
Credits

Credits are listed in order of appearance.

The family as a focus of methodologically consistent study is a relatively recent phenomenon, and multidisciplinary approaches to the topic continue to remain in their formative stages. We would point out that only a little less than fifty years ago the following assessment was made:

One of the paradoxes of contemporary sociology is that the family has been studied as much, perhaps, as any institution in our society, and yet the theoretical organization and development of the voluminous materials that have been gathered are even more conspicuously absent than in other fields of sociological inquiry. (Frankel, 1963, p. 3)

Similarly, in the field of history, it was noted just over forty years ago that “studies of the family have come into vogue only within the past decade, specifically since the publication of Aries’ Centuries of Childhood (1963)” (Hareven, 1971, p. 211).

Also important to note is that early efforts at understanding family functioning employed a deficit model focused on structure rather than process (Billingsley, 1968; Marotz-Baden, Adams, Bueche, Munro, & Munro, 1979). Thus, the topics of concern for researchers generally consisted of structural dimensions such as father absence, or family type, for example, divorced or single parent. This use of a deficit model is consistent with a national concern with family problems nearly as old as the United States (Abbot, 1981), and forecasts of the impending breakdown of the family are hardly a new phenomenon (Becvar, 1983). In recent years, this pattern of doomsday thinking has been most apparent in discussions revolving around concerns that the prevalence of deviations from the traditional two-parent family will inevitably produce negative consequences for children (Coontz, 1992) as well as in discussions about “family values” (Becvar, 1998).

Changes both in the study of the family and in approaches to this study are of crucial importance to family therapy, and, indeed, some have
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occurred in conjunction with the growth of this field. Beginning in the 1970s, scholars began to recognize the limitations of a negativistic, structural approach to the study of families (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Pedersen, 1976). They became aware, for example, that single-parent families are capable of being cohesive, warm, supportive, and favorable to the development of children (Herzog & Sudia, 1972). Researchers began to describe healthy families and to take note not only of the process dimensions within healthy families (Lewis, Beavers, Gossett, & Phillips, 1976; Lewis & Looney, 1983; Walsh, 1998) but also of the variety of family forms that may be supportive of normal growth and development for both adults and children. More recently, an important focus of study is that of family resilience, or the capacity to rebound from crisis situations or other challenges having grown and become stronger than previously was the case (Becvar, 2008, 2012; Walsh, 1998, 2007). Overall, as the importance of contextual considerations has been acknowledged and a focus on the ecology of human development established (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), serious attention has been given to the fact that both individual and family health are indeed complex issues and that “characteristically, psychological events . . . are multiply determined, ambiguous in their human meaning, polymorphous, contextually environed, or embedded in complex and vaguely bounded ways, evanescent and labile in the extreme” (Koch, 1981, p. 258).

In the following section, we consider the topic of family health and dysfunction by summarizing a variety of process dimensions characteristic of well-functioning families and those described as resilient, regardless of their particular structure. We then discuss several theories of development that provide maps for understanding the territory we think of as family. Finally, we take note of contextual issues as well as the importance of diversity considerations, cultural sensitivity and competency, and therapeutic considerations relevant to various groups of families within our society. As you will see, this chapter is somewhat like a visit to a museum or an art gallery. Accordingly, you have an opportunity to get a sense of the complexity of the family in general as well as to see a variety of pictures that depict the specifics of families and family life.

Process Dimensions

Consistent with the systemic/cybernetic perspective underlying our conception of family therapy, our discussion of health and dysfunction focuses on process rather than on content. We are concerned with the patterns that characterize families defined as well-functioning, and thus, implicitly, those defined as dysfunctional. However, our first task is to attempt to define these terms. In so doing, we must recognize that any definition that implies goodness or badness is inconsistent with systems theory at the level of cybernetics. It is only at the pragmatic level of first-order, or simple cybernetics that we as observers may look at a system and decide about its health or pathology. Given the notion of structural determinism (Maturana, 1978), we recognize that a system responds to various perturbations in a manner determined by or consistent with its structure. Thus, all systems do what they do, and what they do is not pathological unless we so define it. With that thought in mind, we feel that any definition of health or dysfunction must include the members of the family we are observing. We therefore would concur with Walsh (1982), who states that “the guiding question is that of how families, with variant forms and requisites, organize their resources and function to accomplish their objectives” (p. 9). Accordingly, we are more concerned with how families do best what it
is they want to do than we are with what they are doing. Consistent with this position, we would define health as the family's success in functioning to achieve its own goals. We would emphasize the fact that we are not defining how a family should be structured or what its goals should be. At the same time, we recognize that all of us live in a society characterized by a range of norms, established by law and tradition, deemed acceptable by that society. These norms must be taken into consideration when working with families. We believe, however, that a family's success in functioning must be dealt with situationally and is more appropriately evaluated relative to context.

