70-24,456

BLUM, Allan Martin, 1943-
THE DIFFERENTIATION OF FAMILY STYLES AND THEIR RELATION TO CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR.

The City University of New York, Ph.D., 1970
Psychology, clinical

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE DIFFERENTIATION OF FAMILY STYLES AND THEIR RELATION TO CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR

by

ALLAN BLUM

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1970

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

4/13/70
date

Mary Engel
Chairman of Examining Committee

4-13-70
date

Norman C. Weeks
Executive Officer

Prof. Max Hertzman

Prof. Herbert Nechin

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Acknowledgements

In completing this study, I owe a debt of gratitude to many people whose various contributions to the over-all effort made it possible to complete this difficult undertaking:

First I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my sponsor, Professor Mary Engel, whose direction and encouragement were a constant source of support throughout the course of the study. In developing my thinking in the area and guiding me through the problems which arose, I will always be grateful for her help and involvement.

To my other committee members, Professors Max Hertzman and Herbert Nechin, I offer my thanks for their timely suggestions at different points in the development of the design and evaluation of the results.

Collectively, I wish to thank this entire committee for their joint flexibility and willingness to allow my own thinking to be the major factor in the study's development.

I would also like to thank Mr. Tom Todd for his skill, patience and understanding in guiding me through the computerized analysis of the results.

Finally, I would like to thank the public school teachers for their time and cooperation in rating over 100 children on the different behavioral measures which I employed.

Abstract

THE DIFFERENTIATION OF FAMILY STYLES AND THEIR RELATION TO CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR

by

Allan Blum

Adviser: Professor Mary Engel

This study marked an attempt to refine assessment of environmental circumstances along dimensions that were within the "disadvantaged" population. The investigation had two major foci of interest: (1) to determine the utility of the concept of family styles in an empirical context; and (2) to examine the relationship between family styles and classroom behavior.

The concept of style was defined as the characteristic expressive mode of behavior observable upon first encounter with a family. The styles chosen for investigation were based on those which Minuchin identified in his own research (1967), namely: "disengaged, enmeshed, juvenile, peripheral male, and non-evolved" with the addition of the coping style by this writer. Regarding Minuchin's work, there were still some questions about the derivation of these styles through alternative procedures. Therefore one of the principal objectives of the present study was the development of techniques for family style assessment that could be quantified and replicated. Three separate instruments were designed by the investigator for this purpose: the Joint Social History; the Family Pattern Q-sort; and the Family Attribute Differential Scale.

To study behavior in the classroom setting, two scales developed by Ullman (1952) and Peterson (1961), along with a modified checklist of items developed by Kellam (1967), were used. These instruments represent respective measures of "global maladjustment, personality and conduct disorders and adaptational difficulties."

Predictions were made in the areas of family style assessment and behavioral functioning as follows:

1. It would be possible to measure family styles using empirical procedures.
2. The "coping" style would have the highest reliability of judge's ratings followed by the "disengaged and enmeshed" styles.
3. Factor analysis of the Family Attribute Differential Scale would yield patterns of factor scores for the different family styles, making it possible to differentiate family styles on the basis of different attributes.
4. The variables of "executive behavior, communicational processes and affective responses," would show a relationship to family styles.
5. Children from "disengaged" families would show the most significant degree of global maladjustment and adaptational difficulties.
6. Conduct disorders would be manifested by attempts to establish control over the environment in the case of the child from a "disengaged" family, and by attempts to

remove restrictions in the case of the child from an "enmeshed" family style.

Four first-grade classes of a predominantly Black West Harlem public school were rated, using Ullman's global maladjustment rating scale. At the time of the study, all children were at least six years old. A final sample of 30 children was obtained which consisted of 23 children with varying degrees of maladjustment and 7 children showing no evidence of maladjustment. The families were therefore reached through the children.

Family styles were assessed by: (1) correlating experimental (by mother) Q-sorts with model (by judge's) Q-sorts for each style; (2) rating interview material (by judges) as representative of each of the family styles; and (3) factor analyzing different attributes for each family member as rated (by judges) on the Family Attribute Differential Scale.

The results demonstrated the utility of all three instruments as assessment procedures and established some relationship between family styles and behavior for the styles of "coping," "disengaged and enmeshed." All major hypotheses were confirmed except for number five as no significant differences were found on global maladjustment or adaptational difficulties when comparing scores for children from "disengaged and enmeshed" families. Some of the other conclusions drawn were:

1. The Family Pattern Q-sort was viewed as a measure of learning and defensive process.

2. Factor scores for the Family Attribute Differential Scale, showed the "coping" family to be primarily "allocentric" and the "disengaged" family primarily "autocentric" in their orientations.
3. Family styles were not all found to be mutually exclusive of one another. The concept of predominant and secondary styles was introduced.
4. The possibility of variations of extreme within a style, as well as etiological factors in the "disengaged and enmeshed" style, were discussed.
5. Personality and conduct disorders were regarded as differential attempts to resolve conflicts created by the nature of the family styles themselves.
6. Implications of the present study for future research were made.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

I

INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

Within the past few years, increasing attention has been directed to the problems of "the lower class and culturally deprived." The current concern with the education of the "disadvantaged child," the discussion of hard core and multi-problem families, the analysis of the number of Americans living below the poverty line and the attempts to understand the relationship between these variables, all reflect a growing awareness of the underprivileged.

However, much confusion exists in these discussions. Those concerned with psychological and social factors, tend to underestimate the importance of economic pressures and those interested in economic deprivation frequently discount the role of social and psychological problems in preventing people from dealing with their difficulties more effectively. Havighurst (1965) has attempted to clarify the concept of socially disadvantaged by describing the disadvantaged child in three ways: (1) certain family characteristics relating directly to the child; (2) personal characteristics; and (3) the social group characteristics of their families.

In this context, the concept of "socially disadvantaged" is viewed as a relative term. Therefore, variations along significant dimensions of experience become important, rather than any hard-fast relationship between socio-economic status and social disadvantage for the child.

A review of the literature indicates that there are essentially three approaches to understanding the disadvantaged: (1) comparative studies; (2) isolated variable studies; and (3) clinical studies. A brief summary of the nature and implications of the findings for these three approaches follows below.

Comparative Studies

The purpose of this style of research has been to arrive at conceptualizations of the disadvantaged through definitions of groups in terms of class factors, especially economic role or income. In contrasting the family characteristics of lower and middle class groups, certain variables have been found to emerge repeatedly.

The lower class family is generally described as "inconsistent and disorganized," where there is limited verbal interaction and relatively poor methods of communication. Parents have been found to be less involved and supporting, while exhibiting greater punitive behavior (Milner, 1951; Kohn, 1960; Bayley, 1960; Duetsch, 1965; Gordon, 1965). These dimensions are regarded as less than model when compared to those of middle class groups and are felt to be contributing causes to many of the "deficit functions" that have been observed in studying the personal characteristics of the children in these families.

Studies of language, intellectual functioning, perceptual styles and patterns of behavior are well documented. Differences in the directions of inferior functioning have been found to exist in all the areas studied in this manner (Dreger, 1964; Klaus, 1965; Deutsch, 1964; John, 1963; McCandless, 1952; Stodolsky, 1967).

Gordon (1965), in an article dealing with the characteristics of socially disadvantaged children, criticizes comparative studies for leading to collective notions concerning "the poor and the culturally deprived." In addition, he points out that this approach tends to distort "intra-group" differences while overemphasizing negative aspects by labeling them as deficits to be overcome.

Isolated Variable Studies

The approach here has been to study particular variables considered important to development. Included in this vast amount of literature are studies of discipline, underachievement, dependence, overprotectiveness, language acquisition, perceptual functioning, and many others (Kohn, 1960; Spilka, 1962; Davidson, 1962; Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Clapp, 1967; John, 1963; Deutsch, 1967).

In a study of "psycholinguistic diversity" among "culturally deprived" children, Sigel (1968) criticizes the tendency for isolated studies to "overgeneralize findings." According to Sigel, the result is to "deny individuality" and to judge a member of a given class as similar to, and representative of, all class members. He goes on to state that the danger in this type of orientation is that the child's competencies and individual range of abilities will be overlooked and will often be treated stereotypically with respect to the particular variable under investigation.

Clinical Studies

Studies in this area have as their objective both the understanding and subsequent helpful intervention for the population in question.

It is more common here to find references to "the home or child rearing environment," in many of the investigations (Baldwin, 1965; LaPray, 1967). Psychological development is regarded as an outgrowth of the family process which involves a combination of many interrelated variables.

Work by Myers (1959) demonstrating the influences of family dynamics in mental illness and a recent study by Mackie (1967) showing the selective influences of family variables on the development of disadvantaged children, would be examples of research of this type. Clinical studies also include investigations which are based on observations of disorganized families (Malone, 1963; Pavenstedt, 1965). These studies, while providing a wider framework for conceptualizing the disadvantaged, generally tend to be primarily descriptive, with little empirical basis.

Stodolsky (1967) points out that research with the disadvantaged demands that new conceptions be based on a much more refined assessment of environmental circumstances. Such assessment would proceed beyond the "group characteristics" that have been dealt with in the past. In this respect the goal is to specify environmental circumstances that are closely related to the developmental processes and which vary within social class and ethnic lines. By beginning with environmental characteristics and then assessing the child's behavior and learning patterns, a new concept of those who are classified as disadvantaged would develop.

This idea is further documented by Minuchin (1967) who notes that certain characteristics of subsamples within the low income group can be described and defined by varying qualities of behavior, family organization and communicational styles, which set them apart from other

equally impoverished samples. He goes on to say:

> "Although various indices such as employment status or education, or income of household head have been used to differentiate certain low-income samples, it is quite common to find only global references to the "poor, the disadvantaged and the culturally deprived." Such designations subsume what we now recognize to be a number of sub-groupings and subcultures. We need to have much more information about differences along a number of dimension among subgroups within the disadvantaged population itself. Research along these lines is still in the preliminary stages" (Minuchin, 1967, p. 25).

One differentiation which has proven meaningful has been to separate the stable from the more unstable and disorganized elements within a low-class sub-culture. Miller (1964) employs the notion of familial stability/instability to represent "a dichotomization of style of life." According to Miller, familial stability patterns are characterized by: effective coping with problems, the meeting of parental obligations and responsibilities, and little manifested behavior difficulties in the children. As Miller points out, even though these may not be the most satisfactory indicators, they are nevertheless suggestive of the kinds of behavior which are characteristics of stability among the low income population.

The disorganized groups within the lower class subculture, while sharing certain characteristics with others in the low income population, also show a greater degree of social pathology, alcoholism, mental illness, addiction, crime and delinquency. Miller's aim is to illustrate the amount of effectiveness of different styles of life in handling relatively similar environments.

Pavenstedt (1967), in studying disorganized families, found that

the maladjustment of these groups was "self-perpetuating." She concurs with Galbraith's statement (1958) which states, "the first step in any attack on poverty is to see that it is no longer self perpetuating."

The present study marks an attempt to refine assessment of "environmental circumstances" along dimensions that are within the "disadvantaged" population. This refinement will be in the direction of identifying and clarifying family characteristics and determining the nature of their relationship to the personal characteristics of the children. The major areas of investigation for the present study can be summarized as follows:

1. Family Style Assessment

   The primary focus here will be the assessment of different family styles. Such assessment has been carried out by clinicians in the therapeutic situation. The contribution of the present study will be the development of assessment techniques which will be more empirical in the sense of their replicability and quantification.

   The concept of style is defined here as the characteristic expressive mode of behavior, observable upon first encounter with a family. It is the belief of the writer that these styles manifest themselves as a result of variations in particular underlying attributes within the families themselves. Family styles will be examined in part, by studying the manner in which such variables as communicational processes, affective responses and personal characteristics of family members, interact with one another to form different family

patterns.

2. Family Style and Function

Existing studies leave unchartered the connection between styles of family life and their relationship to behavior. The significance of studying this relationship becomes important if preventing self-perpetuation of maladjustment and intervening for the purpose of modification are to be considered. The hypothesis that a child's early experiences are among the most decisive influences in the perpetuation of maladjustment is well supported, along with evidence for believing that pathology is more easily reversible at earlier age levels than later on (Skeels, 1939; Freud, 1944; Bloom, 1964). For this reason, children who are in the beginning of their first grade in public school will be chosen for this study. Aspects of classroom behavior will be used in an attempt to clarify their relationship to particular "family styles."

The following two sections will be devoted to a review of research in these two principal areas under investigation. The first part will deal with studies in the area of family characteristics, specifically family styles. The section following will summarize the major findings dealing with the relationship between family styles and personal characteristics of the children, namely classroom behavior.

II

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF RELATED RESEARCH

Research studying the characteristics of disorganized families within the disadvantaged sub-group has been largely an outgrowth of the work of two principle investigators. It is for this reason that the work of Pavenstedt (1967) and Minuchin (1967) will form the basis for the review which follows. A comparative discussion of their research will be presented in three sections: (1) Basic design and rationale; (2) Essential variables studied; and (3) Conceptions of family styles.

Basic Design and Rationale

Pavenstedt's study grew out of the need for a new child guidance program to serve the disadvantaged community. The objectives involved a multi-disciplinaried program of investigation and service for families who were not making constructive use of existing agencies. The aim of the study was to improve conditions under which children in their formative years grew up, since it was hypothesized that the children's early experiences were most decisive in influencing their later development.

The study dealt with 13 families, having a total of 45 pre-school among them. Of these, 21 attended the project's nursery school. Criteria for selecting the families were as follows: (1) evidence of gross social and psychological pathology; (2) failure to work constructively with community services, while availing themselves only of public welfare; (3) children below the age of five; and (4) the existence of a

child-rearing unit consisting of at least mother and child or children.

Only three Black families participated in the project. One of the unique findings was that the father and mother were usually from different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Contacts with all 13 families were made both in the home and in the clinic, where the socio-economic, medical and psychological aspects of the women's lives were explored. Data were also collected about the children's functioning in the nursery school which were based on (1) detailed first impression summaries; (2) contemporary progress reports; (3) summary reports concerning special events in the child's life; and (4) object tests of the child's ability. These two sources served as the basis for descriptions of family characteristics and their relation to the development of the children from these disorganized homes. Contrasts were made of the degree of disorganization within the family and their influence on the personal characteristics of the child.

Minuchin (1967) has dealt with the nature of the disorganized families by identifying patterns within the family constellation that account for differences within the unstable elements of the low income population. This notion stems from his belief that within disorganized disadvantaged families, the child's patterns of behavior are imbued with certain stylistic characteristics required for coping within their families.

According to Minuchin:

> There exists a varied and yet distinctive set of communicational and cognitive styles which can actually interfere with the child's ability to judge correctly the impact of his behavior on others. This organizes

> the child's dominant style of coping and grows out of the modalities of interpersonal contact within the families themselves. These are the result of the special cognitive and affective characteristics of the members of a given family (Minuchin, 1967, p. 194).

On this basis, Minuchin believes that it is possible to observe in the initial contacts with a family, a particular type of structural arrangement from the nature of the patterned transactions among its members. One looked for (1) lines of power and leadership, (2) the labeling of members and their assignment to particular roles, and (3) subgrouping alliances and shifts around significant themes, and (4) the ways in which language was used to support the structural balance.

Within this framework, Minuchin conducted a study of the performance of twelve delinquent producing (experimental families) and an equivalent control sample of ten families, who were matched with the experimental families on a number of variables but with no delinquent children. The families studied consisted of Blacks, Puerto Ricans and Whites, with an approximate equal distribution in both experimental and control groups.

Some of the characteristics of family structure that were the basis of the population as studied by Minuchin were the following:

1. Largely one parent families, where the mother provided continuity through a succession of unstable father figures;
2. In an intact family, the spouse sybsystem functioned mostly as a parent system;
3. The nature of the parent's power was confusing. At times, parents were found to be absolute, at others completely

helpless;

4. There was a breakdown in communication between parents and children and the sibling subsystem tended to encourage expression of opposition to parental control.

The major purpose of Minuchin's study was to determine some of the structural and dynamic features of delinquent producing families and compare them with similar families from the disorganized elements that had not produced delinquent children. Expectations were that families with delinquents would differ from similar families without delinquents and show changes as a result of progress in a program of therapy. Three methods were used to study family members in interaction with one another: (1) A detailed verbal analysis of the interaction during progressive stages in therapy provided one source of data; (2) a specially developed pictorial projective technique (the Wiltwyck Family Interaction Apperception Technique, FIAT); and (3) a specially developed behavioral situation, the Family Task.

Family Interaction Apperception Technique

The Family Interaction Apperception Technique (FIAT) is a pictorial projective technique modeled after the Thematic Apperception Test. It was specifically designed to elicit projective material concerning interaction among family members along dimensions such as control, guidance, nurturance, aggression, and others. The FIAT is comprised of ten pictures depicting families in different activities. The instructions call for stories about the families. In addition, the act in the stories is specific and the racial characteristics of the

people in the drawings are deliberately non-determinate.

Family Task Situation

In order to elucidate some of the structural and dynamic features of the delinquent producing families, and for the purposes of comparison, Minuchin developed a method of studying family members in interaction with one another, while they discussed and answered a series of questions together. The rationale being that this permitted observation in a relatively natural yet unstructured situation. Some of the tasks involved: (1) joint discussion involving decision making; (2) discussion of the "different ways" of each family member; and (3) discussion of the last family fight and others.

The experimental families were given both procedures before and after 30 therapy sessions. Changes were explained as indicating progress as a function of therapy.

Essential Variables Studied

The major variables that were found to be significant in describing patterns of family life included: (1) the nature of the communicational processes; (2) affective responses or the manner in which feelings were conveyed; and (3) executive behavior, which was manifested by the degree of support, guidance and control in a particular family. These variables will be discussed with respect to the findings of both studies.

Communicational Processes

Pavenstedt, distinguished between the communication of the stable and disorganized elements of the poor. The language development with

the stable poor covered the normal range of the Gesell and Wechsler intelligence tests. These mothers were found to talk to their children from an early age. Very often they projected an adult comprehension and response onto their children. Response to encouragement of vocalizations was frequent, but not always present. The mothers' voices were often raised. They would often accuse themselves of yelling at the children.

When analyzing the disorganized multi-problem families, certain characteristics were found to emerge. Communication by means of words hardly existed. Directions were either indefinite or else were left hanging. The child's pleas for attention often went unheeded. There was seldom an attempt on the part of the mother to inquire into a child's injuries, whereabouts, or general activities. Most communication was in the form of short, abrupt, inconsistent commands.

Pavenstedt also noted that children of multi-problem families are raised in an environment in which there is a strong and pervasive sense of devaluation. It is a feeling which constantly surrounds the children and influences their interactions and growth. The children's achievements were often ignored or deprecated. They were found to seldom experience praise or appreciation for their efforts and at times their attempts to attain recognition appeared to threaten their parents. Mothers were heard to say in front of others, "Who is he? He's a nobody," or derogatorily, "She thinks she's somebody."

Minuchin (1967) elaborated further the distinguishing characteristics of the communicational styles of disorganized families. According

to Minuchin, there exists in the process of communication between parents and children a set of implicit rules that govern the exchange of information. These rules are generally concerned with how to signal that one is heard, understood, agreed with or disagreed with.

As a result of his work, Minuchin states that the "entire process by which disorganized family members relate to each other is affected by the characteristics and quality of their communicational system." The low socioeconomic disorganized family showed deficits in the knowledge of rules that regulate the flow of communication. In the overcrowded conditions of these large families, parents payed little attention to the requests of the individual children, and the children in turn accepted the fact that they would not be heard.

Conflicts were found to be resolved primarily through a series of escalated threats and counter threats. The total amount of words and the actual amount of vocabulary that was available was usually scarce. The model of adults communicating with one another was generally not available to the child. The important role of negotiations as a method for resolving disputes remained essentially undeveloped. Conflicts had little closure, and there was a faulty development of themes, a restricted affective range and the lack of meaningful training in the elaboration of questions with which to gather information.

Minuchin summarizes the formal characteristics of communication within disorganized families as follows:

Listening: Subjects did not expect to be heard. If family members are heard, they did not expect a response. Also, if someone responded, it was not necessarily along the lines of the preceding communication. Any irrelevant responses could be forthcoming and accepted.

Themes: A subject was rarely carried to any conclusion, a small number of interactions around one subject were usually discontinued by an unrelated intervention of another member, which initiated the emergence of a new subject.

Noise: Intensity of sound generally was found to replace theme content. In all families, the role of the mother as a regulator was found to be significant; when she was excluded from the group, there resulted a large increase in the level of noise.

Pathways: The mother was found to be the central pathway for most transactions among family members when they were together. The spouses were found to very rarely talk to one another. The children's sustained talk was mostly to the mother.

Content: Variations of the theme that the world was a dangerous place were central. There was a great deal of time devoted to transacting power operations between the siblings, while the mother's messages to the children were mostly framed in don'ts. Very often the mother's response to one child's disruptive behavior was generalized to the whole group. This style of responding often encouraged undifferentiated

evaluation of behavior and a diffusion of responsibility for certain actions. It was found that rarely do the messages of mothers in disorganized families emphasize positives.

With respect to the quantity of verbalizations, Minuchin observed an extreme phenomenon. Experimental mothers and their children talked significantly more or less than the control counterparts. A significant result emerged indicating that the experimental mothers either talked greatly in excess of other family members or relatively ignored them in contrast to the control mothers. Therefore the mothers were found to cluster in two extreme groups with respect to this variable. Minuchin claims support for his clinical view that these parents attempt to cope with their family group by different degrees of involvement.

An attempt was also made to study qualitatively the course and end product of discussions to determine their effectiveness and clarity. Clarity was judged to be adequate for eight of the ten control families, but only four of the twelve experimental families. Minuchin ascribes the basis for the lack of clarity to the "apparent meaninglessness and futility of communication."

Finally there was an examination of the different types of messages the family members sent, when asked to describe what pleased and displeased them about each other. There were found to be three types of response to this question:

Objective: The speaker focused on some acts or behavior of the other and whether it was expressed negatively or positively, presents an objective content oriented opinion of him. For example, "I like him when he does his work, keeps out of trouble, plays with his brother, etc." It is assumed that guidance can grow from this type of response.

Personal: The speaker focused on the other mainly in relation to himself (the speaker). "I don't like him because he hit me," "I don't like him because he helps me." Personal contact seems an integral part of the evaluation or perception of the other.

Affect: This response conveys an affect message primarily and tells more about the attitude of the speaker than about the characteristics of the other. The view of the other is global, the trait is defined with the whole person. "He's lovable," or "He always get away with things," or "He blabs his mouth too much."

One interesting finding was that the question was found to be very difficult for the experimental families, especially the parents. Only in six of the twelve experimental families did a parent give a spontaneous, appropriate response. In others, the question was just not understood, or was just not responded to by either mother or father. In three of the twelve experimental families, no child responded to the question. The explanation was in terms of excessive affective arousal. Another possibility offered was that there existed a real problem in differentiating

formulating and expressing in words, their feelings about another family member.

In analyzing the findings in the area of communicational processes, both qualitative and quantitative differences have been found, which contrast groups of disorganized families from the more stable elements of lower class subjects. In addition, both Pavenstedt and Minuchin have shown that variations in communication can be considered part of the patterns that families have developed to deal with their problems.

Affective Responses

Pavenstedt found that the needs of the parents within the disorganized family unit take precedence over the needs of the children. The parents were in constant rivalry with their children and pressed for their own gratification at every opportunity. They showed little awareness or perception of feeling and consequently they could not empathize with the underlying emotions of their children. Since they were unable to understand the needs of the children, they were limited in their capacity to respond to situations of stress experienced by them.

The mother's relationship was to "children" not to an individual child. Except for gross patterns of identification such as "He is like his father," few patterns of differentiation were expressed through behavior to the children. The mothers often engaged in unpredictable, aggressive, violent outbursts, which were often directed in an indiscriminate manner towards the nearest child.

Minuchin found that affect was communicated mostly through paraverbal channels in the pitch, tempo and intensity of the verbal messsges

and the accompanying kinesthetic modifiers. Rarely did members talk about their feelings, or comment on the feelings of others. When verbal expression of feelings was required, the response was usually a global positive, or a negative stereotype; "sad or happy, angry or well," and "bad or okay" were the major descriptions of feeling.

There was evidence for a lack of selective reactivity on the parent's part to the children's actions; Minuchin feels that this is suggestive of the fact that parental reactions were to their own internal stress, rather than to the behavior of the child. The parental mode of response, when one was made, was usually in the form of some type of violence. In addition, observations of family interaction point to rapid shifts from aggression to affection, which are inconsistent and make it difficult for the child to organize and plan his own behavior.

Themes of physical aggression were prominent in discussions of family disputes and attitudes towards siblings in the experimental group, whereas more control children focused on their siblings' cooperativeness or competitiveness. About the same number of families in each group conceptualized pleasurable, joint family activities, but for the experimental families these revolved primarily around eating, while for the control families descriptions were for a wider variety of shared family experience.

Executive Behavior

The outstanding characteristic of disorganized homes, according to Pavenstedt, was that the activities were impulse determined, with consistency being almost totally absent. The mother might stay in bed till

noon while the children were also kept in bed or ran around unsupervised. Although families sometimes ate breakfast together, there was no pattern for anything. The parents, states Pavenstedt, are children themselves, as they have grown up without any clear normative system. As a result, their interactions are unpredictable. They range from over-control to complete absence of guidance. In many families children were left to their own devices, to go as they pleased.

Minuchin's analysis focused on three types of "executive or managerial behavior," leadership, behavior control and guidance. Leadership was a category devised to describe activities directed towards the performance of some task. It would include calling on people, summing up statements and other similar activities. Behavior control, as differentiated from guidance, was used to refer to "presence-control," as in "do this, or don't do that." Guidance was directed towards instructing as to ways of behaving in the future while pointing out inappropriate aspects of the criticized behavior.

No differences were found between experimental and control mothers with respect to the categories of leadership and guidance. However, the experimental mothers were found to cluster at the extremes on the variable of control. That is, some were found to spend a good deal of their time controlling the behavior of their children, while others hardly did so at all.

Family Styles

As a result of her work with the disorganized family structure, Pavenstedt feels that these families can be looked at from the point of

view of family "life styles." Such a perspective would include, according to Pavenstedt, a consideration of family values, roles, methods of communication and ways of problem solving. She describes the range of disorganization among these families and points to the need to untangle and identify the mutual influences of individual, family and life situations on evolving family life styles.

Her analysis then proceeds to draw together some of the most striking characteristics that these families share with one another. These characteristics include specifically: the need orientation of the adults, the general low self esteem, and the strong parallel between the limited development in the parents and the subsequent "handicaps" that the children experience.

Her delineations are sharpest in the area of identifying degrees of disorganization. She studied families with "maximum disorganization," multi-problem families, multi-problem families with gross pathology but less severe disorganization and multi-problem asocial families (unmarried mothers). As an outgrowth of her work, she has described differences between these families and recognizes the importance of identifying and understanding the dynamics of the individual patterns.

Minuchin's experiences yielded certain observations concerning these patterns, which he found to distinguish and differentiate among disorganized disadvantaged families in a "surprisingly consistent fashion." The profiles and structural differences constituted styles along the dimensions of communicational processes, executive behavior and affective relationships between family members.

Among the styles that Minuchin was able to identify were included:

1. The Disengaged Family
2. The Enmeshed Family
3. The Peripheral Male Family
4. The Non-Evolved Family
5. The Juvenile Family

A description of the major characteristics and dimensions of these families will be presented in the following section.*

The Disengaged Family

> Observing this family, one gets the general impression that the actions of its members do not lead to any vivid repercussions. Reactions from the others come very slowly and seem to fall into a vacuum. The overall impression is of an atomistic field; Family members have long moments when they move in isolated orbits, unrelated to each other. They act as parts of a system so loosely interlocked that it challenges the clinician's notions that a change in one part of the system will be followed by a complementary change in other parts (Minuchin, 1968, p. 354).

The most frequent modes of interaction are characterized by delay of response and a general lack of contact. "The mother's functioning is characterized by disengagement, lack of response and apathy." There is considerable variation with respect to the children's actions. There are situations in which the children and their mothers are involved in parallel play or in activities devoid of any contact among them. One notices little attentiveness from member to member and few attempts to

*Examples of each of the above styles is presented in the chapter, "Clinical Perspectives." The material in Chapter VI is based on actual interview data.

engage in reciprocal interplay.

> The disconnected quality of the relationship among family members in this profile is a feature far more distinguishing than the immobility and passivity of the mother. The mother in this group feels overwhelmed, has a derogatory self-image, experiences herself as exploited, and almost invariably presents psychosomatic complaints, and depressive features along with her slow pace of response. Though these qualities in the mother seem originally to have been central in the organization of this system, by now when she is removed, the sibling subsystem usually retains its loosely interlocking quality (Minuchin, 1968, p. 354).

In this family, the mother demonstrates a marked inability to establish any meaningful and consistent control or guidance over her children. The extreme isolation of the mother makes it difficult for her to establish contact with the external world and draw on extra-familial sources of support. In most cases, according to Minuchin, it is possible to look at a family history usually lacking in anchorage points such as stable working patterns, and stable relationships to a male, other friends, or other social groups. "The mother is alone."

The Enmeshed Family

This family style is characterized by an excessively tight interlocking of its members. "Their quality of connectedness is such that attempts on the part of one member to change, elicits fast complementary resistance on the part of the others. With this family, a quality of immediate reactivity is probably the most predominant characteristic. The family is constantly involved in "engagement" maneuvers. Most of these maneuvers are either a reflection or in response to controlling operations on the part of the mother. These include fast interchanges

around her controlling responses and the children's rebellious activities. The family members use each other as triggers for immediate reactivity. The fact that one is dealing with an over-all clinical process reflecting a system is demonstrated by the absence of the mother and the still remaining tightly interlocked quality of the sibling subgroup. While in the "disengaged" family style, the mothers do not respond or else delay their actions to the children, in this group, the mother's response is immediate.

