom	45.7 never	40.7 seldom
10. This family believes the world is a dangerous and frightening place to live.	31.9 seldom & never	47.1 never	24.1 most never
11. This family knows where all family members are at all times.	57.4 seldom	57.1 most	55.6 always
12. Family members have some say in what is required of them.	38.3 occas.	75.7 most	29.6 most

¹The range of responses is "always true", "most times true", "occasionally true", "seldom true", and "never true". The greatest frequency of occurrence for each item is "always true" and the least frequency of occurrence is "never true".

Questions	%Random	% Open	%Closed
13. The parents in this family stick together.	29.8 most	45.1 most always	59.3 always
14. This family tends to be suspicious of most people's motives.	27.7 occas.	43.7 seldom	37.0 occas.
15. Family members make the rules together.	44.7 seldom	57.7 most	31.5 never
16. Members in this family never seem to have any place to be alone in their house.	36.2 seldom	36.6 seldom	31.5 seldom
17. It is difficult for this family to keep track of what family members are doing.	44.7 most	45.1 seldom	44.4 never
18. Family members do not check with each other when making decisions.	44.7 most	43.7 seldom	44.4 seldom
19. This family tends to withdraw from interacting with others because they feel they have very little in common with most people.	25.9 occas.	54.9 never	29.8 occas.
20. Family ties are more important to them than any friendship could possibly be.	38.3 seldom	31.4 most	37.0 always most
21. When this family has an argument, family members just keep to themselves.	34.0 most	42.0 seldom	29.6 most
22. Family members often answer questions that were addressed to another person.	42.6 occas.	50.7 occas.	33.3 occas.
23. The parents check with the children before making important decisions in this family.	34.0 never	44.3 most	31.5 never
24. Family members like to spend some of their free time with each other.	53.2 seldom	57.1 most	37.0 occas.
25. Punishment is usually pretty fair in this family.	36.2 most	58.6 most	33.3 most

Questions	%Random	% Open	%Closed
26. Family members are encouraged to have friends of their own as well as family friends.	29.8 most	69.0 always	44.4 most
27. Family members discuss problems and usually feel good about the solutions.	57.4 seldom	75.7 most	29.6 seldom
28. Family members share almost all interests and hobbies with each other.	48.9 seldom	45.1 most	35.2 most
29. Members in this family usually don't tell each other about their personal problems and worries.	34.0 most	47.9 seldom	38.9 seldom
30. Family members are extremely independent.	40.4 most	36.6 most	25.9 most
31. No one in this family seems to be able to keep track of what their duties are.	27.7 most	50.0 seldom	40.7 never
32. Family members feel "its everyone for themselves".	38.3 most	44.9 never	46.3 never
33. Members of this family are not allowed to interact with people who would be a bad influence on them.	25.5 most seldom	39.9 seldom	38.9 always
34. This family has a rule for almost every possible situation.	36.2 never	31.0 occas.	42.6 most
35. The members respect each other's privacy.	31.9 most	56.3 most	53.7 most
36. Once this family has planned to do something, it is difficult to change it.	38.3 seldom	36.6 seldom	42.6 most
37. In this family, everyone is on their own when there is a problem to solve.	38.3 most	49.3 never	37.0 seldom
38. This family tends to be judgemental and inflexible in their opinions of other people in society.	43.5 most	45.1 seldom	37.0 most

Questions	%Random	% Open	%Closed
39. Family members do not turn to each other when they need help.	44.7 occas.	42.3 never	42.6 seldom
40. Members in this family find it hard to know what other family members are thinking.	55.3 most	54.9 seldom	31.5 seldom
41. Family members make visitors feel at home.	44.7 most	69.0 always	31.5 always
42. Parents make all the important decisions in this family.	36.2 most	57.7 most	57.4 always
43. Even when everyone is home, family members spend their time separately.	57.4 most	46.5 occas.	35.2 occas.
44. Parents and children in this family discuss together the method of punishment.	51.1 never	37.7 occas.	40.7 never
45. Family members have little need for friends because this family is so close.	57.4 never	46.5 never	37.0 seldom
46. This family feels good about their ability to solve problems.	48.9 seldom	78.6 most	46.3 most
47. Although family members have individual interests they still participate in family activities.	40.4 seldom	54.9 most	40.7 always
48. Each member in this family feels entitled to his or her own opinion and will stick to it.	42.6 most	56.3 most	35.2 seldom
49. Family members are totally on their own in developing their ideas.	55.3 most	39.4 occas.	37.0 seldom
50. Once a task is assigned to a family member, there is no chance of changing it.	34.6 seldom	57.7 seldom	35.2 most
51. Family members seldom take sides against other members.	30.4 seldom	35.2 seldom occas.	29.6 seldom

Questions	%Random	% Open	%Closed
52. Members in this family would likely disagree among themselves what is right and wrong.	38.3 occas.	56.3 occas.	35.2 occas.
53. When rules are broken, family members are treated fairly.	31.9 most seldom	63.4 most	40.7 most
54. Family members don't enter each other's area or activity.	31.9 most	38.0 seldom	44.4 seldom
55. Family members encourage each other's efforts to find new ways of doing things.	46.8 seldom	50.7 most	31.5 occas.
56. Family members discuss important decisions with each other, but usually make their own choice.	36.2 seldom	54.9 most	25.9 most occas. seldom
57. Family members seem to drift from one purpose or goal to another without any plan.	40.4 most	57.7 seldom	50.0 seldom
58. Members find home is one of the loneliest places to be.	38.3 occas.	64.3 never	35.2 never
59. In this family, it is important for everyone to express their opinion	38.3 seldom	56.3 most	29.6 most
60. Family members find it easier to discuss things with persons outside the family.	46.8 most	48.6 seldom	27.8 seldom
61. There is no leadership in this family.	29.8 most	54.9 never	66.7 never
62. This family tries to plan some things during the week so they can all be together.	46.8 never	45.1 most	27.8 occas.
63. Family members are not punished or reprimanded when they do something wrong.	31.9 occas.	42.9 seldom	40.7 seldom