In our own practice of family therapy, as we have noted elsewhere (Becvar & Becvar, 1999), we have found several process dimensions to be characteristic of healthy families. Although no one family is ever likely to possess all these dimensions, the more successful families seem to have a combination that includes at least a majority of the following:

1. A legitimate source of authority established and supported over time.
2. A stable rule system established and consistently acted upon.
3. Stable and consistent shares of nurturing behavior.
4. Effective and stable child-rearing and marriage-maintenance practices.
5. A set of goals toward which the family and each individual works.
6. Sufficient flexibility and adaptability to accommodate normal developmental challenges as well as unexpected crises. (Becvar & Becvar, 1999, p. 103)

Similarly, Lewis et al. (1976) found that optimal family functioning was characterized by a variety of processes interacting with one another. In their study of healthy families, these authors concluded "that health at the level of the family was not a single thread, and that competence must be considered as a tapestry, reflecting differences in degree along many dimensions" (p. 206). These dimensions include (1) a caring, affiliative attitude, versus an oppositional approach to human encounters; (2) respect for the subjective world-views, differences, and values held by self and others, or the ability to agree to disagree, versus authoritarianism; (3) belief in complex motivations and the ability to be flexible and to change both form and structure in active resonation with a complex environment, versus rigidity in approach to the world at large; (4) high levels of initiative, as manifested in high degrees of community involvement, versus passivity; (5) flexible structures characterized by a strong parental/marital or couple alliance, with clear individual and generational boundaries, an absence of inappropriate internal or external coalitions, and high levels of reciprocity, cooperation, and negotiation; (6) high levels of personal autonomy, expressed by clarity of communication, acknowledgment of what the other feels and thinks, and strong encouragement of individual responsibility for feelings, thoughts, and actions; (7) a congruent mythology, with family members perceiving themselves in a manner consistent with how others perceive them; (8) openness in the expression of affect, a prevailing mood of warmth, affection, and caring, a well-developed capacity for empathy, and a lack of lingering conflict or resentment; and (9) high degrees of spontaneity and humor.

Building on this information and adding the findings of several other researchers and clinicians, Kaslow (1982) reports that healthy families reflect a systems orientation, with a sense of mutuality, a clear and definite structure, openness to growth and change, and shared roles and responsibilities. In such families, boundaries are distinct and appropriate,
and the need for both individual and relational privacy is respected. Communication in well-functioning families is effective, and power issues are handled hierarchically yet with strong, egalitarian parental leadership gradually giving way to greater freedom for children relative to their development. Autonomy and initiative are encouraged in a context that nurtures and supports even as it facilitates emancipation and independence. A wide variety of emotions are expressed in the healthy family, and individual members are permitted to be angry with one another while also having the ability to play well together. There is a pervasive feeling of optimism and humor, and negotiation is favored over compromise or conciliation. Finally, well-functioning families have a transcendental value system that embodies a sense of relatedness and continuity in terms of both time and space. Although it is perhaps debatable whether this final dimension must necessarily refer to a religious value system, Kaslow (1982) notes that she has

yet to find a family that rates a 1 or 2 score on the Beavers–Timberlawn Scale (indicating high functioning) that does not speak with certainty of a belief in the harmony of the universe, some sense of a Supreme Being or Force in nature, and a humanistic and ethical system of values. (p. 22)

In addition, the observance of shared rituals and traditions has been found to be another important aspect of healthy families (Becvar, 1985; Otto, 1979; Sawin, 1979, 1982). Indeed, rituals tend to enhance group identity and allow members to accept growth, change, and loss while maintaining their basic continuity. The ritual acknowledges not only tangible but also intangible realities, inasmuch as it involves both content and process. Thus, it may help to strengthen the entire family or relationships within it, encourage and/or acknowledge role performance, and influence the structure—rules and boundaries—characterizing the family:

The word “ritual” implies action . . . . Ritual transforms the state of powerlessness (“life just happens to me”) to one of effectiveness. Its prescribed form and predictability are part of its power to give shape to joy, form to grief and order to the assertion of might—and in so doing contain and relieve our anxieties. (LaFarge, 1982, p. 64)

For example, research regarding the role of rituals in alcoholic families has revealed that “extreme ritual disruption was significantly related to greater intergenerational recurrence of alcoholism, whereas ritual protection was associated with less transmission” (Wolin & Bennett, 1984, p. 403). The authors of this study feel rituals relate to the core quality of the family and its ability to conserve its basic identity even during periods of disruption. They believe that to keep rituals relevant, flexibility of the family through the life cycle is extremely important. Traditions may be just as effective in symbolizing transition as they are in reinforcing the status quo. Perhaps you remember the opening lines of a well-known play in which the following question is asked: “How do we keep our balance?” The answer: “Tradition.” And Tevye goes on to conclude that “without our traditions, our life would be as shaky as a fiddler on the roof.”

Healthy families also tend to have a natural network of relationships outside the family. On the other hand, when a family sees itself, or is perceived by others, as being different, the natural network may drop off. Not only can social isolation be detrimental to family functioning, but it also has been found to be a characteristic of families in which abuse occurs. What abusing families lack is a lifeline, so during particularly stressful times they