> The recurrence of power conflicts and the runaway quality of escalation and counterescalation of the part of the family members typify this family. Usually in this family there is no possibility of developing any language of affection and concern. Almost all interchanges, whether positive or not, are simply variations of power maneuvers. In the disengaged family the mother becomes anxious when she assumes control and guidance. In the enmeshed family profile, any evidence of loss of control over the children makes the mother anxious. The predominant fear is that of becoming helpless rather than of becoming mean. The organizing tendency in the enmeshed family involves constant attempts on the part of the mother to move away from a helpless role or stance. She has an overwhelming need for continuing hold on her children. These families usually do not include an adult male, but if there is one, his power is clearly restricted and controlled by the women (Minuchin, 1967, p. 358).

The Peripheral Male Family

Minuchin points out that within the disorganized lower class families, the center of power generally tends to be the mother. It is his contention that the family has more possibility for change as the complexity of its system increases. When a man participates in the family role of an adult male, he adds differentiation and specialization to the

family's manner of approaching life. Therefore the possibility of mobilizing resources for change within the family increases.

In the low socioeconomic family, exclusion by the male is accompanied by a movement of the center of his own life to a realm outside of the family. In many respects he participates, says Minuchin, in the process of excluding himself. Very often the result is an alliance between the mother and the children which sees the man as largely responsible for the family unhappiness. The mother's problems and incompetence are frequently overlooked by projection of most of the family problems onto the man's incompetence.

> The characteristics of interaction among family members of this profile include: lack of communication between spouses as husband and wife with the consequent over-use of parental channels for transactions which belong in an underdeveloped husband wife sphere, the centrality of the mother and the creation of a mother child subsystem which excludes the man compliments the process by anchoring himself outside of the family (Minuchin, 1967, p. 362).

Another conceptualization of peripheral male families lies in the more structural example of this style. This situation has been found quite frequently in disorganized families where there is no stable male figure in the home. Frequently a succession of boyfriends assume prime importance as male figures for the children of this family. The meaning which their presence has in the family constellation may be different than for the families with a physically present but psychologically absent male.

The Non-Evolved Family

In this type of family, the grandmother is allocated executive power, while the mother and the children function more or less as a

vaguely differentiated subgroup. The mother in this group assumes the role of the older sibling, with a consequent impairment in the three generation family. Even if this profile were to include a man, the emergence of spouse functions is relatively rare because of the arrested development of the role of wife/mother, with the role of daughter being rigidly maintained.

The Juvenile Parent Family

These parents exhibit a style that consists of essential avoidance of adult roles. "Both parents are dynamically related to peer groups, with the functions of spouses and parents assuming secondary importance to their relationships to peer systems outside of the family." Because so many of the parents in this group are found to have remained frozen in their individual development, the appearance of such complex functions as mutuality and responsibility is often blocked. Couples in this family go through crisis after crisis talking about their pending separation and marital breakup, but in reality there has never been a true marriage.

> The adult female sees herself as a "fickle girl. In many crises she is promiscuous, rejects motherly functions and centers her activity and justification of herself on being an attractive woman and in some cases an effective provider. The male is dependent on her and frequently assumes an attitude of defiance against organized institutions. In their interaction, the woman assumes predominance. Although she exerts managerial functions, she is insufficiently related to child care functions. The husband's acceptance of the maternal role seems to be a compensation for his sense of incompetence as a provider or as a husband. His resentment of his wife is manifested by his pleasurable activities outside the realm of the family life with his peers (Minuchin, 1967, p. 366).

For the children in such a family, the result is generally divided loyalties and frequently confused sex role identity. The lack of boundaries in these families pushes the children into the roles of mediators in the parental difficulties.

After careful examination of the literature reviewed in this section, several points can now be raised regarding work in the area of family style assessment.

With specific reference to those styles which developed out of Minuchin's work, it is clear that these were derived through a combination of both therapeutic encounters and specially developed research techniques, namely the FIAT and the Family Task Situation. In the process of assessment and identification, these styles have been shown to involve structural as well as more evaluative components. The "non-evolved" and "disengaged" family profiles being respective examples of these two elements. The therapy sessions as employed by Minuchin, were utilized primarily as intervention measures and were used as indices along with the other tests for comparing samples and measuring changes over time.

However, Minuchin does not describe how these particular styles were developed and the question still remains as to whether it is possible to identify family patterns through procedures which are initially outside the therapeutic medium. This brings us to the primary focus of the present investigation, which may be stated as follows:

1) The major focus of this study will be to determine the utility of the concept of family styles in an empirical

context.

2) The secondary objective of the present study will be to clarify the nature of the relationship between different family styles and the child's behavioral functioning as measured in the classroom setting.

In studying the personal characteristics of the children, one of the most important areas is that of behavioral functioning. Drawing on Minuchin's concepts of family styles and Pavenstedt's greater emphasis on early development, the direction becomes one of clarifying more precisely the relationship between styles and functioning. The literature on the assessment of maladjustment in children is quite vast. For this reason, the writer has chosen for discussion only those studies directly relevant to the present research.

The Relationship between Family Styles and Classroom Behavior

There are few existing studies which attempt to relate these two variables. Malone (1963) did one such study which found variations in behavioral styles between elements of the more stable and disorganized families. He states that pre-school children from disorganized skid-row families were found to be pre-disposed to later chronic acting out and impulse disorders. Children in these families showed low frustration tolerance, impulsivity and unreliable controls. In addition, they tended to use a predominance of motor action for discharge, showed little evidence of constructive play and demonstrated a poor sense of identity with marked use of imitation. Malone notes that this behavior

is representative of a type of pathology, which is indicative of a subculture of the culture of poverty.

Pavenstedt (1967) was able to develop detailed accounts of the behavior of children from disorganized families, based on the comprehensive reports of the teachers in the nursery school setting. In their play, children demonstrated an excessive amount of aggressiveness. In their activities, they exhibited little caretaking or comfort. They would often assume adult roles in which they yelled, cursed and punished as adults. The interpretation here rested on the "identification with the aggressor" in this case the hostile elements of their family environment.

The children's characteristic relationships to people were need oriented, distrustful and nonspecific. They had a facile friendliness, and lacked involvement in their activities. After prolonged contacts with the teachers, they showed signs of concern about helplessness and fears of being abandoned. They would react in fearful gestures to sudden changes in the environment. According to Pavenstedt, this type of reaction suggests an expectation of being blamed.

Their range of affect was narrow and tended to be rigid and inflexible. At times they had great difficulty in controlling their impulses and found concentration, attention and organizing themselves an almost impossible task. Their defensive operations consisted of many forms of denial, avoidance, evasiveness, and ignoring, similar to the tuning out which Deutsch describes (1967). These operations served to remove the child from contacts with his peers or teachers and further

reinforce his isolation and withdrawal.

The antecedent conditions to which the behavior has been related in both the work of Malone (1963) and Pavenstedt (1967) is the "disadvantaged, disorganized family." The variation of classroom behavior as a function of family style still needs greater refinement. Most of the previous research rests on clinical descriptions, while greater emphasis should be placed on clarifying the individual differences and distinctions, from family to family, within this group.

With respect to the identification of behavior disturbances and problems in young school children, Westmen (1932) found clear evidence that if problems could be identified early in nursery school, they were generally signs of the child's impending later emotional difficulties. Identification of disturbances through the use of teachers as observers and raters has been a prevalent style of prior research. There exists in the literature a great deal of supportive evidence that teachers are, in general, valid observers and raters of the child's emotional status (Mitchell, 1942; Schrupp, 1953; Ullman, 1953; Hunter, 1957).

Concepts of Emotional Disturbance

In attempting to measure various aspects of behavior, it is logical to question both the usefulness of different criteria, as well as what these criteria propose to measure. Three concepts that have been used with great frequency in studying this area have been: maladjustment; personality and conduct disorders; and adaptation. Each of these concepts will be discussed in turn.

Maladjustment

Havighurst (1965) describes maladjustment as the failure of the individual to master his developmental tasks. Jahoda (1950) has emphasized active attempts at mastery of the environment and correct perception of the world and the self. Ullman (1953) conducted a study to determine whether teachers and mental health clinicians agreed upon what constituted evidence of good and poor adjustment. His findings support the view that teachers were reliable judges of pupil adjustment. As a result of this study, a scale was developed which has been used as a reliable index of global maladjustment in school age children.

Personality and Conduct Disorders

Dealing with more specific types of behavioral functioning, Peterson (1961) found that teachers' ratings of 126 kindergarten children and 705 older children yielded a two-factor solution which he labeled Conduct and Personality problems. Peterson states that these are not descriptive factors, since the behavior on both factors reflects both personality and conduct. However in the first case, the impulses are expressed overtly and in the second, the impulses are inhibited. Examples of conduct problems, according to Peterson, were: disobedience, fighting, hyperactivity and disruptiveness. Examples of personality problems included: social withdrawal, depression, shyness and anxiety.

Adaptation

In a study of adaptation and mental illness in the first-grade classroom in an urban Chicago community, Kellam (1967) asked each of

fifty-seven first-grade teachers to give a list of ways that children had difficulty "adapting" to the classroom. From this pool, the information was then sorted into five categories, each of which represented an adaptational task.

> The rationale for using teachers' ratings without attempting to reduce the variation from teacher to teacher, was that the child must adapt in the teacher's eyes, whether or not the teacher is permissive or demanding, warm or cold. The teacher's ratings had a face validity derived from the central importance which she occupies with regard to the children in her classroom. They must adapt to her view of the proper classroom functioning. This does not mean that the teacher's ratings are objective and reflect only the child's characteristics. Her ratings are the resultant of multiple forces and represent the child's status in the social field of the classroom (Kellam, 1967, p. 84).

The following is a list of the kinds of adaptational tasks, along with examples of maladaptive items, upon which Kellman's definitions were based.

SOCIAL CONTACTS:	Shy, timid, alone too much, friendless, aloof.
AUTHORITY ACCEPTANCE:	Fights too much, lies, steals, destructive to others' property, obstinate, disobedient.
MATURATION:	Acts too young physically or emotionally, cries too much, has tantrums, seeks too much attention.
COGNITIVE ACHIEVEMENT:	Does not learn as well as he is able to, lazy, does not come prepared for work, under-achiever, lack of effort.
CONCENTRATION:	Fidgets, is unable to sit still, restless.

The results of the study showed the following: (1) boys were less adapted than girls on "authority acceptance, cognitive achievement and

concentration," (2) children with no kindergarten were less adapted than children with kindergarten along the dimension of social contact skills, (3) children whose teachers left during the first year were rated at the end of the year as more aggressive and underachieving by their new teacher. The results of this study were interpreted as support for the validity of both the teacher's ratings and the items of adaptation.

In studying various aspects of behavioral functioning, all three concepts have particular utility. The use of the classroom setting for assessment of behavior by teachers has also been demonstrated as a reliable measure. For the purpose of the present investigation, a more comprehensive picture of the child's behavior will be obtained by employing measures in all of the areas discussed above, namely maladjustment, personality and conduct disorders and adaptational difficulties.

Based on the previous discussion of family styles and classroom behavior, the various phases of the present study have been organized around the areas of assessment and function. An attempt will be made to approach these areas as broadly as possible, within the practical limitations imposed by financial restrictions and other circumstances. It is expected that because of its scope, the study will raise many questions, not all of which will be answered. However some of the more specific predictions, whose answers would offer both evidence as well as understanding of the two areas under investigation, are presented in the following section.

III

HYPOTHESES

Family Style Assessment

1. Utilizing empirical approaches, it will be possible to assess family styles to a measurable degree.
2. When the reliability of judges' ratings are compared, there will be a significant difference in the assessment of family styles, in the following direction:
   a) The highest reliability for ratings will be for that of the "coping" family style.
   b) The styles of "disengaged and enmeshed" will be agreed upon significantly.
3. Factor analysis of the Family Attribute Differential Scale will yield characteristic factor scores for the different family styles, so that it will be possible to differentiate styles as a function of varying dimensions within the families themselves.
   a) It will be possible to differentiate the stable "coping" style from other styles.
   b) It will be possible to differentiate the "disengaged" family style from the "enmeshed" family style.
4. The variables of executive behavior, affective responses and communicational processes will be related to family styles.

Family Style and Function

Investigation of the relationship between family styles and classroom behavior will show the following:

5. Children from "disengaged" families will show the most significant degree of maladjustment and adaptational difficulties.

6. a) Conduct disorders, when present in the case of a child from a "disengaged" family, will manifest themselves by attempts on the part of the child to establish control over the environment and draw attention to himself. This will be represented by high scores on such variables as: show-off, attention getting behavior, difficulty in discipline and disruptiveness.

   b) Conduct disorders, when present in the case of children from "enmeshed" family profiles, will be oriented towards removing controls from the environment. These children will score high on such items as: rebellious, fighting and negativism.

IV

SUBJECTS AND EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

Population

The study used four classes of elementary school children from the first grade of a West Harlem public school. At the time of study, all of the children were at least six years of age. The school chosen was designated as a "Special Service" institution, defining its local as a poverty area with "inherent problems" and difficulties common to the school population. Over 99 per cent of the school's enrollment was Black, with more than 50 per cent of the families receiving some form of public assistance and a large majority of the balance with incomes below the poverty line.

Criterion for Subject Selection

Teachers in the four experimental classes were asked to rate their entire class, using a forced-choice screening device developed by C. Ullman (1952) for the purpose of assessing indices of global maladjustment in school children. The test consists of a total of 80 items paired into tetrads or hexads. Within each pair of items, one is highly indicative with respect to adjustment either favorable or unfavorable, while the other, although of equal preference, has a neutral discriminator and is presumed to act as a suppressor.

Although normative data for the Forced-Choice test were based on 810 ninth-grade pupils, the general applicability of the test easily

lends itself to the grade chosen for the present study. The final statements consist of items judged to have high confidence as indicative of both maladjustment and good adjustment. The items themselves have been assigned scores based on the average ratings of mental hygienists, so that it is possible to derive an over-all adjustment score. A score of 18 has been assigned as a cut-off point for indications of maladjustment. Scores below 18 would indicate the presence of maladjustment which increases as the score becomes lower. Higher scores on the scale (18+) indicate an increasing absence of difficulties.

A frequency distribution of 100 children was obtained and a random selection of 23 children whose scores fell at 18 or below was made. This was followed by a similar procedure for 7 children whose scores fell at 19 and above. The final sample consisted of 30 children, 23 who had been judged to show evidence of varying degrees of poor adjustment and 7 who had given indications of having made a more satisfactory adjustment.

The reader might well question the decision to reach families through the children thus selected and ask why not reach children by selecting families by a random procedure. It was decided not to randomly select families for the following reasons:

1. It would have been practically difficult to canvas the neighborhood simply by a random method.
2. One might have caught in the subject pool, families with children of widely divergent ages attending different grades.
3. The majority of the group selected may have had children who did not have problems of sufficient severity.

4. Even by coming to terms with all of the above disadvantages of selecting families at random, one could still not be sure that all styles would be represented.

It was therefore decided to work from the children back to the families, while taking what the data offered as the basis for assessment and evaluation.

Procedures and Measurements

One of the objectives of the present investigation was to develop alternative techniques that would be useful for work in the area of family style assessment. Towards this end, three separate instruments were designed by the writer for use in assessing family styles. These instruments are: The Joint Social History; The Family Attribute Differential Scale; and The Family Pattern Q-Sort. A description of each method follows below.

The Joint Social History

This instrument, modeled in style like a social history interview, was constructed to yield information from both parents in cases of intact families, or from the mother when she was the only parent in the family unit. It contains questions dealing with the background and history of each parent. The rationale here was that information of this nature would contribute towards understanding the etiology of the present family style. In addition, there are sections dealing with the history of the marriage and areas of present functioning, as well as items dealing with present plans and future aspirations.

In addition, there is a special section that involves three specific

questions that have been derived from Minuchin's "Family Task Situation." The first of these questions involves a description of the last family fight, its course duration and outcome. Secondly, the family is asked to discuss some of the different ways" that others in the family have about them such as: who's the most bossy, the biggest trouble maker and similar items. Finally, there is a question where each parent is asked to describe what others in the family do that please or displease them most, as well as those things each one does that makes them unhappy or sad. (See Appendix, p. 178.)

It was reasoned that data from the Joint Social History would yield information concerning the nature of the interactive process within the family. In addition, objective data concerning family intactness, size, education and occupations was also obtained where possible. (See Appendix, Table 24.)

Family Style Rating Scale. This scale was not developed for assessment of family styles, but simply represents a method for recording the findings obtained from the Joint Social History. It was designed to use in conjunction with the former assessment procedure. The scale consists of a listing of each family style, along with the two categories of other style, and style unscorable. The instructions specify that judges* were to rate each family as a function of the social history, to the degree to which that particular family represented any one or all of the styles on the scale. Judges were given descriptive paragraphs (see Appendix, p.200) of each style to serve as rating guidelines.

A total of four judges were used, with the average rating for each

*Description of level of sophistication of judges follows each rating scale or instrument in Appendix.

family style taken as the final measure for each family. The rating scale was constructed on a seven-point continuum, with a score of 1 representing ("very little like this style"), and a score of 7 representing ("very much like this style").

Family Attribute Differential Scale

This scale, also developed by the present investigator, is modeled in style like the semantic differential. It was designed to use in conjunction with the Joint Social History. The items on the scale were developed by having judges list "polar attributes" after reading paragraphs describing each style. The instructions were to describe the mother and father in these different families in as many ways as possible. The total list of attributes was then combined and resorted by this writer according to family styles, with ambiguous or non-descriptive items being discarded. The final scale consisted of 44 items which were rated on a seven-point continuum, and were randomly arranged with respect to order on the scale.

Judges were given transcripts of the Joint Social History along with the Family Attribute Differential Scale. They were instructed to rate each member of the family separately, depending on family composition. Four ratings were obtained for each family. These ratings were then averaged to obtain a combined score for all judges for each attribute for each family member.

Family Pattern Q-Sort

This task was constructed by the writer to focus on three major areas of family interaction: executive behavior, communicational

processes and affective responses. These have been shown by Minuchin to have significance within the different family patterns which he has identified. The Q-Sort was developed in the following way.

1. The major domains (executive behavior, communicational processes and affective responses) were defined according to Minuchin's guidelines. These definitions were given in turn to three judges who were instructed to list statements about a family that would reflect both positive and negative elements associated with the three areas.
2. The total list was then combined, along with statements developed by the present writer, and judges were asked to resort the items into the three basic areas of family interaction as mentioned above. When at least three judges agreed upon a category, the item was designated to that particular area. An attempt was made to have an approximately equal balance of positive and negative items.
3. Five separate judges were then given the final list of items (totalling 80), along with paragraphs describing six different family styles. They were instructed to make a sort for each style, as if they were doing the sort for the mother in this given family. Sorts were made on consecutive days to prevent fatigue and over-lapping effects.
4. A measure of over-all agreement for each style was obtained. This was accomplished by correlating each response for each judge, with the other four judges for a given style. The

resulting reliability coefficients are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Reliability Coefficients for Six Q-Sorts, Based on Ratings of Five Judges' 80 Items

Family Style					
D.	E.	J.	P.	N.	C.*
.93	.83	.90	.88	.96	.92

r_{tt} is attenuated r based on Spearman Brown adjustment formula.

Family Styles: D., disengaged; E., enmeshed; J., juvenile; N., non-evolved; C., coping.

*See Appendix (p. 186) for description of coping style.

Examination of Table 1 indicates that there is high over-all agreement between judges for each of the family styles. The highest rate on inter-judge reliability occurred for the "non-evolved" family style sort and the lowest reliability scores occurred for the "enmeshed" family style sort.

5. The next step in the development of the Family Pattern Q-Sort was to develop a model Q sort for each family style. The frequency distributions for each model are contained in the Appendix (Tables 26-31, pp. 211-216).
6. To determine the relationship of the Model Q sorts to one another, correlations were made between each of the model Q-sorts. These coefficients are contained in Table 2.

Table 2

Intercorrelations between Model Q-Sorts (by Judges) for Six Family Styles Based on Five Judges' Scores on 80 Items

	Family Styles					
	D.	E.	J.	P.	N.	C.
D.		-.21	.56****	-.07	.60****	-.74****
E.			.17	.42****	-.28	.02
J.				.13	.49****	-.67****
P.					-.16	.07
N.						-.49****
C.						

****Significant at .005.

Family Styles: D., disengaged; E., enmeshed; J., juvenile; N., Non-evolved; C., coping; P., peripheral male.

The intercorrelations between model sorts indicates that there is a significant relationship between the "disengaged" profile and that of both "juvenile" and "non-evolved." In addition, there is a significant relationship between the model sorts of enmeshment and peripheral-male. These high r values were regarded as possible predictors of the dynamic relationship between these styles rather than as a measure of inadequate ratings. It was for this reason that no other changes were made in the construction of the Q-sort itself.

After construction of the Model Sorts for each of the six styles, the Q-sort was employed in the following manner.

7. The Q-sort was administered to each mother, with statements being read aloud to avoid difficulties in reading skills as a possible source of bias.
8. Each experimental sort was then correlated with each model sort to establish the nature and significance of which correlations were most descriptive of a particular style.

The instructions for the Family Pattern Q-sort are presented below:

1. Examiner will read the following:

   "I have here a list of statements that describe things that happen in many different families. Some of these will be like the way it is for you when you are with your family, some statements will have nothing to do with the way things are like in your family. I am going to read these to you one at a time, and when I have finished we will make three piles. One pile will be for what is most like your family, one pile for things that are like your family sometimes, and finally one pile for things which are very much unlike the way you feel things are in your family."

2. Following the completion of this first sort into three piles, the examiner will take the group of statements which have been chosen as those most like the family and proceed as follows:

   "This is the pile you chose for things that are like your

family, let's go through these and see if we can pick out a few that are really the most like your family in this group. I know this is hard, but do the best you can."

3. This procedure will be repeated, in order to obtain the desired distribution. If the initial three piles are highly unequal, it may be necessary to go through the items again to obtain a more even grouping. The distribution required for data analysis is presented here:

very much like my family									very little like my family	
2	4	6	9	12	14	12	9	6	4	2

The numbers refer to the frequency of statements that must be placed within each grouping, so that the total list of 80 items is accounted for.

Classroom Behavior

Global Maladjustment

The information concerning the test developed by Ullman (1952) is contained in the section dealing with criteria for subjects selected. The presentation here will focus mainly on the data involving reliability and validity. The correlation of teachers and clinicians in responding to the items was .86. The reliability for boys was found to be .92 and for girls .87. The mean confidence score of the 79 items used for the test, one item being used twice, was 80.7.

Personality and Conduct Disorders

This was evaluated by a rating scale developed by Peterson

(see Appendix, p. 204) for the purpose of assessing behavior problems in children. The scale was designed to improve structural definition of children's problems. Teachers' ratings of 58 clinically frequent problems were obtained for 831 kindergarten and elementary school children and four separate factor analyses were conducted. One analysis was done for the items of the kindergarten children, and one for each of the grade levels from 1 through 6.

Two factors emerged with "remarkable invariance" in all four analyses. The first factor implied a tendency to express impulses outwardly and was labeled a "conduct problem." The second contained a variety of elements suggesting low self esteem, withdrawal and dysphoric mood. This factor was called "personality disorders."

Reliability and interfactor correlations were examined for the kindergarten group only, since only for that group were dual ratings available. Interjudge r's of .77 and .75 were found for Factors 1 and 2 respectively. The correlation between factors was .18, low enough to meet most requirements for independence.

Classroom Adaptational Difficulties

This was measured by a checklist based on areas in which a child was judged by his teacher to be "experiencing some difficulty." The items on the list were derived from a rating scale developed by Kellam (1967). Items were collected from 57 first-grade teachers who were asked to give lists of ways in which children had difficulty in "adapting" to the first grade classroom. From this pool, the information was sorted by judges into five general categories, with each representing an adaptational task.

The maladaptive behaviors from which adaptational tasks were derived included: social contacts, authority acceptance, maturation, cognitive achievement and concentration. These categories were then transformed into a four-point rating scale ranging from a score of 0 which equalled "adapting," to a score of 3 which stood for "severely maladapting." For the purpose of the present study, teachers were asked to indicate by checking which of these areas was a source of difficulty for a particular child. Each area was accompanied by specific examples to serve as guidelines for checking. In this respect, the checklist represents a modification of the original rating scale.

Based on the information obtained from all three scales -- global adjustment (Ullman), conduct and personality disorders (Peterson), and adaptational areas (Kellam) -- a summary of scores for all 30 children is contained in Table 25.

V

RESULTS

The results section is organized into two separate areas. These areas follow closely the major foci for investigation raised at the beginning of the study and will be presented as follows:

1. Family Style Assessment
    a) Family Pattern Q-Sort
    b) Joint Social History
    c) Analysis of the Q-Sort and Joint Social History Procedures
    d) Family Attribute Differential Scale
    e) Family Interaction Variables
    f) Relationship of Environmental Variables and Family Style
2. Family Style and Function
    a) Global Maladjustment
    b) Conduct Disorders
    c) Personality Disorders
    d) Adaptational Difficulties
    e) Relationship between Subject Variables and Scores on Behavioral Rating Scales

Family Style Assessment

Family Pattern Q-Sort

To measure the extent to which it was possible to assess family styles in an empirical context, Q-sorts (experimental) made by each mother in the study sample were correlated with Q-sorts (model), as

derived by judges' sorts, for six family styles. The results are presented for all thirty families in Table 3.

Table 3

Significant Correlations between Experimental (by subjects) Q-Sorts and Model (by judges) Q-Sorts, on Six Family Styles (N = 30)

Family No.	Correlations between Experimental and Model Q-Sorts		t	p	Predominant Family Style(s)
1.	C., .71**** ,	P., .29****	3.96	.005	Coping
2.	E., .69**** ,	J., .37****	4.35	.005	Enmeshed
3.	D., .40****				Disengaged[a]
4.	E., .73**** ,	P., .34****	4.72	.005	Enmeshed
5.	C., .74**** ,	P., .26***	4.99	.005	Coping
6.	D., .26***				Disengaged
7.	D., .18*				Disengaged
8.	C., .32**** ,	P., .18*	.89	ns.	Mixed[b]
9.	J., .63**** ,	D., .50****	1.26	ns.	Mixed
	J., .63**** ,	E., .36****	2.65	.005	
	D., .50**** ,	E., .36****	1.17	ns.	
10.	D., .22**				Disengaged
11.	C., .81**** ,	P., .26***	7.73	.005	Coping
12.	E., .64****,	P., .25***	3.51	.005	Enmeshed
13.	P., .43**** ,	D., .27***	1.23	ns.	Mixed
	P., .43**** ,	J., .22**	1.52	ns.	

Table 3 - Cont'd.

Family No.	Correlations between Experimental and Model Q-Sorts		t	p	Predominant Family Styles
14.	D., .56**** ,	N., .29****	2.32	.005	Disengaged
15.	N., .41****				Non-Evolved
16.	J., .64**** ,	D., .47****	1.87	ns.	Mixed
	J., .64**** ,	P., .24**	3.24	.005	
17.	D., .36****				Disengaged
18.	C., .28**** ,	P., .24**	.34	ns.	Mixed
	E., .25*** ,	C., .28****	.41	ns.	
19.	D., .35****				Disengaged
20.	C., .62****				Coping
21.	D., .47**** ,	N., .36****	.89	ns.	Mixed
22.	C., .66****				Coping
23.	C., .73**** ,	P., .34****	4.24	.005	Coping
24.	E., .34**** ,	C., .18*	1.07	ns.	Mixed
25.	D., .28****				Disengaged
26.	E., .60**** ,	P., .58****	.07	ns.	Mixed
27.	D., .25*** ,	P., .29****	.23	ns.	Mixed
28.	C., .41****				Coping

Table 3 - Cont'd.

Family No.	Correlations between Experimental and Model Q-Sorts	t	p	Predominant Family Style(s)
29.	C., .73**** , P., .32****	4.26	.005	Coping
30.	C., .75****			Coping

Significance levels: **** = .005; *** = .01; ** = .02; * = .05.

Family Styles: D, disengaged; E., enmeshed; J., juvenile; P., peripheral; N., non-evolved; C., coping.

[a]In cases where no t test was made, the value of r represents the only significant correlation for that family.

[b]Mixed styles refer to correlations which are significant from all other styles not included in Table 3, but are not significant from one another.

Table 3 shows that for all 30 families there was at least one correlation for each family with a p. value of .05. Inspection of Table 3 indicates that the highest magnitude for correlations was for the "coping" family style. For families No. 1, 5, 11, 29 and 30, the magnitude of the correlation was above .70. The styles of "disengaged" and "enmeshed" also show high correlations with their respective model sorts. To take a closer look at the nature of the family styles obtained by this method, a frequency distribution was made based on these findings. The results are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4

Frequency Distribution of Family Styles among Thirty Families, Based on Correlation of Experimental (Subject-Sorts) with Model (Judges' Sorts) with 80 Q-Sort Items

Family Styles	N
Distinct	
Coping	9
Disengaged	8
Enmeshed	3
Non-Evolved	1
Mixed	9

Table 4 indicates that for family styles obtained through correlation of experimental with model Q-sorts, 21 out of 30 families exhibited distinct styles. Distinct styles are defined as those families where one style was found to be significant from all other styles. For the remaining nine family profiles (mixed), two or more styles were found to be significant.

As determined by the Family Pattern Q-sort assessment procedure, the "coping" style, by a margin of one, emerges as the most frequently distinct style. The "coping" family style is closely followed by the "disengaged" style, with an N of eight. There occur three cases where the "enmeshed" style exists as a distinct style and one instance where the "non-evolved" style is observed. The styles of "peripheral male"

and "juvenile" do not occur distinctly as measured by the Q-sort technique.

Another procedure designed to assess family styles was the Joint Social History. The results of the data derived from this instrument now follow.

Joint Social History

Data from the Joint Social History are based on the averaged ratings of four judges. Their scores on the seven-point Family Style Rating Scale represent the extent to which judges felt each of the styles in question paralleled the interview material they had read. Summary scores for all thirty families are contained in Table 5.

Table 5

Mean Scores for Six Family Styles on 7-Point Family Style Rating Scale, N = 30 (Based on Four Judges' Ratings)

	Family Style					
Family No.	D.	E.	J.	NE.	P.	C.
1.	1	1	1.5	1	4.75	6.25
2.	5	7	2.25	1	3.5	1
3.	2.75	1	1.25	1	1.5	3.5
4.	2.25	6	1.5	1	4.25	3.75
5.	1	2.25	1	3.25	1.5	6.5
6.	6.5	1	1	1	1.75	1.75
7.	6.25	1	1.25	1	6.5	2
8.	2.25	4.75	1	1	1.5	4.75
9.	3.75	4	7	1	4.25	1.75

Table 5 - Cont'd.