Questions	%Random	% Open	%Closed
64. In this family, members know each other's close friends.	27.7 most	53.5 most	40.7 most
65. This family does not discuss its problems.	36.2 occas.	38.0 never	38.9 seldom
66. This family doesn't do things together.	38.3 most	47.9 never	35.2 seldom
67. This family is quite tolerant of people who have opinions and lifestyles different than theirs.	31.9 most	52.9 most	31.5 never
68. Family members enjoy doing things alone as well as together.	30.4 occas.	39.4 most	40.7 most
69. In this family, everyone shares responsibilities.	38.3 seldom	50.7 most	38.9 always
70. Parents agree on how to handle their children.	27.7 occas. seldom	50.0 most	37.0 most
71. Members are loyal to each other and would not reveal family information to outsiders.	41.3 seldom	48.6 most	50.0 most
72. It is unclear what will happen when rules are broken in this family.	53.2 most	56.5 seldom	35.2 seldom
73. When a bedroom is shut, family members knock before entering.	36.2 seldom	44.9 most	43.4 most
74. If one way doesn't work in this family, they try another.	38.3 seldom	66.2 most	33.3 most
75. Family members are expected to have the approval of others before making decisions.	38.3 seldom	42.3 most	50.0 most
76. Family members are totally involved in each other's lives.	53.2 seldom	52.1 most	38.9 most
77. Family members speak their minds without considering how it will affect the others.	36.2 most	49.3 occas.	40.7 seldom

Questions	%Random	% Open	%Closed
78. Family members feel comfortable inviting their friends along on family activities.	27.7 most	60.6 most	27.8 occas.
79. Each family member has at least some say in major family decisions.	34.0 seldom	54.9 most	31.5 occas.
80. Family members feel pressured to spend most free time together.	42.6 seldom	49.3 seldom	33.3 occas.
81. Members of this family can get away with almost anything.	38.3 most	43.7 seldom	59.3 never
82. Family members share the same friends.	53.2 seldom	45.1 occas.	29.6 most
83. When trying to solve problems, family members jump from one attempted solution to another without giving any of them time to work.	40.4 most occas.	52.1 seldom	44.4 seldom
84. This family has difficulty thinking of things to do as a family.	53.2 most	56.3 seldom	35.2 never
85. Once this family "makes up its mind", the members won't change their ideas.	44.7 seldom	36.6 occas.	29.6 most
86. It seems as if this family agrees on everything.	40.4 seldom	50.7 most	50.0 most
87. It seems as if males and females never do the same chores in the family.	29.8 most	38.0 occas.	25.9 most never
88. Family members know who will agree and who will disagree with them on most family matters.	53.2 most	52.1 most	40.7 most
89. This family believes it is important for each member to be free to do what they want.	38.3 most	49.3 most	33.3 seldom
90. There is strict punishment for breaking rules in this family.	38.3 seldom	36.8 occas.	42.6 most

Questions	%Random	% Open	%Closed
91. Family members seem to avoid contact with each other when at home.	34.0 occas.	42.3 seldom never	35.2 never
92. For no apparent reason, family members seem to change their minds.	54.3 occas.	49.3 seldom	50.0 seldom
93. They decide together on family matters and separately on personal matters.	34.0 occas.	39.4 occas.	40.7 occas.
94. This family has a balance of closeness and separateness.	40.4 seldom	70.4 most	35.2 most
95. Family members rarely say what they want.	29.8 most occas.	50.7 seldom	37.0 seldom
96. It seems there are always people around home who are not members of the family.	31.9 occas.	45.7 occas.	33.3 never
97. Certain family members order everyone else around.	48.9 most	40.8 seldom	31.5 most
98. It seems as if family members can never find time to be together.	38.3 occas.	54.9 seldom	46.3 seldom
99. Family members are severely punished for anything they do wrong.	31.9 seldom never	41.4 never	31.5 most
100. Family members know very little about friends of other family members.	36.2 most	53.5 seldom	48.1 seldom
101. Family members feel they have no say in solving problems.	40.4 occas.	57.7 seldom	27.8 seldom
102. Members of this family share many interests.	59.6 seldom	60.6 most	33.3 most
103. When a family decision is being made, each member is encouraged to give an opinion.	44.7 seldom	63.4 most	31.5 seldom

Questions	%Random	% Open	%Closed
104. Family members are encouraged to do their own thing.	38.4 most	57.7 most	27.8 never
105. Family members never know how others are going to act.	40.4 occas.	52.9 seldom	42.6 seldom
106. Certain individuals seem to cause most of this family's problems.	40.4 most	35.2 seldom	25.9 occas.
107. This family has a commitment to a religious belief.	31.9 seldom	31.0 always	37.7 always
108. It is hard to know what the rules are in this family because they always change.	31.9 most	46.5 seldom	42.6 never
109. Family members find it hard to get away from each other.	42.6 seldom	43.7 seldom	33.3 most
110. Family members feel that the family will never change.	42.6 most	37.1 seldom	31.5 most
111. Family members feel they have to go along with what the family decides to do.	29.8 most	34.8 most	48.1 most