	Family Style					
Family No.	D.	E.	J.	NE.	P.	C.
10.	7	1	1	1	1	1
11.	1	1	1	1	1	7
12.	3.25	6.5	2.25	1	1	1
13.	3.75	1.25	1.75	1	7	3.25
14.	6.75	2	1.5	3	1	1
15.	3.5	1	4.5	3.75	3.5	2
16.	2.5	1	6.5	6	6.25	1.5
17.	6.5	1	1.75	1	1	1
18.	5.75	2.5	1.5	1.5	1.25	2
19.	2	6	1	1	1.25	2.75
20.	4	3	1	1	3.5	3.75
21.	6.5	2.25	1	1	1.25	2.75
22.	1	2	1	1	2.75	6.5
23.	1	1.25	1	1.25	1.5	5.75
24.	5	6.5	1.25	1	1	1.25
25.	6	1.25	1.75	1	2.25	3
26.	3.25	1.25	1.25	1	6.25	3.75
27.	2	5.5	1	1.25	5.5	4
28.	2.25	3.5	1	1	4	3.75
29.	1	3.75	1	1	2.5	6.75
30.	1	1	1.25	1	1	6.25

Family Styles: D, disengaged; E., enmeshed; J., juvenile; P., peripheral male; C., coping.

Examination of Table 5 indicates that judges as a group were able to make ratings indicating their choice for a particular family style. In most cases, even where a given style was rated quite high, there was also evidence of other styles being present. Only in the case of families No. 10 and 11 did judges rate one style to the exclusion of all others as being significant.

To determine to what extent these ratings on the Family Style Rating Scale were significantly different from one another, a multiple comparison of means based on Duncan's New Multiple Range Test was made. A summary of findings for this procedure follows.

Table 6

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Six Family Styles Applied to Ratings on Seven-Point Family Style Rating Scale

(Based on Four Judges' Ratings) N = 30

Family No.	Highest Rated Style (X)	Style(s) not significantly diff. from highest rated	p
1.	C.		.01
2.	E.		.01
3.	C.	D.	.01
4.	E.	PCD	.01
5.	C.		.01
6.	D.		.01
7.	P.	D.	.01
8.	E.	C.	.01
9.	J.		.01

Table 6 - Cont'd.

Family No.	Highest Rated Style (X)	Style(s) not significantly diff. from highest rated	p
10.	D.		.01
11.	C.		.01
12.	E.		.01
13.	P.		.01
14.	D.		.01
15.	J.	NDPCE	ns.
16.	J.	PN	.01
17.	D.		.01
18.	D.		.01
19.	E.		.01
20.	D.	C.P.E.	.01
21.	D.		.01
22.	C.		.01
23.	C.		.01
24.	E.		.01
25.	D.		.01
26.	P.	.	.01
27.	P.	E.C.	.01
28.	P.	C.E.D.N.J.	ns.
29.	C.		.01
30.	C.		.01

[a]Primary and/or secondary style(s) are significantly different from all styles not included for a given family.

Family Styles: D., disengaged; E., enmeshed; J., juvenile; P., peripheral; NE., Non-evolved; C., coping.

To examine the nature of the findings derived from the Duncan Multiple Range Test, a frequency distribution based on significant findings was made. These results are contained in Table 7.

Table 7

Frequency Distribution of Family Styles among Thirty Families Based on Ratings on the Family Style Rating Scale

Family Styles	N
Distinct	
Coping	7
Disengaged	7
Enmeshed	4
Peripheral Male	2
Juvenile	1
Mixed	7
Undetermined	2

Table 7 indicates that for family styles as determined by judges' ratings, the styles of "coping" and "disengaged" are most frequently agreed upon. For the present sample population, there were 21 families where a particular style was found to be more significant for that family than the other styles. Of these 21 styles, 18 fall into the first three categories of styles as listed in Table 7.

In two instances, the "peripheral male" style has been found

significant from other styles for two families. There is also one family in which judges rated the "juvenile style" as significantly distinct from the other styles. As determined by judges' ratings, the style of "non-evolved" occurs in a mixed-profile situation only. Combining the significant styles obtained from both assessment procedures (Family Pattern Q-sort and Joint Social History), a summary table for results as determined by both methods is contained in Table 8.

Table 8

Summary Typing of Family Styles Based on Combined Q-Sort and Joint Social History Data (N = 30)

Family No.	Style
1.	Coping
2.	Enmeshed
3.	Disengaged-Coping[a]
4.	Enmeshed, Peripheral-Coping-Disengaged
5.	Coping
6.	Disengaged
7.	Disengaged-Peripheral
8.	Coping, Enmeshed-Peripheral
9.	Juvenile-Disengaged
10.	Disengaged
11.	Coping
12.	Enmeshed
13.	Peripheral, Disengaged-Juvenile
14.	Disengaged

Table 8 - Cont'd.

Family No.	Style
15.	Non-Evolved[b]
16.	Juvenile, Non-Evolved-Peripheral-Disengaged
17.	Disengaged
18.	Disengaged, Coping-Enmeshed-Peripheral
19.	Enmeshed-Disengaged
20.	Coping, Disengaged-Peripheral-Enmeshed
21.	Disengaged, Non-Evolved
22.	Coping
23.	Coping
24.	Enmeshed
25.	Disengaged
26.	Peripheral-Enmeshed
27.	Peripheral, Disengaged-Enmeshed-Coping
28.	Coping[c]
29.	Coping
30.	Coping

[a]In cases of mixed styles, the style listed first represents the predominant style in the profile.

[b]Based on Q-sort findings only.

[c]Based on Q-sort findings only.

In analyzing the data so as to yield a final family style that would be representative of both assessment procedures, it was necessary to establish certain scoring criteria. Since the styles in Table 8 were derived from both the Family Pattern Q-sort findings (Table 3) and the Joint Social History data (Table 6), it should be clear to the reader how these final typings were made. In comparing the results from both instruments, certain problems arose which were handled in the following way:

1. In cases where the same style was found to be significant on both measures, the final typing was clearly that particular style (Families No. 1, 2, 10 and others).
2. If a particular family style was found to be significant on one measure and present in a mixed profile on another measure, although the resulting style was regarded as mixed, the significant distinct style was regarded as the more predominant feature of the profile and was placed before the secondary style. For example, family No. 3 was found to be "disengaged" on the Q-sort and both "coping" and disengaged on the basis of the Joint Social History. The resulting family style was labeled "disengaged-coping." The same reasoning was applied to families No. 4 and 7 as well.
3. In cases where both procedures yielded mixed styles, with one common style to both, then this style was also regarded as the predominant style in the particular family in question. To illustrate this situation, family No. 8 was found to be both "coping" and "peripheral" male based on the Q-sort. However

the r. value for the former was .32 (significant beyond .005 level) and for the latter .18 (significant beyond .05 level). The results of the statistical analysis showed no difference between them (Table 3). On the Joint Social History, family No. 8 was found to be both "enmeshed" and "coping." The resulting family style was therefore conceived as "coping, enmeshed-peripheral." The style is therefore mixed, with predominantly "coping" features.

4. If the highest correlation on the Q-sort and the highest rating on the Joint Social History were the same, even if both styles were mixed, and the highest correlation and mean ratings did not differ significantly from the others, the highest style was regarded as predominant. This was the case for family No. 16. This family was rated highest on the Family Style rating scale for "juvenile" characteristics, but was also found to have features of the "peripheral" and "non-evolved" family profiles. On the Family Pattern Q-sort it also attained the highest correlation for the "juvenile" style, .62 (significant beyond .005 level), but was also found to be significant for the "disengaged, .47 (significant beyond .005 level) and "peripheral," .24 (significant beyond .05 level) styles. The resulting family style was labeled mixed, with predominant "juvenile" features, as follows: "juvenile, peripheral-non-evolved-disengaged."
5. Where a different style has been found significant on each measure, the Joint Social History finding was regarded as the

predominant style in a mixed profile. This was found in the case of family No. 19 which was found to be significant on the basis of the Joint Social History (Table 6) for the "enmeshed" family style. The final typing was for a mixed style with predominant "enmeshed" characteristics ("enmeshed-disengaged").

To examine the final results based on family styles from both assessment procedures, a frequency distribution was made. These findings are contained in Table 9.

Table 9

Frequency Distribution of Family Styles among Thirty Families based on Combined Q-Sort and Joint Social History Data

Family Styles	N
Coping	7
Disengaged	5
Enmeshed	3
Mixed	13

Note.--Families 15 and 28 are not included as styles were essentially undetermined when both procedures are combined.

Table 9 shows that when findings for family styles obtained by the Q-sort (correlation-method) and the Joint Social History (rating method) are combined, the following results are obtained.

1. The highest over-all agreement for a particular profile occurs in the case of the "coping" family style.
2. Following the "coping" style, the "disengaged" family style is comparably agreed on by both assessment techniques.
3. As measured by correlation and rating methods, the "enmeshed" style also emerges as a style that can be measured empirically.
4. The number of families of mixed styles increases and there occur no situations in which the styles of "juvenile," "peripheral male" and "non-evolved" exist distinctly.

Analysis of the Q-Sort and Joint Social History Procedures

The question emerges regarding the relationship between these two techniques employed in this study to assess family styles (Family Style Q-sort and the Joint Social History). Since one of the initial questions has dealt with the extent to which it is possible to assess family styles in an empirical context, the nature of the relationship between these two instruments would no doubt have considerable bearing on their ultimate utility. To examine more clearly this relationship, a frequency distribution was made comparing the results obtained from both procedures and is contained in Table 10.

The data in Table 10 were derived by taking the primary style for each family based on each assessment procedure. The primary style, in the case of the Q-sort, consists of the highest significant correlation for a particular family on one of the six major styles. In the case of the Joint Social History, the primary style was determined by the highest significant rating on the Family Style Rating Scale (Table 6).

Table 10

Frequency Distribution[a] (by Families) for Family Styles Obtained by the Q-Sort and Joint Social History (N = 30)

Joint Social History: Family Styles	Q-Sort: Family Styles					
	Dis.	En.	Per.	Juv.	NE.	Cop.
Dis.	6,10,14, 17,21,25					18,20,3
Enmeshed	19	2,4,12 24				
Periph.	7	26	13,27			28
Juv.				9, 16	15	
NE.						
Coping						1,5,8,11 22,23,29 30

[a] Numbers within the table identify families.

Examination of Table 10 indicates that the highest degree of over-all agreement was obtained for the "coping" style. In addition, the styles of "disengaged" and "enmeshed" were also agreed upon when comparing both assessment procedures. However, it is also important to note that for styles that were found in this sample to occur in low frequencies (peripheral-male, juvenile), over-all agreement on primary styles is still quite high.

To determine the exact value of this relationship, a chi square analysis was computed by converting Table 10 into a straight frequency count. The resulting chi square value was found to be (χ = 62.72 > χ p .01 = 44.31). This value was in turn converted into a contingency coefficient. The value of C. was found to be (C. = .80 > C. p. .005 = .47). This finding indicates that for comparable correlation values, there is a significant relationship between findings using both techniques as assessment procedures.

Family Attribute Differential Scale

The third instrument designed for the purpose of assessment of family styles is the Family Attribute Differential Scale. The styles derived from this method are based on the manner in which particular attributes vary from one profile to the next. The objective here has been to determine what characteristics would be useful in defining individual styles, as well as differentiating one style from another.

In order to determine which dimensions judges used to differentiate family styles from one another, the Family Attribute Differential Scale (Appendix, p. 195) was rated by four different judges. These ratings are based on information contained in the Joint Social History. Four

judges rated each family on the scale, and a summary scale based on the average ratings was used as the criteria for a factor analysis.

The attributes were analyzed by the method of principal factors, employing a Varimax criterion in rotation. One of the unique features of the rotation program is the Kiel-Wrigley criterion for the number of factors to be rotated. The two factors with the largest Eigen values are rotated by adding one factor at a time and using the Varimax or the Quartimax methods until the solution is satisfied.

The first step in the assessment procedure was therefore a factor analysis of the items on the scale. The results of the analysis by item for the Family Attribute Differential Scale yielded two principal factors which are summarized in Tables 11 and 12.

Table 11

Factor Loadings for Factor 1 of Family Attribute Differential Scale (44 Items)

Item No.	Attribute		Factor 1 Loading
1.	Irresponsible	- Responsible	.91
2.	Excludes Self	- Includes Self	.91
4.	Isolates Self	- Establishes Contact	.92
5.	Dependent	- Independent	.82
6.	Rejects	- Accepts Others	.79
7.	Cannot	- Can Control	.80
8.	Apathetic	- Interested	.94
9.	Thoughtless	- Considerate	.86

Table 11 - Cont'd.

Item No.	Attribute		Factor 1 Loading
10.	Disapproves	- Approves	.71
12.	Insults Others	- Gives compliments	.71
13.	Unrelated	- Related to family	.92
14.	Thinks of Self	- Thinks of Others first	.83
16.	Passive	- Active	.92
17.	Competes	- Cooperates with others	.72
19.	Cold	- Warm	.71
22.	Hedonistic	- Pragmatic	.67
23.	Selfish	- Unselfish	.77
24.	Expresses dissatisfaction	- Satisfaction	.72
27.	Impulsive	- Reflective	.73
28.	Cannot	- Can be leader in family	.89
30.	Submissive	- Assertive	.85
31.	Unpredictable	- Predictable	.83
32.	Immediate	- Planned verbal response	.72
33.	Incompetent	- Competent	.93
34.	Disorganized	- Organized	.91
35.	Doesn't	- Does concern self with future	.80
37.	Avoids	- Faces problems	.91
38.	Does things alone	- Together with family	.80
39.	Matter of fact	- Enthusiastic	.84

Table 11 - Cont'd.

Item No.	Attribute		Factor 1 Loading
40.	Withdrawn	- Outspoken	.83
42.	Indifferent	- Concerned	.83
43.	Ashamed	- Proud of family	.74

Table 11 shows that Factor 1 represents a huge portion of the Family Attribute Differential Scale. Based on the 44 items of the scale, 32 of these items load high on Factor 1. The amount of variance accounted for by Factor 1 with respect to the total scale is .54.

Examination of Table 12 indicates that Factor 2 represents a small but specific range of items which correlate with one another on the Attribute Differential Scale. Inspection of the items themselves shows that those attributes which have high loadings on this factor tend to deal with such dimensions as authority, control, flexibility and rigidity. For this reason, Factor 2 has been labeled (Control-Autonomy), to represent both extremes of the differential and to take into account the dimensions which each concept incorporates.

Table 12

Factor Loadings for Factor 2 of Family Attribute Differential Scale (44 Items)

Item No.	Attribute		Factor 2 Loading
3.	Authoritative	- Democratic	.86
10.	Disapproves	- Approves	.62
11.	Unable to compromise	- Able to compromise	.77
15.	Strict	- Lenient	.89
18.	Domineering	- Compliant	.91
21.	Controls child behavior	- Allows independent behavior	.82
23.	Rigid	- Flexible	.86
24.	Cannot tolerate disagreement	- Can tolerate disagreement	.86
29.	Restrictive	- Permissive	.67
30.	Immediate	- Planned verbal response	.72

The second step in the assessment procedure utilizing the Family Attribute Differential Scale was to obtain Factor scores for all 30 families on Factors 1 and 2. The Factor score represents a weighted score which is composed of critical items for each factor, for each family. These items are based on either very high ratings (scores of 6 or 7) or very low ratings (scores of 1 and 2) on the Attribute Differential Scale.

A high factor score* for a particular family on Factor would indicate that items on the positive end of the scale for Factor 1 were rated as more like the family in question. Conversely, a high negative score** on Factor 1 would indicate that for the family in question, items on the negative end of the scale were assigned high priority in describing the personal attributes of family members. The same reasoning would apply to scores for families obtained on Factor 2.

The rationale therefore can be explained in the following way:

1. By examining different factor scores for the sample population, it should be possible to obtain different patterns of scores for the 30 families.
2. These different factor scores will represent varying family styles.
3. It will be possible to define these family styles as a function of the attributes which contribute most to the different factor scores.

As a separate assessment procedure, Factor scores could therefore have been analyzed and family styles derived as a function of different patterns of scores. Another way of approaching this issue was to take the family styles obtained through the other measures, and list the scores as a function of these previously typed families. This served as a double check of the first two techniques and a validation of the third.

---

*High positive factor score = 1.000 and above.

**High negative factor score = -1.000 and above.

If factor scores for the different styles showed a clear trend, then this would serve as a type of concurrent validity. In addition, it would serve to clarify the findings obtained by this last method. With this framework in mind, factor scores for Factors 1 and 2 for 26 families are summarized in Table 13. The family styles are based on the combined results, as illustrated in Table 8. The factor scores are based on the weighted attributes as measured on the Family Attribute Differential Scale.

Table 13

Factor Scores by Family Style for Factors 1 and 2 as Derived from the Family Attribute Differential Scale (N = 24)

Family No. and Style	Factor 1 Score	Factor 2 Score
Coping[a]		
1.	.942	1.104
5.	1.443	.067
11.	1.558	1.326
22. a[+]	1.272	.778
b	1.064	.069
23.	1.386	1.005
29.	1.795	-1.210
30. a	1.284	.818
b	1.221	.692
Disengaged		
6.	-1.104	.813
7. a	-1.317	.272
b	.374	-.135
10.	-1.468	.452
14.	-1.081	.026
17.	-1.396	.517
21.	-.932	.946
25. a	-1.373	1.183
b	.668	-1.070

Table 13 - Cont'd.

Family No. and Style	Factor 1 Score	Factor 2 Score
Enmeshed		
2.	-1.208	-1.734
4. a	.808	-1.528
b	-.613	.767
12.	-.439	-2.458
19.	.445	-1.728
24.	.780	-1.298
Juvenile		
9.	-.860	.305
16. a	-.146	-1.154
b	-1.430	-.658
Non-Evolved		
15.	-.659	.299
Peripheral Male		
26. a	.277	-.244
b	-.843	-.083
27.	.844	-1.142

[a] Family styles are based on combined results as illustrated in Table 8, for Q-sort and Joint Social History.

[+] The letters a and b stand for mother and father respectively.

Note.--Cases where styles have been essentially undetermined or do not have a predominant style in the case of mixed styles have been omitted for the sake of clarity.

Utilizing the Family Attribute Differential Scale, it is evident from Table 13 that it is possible to determine family styles as a

function of different factor scores as derived by this last assessment procedure. Characteristic patterns of factor scores emerge for the styles of "coping," "disengaged," and "enmeshed."

Factor Scores and the Coping Family Style. Factor scores for Factor 1 clearly distinguish the "coping" style. "Coping"families attained high weighted scoresfor the positive items on the scale. Items that load high on Factor 1 -- responsibility, involvement, and interest -- were all given high ratings for these families. For Factor 2, there are two trends. One type of coping family would appear to have many of the positive elements of Factor 1, which are combined with certain enmeshed tendencies. Based on the factor scores for family No. 29, one could label this style as "coping-énmeshed." Also for this group of families, there were some instances where families receiving high positive factor scores on Factor 1 did not receive equally high scores on Factor 2.

Factor Scores and the Disengaged Family Style. Table 13 also shows that for a group of families, there was a pattern of heavily weighted negative scores for the items on Factor 1. This would indicate that items on the opposite end of the scale were given most weight in rating these families. In other words, judges rated attributes like apathetic, uninvolved and removed as being very much like the members of these families. Based on the variations in the factor scores, families with these patterns would be typed "disengaged." This is confirmed by the fact that there is a relationship between these scores and the results of the previous two assessment procedures. All three instruments agree that these families are "disengaged" to some extent.

Factor Scores and the Enmeshed Family Style. Using the same procedure, it is also possible to distinguish the "enmeshed" family style. These families have clearly been differentiated on the basis of Factor 2. Once again, highly negative weighted scores indicate that for the items on the lower end of the scale were rated as being very much like these particular families. The dimensions of "authoritative," "rigid," "restrictive" and others emerge as central differentiating attributes where the "enmeshed" style is concerned. Many of these families also received high negative scores on Factor 1, which indicates the presence of a mixed style alternating between "disengaged" and "enmeshed." However the more predominant trend is for factor scores on Factor 2 to be quite negative.

Factor Scores and Other Family Styles. Inspection of the pattern of factor scores on Factors 1 and 2 fails to reveal any clear trend with respect to the styles of "juvenile," "peripheral male" and "non-evolved." The previous assessment procedures yielded similar findings for these styles.

To summarize the major findings with respect to the Family Attribute Differential Scale, the following points can be made:

1. Factor analysis of the Family Attribute Differential Scale yielded characteristic factor scores for different families;
2. These scores varied in relation to families styles which could be derived as a function of the scores;
3. The data obtained in this manner agree with the results obtained by the previous assessment procedures, namely the

Family Pattern Q-sort and the Joint Social History.

Family Interaction Variables

It has been shown that a relationship exists between certain factor scores and family styles. It was also reasoned at the beginning of the study that there would be some expected relationship between predominant patterns of family interaction and family styles. In order to examine this question, let us return to the Family Pattern Q-sort. This instrument was analyzed on the basis of its major constituent variables which were designated at the outset of the study to include the three following areas: communicational processes; executive behavior; and affective responses. Since the construction of the Q-sort reflected an equal distribution among the eighty items for these areas, it was possible to obtain mean scores for each area based on the distribution of the Q-sort items. These scores are summarized in Table 14.

Table 14

Mean Scores for Experimental (by subject) Q-sort, 80 Items Based on Variables of Communicational Processes, Executive Behavior and Affective Responses (N = 30)

	Variable		
Family No.	Executive Behavior	Communicational Processes	Affective Responses
1.	4.34	5.04	4.92
2.	4.51	5.41	4.51
3.	5.30	5.34	4.34

Table 14 - Cont'd.

Family No.	Variable		
	Executive Behavior	Communicational Processes	Affective Responses
4.	5.14	4.80	4.60
5.	5.03	4.74	5.14
6.	4.70	5.26	5.03
7.	4.50	5.80	4.50
8.	4.80	5.42	4.70
9.	4.44	5.44	5.18
10.	4.44	5.51	5.10
11.	5.30	4.81	4.81
12.	4.90	5.50	4.40
13.	4.90	5.10	5.02
14.	4.90	5.20	4.80
15.	5.89	4.80	5.10
16.	4.59	5.40	4.88
17.	4.44	5.30	5.18
18.	4.70	4.80	5.59
19.	5.02	5.80	4.30
20.	5.30	5.02	4.60
21.	4.59	5.44	5.40
22.	5.44	4.55	5.30
23.	5.18	4.55	4.96

Table 14 - Cont'd.

Family No.	Variable		
	Executive Behavior	Communicational Processes	Affective Responses
24.	5.88	4.63	4.62
25.	4.88	5.00	5.01
26.	4.94	5.92	4.33
27.	4.92	5.01	5.15
28.	4.77	5.70	4.66
29.	5.37	4.70	4.95
30.	5.37	4.70	5.18

Table 14 shows little apparent difference in the magnitude of the mean scores for any of the three major variables. In order to determine if there was any meaningful differences, comparisons were made between the highest mean and lowest mean scores for each family. Results of this analysis are summarized in Table 15.

Table 15

Analysis of Significant Patterns of Family Interaction (Executive Behavior, Communicational Processes, Affective Responses) Based on Subject's Response to Q-Sort (80 Items)

(N = 30)

Family No.	Q-Sort Variables		t	p	Family Style
1.	E. C.		1.11	ns.	C.
2.	C.**	A.	2.74	.02	E.
	C.**	E.	2.78	.02	
3.	E.	A.	1.60	ns.	DC.
4.	E.	A.	.79	ns.	EP.
5.	E.	C.	.62	ns.	C.
6.	E.	C.	.93	ns.	D.
7.	E.A.	C.*	2.17	.05	DP.
8.	C.	A.	1.09	ns.	C,EP
9.	E.	C.	1.45	ns.	JD
10.	E.	C.	1.42	ns.	D.
11.	E.	A.	.74	ns.	C.
12.	C.*	A.	2.17	.05	E.
	E.	A.	1.04	ns.	
13.	E.	C.	.29	ns.	PD
14.	C.	A.	1.16	ns.	D.
15.	E.	C.	1.72	ns.	NE.
16.	E.	C.	1.33	ns.	J,NE,P.
17.	E.	C.	1.35	ns.	D.
18.	E.*	A.	2.15	.05	DE,C.

Table 15 - Cont'd.

Family No.	Q-Sort Variables		t	p	Family Style
19.	C.***	A.	3.12	.01	ED
20.	E.	A.	1.08	ns.	DC,P.
21.	C.	E.	1.57	ns.	D.
22.	C.	A.	1.56	ns.	C.
23.	C.	E.	1.17	ns.	C.
24.	E.*	A.	2.31	.05	E.
25.	E.	A.	.19	ns.	D.
26.	C.*	E.	2.08	.05	PE.
27.	C.	A.	.43	ns.	EDP
28.	C.	A.	1.95	ns.	C.
29.	C.	E.	1.07	ns.	C.
30.	C.	A.	1.01	ns.	C.
	C.	E.	1.21	ns.	

Variables: C, Communicational processes; E., Executive behavior; A., Affective responses.

Styles: D., disengaged; E., enmeshed; P., peripheral; J., juvenile; C., coping; NE., Non-evolved.

Significance levels: *** .01; ** .02; * .05.

Examination of Table 15 indicates that for most of the 30 families, there was a tendency for the variable of "Communicational Processes" to be given more weight in the Q-sort distribution. Although findings for significant patterns of interaction are based on a small number of actual

significant differences in variable scores, a closer look at the results indicates some possible trends for the styles of "coping," "disengaged" and "enmeshed."

For the "coping" style, there were no significant findings. There were no instances where a family was typed "coping" where one of the major variables was found to be more significant than the others. When evaluating the pattern of interaction in the case of the "disengaged" style, the only significant finding was in the direction of a greater emphasis on the "Communicational Processes" variable. However, upon closer inspection of the responses for Family No. 7, where this finding occurs, one sees that the high emphasis on communication can be accounted for primarily by negative items which were given high weight in this area. Finally with the "enmeshed" style, there is evidence for heavy emphasis on "Communicational Processes," with accompanying low "Executive Behavior" and "Affective Responses," as in the case of Family No. 2. Another pattern, as observed for family No. 12, is a situation which is characterized by high "Executive Behavior," with subsequent low indices of "Communicational Processes" and "Affective Response."

In the case of both the "disengaged" and "enmeshed" family styles, there is evidence within these families of general low affective levels. Regarding the other family styles, the small number of families in the present study actually typed "juvenile," "peripheral male" and "Non-evolved," make it difficult to draw any meaningful conclusions regarding predominant interaction patterns with respect to the three variables in question.

Relationship of Environmental Variables and Family Style

Although data obtained by all the assessment procedures has led to typing of particular family styles, the issue can be raised that these styles were due primarily to particular "environmental" variables and are in reality artifacts created by the assessment methods themselves. In an attempt to resolve some of the problems that this questions raises, some of the major environmental variables were analyzed by comparing their frequency of occurrence in "coping" as opposed to the rest of the study sample. Among the variables examined were: family intactness; family size; and education.

The data were analyzed by taking a frequency count for each of these variables for families typed "coping" and for "all other styles," the objective being to determine differences with respect to frequency of occurrence. For the variables of family intactness, no significant differences were found ($\chi^2 = 1.64 < \chi^2\ .05 = 3.84$). Similarly for family size, an inspection of the range of number of children for "coping" families (1 - 5) and for "non-coping" families (1 - 7), indicates no appreciable differences.*

However, when examining frequency of high school graduates in "coping and non-coping families," a significant difference was found ($\chi^2 = 17.1 > \chi^2\ p\ .01 = 6.63$). This indicates that for the present sample, families typed "coping" had significantly greater incidence of further education (high school graduate) than non-coping families.

*For range of children in family, highest number of children for each group were eliminated. These were 8 and 15 for coping and non-coping families No. 29 and 13.

Family Styles and Function

Global Maladjustment

Table 16

Significant Scores for Children of Families of Specific Styles on Global Maladjustment Rating Scale (N = 28)[a]

Family Style	N	Mean Ullman Rating[b]	Comparisons Made between Styles	t	p
Coping	7	27.3	C. and D.	5.85	.01
Disengaged	5	11.4	D. and E.	.88	ns.
Enmeshed	3	12.6	E. and M.	.32	ns.
Mixed	13	12.15	D. and M.	.49	ns.

Family Styles: C., Coping; D., disengaged; E., enmeshed; J., juvenile; P., peripheral male; N., non-evolved.

[a] For the evaluation of classroom behavior, families No. 15 and 28 have been omitted as their styles remain ambiguous when assessment procedures are combined (Table 8).

[b] As scores on Ullman decrease below 18, indications are for greater maladjustment, so that a score of 8 would represent a more severe problem than a score of 16.

Inspection of Table 16 indicates that children from families typed "coping" showed significantly greater adjustment as a group. When comparing the mean scores for the family styles of "disengaged" and "enmeshed", no significant results were found. Also, when mixed styles are used as a basis for comparison between scores for children from families typed

"disengaged" and "enmeshed," no significant differences emerge.

Another approach to examining the relationship between scores on global maladjustment and family styles was to take into account the frequency that a given range of scores was found to occur. As a result, the lower end of the scale was considered in terms of low adjustment scores (15 - 18) and very low adjustment scores (9 - 14). Using this guideline, a total frequency count was made for both categories for the styles of "disengaged" and enmeshed." This count was based on all cases where disengagement or enmeshment occurred either as a distinct or a predominant style in a mixed profile. A chi square analysis was computed, with the resultant value: $\chi^2 = 2.78 < \chi^2$ p .01 = 6.63. The analysis is summarized in Table 17.

This finding indicates that when frequency of range with respect to global maladjustment scores is taken into account, children from "disengaged" families show no significant difference when compared to children from "enmeshed" families.

The question can now be raised as to whether any appreciable difference develops in the global maladjustment scores when family styles are mixed. Mixed styles are defined here as situations in which at least two styles are significant from all others, but not from one another. To examine this issue, a similar analysis of the "mixed styles" was undertaken. These styles were derived from the combined assessment procedures (Table 8). The results of this analysis are summarized in Table 18.

Table 17

Chi Square Analysis for Children's Scores on Global Maladjustment for the Styles of Disengaged and Enmeshed (Based on Distinct or Predominant Occurrence of Style, N = 23)

		Family Style	Low Adjustment	Very Low Adjustment	Total
Observed	Scores	Disengaged	2	12	14
		Enmeshed	4	5	9
Expected	Scores	Disengaged	3.6	10.3	
		Enmeshed	2.3	6.7	

Note.--A final analysis was done by comparing scores on the Ullman based on the dimension of intactness for all 30 families. The purpose here was to determine whether children from either family structure had greater difficulties, independent of style. A median test by Chi-Square failed to show any significant differences between scores on the Ullman for children from intact as compared to non-intact families ($\chi^2 = 6.22 < \chi^2$ p .05 $\pm$ 7.9).

Table 18

Significant Scores for Children on Global Maladjustment as a Function of Mixed Family Styles (N = 13)

Family Style	N	$\bar{X}$ Rating	Comparisons Made Between Styles	t	p
Juvenile	2	10	J. and P.	.66	ns.
Peripheral	9	13.0			
Enmeshed-Disengaged	5	13.8			
Coping-Disengaged	5	13.2	J.	.92	ns.

Family Styles: D., disengaged; E., enmeshed; J., juvenile; P., peripheral male; NE., non-evolved; C., coping.

N = the number of times the particular styles to the left occur in mixed profile. The placement of the style as in the case of "enmeshed-disengaged" does not mean one is more predominant than the other, but simply refers to their joint occurrence in a mixed style.

Table 18 shows that the comparisons made on the basis of mixed styles resulted in no significant differences when scores on global maladjustment are the criteria. However, inspection of Table 18 does show a lower mean score in the case of the "juvenile" style than for the score for disengaged children, as illustrated in Table . A comparison of these means yielded no significance ($t = .53 < t\ p\ .05 = 2.44$).

The same procedure regarding frequency analysis of low and very low adjustment scores was followed for these 13 cases of "mixed family styles." This analysis yielded no significant differences as a function of mixed styles ($\chi^2 = 2.06 < \chi^2\ p\ .05 = 3.84$). A final analysis was

made to determine if there was any significant difference between adjustment scores when distinct versus mixed family styles were used as the basis for comparison. A frequency distribution analysis yielded no significant differences ($\chi^2 = .85 < \chi^2$ p .05 = 3.84). This finding indicates that when comparing low adjustment scores, there is no major difference in "poor adjustment" between distinct and mixed family styles.

Conduct Disorders

Table 19

Significant Mean Ratings for Children on Factor 1 (Conduct Disorders) of Peterson Behavior Rating Scale as a Function of Family Styles (N = 28)

Family Style	N	X Rating (F.1)	Comparisons Made Between Styles	t	p
Coping	7	1.43	C. and D.	5.92	.01
Disengaged	5	15.63			
Enmeshed	3	14.00	E. and M.	.86	ns.
Mixed	13	16.61			

Note.--Where styles were undetermined, they were omitted. High scores on Factor 1 reflect high degree of conduct disturbance.

Styles: C., coping; D., disengaged; E., enmeshed; M., mixed.

Table 19 shows that the only significant difference on Factor 1 as a function of family styles occurs for the "coping" families. Children from these families had significantly less conduct problems than the rest of the sample population. Looking at the frequency of conduct disorders as a function of style, a chi square analysis was done on the basis of comparison of low and high scores* between children from disengaged and those from enmeshed families ($\chi^2 = .82 < \chi^2$ p .05 = 3.84). This indicates that for the present population, there was no significant difference in the frequency of occurrence of conduct disorders as a function of the "disengaged" or "enmeshed" family styles. A similar analysis of mixed styles yielded no significant differences ($\chi^2 = .78 < \chi^2$ p .05 = 3.84).

*Low scores on Factor 1 = 0 - 15; high scores = 16+.

Personality Disorders

Table 20

Significant Scores for Children on Factor 2 (Personality Disorders as a Function of Family Style (N = 28)

Family Style	N	$\bar{X}$ Rating	Comparisons Made between Styles	t	p
Coping	7	1.29	C. and D.	6.23	.01
Disengaged	5	18.20	D. and E.	1.12	ns.
Enmeshed	3	25.00			
Mixed	13	18.80			

Note.--Where styles are undetermined, they have been omitted. High Scores on Factor 2 reflect high degree of personality disturbance.

Table 20 indicates that the children from "coping" families show significantly less evidence of personality problems when compared to the rest of the sample population. For the styles of "disengaged" and "enmeshed," as well as for the mixed profile styles, no significant differences were found.

Frequency analysis based on comparisons for low and high scores on Factor 2* failed to produce any significant findings when scores from "disengaged" and "enmeshed" families were analyzed ($\chi^2 = .21 < \chi^2$ p .05 = 3.84). Also, no significant differences were found within the mixed

*Low scores on Factor 2 = 0 - 15; high scores on Factor 2 = 16+.

group when scores were compared ($\chi^2 = 1.24 < \chi^2$ p .05 = 3.84).

Adaptational Difficulties

Table 21

Frequency Distribution of Adaptational Difficulties as a Function of Family Styles (N = 28)

	Adaptational Areas				
Family Style	S.	A.	C.	M.	Co.
Coping	0	0	0	0	0
Disengaged	3	2	1	2	3
Enmeshed	2	2	1	0	2
Mixed	8	6	7	7	9

Note.--Adaptational difficulties were assessed by a modification of Kellam's technique. (See p. 32 for description.)

Adaptational areas: S., social contacts; A., authority acceptance; C., cognitive development; M., maturation; Co., concentration.

A chi square analysis of the above table yielded no significant differences with respect to the frequency of adaptational difficulties as a function of family styles ($\chi^2 = 2.06 < \chi^2$ p .05 = 15.50). This finding indicates that, based on the present population, there is no significant difference as a function of family styles for the occurrence of adaptational difficulties.

To take a closer look at adaptational difficulties in cases of children from families typed "disengaged" and "enmeshed," a frequency

count was obtained by utilizing all cases where disengagement or enmeshment occurred either as a distinct style or as a predominant style in a mixed family profile. Based on this frequency count, the distribution in Table 22 was derived.

Table 22

Frequency Distribution of Adaptational Difficulties Based on Family Style for Disengaged and Enmeshed Profile (N = 26)

	Adaptational Areas					
Family Style	S.	A.	C.	M.	Co.	N.
Disengaged	8	4	6	6	6	14
Enmeshed	4	6	3	1	4	10

Note.--Frequency based on combined scores for distinct and mixed styles.

Adaptational Areas: S., social contacts; A., authority acceptance; C., cognitive development; Co., concentration; M., maturation.

To determine whether the total frequencies for each style were significant, a chi square analysis was done ($\chi^2 = 4.55 < p\ .30 = 4.87$). Therefore, when combining the data in this manner no significant difference between styles occurs. A similar procedure was employed based on mixed styles ($\chi^2 = 9.22 < \chi^2\ p\ .05 = 21.02$). One may conclude that the data for adaptational difficulties fail to provide any significant evidence with respect to their relationship to family styles.

Relationship between Subject Variables and Scores on Behavioral Rating Scales

It can be argued that differences in the scores on the three behavioral measures used in this study are attributable to sex differences rather than to family styles. In an attempt to clarify the nature of this relationship, scores on the scales were converted to means based on sex differences. The resulting population was broken into two segments comprising "coping families" and "all other styles."

In the cases of scores on the Peterson Scale and The Adaptational Checklist, children from coping families had means lower than 2 for Factors 1 and 2, while having no indices of adaptational difficulties as a group. It is for this reason that analysis based on sex differences, for the latter two scales, was based only on the families who were not typed coping. The objective breakdown by sex for coping families was 4 boys and 3 girls. For the remaining N of 23, it was 11 girls and 12 boys.

On the Ullman Global Maladjustment rating scale there were no significant differences for children from "coping" families based on scores for both sexes ($t = .48 < t\ p\ .05 = 2.57$). Similarly, there were no significant differences for the remaining sample when comparing both sexes ($t = .23 < t\ p\ .05 = 2.08$). Differences in scores on the Ullman scale are not attributed to sex differences.

Turning to the Peterson Behavior Rating Scale for Factor 1 (Conduct Disorders), no significant difference was found for subjects' sex differences ($t = 1.48 < t\ p\ .05 = 2.08$). However, for Personality Disorders (Factor 2), girls showed a significant difference by receiving generally

higher ratings in this area than boys ($t = 2.95 > t\ p\ .01 = 2.84$).

When measuring differences in adaptational difficulties as a function of sex, no significant findings emerge except in the cognitive area. For the present study sample, girls were found to have a greater incidence of difficulties in the area of cognitive development than boys ($z = 3.41 > z\ p\ .05 = 1.96$).

Combining the major findings in the two principal areas -- family style assessment and family style and function -- the major hypotheses and resultant findings are presented in Table 23.

Table 23

Summary Findings for Specific Hypotheses for the Areas of Family Style Assessment and Family Style and Function

Area of Assessment	Hypothesis	Finding	Table(s)
Family Style:	1. Utilizing empirical procedures, it will be possible to assess family styles to a measurable degree.	Upheld	3
	2. When the reliability of judges' ratings are compared, there will be significant differences in the assessment of family styles in the following direction:		
	a) The highest over-all reliability will be for that of the "coping" family style.	Upheld	7

Table 23 - Cont'd.

Area of Assessment	Hypothesis	Finding	Table(s)
	b) The styles of "disengaged" and "enmeshed" will be agreed on significantly.	Upheld	7
	3. Factor analysis of the Family Attribute Differential Scale will yield characteristic factor scores for the different family styles.	Upheld	13
	a) It will be possible to differentiate the "coping" style from all other styles.	Upheld	13
	b) It will be possible to dif ferentiate the "disengaged" style from the "enmeshed" family style.	Upheld	13
	4. The variables of "executive behavior, communicational processes and affective responses" will be related to family styles.	Upheld (Partially)	15
Function:	5. Children from "disengaged" families will show the most significant degree of maladjustment and adaptational difficulties.	Rejected	16, 17
	6a. Conduct disorders when present in the case of the child from a "disengaged" family, will manifest themselves by attempts on the part of the child to establish control over the environment and draw attention to himself.	Upheld[a]	

Table 23 - Cont'd.

Area of Assessment	Hypothesis	Finding	Table(s)
	6b. Conduct disorders when present in the case of children from "enmeshed" family styles, will be manifested by attempts at removing controls from the environment.	Upheld	

[a] The results for Hypotheses 6a and 6b are based more on clinical observation than empirical data. For this reason, no tables are listed as a source for support. The reader is referred to the discussion section dealing with behavior and family styles.

VI

CLINICAL PERSPECTIVES

The foregoing results section rested primarily on statistical analysis of interview and other types of data. The purpose of the present chapter is to lend this material greater reality in terms of the experience of the subjects and of this writer in working with them. Sections from several interviews will be presented in context. This is what the subjects themselves have said about their lives. The numbers presented before were a distillation of such experiences as are contained below. This chapter will focus around the following central points:

1. Interview material will be presented according to the different family styles identified in the previous section.
2. Sections of the interviews will deal mainly with questions of "present functioning." The focus will be in areas like the following: ways of handling children; methods of control; types of communication; expression of feeling and attitudes about the children; and total family constellation.*

The Disengaged Family Style

The Fosters:

Mrs. Foster is a shabbily dressed woman who seems to be unconcerned about her physical appearance. She has a downcast, beaten manner and

*All family names have been changed to maintain confidentiality.

appears generally depressed. She was dressed in a torn dress and seemed to drag her feet as she walked through the house. The house itself was in a very run down condition. There was clothing on the floor and papers strewn on most of the tables.

At the appointment time she was in the process of making lunch for the youngest child. She immediately turned off the stove and kept her daughter waiting for the next two hours, in spite of repeated encouragement to take time out to feed her. During this time the child crawled up on a ledge and looked out of the sixth floor window which had no guards. Mrs. Foster only became concerned for her safety when I became alarmed.

At no time during the interview did she maintain eye contact. She continually expressed concern about the possibility of incriminating herself and at times was excessively cautious in responding to particular questions.

E. How would you describe things in the house now?

Mrs. F. You mean with the children?

E. Yes, with you and the children.

Mrs. F. These kids make me nervous, always doin' somethin' to upset me, they make some mess out of this house.

E. What kinds of things do the children do that upset you?

Mrs. F. When they get to me, make me nervous. When they makes a lot of noise also, so I can't rest....Then when they be botherin me to do things they should be doin for themselfs.

E. How do you usually show the children you are upset with them, what kinds of things do you usually do?

Mrs. F. Sometimes I hit em, but most times I put em in the room and close the door, so if they wants to cry or make a fuss they don't get to me.

E. What kinds of things do the children do that please you?

Mrs. F. When they do good in school.

E. Is there anything else?

Mrs. F. When they don't be botherin me all the time and makin me nervous.

E. What kinds of things do the children do that make you nervous?

Mrs. F. ...Making noise, that's one thing...also when I'm not feelin well they ask me to do for em different things.

E. How do you show the children you are pleased with them?

Mrs. F. They know when I'm pleased they just know it.

E. What kinds of things do you do with the children?

Mrs. F. I don't play with em much, they gets rough, start thinkin I'm one of em, so I don't play with em any more. Sometimes we watch television when they come home.

E. What about yourself?

Mrs. F. ...I keeps to myself, dont gets nervous and then there's less fightin.

The Lamberts

Mrs. L. is a quiet, soft spoken woman who seemed unsure of herself throughout most of the interview. She spoke in a pleasant manner but often contradicted herself and appeared to be in a confused state. During most of the time she was talking her son was running throughout the house banging furniture and throwing objects. Mrs. L. responded to this behavior by smiling and stating that she thought Stephen was very funny. As the interview progressed, it became clear that she had little control over his behavior and was quite overwhelmed.

E. When you are upset with Stephen, what kinds of things do you do?

Mrs. L. I usually make him sit down and watch television.

E. How do you usually discipline him?

Mrs. L. If I have to I have a belt, I whip him. I don't whip him that often, I just tell him things.

E. What kinds of things do you like to do?

Mrs. L. Oh, there's lots of things I would like to do, but since I have this kid, I'm not free to do what I want.

E. What would you do if you could?

Mrs. L. I would like to work every day and pick my hours, not to be obligated or responsible to anyone, real independent. I always wanted to be independent. I don't like being bothered with a lot of headaches from other people.

E. Do you find you lose your temper with Stephen a lot?

Mrs. L. Sometimes when he starts actin up....He was a good baby but when he start walkin, god! I can't control him, he really gets the best of me sometimes. He gets into everything, he's just like his father, always actin silly and goofy. People around here, they starts to saying all kinds of things about me.

E. What kinds of things do they say?

Mrs. L. They say I act crazy, they knock on the door and I don't let em in. They say I don't take good care of my son. The neighbors feel I'm not friendly and that I don't want to be bothered with them.

E. How do you feel about this?

Mrs. L. Well, Stephen, I guess he didn't ask to come here. When he gets to be a certain age, he'll be on his own more. If I could afford it I would pay somebody to take care of him for me, he's too much. The social worker, the one who comes up here, she says to me, "why do you sit up here all day and not do nothin, you just sit around or sleep and that's no way to live." I feel like tellin her they could keep the money if they would take him off my hands.

E. What will he really do that upsets you?

Mrs. L. He doesn't do anything really, I use to whip him. I let him do what he wants now. I sometimes punish him by tellin him that different things I promised, well he's

not goin to get that.

Stephen (to Mrs. L.): "and you stick your foot in my mouth."

Mrs. L. I did not.

S. Yes you did.

Mrs. L. Sometimes I have to hold him down with my knees and he's always saying I put my foot in his mouth. I have more trouble with my own. I can control other people's kids. I can't control my own, he gives me more problems than one hundred children. I take him shoppin and the next thing he be beatin up some kid in the store bigger than him. I could be standin in line waiting to pay for somethin, so I just try to pretend that he's not mine, cause these people might figure cause he's rough, that his mother is the same way too. I don't want to fight nobody, so I just pretend he's not mine. I just walk right out of that store and wait for him in the street.

The Hastings

Mrs. Hastings is a frail, rather sickly looking woman. She said I caught her in a "talking mood" that day. She told me that she usually didn't answer the door, even for her relatives. At the beginning of the interview, she told her son to go into the next room and closed the door behind him. He stayed there by himself for the next two hours and only when I left did she first open the door. Mrs. Hastings appeared very high strung and her thoughts were often disorganized. Her answers to many of the questions were often quite removed from the original inquiry.

E. When the children upset you, what happens?

Mrs. H. I get all excited and all of a sudden, I get like fire. I just start to burn up and nothin but water (I don't care how cold it is) will start pouring off me. I starts shakin, so I take an aspirin and lie down. I can't even stand the phone or company.

E. What kinds of things make you nervous?

Mrs. H. Any little thing, sometimes I gets up in the morning and feels like somebody is dead. Then I lie in bed all day. Then even when I lay there and get up, it seems like I done did a whole lot.

E. What kinds of things do the children do around the house that upset you?

Mrs. H. Sometimes, I don't know what it is. I sit right here and watch the TV and can't even tell you what's on. You ask me, I be thinkin I watchin TV but all of a sudden my mind wanders off. I did it so often till this baby here. Im breakin him of the habit myself.

E. Of just staring?

Mrs. H. He stares and I think he must of heard me do it too. Sometimes I have a habit of going around and talkin and mumblin to myself. He was doin it, doin the same thing, he was sittin there and rockin and sayin this and that. Then I catch myself and say that I don't never want to hear you doin that.

Mrs. H. Sometimes I don't remember myself. I come out of the kitchen and I wind up in another room, and when I get in there, I don't remember nothin about what I went in there for. Sometimes I come back and sit down and it may be half a day before I remember what I went into that room for.

Sometimes I'll have my wallet down there. The wallet is there, and there's nobody in here but me and I'll pick the wallet up and take it in my room and I couldn't tell you no more where that wallet is at.

E. Do you remember some of the things that you talk to the children about?

Mrs. H. I don't have very much talkin with the kids about anything anymore. It seems like it bothers me a lot. I don't know why, but it gets on my nerves, you know like even homework, at first it was very simple, but sometimes he'll sit down and say how much is one and one, and I just don't care to hear it. I just don't want to be bothered.

Same thing with school, I don't go to school, it seems when I go, I don't want to be sittin too long. I don't want to be sittin there like other parents, it seems like I don't have no patience to sit there and wait. I just want to walk right in and be served and walk right out.

On the basis of the excerpts from the transcribed interviews, it is possible to make several inferences regarding the major features of the "disengaged" family style.

Regarding the nature of the interaction process within these families, delay of response and lack of contact are predominant characteristics. Parents in these families are involved in a constant struggle to prevent themselves from becoming anxious. This serves to promote further isolation of the sibling subsystem and reduces the over-all rate of responsiveness on the part of the parent. Genuine involvement with the child is almost totally absent and reduction of anxiety is the major theme. Statements like "these kids make me nervous," (Family No. 10) and "I don't do much talkin to the kids, it bothers me a lot," (Family No. 14) are frequent in the "disengaged" family.

Responses, when they are forthcoming, are usually the result of some prolonged effort on the part of the child to elicit some form of reaction. In most cases it is the child who has to initiate activity within the family setting. Comments like "they keep asking me to do things for them," (Family No. 10) and "if she asks me I'll sit down and help her" (Family No. 6) are also common in this family style.

Parental reactions appear to stem primarily from responses to the parent's "own internal stress," rather than to the behavior or individual needs of the child. Interpretations of behavior are frequently made directly in terms of the self: "If I feel like it, I will help her," or "When they start up, I can't get my rest."

In the "disengaged" style, there are tremendous feelings on the

part of the mother of being overwhelmed. Consistency and organization on a routine basis are almost never present. Questions of concern, demonstrations of affection and any meaningful interactions are hardly in evidence. In the extreme case of Family No. 14, the disconnected quality of the relationship has manifested itself in the development of autistic behavioral signs in the child.

The Enmeshed Family Style

The Greens

Mrs. Green was quite reluctant to agree to the interview. She is strikingly belligerent, hostile and defensive. At the age of twenty-three she feels herself "stuck with three kids." Many of her answers were reflections of her own difficulties and problems in managing her family. The entire family was living in a small two-room apartment and there was a highly charged and explosive atmosphere throughout the interview.

E. Could you describe a little about the children, what are they like?

Mrs. G. (long pause): Not much to say about the others, but Tina, she's somethin else.

E. What is she like?

Mrs. G. That child is just no good and that's all there is to it.

E. What kinds of things does she do that upset you?

Mrs. G. What kinds of things?....She lies, she steals, she's always up to no good. You can't trust her. I send her

to the store and she gets lost, then she doesn't bring me back my change. When I ask her where my money is she don't answer.

E. When she does things like this, what will you usually do?

Mrs. G. I beat her. Sometimes I hit her so hard I can't stop. You think that does any good? Nothin helps this child.

E. What else have you tried?

Mrs. G. I lock her in her room, don't let her go no place. That way I figure she can't get into trouble, or lie about what she's been doin.

E. What kinds of things does she do that please you?

Mrs. G. When she comes right home from school. Also when she tells the truth about where she's been.

E. Does she tell you what she does at school?

Mrs. G. Are you kiddin? I know everything she does. I ask her what she does, where she's been and who she's been with. I ask her all the time. She has to tell me everything.

E. How will you show her you are pleased with her?

Mrs. G. I let her go out and play with her friends. Sometimes I give her money to buy herself something with. But that don't happen too often cause she's usually under punishment for somethin.

E. What kinds of things do you talk to her about?

Mrs. G. She doesn't like to talk to me, I told you, she won't tell me the things I ask her. She just stands there with a smile on her face and I have to smack her for it.

E. What kinds of things don't you like her to do, or won't you let her do by herself?

Mrs. G. I like her to keep out of trouble. She's always askin people for money. I also don't like when she comes snoopin around. She always wants to know my business, what I'm doin where I'm going. Then she likes to go to other people's houses and gets lost.

Eating that's another thing, I won't let her eat any old time she wants to. She has to eat when I eat and what I eat. I catch her throwin food behind the sink that she can't finish. I don't know what's the matter with her.

E. What kinds of things do you usually do with her?

Mrs. G. We watch television. I do homework with her, but she lies about that too, always tellin me she has no work, till I get a note from her teacher tellin me, she ain't doin her work.

E. What kinds of things will you let her do herself?

Mrs. G. I let her take care of the baby, she likes that. But when it comes to cookin and cleanin, she only messes up, so she knows she's not supposed to touch anything without askin me, else she gets it.

The Burns

Mrs. Burns was quite reserved throughout the interview. During this time, the youngest boy was constantly striking this writer. Mrs. Burns hit him repeatedly but to no avail. When the other children came home

from school an argument followed which concluded by Mrs. Burns hitting all four children.

She spoke to her children in short, abrupt shouts, with comments like: "Shut up, sit down, behave yourself, go to your room, sit still and come here." She seemed, in spite of all her yelling and hitting, to be having a difficult time controlling the behavior of her children.

E. Could you tell me something about each of the children, how would you describe them?

Mrs. B. They are all about the same, you know they act the same.

E. How is that?

Mrs. B. Bad and gettin into everything.

E. Is there anyone who gives you perhaps a harder time than the others?

Mrs. B. They's all the same (motioning to her four-year-old boy) "Keep still!"

E. What kinds of things will you do when they upset you?

Mrs. B. I take the strap to em, or I yell at em or something like that.

E. What kinds of things do they do in the house that upset you?

Mrs. B. They start fightin each other (to her son - "Get out of here, stop that, keep still!").

E. What kinds of things do they fight about?

Mrs. B. Like somebody has crayons and the other one wants it. They just fight for nothin sometimes.

E. What kinds of things do you talk to them about?

Mrs. B. Well, I don't talk that much to them.

E. How would you describe Cheryl, what would you say she is like?

Mrs. B. I guess she's an average kid. Sometime she gets on my nerves and starts cryin for nothin at all. I tell her to go upstairs or go outside. If it gets too bad, I get a strap to her behind.

E. Is there anything that you find difficult to do with the children?

Mrs. B. Difficult? I been at it so long (strikes child again - "Behave I said, now sit down, I'll pull your pants down." lets see, "I told you to stop it, behave yourself!"

E. Do the children fight with each other sometimes?

Mrs. B. Yeah, they fight.

E. What are the fights usually like?

Mrs. B. He hit her, then he'll pinch her or smack or bite her or somethin like that. Then I have to hit both of them. (To Karen who had just come in, "Sit down, get over there, shut up!")

E. In some families, maybe one child will get away with more than the others, how about in your family?

Mrs. B. None do, I beat them all the same.

E. How about you and your husband, do you spend much time together with the children?

Mrs. B. No. (Reaches over and slaps Karen) "Stop that! Don't touch that."

E. Who would you say is more affectionate with the children?

Mrs. B. I guess I am. (To child - "Stop that or I'll beat you.")

E. How about you, about how would you describe yourself now?

Mrs. B. Bored, bored, bored, there is nothin to do. I do the same thing every day. Washing, ironing, going to bed, the same old thing.

The Bridges'

Mr. Bridges was sitting in a corner of the room when I arrived. There was a great deal of screaming and yelling going on all around him. He appeared to be functioning in the role of a non-participant observer. Mrs. Bridges is a large, overpowering woman in appearance. She speaks in a deep booming voice and while introducing herself was busy giving orders to her husband and the children.

During the interview, Mr. Bridges attempted to raise some questions, but was essentially ignored by the rest of his family. Mrs. Bridges maintained a serious downcase manner and reflected her frustration with the other children. She seemed to make little distinction between the children and tended to perceive them somewhat globally -- "They are all bad and some is worse than others."

E. Could you tell me a little more about each of the children. How would you describe them?

Mrs. B. Ani't none of them alike, they all different and some of them is worse than others.

E. How would you describe Wayne?

Mrs. B. He fights all the time. If the boy is bigger than him, he don't care, firls, he fights his sisters and I don't care what you tell him, if he want to do it, he gonna do it no matter what you say.

He gets more beatens than anybody else, and as far as work is concerned, he don't want to do no work, when he comes home all he wants to do is play.

E. What about the other children, how would you describe them?

Mr. B. Then you got Kim, that's the youngest, very stubborn. If she can't get her way....

E. What happens?

Mrs. B. She'll throw a tantrum.

E. In other words, most of the children seem to want their own way?

Mrs. B. Yeah, seems like we have more trouble with the big one, looks like the older they get, the worse off they get.

E. What kinds of things do they do that upset you?

Mrs. B. Oh, they fight each other all the time. They got the habit. Like you tell them to do something and the first thing they do is jump up, you know, and they say, this one didn't do that, or that one didn't do this, or you didn't make this one do that.

E. What will you do when that happens?

Mrs. B. Sometimes, I try to hit them, but I find I hurt them, a couple of times I hit them and busted a lip or somethin like that.

E. Is there anyone who you feel has more difficulty than the other children?

Mrs. B. Yeah, Wayne, he's more difficult than the rest of them.

E. What kinds of things does Wayne do?

Mrs. B. Wayne curses.

Mr. B. This also, I have never heard him do. I know that he does it, but if I ever hear him, that would be somethin else.

E. What do you think you would do?

Mr. B. Well, ah,...punishment, you know, what I think you know for what it is like....

E. What do you feel is the hardest thing for you to do with the children?

Mr. B. To send them to bed, they never want to go to bed.

Mrs. B. They never want to get up also.

E. What is it like in the morning?

Mrs. B. Terrible. I'm hollering at this one and then I got to turn around and holler at that one. The fastest one gettin out of here, that's the one that aint done nothin. I look at William and say, "Where you goin William?" He hasn't washed his face or nothin. Half the time he got on dirty socks, it's like that all day.

E. We were talking about Wayne before...

Mrs. B. Yeah, he's the one who gets into more trouble than the others. But they all jealous, they all jealous of each other. One trys to get more than the others, because they think, you know, because they figure that I'm goin to get that because you goin to get that. I don't know what, and they selfish too. They don't want to give the other one nothin, you have to make em do it. He says, he didn't give me nothin yesterday, why do I have to give him some of mine today, or somethin like that.

E. Are there any things that you may have certain disagreements when it comes to the children?

Mrs. B. Yeah, if he tells one of them to do somethin, like if he tells Joyce to wash the dishes and I tell Marie to wash then he says, well I told Joyce to wash them and we get into those kinds of conflicts. He says it was Marie's turn to wash the dishes, and I tell him I told Joyce to do the dishes, see I can figure it out already. He says, I told them to do somethin and you tell them, but you want them to do what you tell them to not what I tell them to.

E. Is there anyone who usually has the final say about things?

Mr. B. Uh huh, who's doing all the talking.

Mrs. B. Television, that's another thing. They wants to look at this program and he wants to see the news and we have a conflict there. Every day they looks at these programs, and they know that by now. They so use to lookin at it every day that when he wants to look at the news they all starts to holler and scream. So I have to come into it.

E. What usually happens?

Mrs. B. I let them look at their programs.

Mr. B. (Turning towards E.) "See? What can I tell you, I'm a loser."

Examination of the preceeding interviews lends some insight into what emerges as some of the major characteristics of the "enmeshed" family style.

One of the most outstanding features of the "enmeshed" family style is the nature of the mother's response to the children's behavior. "The mother in this family, centralizes control in such a way that she is most often responding to the children's behavior with some form of control response" (Minuchin, 1967). The degree of this control varies. In some cases (Family No. 12) it appears to represent an almost total restriction of the child's life space both within and outside of the home. At the other extreme are repeated attempts aimed at establishing some form of control, which are generally unsuccessful. In most cases, the messages are operating primarily in terms of here and now, with little regard for or attention to guidelines for future behavior. What

is wrong today, may be overlooked tomorrow.

Communication is generally in the form of short, abrupt, negative commands, with little evidence of overt affection or true concern. Distinction between the children are rare and the sibling subsystem is seen mostly as a vaguely differentiated unit ("They are all the same, bad! (Family No. 2), "They are all different and some of them is worse than others." (Family No. 4)). The prevalent atmosphere in the home is highly charged and explosive. Rules, punishment and favors are rarely equitable and fair. In many instances, all will suffer for the act of one.

There is generally a feeling of helplessness about effecting some change inccontrolling the child's behavior outside the immediacy of the mother's presence. The mothers in these families consider their role as one of central importance in preventing the loss of control. "All I have to do is step outside for one minute and they start fightin." (Family No. 19) However in reality they exert very real control even in the family setting. However, they often fail to take responsibility for behavior which occurs outside of the home and direct influence of the mother. This can be illustrated by the mother's general ignorance and bewilderment in describing the child's activities outside of the home. "I send him to school, but I don't know if he goes." (Family No. 19)

The sibling subsystem is engaged in operations which have as their central theme power and control. Fights around possessions, rights, duties are frequent and usually not successfully resolved. Absence of a sense of justice and fair play is common, while aggression and anger are

predominant modes of interaction. The context of most communication usually contains some elements of criticism. In the case of Family No. 4 which includes an adult male, his power is clearly restricted and controlled by the mother.

The Peripheral Male Family Style

The Hutschins

Mrs. Hutschin is a tired, depressed and passive woman who looks as if she has been through the wars. She sat with a baby on her lap while there were children screaming throughout the house. She has adapted a matter of fact, accepting attitude about the way things are. Although she has 15 children, she claims that she really never wanted to have any, but that's "how things are."

She was able to answer most of the questions and appeared concerned about her children. Her orientation has been to "keep peace" in the family under extremely difficult conditions. The demands made on her by her family create an oppressive atmosphere in the family that made itself felt quite easily. It was easy to capture a sense of her burdens and difficult to imagine that anyone could reasonably cope with them.

E. How many children are there in the family altogether?

Mrs. H. Well, I have 15. Ten boys and five girls, 13 living in the house.

E. Could you describe some of the children, what are they like?

Mrs. H. Well...all of them act just about the same way, they all shy.

E. What is it like when all of them are in the house together?

Mrs. H. It sound like a jungle. That's the way I would describe it, especially sometimes, it sound just like a jungle.

E. It must be very hard for you to spend time with each one.

Mrs. H. Oh yes it is, and they bring all of their troubles to me.

E. They usually come to you first?

Mrs. H. They come to me first.

E. Do you make most of the decisions about the children?

Mrs. H. Well yes, well mostly, cause he don't have too much to say about them one way or the other.

E. How would you describe your husband, what is he like?

Mrs. H. You talk about the children bein quiet, that's him. I don't have too much mouth now, but I can talk when necessary, but he don't like to talk too much.

E. Does he talk to the children much?

Mrs. H. No, he plays with them a few minutes, the smart ones, a few minutes and after that, that's it.

E. Who would you say does most of the punishing? Do you, or does he?

Mrs. H. Well he punishes when they're small, you know like babies and after they get older, he done hardly bother with them, ever.

E. So you have to do that too.

Mrs. H. I have to do everything!

E. What kinds of things do the children do that please you?

Mrs. H. When they do things that I didn't tell them in the beginning, but they do it anyway.

E. Do you and your husband have a chance to talk much about the children?

Mrs. H. Well, we don't talk too much about em, he don't like to talk about em anyway.

E. What does he do when he comes home?

Mrs. H. Well, he plays with the baby for a few minutes, then he'll say "I'm sleepy" and he'll go to sleep if I don't have dinner ready.

E. What kinds of things does he tell the children to do, does he give a lot of orders?

Mrs. H. He don't have too much to say to them anyway. I tell him that it's wrong. He should have more to say to them now, like when they were younger. He should talk to them and try to help them or advise them. He don't have no advice or lessons for them and it makes it harder for me.

I have to advise them to the best of my ability and I have to think about how he would do it, if it was him.

E. Have you tried to talk to him about it?

Mrs. H. Uh huh, then we start the silent period all over again. When he's in a bad mood, I don't even tell him that someone has been here. I really get upset, like our oldest boy dropped out of school. My husband hardly talked to

him. I don't know maybe he felt we weren't interested in him.

The kids need him, but he don't give them no encouragement. I just don't know....

Profile of a Mixed Family Style

Juvenile-Non-Evolved-Peripheral

The Kirks

Mr. Kirk is a tall, well built man who speaks slowly and awkwardly. He appears self conscious, unsure of himself, and unahppy. There is a sulky, whineing quality about him that carries with it many of the characteristics of a deprived child. Throughout the interview he sat on the other side of the room and at several points when he wife became excessively critical towards him, threatened to stop and leave.

Mrs. Kirk is an attractive, well groomed woman who seems quite high-strung. Most of her responses were reflections of her husband's incompetence, with attempts to place much of the blame for the family's difficulties on him. It was difficult to get objective responses from either Mr. or Mrs. Kirk, as both seemed determined to emerge as the more capable in their relationship.

The apartment has very little furniture and has an unfinished quality to it. It appears that nothing gets to completion in this family. There was a room with half the wall covered with wallpaper, a bookshelf left hanging with one side being up and a curtain rod with the curtains on the chair.

E. Could you describe a little about the children? What are they like?

Mr. K. Go ahead, you do most of the talking anyway.

Mrs. K. Well Andrea, she's a problem. She's a big girl and very defiant, won't listen to me or obey my instructions. She also has this speech problem, stutters a lot. Then when she can't get her way she throws fits. Of course he (pointing to her husband) is usually never here to see any of it, and when he is, he just hits her and that's the end of it. Like I say she is very high strung, never knows what's happening, especially with her father and me.

E. I don't care, really don't care, what's the difference. If she don't like it, she can take me or leave me.

Mrs. K. You see, he doesn't care. He doesn't care about the children, that's one thing. If he cared he wouldn't be running around like he does all the time.

Mr. K. That's right, tell like that, boy, let me tell you, she puts those kids first, lets them do anything they want, she cut off her right hand for them, while I sit in the other room and starve to death. As a matter of fact if you goin to start this stuff again, we'll just stop right now.

E. Let's try to talk a little about the children. What kinds of things do you talk to the children about?

Mr. K. Nobody talk to anyone round here, that's it.

Mrs. K. Speak for yourself, you don't talk to anyone. If he comes home he just sits around and stares at the walls, then jumps up and says he's gotta get out of here and he's gone again. I try to talk to the kids, but most of the time I'm busy makin excuses why their father isn't here, or why daddy and mommy fight all the time. Do you know this is the first time in two months we have sat down together.

E. What kinds of things will the children do that upset you?

Mrs. K. Mostly they don't listen to what I say. I have to do all the punishing, cause he's never around.

Mr. K. Maybe, if you wouldn't let them run to your mother all the time, they would listen to you, not her. Boy, that really gets me going. This place is just like Grand Central Station. The kids, if they don't like something, they run right downstairs to her mother and father. Her mother she lets this happen, a lot of it is her fault. Like I say, for a lousy toothpick, we got to go downstairs. Everyone always chargin in and out of here, it's just plain crazy.

I mean, her folks helped us out a lot, but they never let me forget it either. They also tell Judy what a bum I am and this and that. Judy, you ask her, she can't do nothing without checking with her mother first. That really gets me.

Mrs. K. Look, you took plenty too, and don't forget it.

E. Are there any things that you manage to do together with the children?

Mrs. K. Well, anytime we make plans, we can't count on him anyway, so I wind up doing it myself. Like last Thursday I made a party for Denise, he shows up at the end, and starts crying that nobody ever made him a party when he was a kid.....

E. Have you ever talked about separation before?

Mrs. K. Are you kidding, this will be the third time. I have the divorce papers just sitting on my table. The first time I walked out.....

Mr. K. Well, this time it's going to be different, if anyone does the walkin it's going to be me.

Mrs. K. Don't threaten me.

Mr. K. I'm just telling you where it's at, that's all. If you want you can move the whole bag in with your mother, that what she wants anyway.

Mrs. K. You see, I told you he didn't care.....

Mr. K. Not any more.

Conceptions of the Peripheral Male

Based on the present study sample and the indices of peripheral maleness in typing various families, it appears that this pattern does not occur exclusive of one or more of the other styles. However, variations as to the degree and influence the peripheral male may have in a

given family setting have varied from one family to another and findings will be examined below.

Enmeshed-Peripheral Male. In the case of Family No. 4, one can observe how attempts on the part of Mr. B. to involve himself actively in the ongoing process of his family are restricted by the power operations of his wife, who cannot relinquish her role as final authority. Consequently, the result is an impairment of both Mr. B.'s role and subsequent effectiveness both in his own and his family's eyes. His response has been to continue in a passive interplay with his wife which serves as a constant source of conflict and agitation in the family. His messages and orders carry little weight and in many respects he is regarded as a second class citizen by his wife and children.

Partially Responsible Male. Turning to Family No. 13, one observes a somewhat different type of interaction process. Here there is a clear lack of communication between husband and wife. In this intact family, the male remains peripheral, although he assumes some responsibilities. He is contributing to the financial support of the family, engaged in procreative activities with his wife, but leaves the handling and rearing of the children completely to his wife.

Actively Withdrawn Male. In the case of Family No. 16, Mr. K has participated actively in removing himself from the family. He is the constant focus for placement of blame and criticism and consequently accepts this role, while jointly moving the center of his life outside the realm of his family. He is seen by Mrs. K. as largely responsible

for the family's unhappiness, while her own incompetence is frequently overlooked. There is a constant attempt to project all of the family's problems onto her husband's ineffectiveness.

A Case of Mixed Family Styles

Juvenile-Non-Evolved-Peripheral

In the present study sample, there were very few cases of either juvenile or non-evolved family styles. It would appear that these styles do not exist independently of other styles and occur in some related fashion to other styles.

Since Family No. 16 represents, to some extent, elements of both the juvenile and non-evolved profile, it offers some interesting contributions from a dynamic standpoint and has therefore been included in the present chapter.

Juvenile Characteristics

For Family No. 16, the history of their marriage has been one of constant turmoil and impending separation. Mr. Kirk, while quite dependent on his wife, attempts to move away from the family by carrying on pleasurable activities outside of the family. The wife here has clustered her husband along with her children in a subsystem of "burdensome dependents." She feels unfairly saddled with the responsibility of caring for "incompetent people."

Non-Evolved Characteristics

This pattern is further complicated by allocation of most of the executive power to Mrs. K.'s mother. The family thus becomes rather vaguely differentiated, with Mrs. K. quite often assuming the role of

the older sibling. Many of the decisions and child rearing practices are taken over by the grandmother in this family. This serves to reduce Mr. K.'s role even more and furthers his anchoring point outside of the family. This is in apparent response to his own ineffectiveness as a husband and provider in his own family.

The Coping Family Style

The Browns'

Mrs. Brown was quiet and very soft spoken. She was cordial, mild mannered and warm in her own personal way. She responded to the questions quite freely and demonstrated both concern and sensitivity in her responses.

E. What kinds of things do you do with the children now?

Mrs. B. I always try to have time for them, if they come to me when something is bothering them. Sometimes I may be tired and may not really want to be bothered, but I realize it is important to take time out. This way maybe they won't have to go to their friends and get the wrong advice. I may not always have the right advice, but I try to advise them.

E. Is there anyone who you would call the favorite?

Mrs. B. No, I wouldn't say that. I think I love them all in a special way. One is good with this thing, one is so nice with the other. It adds up so that they are all nice in their own special way.

E. How do you usually show the children you are pleased with them?

Mrs. G. I always try to praise them or give them some compliment. Some of them are affectionate and like it especially when I give them a big hug or a kiss. Some of them really appreciate that kind of thing and want you to show them that way.

E. How about when they have done something that upsets you, or something you don't like?

Mrs. G. Well...sometimes I'll just spank, or sometimes I'll scold them. It depends on whether I have told them about it before. If I find that talking doesn't do any good, I just have to resort to spanking them.

E. What kinds of things do you talk to the children about?

Mrs. G. Most everything. Especially the older ones. They come to me and ask me certain things. With the older ones I pull no punches. I tell them exactly what they will have to face and how to conduct themselves.

E. Do the children usually come to you when something is bothering them?

Mrs. G. Yes definitely, and it makes me feel very good. You know because it makes me feel that's what a mother is for.

The Yarrows

Both Mr. and Mrs. Yarrow appear to be on top of things with respect to their family. Mrs. Yarrow is a thin, outspoken and energetic woman. Her husband is a soft spoken, well controlled and organized man who appears to carry an equal share of responsibility where his children are concerned. Throughout the interview, they discussed mutually many of the questions and were able to express openly differences of opinion, which were eventually resolved.

E. How would you describe things in the family now?

Mrs. Y. The relationship between our children and us is good, it's easy. They understand Bobby and I too, the kinds of changes we go through, they just go along with the good and the bad and don't get upset. For example, Mike, he might see us fight and ask me about it. I tell him, "I'm not talking to daddy now because I don't have anything nice to say." Then Mike might say, "Yes, but I just don't think that's very nice," and then he just goes on and minds his business.

E. When something is bothering the children, will they come to you?

Mr. Y. It depends on the type of thing.

Mrs. Y. I had a talk with him last week and told him if he ever had anything on his mind, he could always come to his father and I. I just say things to Mike. I don't expect him always to talk back to me about it. Sometimes

he don't even know why I say it. Like these little cliches, I like to give them food for thought, cause I know they think.

E. When they have done something that upsets you, what will you usually do?

Mrs. Y. I yell, and Bobby is the one who uses diplomacy.

E. When you say diplomacy, what will you usually do?

Mr. Y. If it involves the three of them, then I usually get them together. I say, "let's talk this thing out." I don't like beating, whatever you want to call it.

I don't know, I feel that because of the type of children we have, they think and we can always reason. Things like, "Why did you do this, or what made you do that, or why are you hitting your sister?" Usually we can resolve it that way. Of course sometimes you reach a point where it might be your own hangup and there might be no time for reason and so you just grab a belt and spank them. I always have afterthoughts about it.

E. What about when you are pleased with them, when they have done something you like. Howwill you show them you are pleased?

Mrs. Y. It just comes out naturally, "Oh that's great," it's genuine. If I'm washin the dishes and Troy shows me the same picture five times and I compliment her on it, then I might finally just say uh huh.

I don't ignore anything they do. As a matter of fact, I make it my business to stay in their business. I want them to think I know everything they are doing and I do.

Mr. Y. Usually when I come home and they are still up, I'll ask them what they did in school that day, what happened and so on.

E. What kinds of things do you like for the children to do for themselves, either around the house or little jobs that you have for them?

Mrs. Y. That's a good question, you know why, when you talk about relationships to childhood. You know my own mother never taught me anything, cause it takes time to teach children things like ironing or sewing. She would have to take time to do that and go through my blunders first.

My mother was very impatient. "I do it myself" and snatch and carry on. I was never allowed to touch an iron or sew. I made a point that these children know this whole house. I let them know that this is their house. I don't want them to just know their room, I want them to know what clothes are in this closet, what things are down in that closet, just anything, so anything we can do, they can do.

Mr. Y. I try to keep control of things as well. Sometimes I don't see the children that often, my job and all. I might be out of town two or three weeks.

Mrs. Y. They miss him too, they will ask me after the second day, "When is daddy coming home?" They have gotten use to it. I just want my children to know when I say I am coming back, it means I am coming back and never think I am not coming back.

Examination of the transcripts for "coping" families illustrates some of the outstanding features which differentiate these families in many respects from the other styles.

These families exhibit a greater sensitivity to both the needs and individual differences of their children. The degree of involvement, interest and concern is evident throughout. "Coping" families have parents who as a rule make themselves available to their children. Interaction in the coping family is characterized by a reciprocal interchange where the child's voice is heard and respected. Displays of affection are overt and reflect a concern for the welfare of the child first.

There is a tendency to recognize the child's ability to think and reason and an opportunity to share in the activities of the home. There is a constant attempt to arrive at understanding through an atmosphere that is both flexible and encouraging. In the "coping" families there also appears to be a greater emphasis on learning, both in school and in the home. Distinctions between siblings have an opportunity to emerge and there is evidence for a setting which offers both fairness and consistency of routine.

VII

DISCUSSION

This section will follow closely the major areas that have been the organizational guidelines throughout this study. Material will be presented for the areas of family style assessment and the relationship between family style and function. Explanation of findings as well as theoretical implications will be discussed separately for each area.

Family Style Assessment

On the basis of the present study, it is now possible to answer the major question raised at the outset of the investigation. It is clearly possible to assess family styles using empirical procedures. Since the major assessment techniques (Model Q-sort and Joint Social History) have somewhat different structures, the subsequent portion of this section will be devoted to a separate evaluation of both methods.

Model Q-Sort

The Model Q-sort, as used in family style assessment, is entirely an empirical procedure. Data obtained in this manner are based on correlations obtained between the experimental sorts made by the subject (the mother of the family) and the six Model Q-sorts derived by consensual judges' sorts. Data for the family styles derived from the Q-sort (Table 3) demonstrate that it is possible to assess family styles in this way to a "measurable degree."

In all 30 families, at least one style emerged as significant. In

over 20 of the families, a secondary style was found significant based on the correlation data (Table 3). This indicates that for most families, as measured by the mother's completion of the items, there are less predominant or secondary styles present. However, when significance tests between these styles are made (Table 3), it is possible to identify 21 families where a particular style is predominantly significant from all others.

The highest magnitude of correlation (between experimental and model Q-sorts) scores was obtained for the "coping" family style. In other words, the sorts of mothers from coping families showed higher correlations as a group when compared to the sorts for the other styles. Although the magnitude of correlations between experimental (by subject) and model (by judges) sorts was not as great for "disengaged" and "enmeshed" styles, it is possible on the basis of this assessment procedure to clearly identify cases of predominantly "disengaged" and "enmeshed" family styles (Table 4).

In evaluating the Family Pattern Q-sort for the purpose of assessing the three styles above, there can be little question of the instrument's utility. With respect to the styles of "peripheral male," "juvenile" and "non-evolved," the Family Pattern Q-sort also measures their presence. Examination of Table 3 indicates that there was at least one correlation for these styles with a p. value of .01.

Let us turn to the following question: Do the styles of "juvenile," "peripheral male," and "non-evolved," represent mutually exclusive family styles? When the Model Q-sort is used as the assessment procedure, the answer is no. Examination of Table 3 shows that only in

the case of Family No. 15 ("Non-evolved") were any of the above three styles found distinct from all other styles.

One criticism of the Model Q-sort could be that the high correlations between experimental and model Q-sorts represent to some extent an artifact created by the method itself. Since each experimental sort was correlated with each of six model sorts, the point may be made that some correlation would be expected for each family for at least one of the styles. This question was examined by looking at the direction of the correlations obtained by the Q-sort, with the styles derived for ratings on the Joint Social History. Family styles obtained from both procedures indicate that the predominant style is significant on both measures ($r = .80 > r.\ p.\ .005 = .47$) (Table 10).

Experimental Q-Sort as a Learning Situation

The Q-sort may be viewed as a process of sensitization and the end product of a previous learning situation. The previous learning situation in this study would be the Joint Social History. The administration of the Q-sort followed the Joint Social History as a matter of standard procedure. The questions contained in the Joint Social History could have been the basis for increasing self-awareness and evaluation of her family experiences for the mother. In this respect, some degree of an over-lap effect on the Q-sort may be explained by the previous influence of the Joint Social History.

However, in dealing with this possibility, it is also important to note that the items on the Q-sort are, in many cases, even more specific and of a somewhat different nature than the questions on the Joint Social

History. Therefore, although some portion of the correlation on the Model Q-sort may be accounted for by the Joint Social History, it is unlikely that this would explain the major degree of this relationship.

One can also regard the Q-sort as a separate process of self-awareness and sensitization. The mother is forced to make choices concerning priority of responses and must give some thought to the place on the distribution for particular questions. It is possible to conclude that the Q-sort is a fairly reliable measure of family styles and does reflect some degree of awareness on the part of the subject. It has the advantage of specificity and represents a useful clinical tool.

Q-Sort as a Measure of Defense

Although the majority of findings for both the Q-sort and the Joint Social History are in a similar direction with respect to the predominant style, there were several instances where the results on both techniques contradicted one another. There were two mothers (No. 20 and 28), who based on the Q-sort were found to correlate significantly with the "coping" family style (Table 3). However on the Joint Social History, judges failed to find either family significantly "coping." For Family No. 20, there was evidence for "disengagement," while for Family No. 28, judges were unable to agree on a predominant family style (Table 6). In addition, the children from both of these families were rated low on global maladjustment and found to have high scores in the area of personality and conduct disorders (Table 25).

Since these were the only two cases where families scored high on "coping" and were not rated significantly "coping" on the basis of the

Joint Social History, one can infer that for these families it was important to maintain the appearance of functioning on a higher level than was actually true. It is also possible that these mothers lacked insight into their real difficulties and believed they were doing a good job. However if one inspects the other correlations obtained for the other five styles (see Appendix, p.220), they are so low or negative as to indicate a tendency to place all positive items in the area that was designated as "like the way things are in my family." Mothers in these families organize their behavior on a global, surface level, tending to describe things as "normal, fine and average." Underlying problems are often overlooked, with the appearance of being "coping."

Another interesting finding emerged when comparing the Q-sort and the Joint Social History family styles for Family No. 19. On the Q-sort, the mother in this family sees herself as "disengaged" (Table 3), while on the Joint Social History judges rate her as "enmeshed" (Table 6). It is possible that this discrepancy may reflect something about the polarity between the two styles as well as the differences between self-perception and action. The mother in this family does not see herself as "strict or strong" as she would like to be. As Minuchin (1967) points out, part of the "enmeshed" pattern is the constant but ineffectual struggle to establish control. In the case of Family No. 19, the mother fails to see herself as controlling and restricting, as she actually is. This may also represent a defensive process whereby "disengagement" is used as a defense against the more negative and aggressive feelings connected with "enmeshment." To a certain extent, it is possible to say

that one of the dimensions that can be measured on the Q-sort is not only the predominant style, but the major defensive operation. It is for this reason that use of the Model Q-sort by itself would no doubt present certain limitations on the information obtained.

The Joint Social History

Family styles derived from the Joint Social History represent the extent to which judges are able to agree on a given family (Family Style Rating Scale) following the actual reading of the interview. In this procedure, the family styles are based on judges' ratings rather than on correlations derived from the mothers' self descriptions. Although the assessment procedure is outside of a formal therapeutic medium, it is possible to regard most interviews as related to the therapeutic process. As a point of reference, Sullivan (1954) defines the psychiatric interview as follows: "A situation of primarily vocal communication in a two group, more or less voluntarily integrated, on a progressively unfolding client expert basis, for the purpose of elucidating the characteristic patterns of living of the subject, and which patterns he experiences as particularly troublesome or especially valuable" (p. 4).

Most interview procedures incorporate the major features of this definition. In this respect, it is possible to establish some connection between interview and therapy techniques. The Joint Social History, as employed in the present study, can be viewed as part of the therapeutic medium. The data obtained from the Joint Social History have contributed to the reality of experience, making for greater dynamics and clarity of actual family situations. This is quite evident in interviews contained

in the chapter on clinical perspectives. Taking a closer look at family style assessment based on this procedure, several questions raised by the present investigation can now be answered.

As determined by judges' ratings, family styles are not all equally distinctive and easily agreed upon. Comparing the agreement of judges' ratings, the highest over-all agreement is for the "coping" family style (Table 7). However judges were also able to agree equally as well for the "disengaged" family style (Table 7). These ratings are followed by general over-all agreement for the "enmeshed" family profile. It appears that these three styles can be readily identified and agreed upon on the basis of the Joint Social History.

Although there were three cases where other styles were found to be significantly predominant (2 "peripheral male," 1 "juvenile") (Table 7), there were no instances of the "non-evolved" family style emerging as predominant for a given family. This finding may be due to sampling factors in the present study. One way of exploring this issue would be to increase the sample size. However, when the data for both procedures are combined (Table 8), there are no cases where any of these three styles occur in a predominant setting. This brings up the question now of the extent of mutual exclusiveness and family styles.

Distinct and Mixed Family Styles

The styles of "juvenile," "peripheral male" and "non-evolved" are scarce in the present sample. For the "non-evolved" family, this is based on Q-sort findings for Family No. 15 (Table 3), and for the "peripheral" and "juvenile" styles, on Joint Social History findings for

Families No. 13, 26 and 16 respectively. However when data for both assessment procedures are combined, it would seem that these styles do not exist separately from other styles (Table 8). Even in examining the mean ratings for the other styles (Table 5), in most of the cases "disengaged," "enmeshed" and "coping" families were judged as having some elements of the other styles.

It is logical to ask now whether there really exists a pure, distinct family style. The data here suggest a negative answer. But in the case of most families, one style appears to be more predominant than the others. In other words, if a style is found to be significant based on the Q-sort or Joint Social History, it does not represent the only style that can be present in that family. To take such a view would be both reductionistic and an oversimplification of the concept of family styles. To illustrate how other styles may be present but play a less important role in the family process, let us turn to the "coping" families. Table 5 shows that even for these families, judges found evidence of the "enmeshed," "juvenile" and "peripheral male" styles. However, these families are significantly more "coping" than anything else (Table 6).

Since it appears that the styles of "peripheral male," "juvenile" and "non-evolved" do not occur frequently as predominant styles, one may conclude that for the present sample, the styles of "coping," "disengaged" and "enmeshed" represent the three most predominant family styles. These styles, therefore, account for the major variations in family patterns as they occur in different compositions with the other styles as

well. If these three styles are in fact predominant, then it becomes important to determine how stable the styles actually are. In other words, would a family typed predominantly "coping" one day, be typed predominantly "disengaged" the next?

To determine how stable a particular style is, an attempt was made to examine the Joint Social History, paying close attention to questions dealing with the family backgrounds of the parents themselves. It was reasoned that information could be obtained here regarding the possible etiology and stability of the different styles. If there was a tendency for "self-perpetuation" of style, the logical place to look for such clues was the family histories of the present sample population. For this reason, excerpts from the parents' own descriptions of their families have been included for families typed "disengaged" and "enmeshed."

Etiology and Stability of Family Styles

The "Disengaged" Style.

Parents typed "disengaged" more often came from families that exhibited a high degree of disconnectedness themselves. The following brief excerpts are from several interviews to illustrate this point.

E. How far did you go in school?

Mrs. L. I really didn't go but to the 10th grade, I think they passed me on good behavior. I couldn't do no good work. I could hardly concentrate with my mother, her being the way she was. She hardly ever talked to me.

E. How do you feel that she is different from the way you are now?

Mrs. L. My mother, I don't know, it seems she couldn't get along with anybody and sometimes, I feel I can't get along with anybody.

. . . . . .

E. It sounds like it was very hard for you to talk to your mother.

Mrs. R. Even now, I find it very hard. I talk to her very little.

E. Did your mother show much of an interest in what you did?

Mrs. R. In school, I remember I got good marks, but she never said it was good.

E. Did you do many things together with her?

Mrs. R. No, nothin much.

E. What kinds of things did your mother do that you liked?

Mrs. R. Long pause (begins to cry) no answer.

E. What about your father?

Mrs. R. There was nothin there you know.

These two examples illustrate the detachment and isolation that is part of these mothers' earliest memories concerning their own families.

In addition to the similar quality of the family interaction process, there also appears to have been a greater frequency of either early separation or death in the families of disengaged mothers. Once again interview data serves to document this point:

E. How would you describe yourself as a child?

Mrs. F. I....I was happy then, things were different then.

E. What was your family like?

Mrs. F. I come from a large family, lots of brothers and sisters, don't remember exactly how many, but there were lots. My father died when I was seven.

E. Do you remember much about your father?

Mrs. F. I remember that he worked hard, he never did nothin that upset me, he was nice.

E. How about your mother?

Mrs. F. He was strict, she didn't pay us much mind, but we got things done.

E. Do you remember her talking to you about things?

Mrs. F. She didn't talk to us much, she was under a lot of pressure and she was very nervous. She worked as a nurse and she wasn't home all that much after my father died, so we was by ourselves most of the time.

E. Do you remember much about how things were before your father died?

Mrs. F. It was a happy house, I had a mother and a father, what else can I say....

For Mrs. F., a critical period in her life was the time following the death of her father and the loss of her mother as a stable figure in the home.

For Mrs. R., separation from a significant love object appears to

have played an important part in her later development.

E. What are some of the things you remember most about your own family?

Mrs. R. You mean my mother and father?....Well, I don't really remember my father. My grandmother raised me until I was thirteen, then she got sick and I had to come and live with my mother.

E. How would you describe your mother, what was she like?

Mrs. R. I used to call her mother, but I felt my grandmother was my real mother. I didn't want to come and stay with my mother, but I had no choice. My grandmother was sick and couldn't take care of us. It was terrible after that.

In both cases, these parents had to make premature adjustments to their life situations. Both suffered some degree of loss and separation. It now becomes possible to make some inferences regarding the development of disengagement and its meaning in terms of the families involved.

Disengagement - Detachment - Early Separation and Helplessness. On the basis of the backgrounds of parents from "disengaged" families, experiences of critical importance center around the lack of relatedness in their own families and frequent instances of either premature death or significant changes in the immediate family constellation. The major effects of these early experiences has been to create for these mothers strong feelings of helplessness and a sense of loss.

One overt component of the "disengaged" family prototype is the degree of depression which appears to be very much a part of the family

process. It is quite possible that to a certain extent disengagement represents a belated and unresolved depression. This can be seen as associated with the early death of a significant love object or a premature separation with the absence of any subsequent opportunity to successfully resolve the feelings related to these events.

Detachment - A Defense Against Helplessness. The quality of "disconnectedness" in the "disengaged" profile may be explained as a partial defensive operation aimed at reducing anxiety about helplessness. There are several theoretical propositions which may help to shed light on this idea.

Resignation: According to Karen Horney (1937), "alienation from the self" can be a self protective device as a measure to relieve tensions. Apathy can represent an attempt to "feel less bothered" by one's conflicts and maintain a semblance of inner peace. Since this is accomplished by "resigning" from active living, hence the labeling of this name for the solution.

Depersonalization: Another concept that has been employed in a similar context is that of "depersonalization" (Laing, 1960). The term is used by Laing to refer to a technique universally used as a means of dealing with "the other" when he becomes too tiresome or disturbing. One no longer allows oneself to be responsible or responsive to his feelings and treats him as though he had no feelings. The people here tend to feel themselves as more or less depersonalized and tend to depersonalize others.

In light of the helpless condition in which the mother of the

"disengaged" family finds herself, it is clear that part of the detachment is more of a response to the helplessness than a cause of it. The etiology of disengagement can be seen here as having its roots in the early situations that promote and foster helplessness. Turning to the etiology of the "enmeshed" profile, one finds somewhat different contributing factors. Once again, examination of interview material serves to clarify the nature of this pattern.

Enmeshment - Autonomy and Control

For parents who were typed predominantly enmeshed, one finds in their own family structure a framework which is similar to the present patterns in their own families. Examination of some brief excerpts illustrates the degree of excessive controls and restrictions that existed in the families of these parents.

E. What do you remember most about your own childhood?

Mrs. G. I really don't remember that much about it. I know I couldn't do nothin I wanted to, that much I do remember.

E. Do you come from a large family?

Mrs. G. There were three of us, my brother died and my sister ran away from home when she was twelve. I never saw her after that.

E. What was it like for you in your family?

Mrs. G. Terrible.

E. What do you remember about your mother?

Mrs. G. My mother was a real...never mind....She wouldn't let me do a thing, she would beat me if I looked at her the wrong way.

E. Did she talk to you about anything?

Mrs. G. Yeah, to tell me what I had done wrong and what I was goin to get my next beatin for.

E. Did she allow you to have friends and go out?

Mrs. G. I could hardly ever get myself out of the house, so you know I didn't have no friends or nothin like that.

It is evident from the above portion of the interview that for Mrs. G., her early childhood was characterized by little opportunity for independent behavior. The major emphasis in her own family appears to have been based on restricting and limiting behavior.

Other parents typed "enmeshed" (No. 2, 4, 24) also recalled their own family system as being characterized by rigid controls, little explanation for these controls and unrealistic expectations regarding obedience and compliance. The issue of autonomy and initiative has never been fully resolved in the case of many "enmeshed" parents. They illustrate very clearly the self perpetuation of similar patterns in their own families. One possible reason for this may be found in the following statement by Erickson:

> When a child is denied the gradual and well guided experience of the autonomy of free choice, the child will turn against himself all his urge to discriminate and manipulate. He will over-manipulate himself. Instead of taking possession of things in order to test them by purposeful repetition, he will become obsessed by his own repetitiveness. He thus learns to repossess the environment and to gain <u>power</u> by stubborn and minute control, where he could not find large scale mutual regulation (Erickson, 1950, p. 252).

In essence, the absence of reciporcal controls sets the stage for the drive to gain power as the central theme in the "enmeshed" parent.

The "repossession" of the environment takes place at the child's expense. These strivings for power serve not only as a protection against the anxiety of loss of control, but also serve as channels for discharging repressed hostility, stemming from similar restrictions in the parents' own family. The open hostility in many "enmeshed" families is primarily the result of this constant striving for controls.

Dependency - A Central Variable. Due to the fact that when data for the Q-sort and Joint Social History are combined there occur no cases of predominant "non-evolved," "peripheral male" or "juvenile" family styles, it is not possible to make any inferences regarding the etiology of these styles. If one takes into consideration the variations in information that different subjects were willing to give regarding their own backgrounds, the data available for speculation become quite small. However, in examining some of the responses for families with features of any one of these styles, there does appear to be a central factor that connects these styles with each other.

For these parents, their early family relationships appear to be characterized by a general lack of sensitivity on their own parents' part to the individual needs of their own children, our subjects. As a result of the failure to establish a firm sense of self worth and identity, complicated and ambivalent dependency relationships are formed on the one hand, or rejection of closeness and ties with others is an alternative solution.

One sees in the case of the "juvenile" male, his dependency on the wife in the family system, but his subsequent rejection and resentment

of this dependency at the same time. In all three of these styles, the parents lack confidence, have difficulty in asserting themselves, and show some tie with other figures either within or close to the immediate family. In the case of the "peripheral male," it is usually the wife, while in the case of the "juvenile" female, it may be her own mother, with the resulting family patterns taking on the characteristics of both the "juvenile" and "non-evolved" style as in the case of Family No. 16.

Several similar connections can be made between dependency and the "disengaged" and "enmeshed" family styles. However in these families, it appears that the dependency needs are less overt, since they are in the processes of being defended against. For the "disengaged" mother, this takes the form of progressive detachment, while for the "enmeshed" parent, one can observe a process of superficial independence as manifested by being on top of the situation. However the "enmeshed" mother must constantly guard against any loss of control; she cannot allow herself to seem weak.

In exploring this process in the above styles, it would appear that dependency needs may be even greater here than in the cases of the other styles. Taking into account the fact that there has usually been little opportunity for any of these parents to establish meaningful relationships in their early development, it is not difficult to understand their tremendous suspicion and mistrust of outside agencies. In the final analysis, resolution of conflicts centering around dependency represent a central factor in understanding the etiology of multi-problem family systems.

Still another approach to understanding family styles through a different approach has been the Family Attribute Differential Scale. Analysis of different factor scores and their relationship to family styles has provided information regarding both the characteristic expressive mode for each style, as well as defining the various underlying attributes which make up the different styles. A discussion of the findings regarding this procedure now follows.

The Family Attribute Differential Scale and Family Styles

The first conclusion that can be drawn from the Family Attribute Differential Scale is that it does represent a useful assessment technique for the styles of "coping," "disengaged" and "enmeshed." This is based on the fact that different factor scores correspond to the previously obtained styles as measured by the Q-sort and Joint Social History techniques (Table 13). Turning to these findings, let us examine the three styles most readily differentiated by this method.

The Disengaged Family - Autocentric Mode. On Factor 1 of the Family Attribute Differential Scale, judges apparently were able to make a fairly clear distinction between "disengaged" and "coping" family styles. Factor scores for a number of families (Table 13) show that items on the low end of the scale were given the greatest weight in contributing to the resulting negative factor scores. In other words, for the same attributes that were rated with a score of six or seven for "coping" families, judges rated other families one or two. These families, as measured by the other assessment procedures, had all been typed "disengaged."

Based on the factor scores alone, it would also be possible to determine these styles as "disengaged." Attributes on the scale that were rated very low for these families include: "excludes self from family, isolated, apathetic, unrelated, passive and disorganized." Collectively these attributes define a characteristic expressive mode of behavior that involves movement away from people. This aspect of the factor scores describes the major feature of this type of family and could be defined as an autocentric mode.

To clarify what is meant by autocentric mode, let us examine the concept of "objectification" as developed by Schachtel (1957). By objectification, Schachtel refers to the phenomenon of man's encounter with "more or less definite objects as a certain type of relatedness emerges between him and his environment." In the "disengaged" or autocentric mode, there is little or no objectification. Responses are made primarily in terms of internal responses that are felt to be impinging on the self. Examination of some of the responses for "disengaged" parents, as described in the previous chapter on clinical perspective, would support this point.

According to Schachtel, the quality of physical sensations which characterizes perception in the autocentric sense is accentuated in felt organ locations. "The taste on the tongue, the pain in the bruised knee," are actually felt as affecting the person through these parts of the body. The word sensation, states Schachtel, expresses this quality better than perception. It therefore becomes possible to speculate that physical conditions, stresses, or anything which creates anxiety, will

be reacted to on an almost purely sensory level by many parents who function within this mode. This is clearly the case of Family No. 14, where the mother constantly makes reference to being nervous. There may indeed be a lower threshold for discomfort, that may have a primary physical base in some cases of disengagement.

In the final analysis, moving away from people, with little evidence of direct experience of the "other," is the major characteristic for the "disengaged" family profile. It is for this reason that the attributes, as rated by different judges in defining this style, become part of the conceptual framework of Schachtel's autocentric mode of response. Therefore when one speaks of the "disengaged" style, reference is made to the autocentric mode and the major features or attributes which this concept incorporates.

The Coping Family - Allocentric Mode. Examination of Table 13 indicates that for "coping" families, there was a clear trend to receive high weighted scores for the items on the positive end of the differential scale. For the "coping" families, the items which contribute heaviest to the total score on Factor 1 include such attributes as: establishes contact; related to the family; responsible; active; organized; interested; and faces problems.

The attributes that form the "coping" style represent an organization of internal family activity around personal involvement. This can be conceptualized as a movement towards people as the most salient feature of the "coping" style. Another type of perceptual relatedness as described by Schachtel (1957) is the allocentric mode. The main

difference between the allocentric and autocentric modes of perception according to Schachtel are the following: In the autocentric mode there is little or no objectification, the emphasis is on how and what the person feels. There is a close relationship amounting to fusion between sensory quality and pleasant or unpleasant feelings, with the perceiver reacting primarily to whatever may be impinging on him. In the allocentric mode, there is objectification, the emphasis is on what the object is like, the perceiver usually approaches or turns to the object actively and in doing so, either opens himself towards it receptively and figuratively or literally takes hold of it and tries to grasp it. It is this openness towards the world and the activity or attempt to grasp and involve oneself with the immediate which is most characteristic of the items which judges tend to equate with coping. It is for this reason that allocentricity can be used as relatively synonymous with the most characteristic mode of response in the "coping" style.

The Enmeshed Family - Control - Autonomy. Factor scores for a number of families on Factor 2 indicate a particular constellation of attributes that judges felt were common to this group. Although Factor 2 represents a small number of items (Table 12), inspection of these items reflects a very clear concentration in terms of their dynamic content. Judges were able to make a clear distinction between these families and other families on the basis of these items. Based on these scores, it would have therefore been possible to type families with high negative scores on Factor 2 as "enmeshed." In other words, attributes that were judged to be characteristic of the "enmeshed" family style

include the following items: domineering, rigid, strict, authoritative, cannot tolerate disagreement, and authoritative. The major orientation in this family represents a tendency to move against people through attempts to gain power by control.

Variations of the Coping Style

Closer inspection of the factor scores for the "coping" style reveals an interesting finding (Table 13). If the positive end of the scale represents in a sense the good qualities, then one would expect that "coping" families would score high on the positive side for both Factors 1 and 2. However this was not always the case. All coping families score high (Table 13) on Factor 1, which has been defined as moving actively towards the environment in a receptive, open manner. However not all families typed "coping" received high factor scores on Factor 2, which would represent such attributes as flexibility, independence and variables of this nature.

It would seem that for some families, the method of coping is to be actively involved in a somewhat restricting manner. These are parents like Family No. 2 and 29 (Table 13), who maintain an interest but who also are quite strict. If one takes into account that for Family No. 29, the mother is managing with eight children and without a husband, it becomes understandable that there is a need to maintain control, perhaps to a greater extent than in some of the other "coping" families. Also, if the social situation of the neighborhoods in which some of these families live is considered, it is logical to assume that one cannot allow complete autonomy even if it were possible. In

conclusion, one style of "coping" appears to incorporate features of "enmeshment." The difference here lies in the fact that the parent is available and open to the children so that they learn to tolerate reasonable controls.

The Family Attribute Differential Scale and Other Styles

Based on the results of the present study, no clear-cut trend emerges for the factor scores regarding the styles of "juvenile," "peripheral male" and "non-evolved." This may be due to a sampling factor in that these styles were not tapped by the sampling employed in this investigation. It is also possible that the items on the Family Attribute Differential Scale did not separate these styles. Also, when all three assessment procedures are compared, ambiguity regarding the presence of these styles as distinct profiles still raises many questions. It would appear that the styles of "coping," "disengaged" and "enmeshed" emerge as clearly distinguishable when any one of these procedures is employed as an assessment technique.

In evaluating the relative merits of the three instruments designed by the writer for this study, the following points can be made:

1. To return to the definition of "style" as described in the introduction to the study, all three methods can be used to assess the characteristic expressive modes of behavior for the styles of "coping," "disengaged" and "enmeshed."
2. Since it was suggested that these styles are composed of underlying qualities, each assessment procedure has made some contribution towards clarifying the nature of variations from one family to another.

a) For the Family Attribute Differential Scale, these underlying qualities which differentiate the family styles are based on attributes which have been shown to vary from one family style to another.

b) For the Joint Social History, although the styles were empirically derived through ratings, the chapter on Clinical Perspectives provides a rich description of the dynamics that are central for each of the styles discussed.

c) For the Family Pattern Q-sort, although results for family styles have been derived through correlation procedures, variations in the constituent variables of communicational processes, executive behavior and affective responses provide a richer understanding of what some of the more important underlying qualities of the different styles are, as measured by this procedure.

The last point still needs further clarification. The next few pages will be devoted to a description of the findings for variations in the variables mentioned above and their relation to family styles.

Family Interaction Patterns and Family Styles

Based on the analysis of the Q-sort variables of executive behavior, communicational processes and affective responses (Table 14), the variable of communication was found to be significant more often than the

other variables composing the Q-sort (Table 14). This finding may be partially due to the construction of the items themselves, as separation between the three areas may not be as clean as intended. However, it is more logical to assume that this finding was to be expected, as it can easily be pointed out that it is primarily through the use of communication that the other two variables can be successfully implemented. It is difficult to imagine, for example, how variables connected with executive behavior like discipline, guidance, leadership and rules can be carried out without adequate verbal channels. Similarly, affective responses often take place through vocal expression. In spite of this finding, the composition of the items does reflect both negative and positive responses for each variable. It is for this reason that a closer look at some of the significant findings may clarify the nature of the interaction process for the different family styles in question. It is for this reason that the results will be discussed below in conjunction with the "coping," "disengaged" and "enmeshed" family styles.

Coping Family Interaction Patterns. As indicated in Table 14, for the "coping" families there were no significant findings. For this profile, none of the variables was found to be more significant than the others. The interpretation of this finding would indicate that for these families, the interpersonal process is characterized by a fairly well balanced and integrated system. In this setting, there are open expressions of feelings (affective responses), there is adequate supervision, guidelines for behavior, support and leadership (executive behavior), and there are reciprocal channels for interchange

(communicational processes). Therefore one can understand the absence of significant findings more clearly in the case of "coping" families.

Disengaged Family Interaction Patterns. In the case of the "disengaged" families, no significant trend emerges. However, it is possible to speculate about this finding as in the case of the "coping" families, but in a reverse direction. In other words, for the "disengaged" mother, there is a generally equal "depression" of all the areas of interpersonal behavior. This can be validated by examination of some of the highly critical items chosen by many of the "disengaged" mothers as being most like their families. Items like, "I feel helpless, we hardly talk to each other, and every one comes and goes as he pleases," were often chosen as being significant for the "disengaged" mother. Since there is a general deficit in terms of positive items, the distribution that is given is essentially equal for all the variables but represents more of the negative responses associated with each of the areas in question, namely executive behavior, communicational processes and affective responses.

Enmeshed Family Interaction Patterns. For the "enmeshed" family style, there is evidence for two kinds of enmeshment (Table 14). In one instance, communication was found to be significant for Family No. 2. For this family, as described in the chapter on clinical perspective, there is a constant, but ineffectual attempt to control the behavior of the child. This usually takes the form of yelling and screaming, with most commands being very short and generally negative. This is documented by Q-sort items like, "My kids don't do what I tell them," or

"I always seem to be yelling at the children." Therefore the significant finding with respect to the variable of communicational processes does not reflect a high level of meaningful interchange, but the items that have statements related to general noise level -- screaming and other types of faulty communication.

A somewhat different finding occurred in the case of family No. 12. Here the variable of executive behavior was found to be significant (Table 14), with very low scores for affective response and communicational processes. Once again the items here reflect the complete and constant controlling operations on the part of the mother. The child in this situation is provided with little guidance, support, or leadership qualities from the mother.

Both findings with regard to the "enmeshed" style are possible. They can be viewed as representing different degrees of enmeshment varying along the dimensions of control and rigidity as defined by Factor 2 of the Family Attribute Differential Scale. This raises an interesting question regarding differences within a given family style.

Family Styles as a Continuum

If the preceeding interaction findings for the "enmeshed" style can be reconciled, they would represent a range along the dimension of enmeshment. It is difficult to determine whether judges in their ratings of the different styles were responding more to differences between styles, as opposed to differences within the style itself. When reading interview material for a "disengaged" family and then for an "enmeshed" family, the differences between these two styles are fairly

clear. However, the question is whether a high rating for either style means that this represents the degree of the particular style, or that this style is highly "disengaged" or "enmeshed" by comparison with the other styles for that family. In other words, would the mothers from Families No. 2 and 12 be considered as equally "enmeshed"? It seems possible to imagine a continuum within each style, which may range in terms of degree. Within-style variation represents an area for further exploration in the area of family style assessment

Returning to the original statement regarding the merit of all three assessment procedures, it can be stated now that all three measures provide fairly reliable indices of the three major family styles, as well as contributing some clarity as to the nature of the underlying dimensions that form the styles. One way to conceptualize this would be to refer to the style as the expressive element and the underlying variables as the dynamic element.

Family Style Profiles

A final note should be made regarding the emergence of other family styles in the present study. It would appear that the six styles used in this investigation represent, for the most part, a fairly inclusive measure of the different possible patterns that one is likely to encounter in the assessment of most family styles. In all cases, judges were able to make some ratings based on a combination of the styles as listed in the Family Style Rating Scale. There were no instances where the category of "other style" was used. This seems to indicate that these styles do in fact represent fairly good categories and most styles

can be identified through some combination of these six profiles.

Family Style and Function

Global Maladjustment

Coping and Global Maladjustment. Based on the means in Table 16, children from "coping" families scored very low on maladjustment on the Ullman Scale. This finding was independent of differences based on sex and clearly demonstrates that children from these families are rated consistently by their teachers as being well adjusted to the school setting. Children scoring high on the Ullman scale were rated as being actively involved in the functions of the school, self confident, dependable, assertive and popular with the other children. Considering the major orientation of the "coping" parents as basically "allocentric," one can see the beginning development of the children from these families in a similar way. There is an openness to the environment which is complimented by the confidence to be an active part in one's surroundings.

Disengagement, Enmeshment and Global Maladjustment. Examination of Table 16 indicates that there are no essential differences between children from "disengaged" as opposed to "enmeshed" families when ratings on global maladjustment are compared. When analyzing the data based on a frequency count for low (15 - 18) and very low (9 - 14) scores, no significant findings for maladjustment emerge when scores for children from "disengaged" families are compared to those of children from "enmeshed" families. At the outset, the issue of significance may not be an important one, as children from both family types scored comparatively low on this scale. However since these ratings were made

independently from the assessment of the styles themselves, it is safe to conclude that on measures of global maladjustment, children from both family styles manifest rather severe adjustment problems.

Ego Development and Family Styles

It is possible to view the styles of "disengaged and enmeshed" as representing somewhat different roles in terms of ego development. In the case of the "disengaged family profile," there is almost always a general lack of structure in the family constellation. The "isolated vacuous quality" of these families provides little opportunity for appropriate feedback from external sources for the growing child.

If the ego, as Freud (1923) states, comes into existence because the needs of the organism require appropriate transactions with the objective world of reality, then in situations where such transactions are virtually non-existent, one can postulate several consequences. Keeping in mind that it is possible to conceptualize variations of degree within a style, in extreme cases of disengagement, a typical reaction on the part of the child would probably take the form of an autistic mode of response.

Kanner and Eisenberg (1957) have described families in which there exists a "cold, mechanical and preoccupied attitude" on the part of the parents. The child in this family, according to Kanner (1943), does not experience his own effort as having any effect on the human environment, "it draws no more interest than furniture, over which he has no influence." This would suggest that one of the major factors contributing to

schizophrenia is a bad start in eliciting response from the human environment.

Many of the children whose families were assessed as "disengaged" were checked high on the Ullman for such items as: "lacks confidence in himself, shows emotions in a restrained way, needs much prodding and is tense or ill at ease when talking." These items would seem to reflect the early consequences of an essentially "non responsive" environment. It is for this reason that the prediction was made at the beginning of the study that children from these families would tend to show the greatest over-all maladjustment. Based on the results of the frequency analysis (Table 17), this prediction has not been borne out.

In the case of the child from the "enmeshed" family style, there is clearly a greater degree of response on the part of the mother. However, this transaction is largely a negative one and, as Minuchin has pointed out, offers little opportunity for learning any controls and behavior apart from the immediate situation. In the extreme case of rigid control, as in Family No. 12, one can reasonably conclude that as a consequence of the lack of approval and immediacy of the controls, that super-ego formation and subsequent moral anxiety are rare. The solution to extreme enmeshment might represent a turning inward of the feelings connected with being controlled by the parent, in this case no doubt a great deal of repressed anger and hostility. If this is allowed no avenue for expression, a catatonic response could represent a last resort for the child. In the final analysis, extreme cases of either style could be the basis for a psychotic reaction in the child.

The results may be unclear because of the items on the scale itself. An inspection of the scale reveals that many of the items tap areas that reflect cognitive functioning. It is quite possible that in the rating of global maladjustment, a large portion of the low score can be accounted for by cognitive rather than behavioral items. Although there is no doubt a relationship between cognitive functioning and family styles, this cannot be conclusively determined from the present study, nor can the effects of this variable on the scale scores.

In order to study more specifically the relationship of family styles to particular behavior problems, the Peterson Behavior Rating Scale (see Appendix, p. 204) was used. Although no statistical significance was found for styles other than coping, (Tables 19 and 20), a closer look at the data helps to explain this negative finding, as well as giving insight into the particular disorders themselves.

Conduct Disorders and Family Styles

> Disease is not just suffering, but a fight to maintain the homeostatic balance of our tissue despite damage (Selye, 1956).

The orientation of this section can best be expressed in the above quote by Selye. At the beginning of the present investigation, two predictions were made concerning conduct disorders and family styles. It is now possible to examine both of these hypotheses separately while discussing the findings for each style.

Conduct Disorders and Disengagement. It was originally stated that if conduct disorders were present in children from "disengaged" families, they would be manifested by some attempt to establish control in the

environment. An example of this nature occurred for Family No. 17. This family was significantly typed "disengaged" (Table 10) but the child in this family scored high on Factor 1 of the Peterson Scale (see Appendix, p. 210). Examination of the items that account for a high score in the area of conduct disorders is found to include such items as: "attention seeking, show-off behavior, tendency to annoy others, difficulty in disciplinary control, restlessness and the inability to sit still."

These items, while contributing to a high score on Factor 1, do not reflect a destructive, acting against others orientation. In this instance they represent an attempt to make some meaningful contact with the environment while establishing boundaries and limits for acceptable behavior. This behavior can be regarded as a solution to the conflicts in the family. However in a school setting, this child is regarded as a nuisance and a pest by his teachers and others in the classroom. Although part of his problem does stem from his apparent difficulty with rules and regulations, it is more a representation of the struggle to keep the lines of communication open.

Mitchell, a child from a family typed"disengaged"(Family No. 10), is described by his teacher as follows:

> "Mitchell is constantly coming over to me or calling out. He wants my attention all the time. He doesn't know what is expected of him and has no confidence in himself. He tries hard and is capable of doing good work but needs constant praising. He comes to school

poorly dressed and is never clean. His mother has never been to school to see me in spite of constant reminders."

Although both of these children scored fairly high on conduct disorders, their behavior is characterized by similar problems. However, as conceptualized here, these difficulties represent a first step aimed at some mastery and resolution of the conflicts related to the "disengaged" process.

Conduct Disorders and Enmeshment. It was predicted at the outset that when conduct disorders are present in children from "enmeshed" families, they will be manifested by attempts to remove controls and restrictions. Based on the present investigation, this hypothesis is clearly borne out. One solution to the enmeshed style appears to be the type of conduct disorder that is characterized by open rebellion.

The objective in this case is to establish some freedom in the immediate environment outside of the family. Also, one sees here the freer expression of the hostility and defiance that is repressed often within the family constellation. Children high on Factor 1 of the Peterson, who came from families typed enmeshed, were often found to be rated high on such variables as: negativism -- does the opposite of what is requested, fighting, destructive to others' property, easily aroused to anger, hot tempered and similar items.

A male child from a family typed "enmeshed" (No. 4) is described by his teacher in the following way:

"Warren is very resentful of others telling him what

> to do. He will not accept correction, and has a difficult time abiding by the rules. He is easily aroused, and becomes violently angry when he is reprimanded by me. Several times he has had violent tantrums in the classroom when I tried to correct him. At times he will just not listen. He responds well to praise and likes to be given responsibilities in the class, which he handles very well. He is a bright but very angry child."

Conduct disorders of this type represent both a solution and vehicle for discharging much repressed anger and hostility. It therefore becomes clear that for this child some freedom and autonomy are at the core of his behavioral difficulties. Faced with an environment that allows little flexibility and where the child's words are given little value, another solution to the enmeshed profile emerges within the conduct disorder area. One method of attaining freedom and autonomy in a world where the child has little control is to learn other more subtle ways of manipulating one's environment. In many families typed "enmeshed," girls who scored high on Factor 1 were found to engage in a great deal of lying and stealing. What has developed here is essentially the beginning of a psychopathic orientation. Whether this difference can be predictable based on sex is difficult to determine. One can speculate that open rebellion would be more characteristic for males and the latter orientation for females. Further investigation of this style and conduct disorders would serve to clarify this point.

In conclusion, both styles have been found to show a relationship to conduct disorders. This would of course account for the lack of significant differences when comparing scores for both styles. However, high scores on Factor 1 do reflect different behavior orientations which can be better understood as a function of the dynamics associated with the styles themselves.

Personality Disorders and Disengagement

Another type of response to the disengaged profile appears to be less adaptive in terms of prognosis and is manifested by a tendency to withdraw and remove oneself from external interactions. Children scoring high on Factor 2 (Personality Disorders) from families typed "disengaged," were rated high on such items as: "preoccupation, lack of interest in the environment, depression, chronic sadness, passivity and suggestibility." In this instance, the child appears to have identified with the major elements of the family constellation. Also, as described in the section on global maladjustment, there is a tendency to stop sending messages if one has never really received any from the immediate environment. There is no attempt at achieving a solution, but rather a giving up and surrendering of oneself and the hope of ever being an object that is capable and worthwhile to other people.

Personality Disorders and Enmeshment

One response to the "enmeshed" style appears to be very similar to that observed in the disengaged profile. Children from "enmeshed" families who scored high Factor 2 showed the same difficulties as did the children from "disengaged" families. There were marked signs of

depression, social aloofness and isolation. The following is a description of a child from a family typed"enmeshed"who scored high on Factor 2:

> "Susan is a sad little girl, she cries at least once a day about very small and minor incidents that occur in the classroom. She speaks very little and it is hard to relate to her. She likes praise and on a one-to-one basis shows more responsiveness. Sometimes I think she will never make it through the day."

In this situation, the response does not appear to be so much to the depressive elements in the family, but rather to the overwhelming controls imposed on the child. It is possible to view this child as a "broken" child, in the sense that the will to initiative and autonomy have been destroyed by the limitations that exist within the family situation.

In examining the findings, there is evidence of personality disorders for both styles. However these are not children who are seen as anxious or obsessive, but as sad, depressed and detached. It is for this reason that although these disorders can be seen as a solution to the family conflicts as well, they are signs of giving up rather than struggling with the problems. Unfortunately, these children are generally less bothersome than those with conduct disorders and, on the basis of this study, clearly more disturbed. The end result is often a continued lack of responsiveness on the part of the environment.

Although it was not intended or reasonably possible in the present

study to examine the other areas of functioning as they relate to family styles, one approach to enriching this area was to examine the frequency with which particular disorders occurred in the classroom to determine if there was some relationship between these "adaptational" problems and particular family styles. The last section of the behavioral analysis is devoted to this question.

Adaptational Difficulties and Family Styles

Using Kellam's Adaptational Areas (social contacts, authority acceptance, cognitive achievement, maturation and concentration), no significant differences were found to exist with respect to frequency of occurrence and particular family styles (Table 21). Examination of Table 22 does indicate that with perhaps a larger sample, more specific findings would emerge. Given more subjects, one might speculate that the area of social contacts would be significant for children from "disengaged" families, while the area of authority acceptance would be central in the "enmeshed" style. However, since it has been shown that children from "enmeshed" families can have problems in the area of social relationship, while children from "disengaged" families have children with problems in authority acceptance, the lack of significance is not surprising. It would appear that of the three scales, the checklist offered the least utility in terms of making finer discriminations among the styles.

Mixed Family Styles and Function

Before closing the discussion of the relationship between behavior and family styles, a note should be made regarding the concept of mixed

styles. The question can be raised here regarding the whole issue of complexity and family dynamics. On one side is the argument that the more complex the family system is, the greater the possibilities for change. If this were the case, then one could expect less difficulties in families with mixed styles. The other side of the argument is that with mixed styles of this type, the greater the number of constituent styles, the greater the internal confusion and resulting pathology in the child.

It is difficult to determine, on the basis of the present study, which of these points is more correct. All analysis of mixed family styles failed to yield any significant findings, either within the group of mixed styles or when comparing scores on mixed styles with those of more distinct styles (Table 18). One reason for this may be that since it is possible to conceptualize most families in terms of a predominant style, the concept of mixed style assumes less importance. However, in the case of Family No. 16, there are two styles which appear to be central. Furthermore, the child in this family shows difficulties in almost all areas of functioning. With this point, the whole area of family styles and their relationship to behavioral functioning is still in need of further clarification.

The findings of this last section indicate that certain relationships do exist between family styles and classroom behavior. These findings are based primarily on clinical observations which proved more subtle than the group tests employed to measure classroom behavior. The absence of statistical significance based on these instruments may

reflect their general lack of sensitivity. The most important clinical point here may be restated as follows: behavioral functioning often represents a resolution process by the child in response to the nature of a particular family style.

Implications for Future Research

Based on the present study, it is now possible to speculate what lines of investigation are suggested for further exploration.

Generality of Family Styles

The present study has demonstrated that it is possible to assess family styles and that the three assessment procedures employed for this purpose all have considerable utility. However it is difficult to generalize the concept of family styles beyond the study sample. For this reason, additional research is needed with different groups to determine if these particular styles or others are present in other populations. A study of Puerto Rican family styles might show interesting variations of the different profiles. Another important sample might be a clinic population. It is quite possible that examples of all the styles would be more extreme and perhaps more readily identified. It would seem essential to investigate the frequency with which the styles of "juvenile," "peripheral male" and "non-evolved" are found in this type of population. With further clarification of family styles in different groups, it would be possible to answer questions dealing with variations both within and between styles.

Family Styles and Therapeutic Intervention

Since family styles have shown fairly high stability over time, a

differential treatment program for families manifesting particular styles might provide some insight into various treatment techniques and effective change that occurs for each style. Using the Family Pattern Q-sort, it would be possible to obtain a measure of family style at the outset of treatment and at different stages in the treatment process. These could be used as indices of change as well as defining which families are most resistant to change over time.

Family Styles and Behavior

a) The Case Study

Since it has been shown that for the styles of "coping" "disengaged" and "enmeshed," it is possible to make distinctions based on different "attributes" within the families, it appears critical to clarify what these "attributes" are. To examine the manner in which all children in a given family are influenced by the style in question would require a closer study of a few selected samples. This would provide information about the relationship, not just of one child to a particular family style, but of the total family. It is quite possible that all children in a given family will not be affected in the same manner and variations in behavior should be both considered and clarified.

b) Longitudinal Studies

In studying the relationship of family styles and behavioral functioning, changes in behavior assumes central importance in any meaningful attempt at intervention. If it can be

shown that children from particular family styles manifest certain behavioral problems which are relatively resistant to change, then the objective becomes that of developing techniques that will augment such change. If differential approaches on an educational level can produce change in this group of children, it is then possible to speak of meaningful intervention.

The major suggestions for further research remain close to the original areas of investigation. Although the ultimate objective would be intervention for change both on a therapeutic and educational level, it is felt that many questions still remain regarding the "generality" of family styles and the relationship between family styles and behavior. The directions for further research should therefore be one of continued clarification along these lines.

VIII

SUMMARY

The major findings for the present study may be summarized as follows:

Family Style Assessment

1. Using empirical measures, it was possible to assess family styles to a considerable degree.
2. The Family Pattern Q-sort was viewed as both a learning experience for the mother, as well as a measure for defensive processes. Both of these explanations were used to account for contradictory findings.
3. The Joint Social History was conceptualized as being partially analogous to therapeutic procedure.
4. It was possible to differentiate family styles as a function of varying dimensions within the families themselves:
   a) The "disengaged" family style was characterized by a movement away from people and was conceptualized in accordance with Schachtel's "autocentric" mode of response.
   b) "Coping" families were found to exhibit an openness and receptive orientation, which incorporated the qualities of Schachtel's "allocentric" mode of response. Variations in the "coping" style were discussed.
   c) An analysis of predominant family interaction patterns of "communicational processes, affective responses, and executive

behavior" was made, with significant findings explained.

5. All family styles were not found to be mutually exclusive of one another. It was suggested that further investigation was warranted to clarify the styles of "peripheral male," "juvenile," and "non-evolved."
6. Significant family styles were interpreted as representing predominant styles, while recognizing the existence of secondary and less influential styles in the same family constellation.
7. The concept of variations of extremes within a given style was discussed.
8. The etiology of family styles was explored to clarify the notion of "self perpetuation":
   a) Disengagement was viewed in terms of experiences involving early separation and the subsequent defense against anxiety through "resignation and depersonalization."
   b) Enmeshment was explained as a response to unresolved issues in the area of autonomy and independence.
   c) Dependency was recognized as a central variable in the etiology of all family styles.

Family Style and Function

9. When comparing scores on global maladjustment, no significant difference was found for children from "disengaged" and "enmeshed" families.
10. The relationship between family styles and ego development was discussed for the styles of "disengaged" and "enmeshed," with a

possible differential psychotic outcome being postulated for extreme cases.

11. Conduct disorders (Factor 1) were viewed as attempts to resolve conflicts for children from different family styles.
12. Distinctions as to the nature of conduct disorders for the "disengaged" and "enmeshed" styles were made.
13. Personality disorders (Factor 2) were explained as the surrendering of mastery functions in both the case of "disengaged" and "enmeshed" family styles.
14. Lack of significant findings regarding the adaptational difficulties and family styles was explained.
15. Implications of the present study for future research were made.

APPENDIX

THE JOINT SOCIAL HISTORY

Name:

Age:

Family Composition: Age and sex of each child, other relatives living in the home. Does husband live home, if not are husband and wife separated, divorced and how recently?

Physical Setting: What is the neighborhood like? What is the physical condition of the home? (Number of rooms, furnishings, arrangements for sleeping and eating, as well as the opportunity for privacy.)

Educational Level: Highest grade completed for each parent and the reason for stopping.

Background History of Parent

Questions will be directed separately to both the mother and father where applicable and possible.

1. What was your own family life? (open ended)
    a. What is it that you remember most about your family?
    b. How large was it? How were things in your house, what was it like for you?
    c. What was/is your mother like? How would you describe her?
    d. What kinds of things would she do that you liked/upset you?
    e. What kinds of things did you do together?
    f. What kinds of things did you talk about with her?
    g. How did she show you she was pleased with you?

h. How did she show her affections?

i. What kinds of things did she do when she was upset with you?

j. Did she make any special plans for you? What were they?

k. What was your father like? How would you describe him? (Repeat all of above same questions for father.)

Where both parents are present, background data will be obtained in this manner for each parent.

2. What do you remember most about your childhood?

a. How would you describe yourself when you were a child?

b. What did you like to do most/least?

c. Do you remember making any special plans about what you would do when you grew up? What were they?

History of Marriage (where applicable)

1. Where did you both meet?

2. How did you decide to get married? How old were you?

3. How would you say things were in the beginning?

a. Were there any special difficulties?

b. Have things changed much since then?

c. How were things after the first child?

d. What kinds of things do you do together?

e. What do you talk about?

f. Are there any areas that you disagree about?

Current Family Functioning

1. How would you describe your husband (open ended)? What are some of the things you would say about him that he will probably agree with/disagree with?

2. How would you describe your wife? (Same as 1)

3. How would you describe your family now? What are things like in your family?

4. Let's talk a little about the children.

   a. Is there one who you would call the favorite?

   b. Do you find that one child has more difficulty at home/in school then the others?

   c. Does one child seem to always give you the hardest time?

   d. Who has the final say when it comes to the children?

   e. Does any one person make the rules, do the punishing?

   f. Will the children come to one of you when something is bothering them?

   g. How do you show the children you are pleased/upset with them?

   h. What kinds of plans have you made concerning the children?

   i. What kinds of things do you think the children should do for themselves?

   j. What types of things won't you let the children do by themselves?

Now I would like to ask you some other questions about the family which you can both answer together.

1. In every family different people have different ways about them. How about in your family? Who's the most bossy, the biggest trouble maker, the one who gets away with murder, the one who fights the most? Talk about it together and decide who in your family is the most in these ways.

2. Now in every family things happen that cause a fuss now and then. Discuss and talk together about an argument you had, a fight or an argument that you can remember. Talk about it together, like who started it, who was in on it, what went on and also how it turned out. See if you can remember what it was all about.

3. For this one, each of you tell about the things everyone does in the family that please you most and make you feel good and also the things that each one does that makes you feel unhappy or mad.

INSTRUCTION MANUAL FOR JOINT SOCIAL HISTORY

On the following pages of this manual are descriptions of six different family styles. The concept of style is used here to refer to the nature of "patterned transactions" among different families. One of the major points being raised is whether it is possible to observe in the initial contacts with a family the structural arrange of such factors as: (1) lines of power and leadership; (2) the labeling of members and their assignment to particular roles; (3) significant themes; and (4) the ways in which language is used along with feelings to support the structural balance. The styles in question represent in effect different degrees of effectiveness in handling relatively similar environments.

1. Please read through each of the styles carefully.
    a. Familiarize yourself with each style.
    b. Underline the major variables which you feel differentiate the styles from one another.
2. You have been given a number of Joing Social Histories which have been recorded and transcribed.
    a. Read through separately each of the interviews.
    b. Pay careful attention to the nature and type of responses given by each family member.
    c. At the conclusion of the interview there are two scales to be filled out as follows.

The Family Attribute Differential Scale

This scale consists of a list of attributes that can describe the mother and father. In cases of intact families, one rating will be completed for each family member.

Since no two interviews are the same and since some parents talked more openly about particular areas than others, it may not be possible to complete all the items on the Attribute Scale for each family. However, please fill in as many of the items as is possible. The ratings range from one to seven and can generally be inferred from the nature of the interview. In this context, it is very important to note the manner as well as the content of the responses. This will help you fill out the Differential Scale more completely.

Family Style Rating Scale

At the conclusion of the folder is a yellow sheet. This sheet is the Family Style Rating Scale. It has been constructed to reflect all of the styles in the manual, as well as the provision for "other style" and "style unscoreable." Following your reading of the Joint Social History, rate this scale for the entire family system. The basis of your ratings should be determined by frequent references to the manual. The idea being to compare the interviews with the clinical descriptions of the families. Once again, the scale range is from one to seven. This allows for flexibility in ratings, as some families may be characteristic of one or more styles, but to different degrees. For example, a family may be predominantly enmeshed with a peripheral male. Try to determine which style is most significant and characteristic for the given interview you have read.

There are no right or wrong answers, but rather questions concerning interpretation of the interview data. It is for this reason that familiarity with the manual and careful reading of the histories is essential.

Things to look for in the Joint Social History

1. Global references to children as opposed to distinctions.
2. Contradictions in responses by the parent.
3. Insight and awareness regarding the behavior of their child.
4. Nature of communication in the family system.
5. Major problems or difficulties and how they are handled.
6. Nature and types of controls (rules, discipline and guidance).
7. Nature of family interactions.

The Disengaged Family Profile

Observing this family, one gets the general impression that the actions of its members do not lead to any vivid repercussions. Reactions from the others come very slowly and seem to fall into a vacuum. The over-all impression is one of an atomistic field; family members have long moments in which they move as in isolated orbits, unrelated to each other.

Delay of response and lack of contact are prevalent modes of interaction in this group. There is an over-all lack of selective activity on the part of the parents to the child's actions; this suggests that parental reactions here are to their own internal stress, rather than to the behavior of the child. The child acts and often gets no response. Events build up and then the mode of response is usually expected in the form of uncontrollable violence of some form.

The mother's functioning is characterized by lack of response and apathy. The children's predominant interactions vary. There are situations in which the children and their mother are involved in parallel play or in activities devoid of any contact among them; at other moments the children activate themselves in ways that are seemingly designed to force their mother into making some form of related response.

The disconnected quality of the relationship among family members in this profile is a feature more distinguishing than the immobility and passivity of the mother. The mother in this group feels overwhelmed, has a generally derogatory self-image, experiences herself as exploited, and almost invariably presents psychosomatic complaints and depressive features along with her slow pace of response.

The nature of missing interactions between mother and child appear to be reflections of this style. For instance the common question, "What did you do today?" asked by parents when the child comes home from school, seems to be missing in these families. No inquiry into the child's day, into "what happened?" or "What going to happen tomorrow?" ever has a chance of becoming articulated. The family form is most marked by the mother's inability to establish control and guidance over her children. The vacuum in the family system created by the lack of parental functioning is often filled by the attempts to assume executive functions on the part of the parental child or children.

The Enmeshed Family Profile

An outstanding characteristic of "enmeshed" families is the quantity of maternal response to the children's behavior. The mother in this family centralizes control in such a way that she is most often responding to the children's behavior with some form of control response. These control signals operate like traffic signals. They carry only the instruction of don't do that now.

The unpredictability of parental controlling signals handicaps the development and internalization of rules, for the child cannot determine what part of his behavior is inappropriate. As a result, he learns to define the limits of permissible behavior by reacting mostly to his parent's mood responses. He learns that the don'ts of behavior are related to the pain or power of the mother or other powerful figures. "Don't do this because I say so," or "Don't do this because it bothers me," or "don't do this or I'll beat you." Lacking norms to regulate behavior and caught in experiences that hinge on immediate interpersonal control, the children need the continuous parental participation to organize their interpersonal transactions. Rules in the enmeshed family are continually stated only in terms of immediate interpersonal control.

Regardless of the effectiveness of "presence-control," the mother seems rather helpless about effecting change in controlling the child's behavior when it occurs outside the immediacy of her presence. The child learns that the range of mother-effectiveness extends to the limits, at most, of her visual or auditory field. Illustrations of this limitation in the mother's functioning are her ignorance and bewilderment in describing her child's activities outside the home. "I do not know if he goes to school, he leaves the house, that I know"; or "I learned about his behavior in school, but I don't likely know cause I wasn't there."

The enmeshed family system is characterized by a tight interlocking of its members. Their quality of connectedness is such that attempts on the part of one member to change elicit fast and complimentary resistance on the part of others. In this profile, a quality of immediate reactivity seems to be a predominant characteristic.

Enmeshed Profile

In this family, one can observe constant engagement maneuvers, most of which reflect or are in response to controlling operations on the part of the mother. These include fast interchanges around her controlling responses and the children's rebellious activities. The family members use each other as triggers for immediate reactivity.

Ways of transacting power operations occupy a large part of the sibling's interaction and "ranking" of each other can occur around an almost infinite variety of subjects. They attempt to resolve conflicts by a series of escalated threats and counter-threats. The eheme constantly being transacted is some variation of, "I am more powerful than you," or "You are worse than me."

Many of the mothers explicitly express or convey the concept of availability as the central value of mothering. The mothers become the pathway as noted, through which most of the family transactions are conducted. These mothers are not, however, child oriented; they are oriented in "being mother." While in the disengaged family style the mothers do not respond or else delay their response, in this profile the mother's response is immediate. Usually in such families there is virtually no possibility of developing any language of affection and concern. Almost all interchanges, whether positive or not, are simply variations of power maneuvers.

In the disengaged family, the mother becomes anxious when she assumes control and guidance. In the enmeshed family profile, any evidence of loss of control over her children makes the mother anxious. The predominant fear is that of becoming helpless, rather than of becoming mean. The organizing tendency in the enmeshed family involves constant attempts by the mother to move away from a helpless role or stance. The struggle for control is constant, but seldom effective, and the mother is generally rendered inadequate in her attempts to modulate the behavior of each of her children.

These families usually do not include an adult male, but if there is one, his power is usually restricted and controlled by the woman.

The Peripheral Male Profile

In this family system, there are a number of possible roles that the male can assume. The male's role may be that of a husband and father in an intact family, or an almost undelineated image shifting continuously and unpredictably.

In certain intact families when the male plays a role, the organization of the family will vary according to the specific nature of the male-female subsystem. If the wife's role tends towards disengagement, participation of the male in the family becomes both necessary and possible. If the wife moves towards the enmeshed type of response, then her involvement with the children and her strong need to function as a mother, push the man towards increased peripherality.

In this latter instance, the man's attempts to be in the family make him an instrument of "intrusive nuisance" in the perception of the other family members. He sometimes tries to mitigate his exclusion by ineffective attempts to make himself part of the family, but he is usually rejected in these efforts. Consequently, the man's acceptance of family exclusion is accompanied by a movement of the center of his life to a realm outside of the family. In effect, he participates actively in the process of excluding himself. Quite often the man is seen by mother and child as responsible for the family unhappiness. The mother's incompetence and problems are frequently obscured by the projection of all family problems onto the man's incompetence.

The characteristics of interaction among family members in this profile include: the lack of communication between husband and wife; the centrality of the mother; and the creation of a mother-children subsystem which excludes the male, who compliments it by anchoring himself outside of the family.

Even in intact families, it is therefore possible for the male to remain peripheral. The male contributes to the financial support of the family, engages in sexual activities with his wife, but leaves the handling and rearing of the children completely to the mother although he might demand immediate obedience from the children.

Another type of peripheral male family exists in a situation consisting of a variety of rotating paramours "floating through the household." In many families, children have different fathers who are accepted only peripherally in the family structure. In the families in which there is a sporadic but stable flow of male figures, it is generally the mother who determines the boundaries of his engagement with and participation in the family.

The Juvenile Family Profile

In this profile, the parents are involved in a complementary system of avoidance of adult roles. Both parents are dynamically related to peer reference groups primarily. The functions of spouses and parents are secondary to the importance of their relationship to peer systems outside of the family. The couple may go through crisis after crisis talking about their impending separation and marital break-up, but actually there has never been a true marriage.

The adult female sees herself as a "fickle" girl. In many cases she is promiscuous, rejects motherly functions and centers her activity and justification of herself on being an "attractive woman" and in some cases an effective provider. The male is dependent on her and frequently assumes an attitude of defiance against authority and organized institutions. In their interactions, the woman assumes predominance. Although she exerts managerial functions, she is insufficiently related to child care functions. The husband's resentment of his wife is manifested by his pleasurable activities outside of the realm of the family in his life with his peers.

The wife clusters her husband with the children in a subsystem of burdensome dependents; she rejects the spouse and maternal roles and feels unfairly saddled with the job of caring for incompetent people. For the children the consequences are divided loyalties and frequently sex-role confusion. The lack of general boundaries in these families pushes the children into the roles of mediators in the parental strife.

The relative needs of both husband and wife are primarily the determining factors in their relationship with each other. The husband often feels deprived, and resentful of the children and will frequently accuse the wife of placing them before his own interests. The verbal channels are highly critical and are characterized by continued fault finding and placement of blame between both parents.

The Non-Evolved Family Profile

The most important aspect of this family style is that the grandmother is allocated executive power, while the mother and grandchildren function as one vaguely differentiated sub-group. The mother assumes the role of an older sibling, with a consequent impairment of a three-generation family.

The grandmother relates to her daughter generally in the same manner as she does to the other children. She makes the major decisions and trys to influence the child-rearing of her grandchildren. This often results in power conflicts between daughter and mother, with the result being inconsistent approaches in dealing with the children.

Of significance here is the degree to which the lines of power are distributed in the family system. If the daughter can be regarded as functioning as a vaguely differentiated unit from the rest of her children, then one is dealing with a "non-evolved" family style.

The Coping Family Style

There is no clear cut definition of what characteristics would best fit a description of a "coping family." Generally speaking, rather than global references to behavior, there are greater distinctions made between the individual children. One can look for clearer evidence of guidance, insight and explanations as significant modalities of interaction. The nature of communication, the feelings expressed towards the children and the types of controls that are exhibited by parents should clearly differentiate this style for the reader. Use your own judgment in this area to determine what you judge to be a "coping family."

MODEL Q-SORT ITEMS*
(N = 80)

1. When my child cries, I know what to do.
2. Everybody talks at the same time.
3. Even when I am with my family I feel lonely.
4. I can be strong with the rest of my family.
5. I say things without thinking.
6. I feel good when I am with my family.
7. The older boys and girls take care of their younger brothers and sisters.
8. I sometimes fight with my husband in front of the children.
9. I like to be by myself.
10. I am the one who makes the decisions in this family.
11. I sit down and explain things to the children.
12. I feel left out of things.
13. I can count on my husband to help me with the children.
14. I always seem to be telling the children they are doing something wrong.
15. I feel confident about what I do.
16. My family does fine when I take charge of things.
17. My children do what I tell them.
18. It is easy for me to show my affections to the children.
19. The children fight with each other.
20. I will give in rather than continue when there is a quarrel.

21. I spend very little time worrying.
22. I know what the children are doing when they are not at home.
23. My children do the opposite of what I say.
24. There is a warm feeling in our family.
25. My mother makes a lot of decisions in this family.
26. My husband can talk to me about the things that upset him.
27. My husband understands the way I feel.
28. I get confused when I have to make a choice.
29. I enjoy talking to the children.
30. I get upset easily.
31. My husband pitches in when things need to be done.
32. In this house what I say goes.
33. I will often lose my temper over the smallest things.
34. I am strict with the children.
35. When the children do something wrong, I tell them why it is wrong.
36. There is so much to do I feel trapped.
37. My mother will punish the children when they have done something wrong.
38. The children talk about what is bothering them.
39. My husband cares more about his friends than he cares about his children.
40. We have rules about what is right and wrong.
41. I get upset when the children don't do what I say.
42. I will give things up for my children rather than have a good time.
43. My husband keeps out of the fights.

44. It's hard for me to put my feelings into words.
45. I feel content.
46. The children are well behaved.
47. When someone starts to talk, we listen until he is finished.
48. I feel helpless.
49. It's hard for me to get started when I have something important to do.
50. It's hard to talk without someone butting in.
51. The children respect my feelings.
52. My mother has more to say about what the children do than I do.
53. I can talk about how I feel when I am with my family.
54. My friends understand the way I feel better than my family does.
55. My husband and I agree on how the children should be punished.
56. I get uncomfortable when I have to talk to the children about something.
57. Everyone feels angry most of the time.
58. In this house everyone comes and goes as he pleases.
59. I tell the children why I punish them.
60. I feel things could explode at any moment.
61. My husband makes the important decisions.
62. The children call each other bad names.
63. I feel close to the rest of the family.
64. I have to hit the children to make them listen.
65. My children disagree with what I say.
66. I feel good when I look good.

67. My mother treats me like a child.

68. I will praise the children when they do their work.

69. I feel good when the children do what they are supposed to.

70. My children do most things for themselves.

71. We talk to each other very little during the day.

72. Sometimes I feel that the children can handle things better than me.

73. We do things together in this family.

74. My mother will sit down and talk things out with the children.

75. The children try to make me feel that they know more than me.

76. My children tell me what they do in school.

77. I feel happy.

78. I always seem to be yelling at the children.

79. My husband does the punishing.

80. When I'm not around, there's no telling what my child will do.

---

*1. Three judges made statements about a family related to three interactional definitions (all judges were graduate students in clinical psychology).

2. Five separate judges were then given final list and asked to make sorts based on paragraphs describing family styles. (All judges were graduate students in clinical psychology, but not the same as the judges in step one or those judges used for the Family Style rating scale.)

MODEL Q SORT RESPONSES AS A FUNCTION OF SPECIFIC VARIABLES

Executive Behavior

1. When my child cries I know what to do.
2. I can be strong with the rest of the family.
3. The older boys and girls take care of their younger brothers and sisters.
4. I make the important decisions in this family.
5. I can count on my husband to help me with the children.
6. My family does fine when I take charge of things.
7. The children fight with each other.
8. I know what the children are doing when they are not at home.
9. My mother makes a lot of decisions in this family.
10. I get confused when I have to make a choice.
11. My husband pitches in when things need to be done.
12. I am strict with the children.
13. My mother will punish the children when they have done something wrong.
14. We have rules about what is right and wrong.
15. My husband keeps out of the fights.
16. The children are well behaved.
17. It's hard for me to get started when I have something important to do.
18. My mother has more to say about the children than I do.
19. My husband and I agree on how the children should be punished.

20. In this house everyone comes and goes as he pleases.
21. My husband makes the important decisions.
22. When I'm not around there's no telling what my child will do.
23. My husband does the punishing.
24. I have to hit the children to make them listen.
25. My mother treats me like a child.
26. My children do most things for themselves.
27. We do things together in this family.

Communicational Processes

1. Everybody talks at the same time.
2. I say things without thinking.
3. I sometimes fight with my husband in front of the children.
4. I sit down and explain things to the children.
5. I always seem to be telling the children they are doing something wrong.
6. My children do what I tell them.
7. I will give in rather than continue when there is a quarrel.
8. My children do the opposite of what I say.
9. My husband can talk about the things that upset him.
10. I enjoy talking to the children.
11. In this house, what I say, goes.
12. When the children do something wrong, I tell them why it is wrong.
13. The children talk about what is bothering them.
14. I get upset when the children don't do what I say.

15. It's hard for me to put my feelings into words.
16. When someone starts to talk, we listen until he is finished.
17. It's hard to talk without someone butting in.
18. I can talk about how I feel when I am with my family.
19. I get uncomfortable when I have to talk to the children about something.
20. I tell the children why I punish them.
21. The children call each other bad names.
22. My children disagree with what I say.
23. I will praise the children when they do their work.
24. We talk to each other very little during the day.
25. My mother will sit down and talk things out with the children.
26. My children tell me what they do at school.
27. I always seem to be yelling at the children.

Affective Responses

1. Even when I am with my family I feel lonely.
2. I feel good when I am with my family.
3. I like to be by myself.
4. I feel left out of things.
5. I feel confident about what I do.
6. It is easy for me to show my affections to the children.
7. I spend very little time worrying.
8. There is a warm feeling in our family.
9. My husband is sensitive to my needs.
10. I get upset easily.

11. I will often lose my temper over the smallest things.
12. There is so much to do I feel trapped.
13. My husband cares more about his friends than he cares about his children.
14. I will give things up for the children rather than have a good time.
15. I feel content.
16. I feel helpless.
17. The children respect my feelings.
18. My friends understand the way I feel better than my family does.
19. Everybody feels angry most of the time.
20. I feel things could explode at any moment.
21. I feel close to the rest of the family.
22. I feel good when I look good.
23. I feel good when the children do what they are supposed to.
24. Sometimes I feel that the children can handle things better than I can.
25. The children try to make me feel that they know more than me.
26. I feel happy.

FAMILY ATTRIBUTE DIFFERENTIAL SCALE*

On the basis of the Joint Social History, rate as many of the variables on the Family Attribute Differential Scale as possible. Where both parents have taken part in the interview, rate the mother and father separately. You will find two copies of the scale enclosed in such cases, with one being labeled for each parent. Place a circle around the number you feel represents the degree to which that attribute is characteristic of the parent in question.

Irresponsible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Responsible
Excludes self from family	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Includes self in family
Authoritative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Democratic
Isolates self	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Establishes contact
Dependent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Independent
Rejects others in family	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Accepts others in family
Cannot control	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Can control
Apathetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Interested
Thoughtless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Considerate
Disapproves	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Approves
Unable to compromise	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Able to compromise
Insults others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Gives compliments
Unrelated to family	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Related to family
Thinks of self first	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Thinks of child first
Strict	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Lenient
Passive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Active

Competes with child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Cooperates with child
Domineering	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Compliant
Cold	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Warm
Maternal-sibling alliance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Husband-wife alliance
Controls child's behavior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Allows independent behavior
Hedonistic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Pragmatic
Rigid	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Flexible
Selfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unselfish
Experiences dissatisfaction with family	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Expresses satisfaction with family
Can tolerate little or no disagreement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Can tolerate disagreement
Impulsive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Reflective
Can be leader in family	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Cannot be leader in family
Restrictive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Permissive
Submissive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Assertive
Unpredictable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Predictable
Gives immediate verbal response	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Plans verbal response
Incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Competent
Disorganized	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Organized
Discourages	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Encourages
Doesn't concern self with future	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Thinks about the future

Faces problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Avoids problems
Does things alone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Does things with family
Matter of fact	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Enthusiastic
Withdrawn	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Outspoken
Agrees with family members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Disagrees with family members
Irrational	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Rational
Concerned about family	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Indifferent about family
Proud of family	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Ashamed of family

*1. Construction of scale items was made by the writer and a school teacher.

2. Items were rated by the same judges who rated a particular family on the family style rating scale.

ATTRIBUTES AS A FUNCTION OF FAMILY STYLE

The attributes below are based on consensual agreement between three judges as describing the particular family styles.

Disengaged

Isolates self - Establishes contact
Solitary activity - Group activity
Apathetic - Interested
Unemotional - Emotional
Cold - Warm
Indifferent - Concerned
Unrelated - Related
Passive - Active
Helpless - Capable
Lack of control - Control
Submissive - Assertive

Enmeshed

Immediate Responsiveness - Planned responsiveness
Intolerance of disagreement - Tolerance of disagreement
Flexible - Rigid
Authoritative - Democratic
Strict - Lenient
Connot compromise - Can compromise
Controls child's behavior - Allows independent behavior

Juvenile

Irresponsible - Responsible
Dependent - Independent
Thoughtless - Considerate
Selfish - Unselfish
Impulsive - Reflective
Competes with child - Cooperates with child
Hedonistic - Pragmatic
Faces problems - Avoids problems
Thinks of self first - Thinks of child first

Peripheral Male

Rejects others - Accepts others
Maternal-sibling alliance - Husband-wife alliance
Can be a leader in family - Cannot be a leader in family
Withdrawn - Outspoken
Involved in family - Uninvolved in family
Participates in decisions - Does not participate in decisions
Rejected by others in family - Accepted by others in family
Insults others - Gives compliments
Expresses dissatisfaction with family - Expresses satisfaction with family

FAMILY STYLE RATING SCALE*

On the basis of the Joint Social History, please rate this family to the extent that it is characteristic of the different styles listed below and described in the instructions. A score of (1) would indicate that you feel this family is very little like the style in question, while a score of (7) would indicate that you judge this family to be very much like the style in question.

	unlike						like
Disengaged	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Enmeshed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Juvenile	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Non-Evolved	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Peripheral-Male	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Coping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other (specify)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unscoreable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Comments: _____

_____

It is possible for any given family to be characteristic of just one or possibly all the styles. The matter of degree is quite important and should be given important consideration.

*Four judges read each interview and rated this scale according to variations in style. A total of 120 ratings were made by nine different judges. Of these nine, three were Ph.D's in psychology, two were social workers, two were teachers and one was a para-professional family worker.

FORCED-CHOICE - GLOBAL MALADJUSTMENT SCALE (ULLMAN)*

Directions: In each of the 18 sets of descriptive statements below, pick out for each pupil the statement which you feel fits the child most aptly. Place the letter of that description in the proper column on the record sheet beside the number corresponding to the set. Do not be concerned if the description does not apply exactly, and do not dwell too long upon your decision. Experience has shown that in most instances, the ratings can be completed in about five minutes for each child. Just pick one statement in each set which comes closest - the one which the pupil is most like.

			Letter
1.	A.	Sees the bright or funny side of things.	
	B.	Likes to be praised.	
	C.	Obedient.	
	D.	Participates actively in school functions.	_____
2.	A.	Pitches in when things are to be done.	
	B.	Requires corrections.	
	C.	Needs much extra help.	
	D.	Respects the rules.	_____
3.	A.	Is easily excited.	
	B.	Dislikes criticism.	
	C.	Works better when praised.	
	D.	Popular, has many friends.	_____
4.	A.	Talkative.	
	B.	Is happy and easy to get along with.	
	C.	Is conscientious.	
	D.	Will always manage to get along.	_____
5.	A.	Carries through an undertaking about as well as others of his age.	
	B.	Figures things out for himself	
	C.	Requires encouragement and praise.	
	D.	Does only what he has to.	_____
6.	A.	Would answer truthfully if asked a question, but would not volunteer an answer harmful to himself.	
	B.	Recognizes his own shortcomings.	
	C.	Shows emotions in a restrained way.	
	D.	Helps others who are having difficulty.	_____

			Letter
7.	A.	Other children are eager to be near him or on his side.	
	B.	Sensitive.	
	C.	Enjoys being part of the group without taking the lead.	
	D.	A scattered thinker.	
8.	A.	Is easily irritated, flustered or upset.	
	B.	Talks about self, what he has done, how he feels, etc.	
	C.	Has trouble getting along.	
	D.	Quiet.	
9.	A.	Resentful.	
	B.	Puts up a good front.	
	C.	Gives up a habit that annoys others when it is called to his attention.	
	D.	A typical child for his years.	
10.	A.	Will work hard at a task only when he has chosen it himself.	
	B.	Is easily upset.	
	C.	Is more apt to give in than continue a quarrel.	
	D.	Rubs people the wrong way.	
11.	A.	Does not seem to profit by experience.	
	B.	Criticizes other people.	
	C.	Is easily confused.	
	D.	Quiet.	
12.	A.	Other children regard this child as a pest.	
	B.	Is always thinking up alibis.	
	C.	In group work, often insists that his way is better.	
	D.	When something goes wrong, is more apt to blame himself than the other fellow.	
13.	A.	Never gives up regardless how difficult the job.	
	B.	Is self-confident.	
	C.	Resents it when people hurt his feelings.	
	D.	Repeats mistakes.	
14.	A.	Is rarely asked for his opinion by other children.	
	B.	Considers the welfare of others as his own personal interest.	
	C.	Maintains a calm appearance and behavior even when emotionally disturbed.	
	D.	Lacks confidence in himself.	

			Letter
15.	A.	Can become absorbed by his own interests.	
	B.	Gets along well in school activities.	
	C.	Is alert, interested.	
	D.	An active child.	
	E.	Can be depended on by adult leader of a group to do his share.	
16.	A.	Needs much prodding.	
	B.	Expresses his annoyance when provoked.	
	C.	Makes sensible practical plans.	
	D.	Is popular with the other children.	
	E.	Pretty honest on the whole, though he may occasionally slip.	
	F.	Assertive.	
17.	A.	Others come to him for help.	
	B.	Reports those who break the rules.	
	C.	Sometimes disturbs others by laughing and talking, but stops at once when he is reminded.	
	D.	Continually on the defensive.	
	E.	Is forgetful.	
	F.	Show-off, attention getter.	
18.	A.	When assigned work in school, does only part of it.	
	B.	Others cannot work with him.	
	C.	Will not give in when proven wrong.	
	D.	Likes to daydream, but can bring himself back to reality when there is work to be done.	
	E.	Is tense or ill at ease when talking.	
	F.	Although he does not show enthusiasm for group activities, he cooperates when assigned a task.	

*All ratings were made by the child's classroom teacher.

PETERSON BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE

Please indicate which of the following constitute problems as far as this child is concerned. If an item does not constitute a problem, envircle the zero; if an item constitutes a mild problem, encircle the one; if an item constitutes a severe problem, encircle the two. Please complete every item.

0	1	2	1.	Thumb-sucking.
0	1	2	2.	Restless, inability to sit still.
0	1	2	3.	Attention seeking, "show off" behavior.
0	1	2	4.	Doesn't know how to have fun, behaves like a little adult.
0	1	2	5.	Self consciousness; easily embarrassed.
0	1	2	6.	Headaches.
0	1	2	7.	Disruptiveness; tendency to annoy and bother others.
0	1	2	8.	Feelings of inferiority.
0	1	2	9.	Dizziness, vertigo.
0	1	2	10.	Boisterousness, rowdiness.
0	1	2	11.	Crying over minor annoyances and hurts.
0	1	2	12.	Preoccupation: "In a world of his own."
0	1	2	13.	Shyness, bashfulness.
0	1	2	14.	Social withdrawal, preference for solitary activities.
0	1	2	15.	Dislike for school.
0	1	2	16.	Jealousy over attention paid to other children.
0	1	2	17.	Prefers to play with younger children.
0	1	2	18.	Short attention span.
0	1	2	19.	Lack of self confidence.
0	1	2	20.	Inattentiveness to what others say.

0 1 2 21. Easily flustered and confused.

0 1 2 22. Lack of interest in environment, generally "bored."

0 1 2 23. Fighting.

0 1 2 24. Temper tantrums.

0 1 2 25. Hypersensitivity; feelings easily hurt.

0 1 2 26. Laziness in school and in performance of other tasks.

0 1 2 27. Anxiety, chronic general fearfulness.

0 1 2 28. Irresponsibility, undependability.

0 1 2 29. Excessive daydreaming.

0 1 2 30. Tension, inability to relax.

0 1 2 31. Disobedience, difficulty in disciplinary control.

0 1 2 32. Depression, chronic sadness.

0 1 2 33. Uncooperativeness in group situations.

0 1 2 34. Aloofness, social reserve.

0 1 2 35. Passivity, suggestibility; easily led by others.

0 1 2 36. Clumsiness, awkwardness, poormuscular control.

0 1 2 37. Stuttering.

0 1 2 38. Hyperactivity, always on the go.

0 1 2 39. Distractibility.

0 1 2 40. Destructiveness in regards to his own or others' property.

0 1 2 41. Negativism, tends to do the opposite of what is requested.

0 1 2 42. Sluggishness.

0 1 2 43. Prefers to play with older children.

0 1 2 44. Nervousness, jitteriness, easily startled.

0 1 2 45. Irritability, hot tempered, easily aroused to anger.

ADAPTATIONAL CHECKLIST

Please indicate which of the following areas you consider to be important and in which _____ is experiencing some difficulty. Also describe below which one, if any, is the most troublesome area. If there are any problems which are not included, you may list them below as well. If you feel there are no special difficulties, then check the appropriate line.

Social Contacts:

Shy, timid, alone too much, aloof. _____

Authority Acceptance:

Fights too much, lies, is destructive to others' property, disobedient, uncooperative. _____

Cognitive Achievement

Does not learn as well as he is able, lacks effort, repeats his errors. _____

Maturation

Acts too young physically and/or emotionally, cries too much, has tantrums, sucks thumb, seeks too much attention. _____

Concentration

Fidgets, is unable to sit still in classroom, mind wanders _____

None of the Above _____

Additional Areas: _____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

Table 24

Summary of Major Environmental Variables for 30 Experimental Families

Family No.	Intactness	Size	Education of Parents	Occupation
1.	-	4	H.S. (completed)	E. Transit Authority
2.	+	6	11th grade (wife) 10th grade (Husb.)	Factor worker
3.	-	2	8th grade	Public Assist.
4.	+	6	11th grade (wife) 10th grade (husb.)	Truck Driver
5.	-	1	H.S. (completed)	Teacher-aid
6.	+	5	11th grade (wife)	Domestic
7.	-	4	11th grade	Public Assist.
8.	+	2	11th grade wife 10th grade husb.	Maintenance work
9.	+	1	10th grade wife 11th grade husb.	Factor work
10.	-	6	11th grade	Public Assist.
11.	-	5	H.S. (completed)	Part-time work
12.	-	3	10th grade	Public Assist.
13.	+	15	10th grade wife H.S. completed husb.	Public Assist. & Factory work
14.	-	3	Ninth grade	Public Assist.
15	-	1	11th grade	Public Assist.

Table 24 - Cont'd.

Family No.	Intactness	Size	Education of Parents	Occupation
16.	+	3	10th grade (wife) 11th grade (husb.)	Public Assist.
17.	-	1	10th grade	Public Assist.
18.	+	5	Eighth grade (wife) Ninth grade (husb.)	Taxi driver
19.	-	3	11th grade	Public Assist.
20.	+	6	Not obtained	
21.	-	6	H.S. (completed)	Public Assist.
22.	-	3	H.S. (completed)	Public Assist.
23.	+	3	H.S. (wife) H.S. (husb.)	Garage mechanic
24.	-	3	H.S. (completed)	Public Assist.
25.	+	7	11th grade (wife) H.S. (husb.)	Factory work
26.	+	5	10th grade (wife) 9th grade (husb.)	("Night work")
27.	+	3	8th grade (wife) 5th grade (husb.)	Superintendent
28.	+	5	11th grade (wife)	Public Assist.
29.	-	8	H.S. (completed)	Teacher-aid
30.	+	3	C. 1. (wife) C. 4. (husb.)	"Personnel work"

Note.-- Any information not included in table was not obtained from subject.

+ = family intact; - = family not intact.

Table 25

Summary Scores for 30 Children on Three Behavioral Rating Scales

Subject No.		Global Maladjustment: Ullman	F 1. Conduct Peterson	F 2. Personality Peterson	Adaptational Difficulties Kellam
1.	F.	29*	4	0	None
2.	F.	9	14	31	S.A.*
3.	F.	11	6	22	S.
4.	M.	16	19	4	A.
5.	F.	25	0	0	None
6.	F.	11	10	31	S.C.
7.	F.	9	13	31	S.C.Co.M.
8.	M.	10	10	17	S.Co.
9.	M.	10	30	15	C.M.Co.
10.	M.	12	20	17	M.Co.
11.	M.	27	0	3	None
12.	F.	14	24	14	A.C.Co.
13.	M.	14	5	18	S.C.
14.	M.	14	20	6	Co.
15.	M.	11	19	16	Co.
16.	F.	10	19	26	A.C.Co.M.
17.	M.	10	26	8	A.Co.
18.	F.	16	3	30	S.M.
19.	F.	12	18	11	A.C.
20.	F.	15	20	29	S.C.M.
21.	M.	13	21	25	S.A.M.
22.	M.	25	2	1	None
23.	F.	28	0	5	None
24.	F.	15	4	30	S.
25.	M.	10	2	29	S.
26.	F.	17	25	9	A.C.Co.
27	M.	10	28	18	A.Co.
28.	M.	13	16	7	A.Co.
29.	M.	29	0	0	None
30.	M.	28	4	0	None

Note.--A high score on Ullman Global Maladjustment means <u>good</u> over-all adjustment.

Kellam's Adaptational Areas: S., Social contacts; A., Authority acceptance; C., Cognitive achievement; M., maturation; Co., Concentration.

Table 26

Frequency Distribution of Model Q-sort for Disengaged Family Style Based on Five Judges' Sorts (80 Items)

	Like my family								Unlike my family		
f.	2	4	6	9	12	14	12	9	6	4	2
	58	3	9	19	5	2	10	1	4	6	15
	71	28	12	23	7	8	21	11	13	45	77
		36	20	30	33	25	14	16	17	63	
		48	44	41	39	37	22	27	18	73	
			56	43	54	42	26	32	24		
			72	49	57	50	31	34	29		
				60	62	55	35	38			
				70	64	52	40	53			
				75	65	61	46	76			
					69	66	47				
					79	67	51				
					80	68	59				
						74					
						78					

f. = frequency of items in each category.

Table 27

Frequency Distribution (by Item) of Model Q-Sort for Enmeshed Family Style: Based on Five Judges' Sorts (80 Items)

	Like my family								Unlike my family		
f.	2	4	6	9	12	14	12	9	6	4	2
	10	41	33	30	6	59	29	28	74	12	61
	32	40	14	8	42	21	70	72	71	20	79
		34	78	73	76	11	77	55	58	18	
		16	50	80	75	68	56	47	52	48	
			19	69	65	67	49	46	26		
			2	64	62	66	45	24	25		
				57	60	54	44	13			
				43	23	63	38	9			
				4	22	53	37	3			
					15	51	36				
					7	39	31				
					1	35	27				
						18					
						5					

f. = frequency of items in each category.

Table 28

Frequency Distribution (by Item) of Model Q-Sort for Juvenile Family Style: Based on Five Judges' Sorts (80 Items)

	Like my family								Unlike my family		
f.	2	4	6	9	12	14	12	9	6	4	2
	54	5	30	48	67	2	22	31	73	6	27
	39	8	72	70	14	47	15	55	24	42	13
		60	21	62	33	32	77	51	29	26	
		75	36	57	69	68	45	79	11	61	
			7	78	23	28	20	76	1		
			66	56	65	52	17	59	63		
				19	3	25	38	35			
				49	80	74	34	53			
				58	64	40	18	4			
					50	46	9				
					43	44	16				
					71	10	41				
						12					
						37					

f. = frequency of items in each category.

Table 29

Frequency Distribution (bt Item) of Model Q-Sort for Non-Evolved Family Style: Based on Five Judges' Sorts (80 Items)

	Like my family							Unlike my family			
f.	2	4	6	9	12	14	12	9	6	4	2
	52	74	72	30	63	38	46	68	51	13	32
	25	37	65	43	7	41	18	42	31	16	10
		67	48	5	36	60	29	11	35	34	
		28	49	66	39	69	76	22	17	61	
			44	19	57	8	6	59	4		
			70	20	50	53	47	33	15		
				56	54	40	58	26			
				12	71	21	14	79			
				75	2	9	80	1			
					62	73	45				
					3	24	27				
					23	64	55				
						77					
						78					

f. = frequency of items in each category.

Table 30

Frequency Distribution (by Item) of Model Q-Sort for Peripheral Male Family Style: Based on Five Judges' Sorts (80 Items)

	Like my family						Unlike my family				
f.	2	4	6	9	12	14	12	9	6	4	2
	39	43	8	1	57	58	80	72	23	55	31
	42	16	4	41	33	21	28	64	78	79	61
		51	17	18	44	71	49	3	75	27	
		10	76	29	46	54	19	12	13	26	
			36	68	59	15	66	56	77		
			30	32	35	5	14	65	45		
				7	38	70	52	20			
				69	11	50	25	48			
				60	53	67	2	62			
					63	40	73				
					22	74	9				
					34	47	24				
						37					
						6					

f. = frequency of items in each category.

Table 31

Frequency Distribution (by Item) of Model Q-Sort for Coping Family Style: Based on Five Judges' Sorts (80 Items)

	Like my family							Unlike my family			
f.	2	4	6	9	12	14	12	9	6	4	2
	73	15	68	11	79	21	64	14	30	60	48
	24	46	1	53	26	54	25	65	3	39	12
		29	13	59	17	37	52	49	71	28	
		6	63	38	35	62	72	44	56	57	
			22	18	77	10	70	33	78		
			42	4	76	32	67	23	80		
				31	61	34	75	36			
				51	40	16	19	9			
				55	69	74	66	58			
					27	20	5				
					45	2	43				
					47	7	50				
						8					
						41					

f. = frequency of items in each category.

Table 32

Correlations between Five Judges for Disengaged Family Style Based on Q-Sort (80 Items)

	Judge				
	1	2	3	4	5
1.		.87	.68	.75	.81
2.			.74	.71	.70
3.				.53	.70
4.					.67
5.					

Note.--Average r. based on z transformation = .75.

Table 33

Correlations between Five Judges for Enmeshed Family Style Based on Q-Srot (80 Items)

	Judge				
	1	2	3	4	5
1.		.39	.48	.51	.18
2.			.65	.68	.51
3.				.73	.37
4.					.35
5.					

Note.--Average r. based on z transformations = .50.

Table 34

Correlations between Five Judges for Juvenile Family Style Based on Q-Sort (80 Items)

	Judge				
	1	2	3	4	5
1.		.67	.76	.53	.70
2.			.70	.56	.72
3.				.58	.70
4.					.55
5.					

Note.--Average r. based on z transformation = .66.

Table 35

Correlations between Five Judges for Non-Evolved Family Style Based on Q-Sort (80 Items)

	Judge				
	1	2	3	4	5
1.		.80	.77	.80	.77
2.			.82	.83	.83
3.				.84	.84
4.					.82
5.					

Note.--Average r. based on z transformations = .81.

Table 36

Correlations between Five Judges for Peripheral-Male Family Style Based on Q-Sort (80 Items)

	Judge				
	1	2	3	4	5
1.		.73	.43	.62	.79
2.			.30	.48	.79
3.				.69	.39
4.					.62
5.					

Note.--Average r. based on z transformations = .61.

Table 37

Correlations between Five Judges for Coping Family Style Based on Q-Sort (80 Items)

	Judge				
	1	2	3	4	5
1.		.72	.73	.72	.69
2.			.67	.68	.60
3.				.79	.71
4.					.70
5.					

Note.--Average r. based on z transformations = .71.

Table 38

Correlations between Experimental (by Subjects) Q-Sorts and Model (by Judges) Q-Sorts on Six Family Styles (N = 30)

	Model Sorts					
Family No.	D.	E.	J.	P.	N.	C.
1.	-.72****	.20*	-.44****	.29****	-.32****	.71****
2.	.17	.69****	.37****	.24**	.004	-.34****
3.	.40 ****	-.07	.10	.048	.13	-.26***
4.	-.03	.73****	.23**	.34****	-.17	-.09
5.	-.69****	.098	-.50 ****	.26***	-.37****	.74****
6.	.26***	-.22**	-.06	.07	.11	-.01
7.	.18*	-.14	.004	.083	.189	-.046
8.	-.27***	.14	-.37****	.18*	-.31****	.32****
9.	.50****	.36****	.63****	.27***	.24**	-.54****
10.	.22**	.03	.07	.13	.05	-.016
11.	-.71****	.022	-.49****	.26***	-.35****	.81****
12.	-.09	.64****	.03	.25***	-.31****	-.12
13.	.27***	.07	.22**	.43****	.08	-.15
14.	.56****	-.24**	.13	.09	.29****	-.30****
15.	.06	-.14	.17	-.07	.41****	-.09
16.	.47****	.03	.64****	.24**	.62****	-.50****
17.	.36****	.07	.17	-.004	.05	-.41****
18.	-.22**	.25***	-.21**	.24**	-.31****	.29****
19.	.35****	-.09	.004	-.35****	.11	-.26***

Table 38 - Cont'd.

Family No.	Model Sorts					
	D.	E.	J.	P.	N.	C.
20.	-.52****	-.19*	-.51****	.14	-.40****	.62****
21.	.47****	-.22**	.13	-.02	.36****	-.29****
22.	-.59****	-.03	-.64****	.02	-.49****	.66****
23.	-.70****	.13	-.49****	.34****	-.40****	.73****
24.	-.29****	.34****	-.188*	.39****	-.51****	.18*
25.	.28****	-.50****	-.20*	-.35****	.14	.007
26.	-.07	.60****	.16	.58****	-.19*	.02
27.	.25***	-.002	.079	.29****	.09	-.06
28.	-.29****	-.15	-.41****	-.06	.03	.41****
29.	-.72****	.23**	-.62****	.03	-.55****	.73****
30.	-.71****	.13	-.62****	.034	-.55****	.75****

Significance levels: * .05; ** .02; *** .01; **** .005.

Family Styles: D., disengaged; E., enmeshed; J., juvenile; P., peripheral male; N., non-evolved; C., coping.

Table 39

Rotated Factor Loadings for Factor 1 and Factor 2 of Family Attribute Differential Scale (44 Items) (N=38)

Item No.	Factor 1 Loading	Factor 2 Loading
1.	.918	.228
2.	.915	.093
3.	.253	.867
4.	.927	.120
5.	.885	.011
6.	.795	.530
7.	.807	.085
8.	.941	.200
9.	.863	.435
10.	.718	.624
11.	.516	.776
12.	.713	.581
13.	.928	.203
14.	.830	.435
15.	-.156	.893
16.	.950	-.154
17.	.728	.536
18.	-.153	.916
19.	.710	.568
20.	.038	.309
21.	.244	.821

Table 39 - Cont'd.

Item No.	Factor 1 Loading	Factor 2 Loading
22.	.669	.323
23.	.303	.863
24.	.770	.512
25.	.725	.598
26.	.416	.856
27.	.739	.485
28.	.899	.158
29.	-.265	.672
30.	.858	-.038
31.	.831	.386
32.	.494	.724
33.	.983	.268
34.	.916	.215
35.	.787	.556
36.	.803	.272
37.	.910	.150
38.	.897	.234
39.	.846	.174
40.	.830	-.138
41.	.283	.010
42.	.848	.373
43.	.828	.370
44.	.744	.472

Table 40

Factor Scores for Thirty Families on Factor 1 and Factor 2 of Family Attribute Differential Scale

Family No.	Factor 1 Scores	Factor 2 Scores
1.	.941	1.104
2.	-1.208	-1.734
3.+	.237	.211
4. a	.808	-1.528
b	-.613	.767
5.	1.443	.067
6.	-1.104	.813
7. a	-1.317	.271
b	.374	-.135
8. a	.393	-.860
b	.121	1.125
9.	-.860	.305
10.	-1.468	.452
11.	1.558	1.325
12.	-.439	-2.458
13.	.165	.876
14.	-1.081	.026
15.	-.659	.299
16. a	- .146	-1.154
b	-1.430	-.658
17.	-1.396	.517
18.	-.177	-.302

Table 40 - Cont'd.

Family No.	Factor 1 Scores	Factor 2 Scores
19.	.445	-1.728
20.	-.721	1.402
21.	-.932	.946
22. a	1.272	.778
b	1.064	.069
23.	1.386	1.005
24.	-.780	-1.298
25. a	-1.373	1.183
b	.668	-1.070
26. a	.277	-.244
b	-.843	-.083
27.	.844	-1.142
28.	.299	.546
29.	1.795	-1.210
30. a	1.284	.818
b	1.221	.692

+ Letters a and b indicate mother and father in same family.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ausubel, D., "Effects of Cultural Deprivation on Learning Patterns," Audio-Visual Instruc., 10:12, Jan., 1965.

2. Baldwin, N., "The Effects of Home Environment on Nursery School Children," Child. Develop., 1964, 20-49.

3. Bayley, N., "The Relationship between Socio-Economic Variables and the Behavior of Mothers Towards Their Children," J. Genet. Psychol., 1960, 96, 61-67.

4. Bayley, N., "Consistency of Maternal and Child Behaviors in the Berkeley Growth Study," Vita. Human., 1964, 7, No. 2.

5. Bean, K., "Negro Responses to Verbal and Non Verbal Test Material," J. Psychol., 1942, 13, 343-353.

6. Bernstein, B., "Language and Social Class," Brit. J. Sociol., 1960, 11, 271-276.

7. Bing, E., "Effect of Child-Rearing Practices on Development of Differential Cognitive Abilities," Child. Develop., 1963, 34, 631-648.

8. Bloom, B. S., "Stability and Change in Human Characteristics." New York: Wiley & Sons, 1964.

9. Bower, E. M. "Early Identification of Emotionally Handicapped Children in School," Springfield, Illinois, 1961.

10. Bronfenbrenner, U., "The Changing American Child: A Speculative Analysis, Merrill Palmer Quart., 1961, 7, 73-84.

11. Bruner, J. S. The Cognitive Consequences of Early Sensory Deprivation. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1961, pp. 195-207.

12. Bruner, J. S., "The Course of Cognitive Growth," Amer. Psychol., 1964, 19, 1-15.

13. Bruner, J. S. "Effectiveness of Information Feedback," Annual Rev. Psychol., 1967.

14. Cattell, J. Mck., "Personality Structure in 4 and 5 Year Olds," J. Clin. Psychol., 1959, 355-369.

15. Clapp, W., "Dependence and Competence in Children: Parental Treatment of 4 Year Olds," Dissert. Abs., 1967, 27 9-A, 38-2739.

16. Cohen, T., "Prediction of Underachievement in Kindergarten Children," Arch. Gen. Psychiat., 1963, 9, 444-450.

17. Davidson, H. "Characteristics of Successful School Achievers from a Severely Deprived Environment: New York City," University New York, 1962 (mimeo).

18. Deutsch, M., "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process," W. H. Parson Ed. Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1963.

19. Deutsch, M., The Role of Social Class in Language Development and Cognition," Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1965, 35, 78-88.

20. Deutsch, M., "Some Psychological Aspects of Learning in the Disadvantaged," Teachers College Record, 1966, 67 (4), 260-265.

21. Deutsch. M., The Disadvantaged Child. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

22. Digman, J., "Child Behavior Ratings: Further Evidence of a Multiple Factor Model of Child Personality," Educat. & Psychol. Meas., 1965, 25, 787-799.

23. Dreger, R. M., "Comparative Psychological Studies of Negroes and Whites in the United States," Psychol. Bull., 1964, 57, 361-402.

24. Eisenberg, L., "The Fathers of Autistic Children," Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1957, 27, 715-724.

25. Erikson, E. H. Childhood and Society. W. W. Norton & Co., 1950.

26. Freud, A., and Burlingham, D. Infants Without Families. New York: International Univ. Press, 1944.

27. Freud, S. The Ego and the Id. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1960.

28. Gans, H. J. The Urban Villagers. New York: The Free Press, Glencoe, 1962.

29. Goldfried, R. "Head Start Children and Their Mothers: Relationships among Mental Health, School Functioning and Maternal Attitudes." Paper presented at Eastern Psychological Meeting, April 16, 1966.

30. Gordon, E. "Characteristics of Socially Disadvantaged Children," Rev., of Educat. Research., XXXXV, 1965, 377-388.

31. Handel, G. "Psychological Study of Whole Families," Psychol. Bull., 1965, 63, 19-41.

32. Havighurst, H. J., "Who are the Socially Disadvantaged?" J. Negro Educat., 1965, 63, 19-41.

33. Henry., J. Culture Against Man.

34. Hess, R. D., & Shipman, V. "Early Experience and the Socialization of Cognitive Modes," Child Develop., 1965, 36, 869-886.

35. Hess, R. D., & Bear, R. M., Early Education. Aldine Publishing Co., 1968.

36. Horney, K. Neurosis and Human Growth. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1965.

37. Hunt, J. McV., "The Psychological Basis for Using Pre-School Enrichment as an Antidote for Cultural Deprivation," Merrill Palmer Quart., 1964, 10, 209-248.

38. Hunter, E. C., "Changes in Teachers' Attitudes Towards Children's Behavior over the Last 30 Years," Mental Hygiene, 1957, 41, 3-11.

39. John, V. P., "The Intellectual Development of Slum Children," Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1963, 33, 813-22.

40. John, V. P., "A Brief Survey of the Literature on the Characteristics of Children from Low Income Backgrounds," Urban Educat., 1965, 1, 215-222.

41. Kanner, L., "Autistic Disturbances of Affective Contact," The Nervous Child, 1943, II, 217-250.

42. Keller, S., "The Social World of the Urban Slum Child: Some Early Findings," Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1963, 33, 823-31.

43. Kellam, S., & Schiff, S. K., "Adaptation and Mental Illness in the First Grade Classrooms of an Urban Community," reprinted from Psychiatric Research Report 21, Amer. Psychiat. Assoc., 1967, 77-91.

44. Kohn, M. "Social Class and the Allocation of Parental Responsibilities," Amer. Sociol. Rev., 1959, 24, 352-366.

45. Laing, B. D. The Divided Self. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1960.

46. LaPray, A., "A Study of Child Rearing Attitudes of Mothers of Emotionally Disturbed Children," Dissert. Abs., 1967, 38, (2), 553-561.

47. Lesser, G., "Mental Abilities of Children in Different Social and Cultural Groups." U. S. Dept. of Health Cooperative Research Project 1435. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office.

48. Mackie, J. B. "Psychological Development of Culturally Disadvantaged Children." A study of the selective influence of family and school variables. Paper presented at 44th Meeting of Amer. Orthopsychiatric Assoc., Washington, D.C., March 1967.

49. Malone, C. A., "Some Observations on Children of Disorganized Families and Problems of Acting Out," J. Clin. Psychiat., 1963, 2, 22-49.

50. Mass, H. S. "Some Social Class Differences in the Family Systems and Group Relations of Pre and Early Adolescents," Child Develop., 1951, 22, 145-152.

51. McCandless, B., "Environment and Intelligence," Amer. J. Ment. Def., 1952, 56, 674-691.

52. Miller, S. M., "The American Lower Class: A Typological Approach," Soc. Research, 1964, 31, 1-22.

53. Milner, E., "A Study of the Relationship between Reading Readiness in Grade One School Children and Patterns of Parent Child Interaction," Child Develop., 1951, 22, 95-112.

54. Mitchell, J. A., "A Study of Teachers' and Mental Hygienists' Ratings of Certain Behavior Problems of Children," J. Educat. Research, 1942, 36, 292-307.

55. Minuchin, S. Families of the Slums. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

56. Myers, J. K, & Roberts, B. H. Family and Class Dynamics in Mental Illness. New York: Wiley, 1959.

57. Passemanick, B., "Early Language Behavior in Negro Children and the Testing of Intelligence. J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 1955, 50, 401-402.

58. Pavenstedt, E., "A Comparison of the Child Rearing Environment of Upper Lower and Very Low Lower Class Families," Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1965, 35, 89-98.

59. Pavenstedt, E. "The Drifters," Children of Disorganized Lower Class Families. Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1967.

60. Peterson, D. R. "Personality Factors in Nursery School Children, Derived from Parent Ratings," J. Clin. Psychol., 1958, 346-355.

61. Peterson, D. R., "Behavior Problems of Middle Childhood," J. Consult. Psychol., 1961, 25, 205-209.

62. Reissman, F., The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

63. Schachtel, E. Metamorphosis. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

64. Schrupp, M. H. "Teacher Growth in Attitudes Towards Behavior Problems of Children," J. Educat. Psychol., 1953, 44, 213-214.

65. Selye, H. The Stress of Life. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

66. Siegel, I., "Psycholinguistic Diversity among Culturally Deprived Children," Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1968, 38, 1, 122-127.

67. Stodolsky, S., "Learning Patterns in the Disadvantaged," Harvard Educat. Rev., 1967, 37, 546-593.

68. Sullivan, H. S. The Psychiatric Interview. New York: Norton & Co., 1954.

69. Ullman, C. A. Identification of Maladjusted Children. Monograph 7, Washington, D.C., U.S. Public Health Service, 1952.

70. Wickman, E. K. Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes. New York"

71. Witkin, H. A., et al., Psychological Differentiation. New York: Harper, 1962.