

FAMILY AND SOCIAL SYSTEMS DYNAMICS

This educational Module is part iii in Section III:

Theories of Human Functioning and Spirituality

Written by Peter L. VanKatwyk, Ph.D.

Systems Thinking

In the history of philosophy and science we encounter the perennial question whether to think small or big. Cartesian thinking emphasized that in order to know a phenomenon it needs to be reduced to its elementary units for analysis. When Freud applied the scientific method to understand human functioning, he focused on the intrapsychic personality structure. His therapy became *psycho-analysis*. Yet the psychoanalytic personality structure is composed of three parts – *id*, *ego*, *superego* – that function interdependently in a shared process. Furthermore, these parts are related to and affected by surrounding social realities: parents, religion and civilization. There is a large systemic dimension to psychoanalysis.

What makes Freudian psychology intrapsychic rather than systemic is that family dynamics and the cultural context were studied as realities internalized within the psyche, with the therapy confined to the individual patient. In contrast, family therapy sees individuals as interacting parts of a family system and thus addresses the process of interaction between family members rather than the individual member with his or her personal symptoms. Thinking even larger is to simultaneously see families as parts of more extensive social systems such as work cultures, faith communities and societal attitudes that impact and interact with the family and its individual members. Ecological thinking goes larger yet, extending beyond social and ideological contexts to the natural biosphere. In his book *Ecotherapy – healing ourselves, healing the earth*, Howard Clinebell in 1996 made the following critical assessment:

Western personality theories and therapies have primarily an intrapsychic and, to a lesser degree, an interpersonal orientation...But the formative interaction between persons and their natural environment has been virtually ignored in most personality theory and therapy until recently. It is as though the crucial interactions within and among humans occur in a natural vacuum, without any relation to a particular place on the earth or to the life-generating and sustaining earth.¹

Some Questions

- Can you think of reasons why this human “ecobondedness” has been ignored?
- Is thinking “big” more difficult or better than thinking “small”?
- Does the distinction between “conceptual” and “analytical” thinking exemplify thinking big vs. thinking small?
- How do you see yourself as a thinker?
- Where do you want or need to go as a thinker?

I. Biological Systems Thinking

Murray Bowen established a prominent school in family therapy that is based on natural systems and the biological sciences. Early in his psychiatric practice Bowen noted that many clinical families functioned as a closed system with its individual members stuck together in one lump of emotional dependency and reactivity. Bowen typified such a family as an *undifferentiated family ego mass*, and gradually came to the conviction that to some degree this is a common feature also in so-called normal, non-clinical families.

The *emotional system* is a system that is present in all forms of life. It is exceedingly sensitive to its environment and responds to its stimuli generally in instinctual and automatic ways. The *intellectual system* as a recent brain development in evolution sets the human person apart from all other forms of life: “Man is unique in that his capacity to know, to understand, and to communicate complex ideas far exceeds that of any other animal.”² These two systems, the emotional and the intellectual, however do not operate in isolation: “much of the time man’s intellect operates in the service of the feeling and emotional process.”³

The goal of Bowen family therapy is to coach the more capable members in the family in exercising their *differentiation of self* – developing a self that can stand on its own yet be connected to others and, rather than impulsively react, act responsibly in their best interests:

*The more differentiated a self, the more a person can be an individual while in emotional contact with the group. The human appears to be a unique species in the degree to which he can simultaneously be an individual and a team player...The ability to think and reflect, to not automatically respond to internal and external emotional stimuli, gives man the ability to restrain selfish and spiteful urges, even during periods of high anxiety.*⁴

Edwin Friedman has popularized Bowen theory in religious and spiritual care and extended family systems theory to the larger social systems of faith communities and institutional workplaces. His classic *Generation to Generation: Family Process in Church and Synagogue* has been hailed as a survival guide for those working in religious and health care institutions. In this book Friedman summarizes family systems theory in five basic concepts:⁵

1. THE IDENTIFIED PATIENT

- *In a family emotional system, when an unresolved problem is isolated in one of its members and fixed there by diagnosis, it enables the rest of the family to “purify” itself by locating the source of its “disease” in the disease of the identified patient. P.20*
- *With an organic systems model, the criterion of whom to counsel is no longer who has the symptom, but who has the greatest capacity to bring change to the system. P.22*

2. HOMEOSTASIS (BALANCE)

- The concept of homeostasis proposes that living systems value stability or a state of balance, and consequently resist change: “*the tendency of any set of relationships to strive perpetually, in self-corrective ways, to preserve the organizing principles of its existence.*” P.23
- *In work systems, the stabilizing effect of an identified patient and the resistance from the togetherness at all costs help explain why even the most ruthless corporations (no less churches and synagogues) often will tolerate and adapt to trouble-making complainers and downright incompetents, whereas the creative thinker who disturbs the balance of things will be ignored, if not let go.* P.25.

3. DIFFERENTIATION OF SELF

- *It includes the capacity to maintain a (relatively) nonanxious presence in the midst of anxious systems, to take maximum responsibility for one’s own destiny and emotional being. It can be measured somewhat by the breadth of one’s repertoire of responses when confronted with crisis.* P.27
- Bowen proposed a *scale of differentiation*. Our place on this continuum is largely determined by our generational history, suggesting that it is hard to escape the homeostatic pressures from our parents as they could not escape these genetic forces from their parents. Bowen thus saw a person’s level of differentiation largely predetermined if not permanent, with close to 90% of the population as poorly differentiated. Friedman appears a bit more optimistic about the human capacity to grow a self, as apparent in the following section on the benefits of doing “family of origin” work.

4. EXTENDED FAMILY FIELD

- This term refers to the so-called *family of origin* consisting of our birth family plus other relatives. A *genogram* is a way to chart multigenerational transmissions in order to gain needed distance for thoughtful reflection and understanding.⁶
- *The importance of emphasizing the contemporary relevance of the extended family field is that one “can go home again.” Gaining a better understanding of the emotional processes still at work with regard to our family of origin, and modifying our response to them, can aid significantly in the resolution of emotional problems in our immediate family...or of leadership problems...p.31*
- *The position we occupy in our families of origin is the only thing we can never share or give to another while we are still alive. It is the source of our uniqueness, and, hence, the basic parameter for our emotional potential as well as our difficulties.* Pp.33,34.

5. THE EMOTIONAL TRIANGLE

- *An emotional triangle is formed by any three persons or issues...when any two parts of a system become uncomfortable with one another, they will “triangle in” or focus upon a third person, or issue, as a way of stabilizing their own relationship with one another. P.35*
- *To the extent a third party to an emotional triangle tries unsuccessfully to change the relationship of the other two, the more likely it is that the third party will wind up with the stress for the other two. P.37*
- *We can only change a relationship to which we belong. Therefore, the way to bring change to the relationship of two others (and no one said it is easy) is to try to maintain a well-defined relationship with each, and to avoid the responsibility for their relationship with one another. P.39*

For Reflection and Conversation:

- In doing further research on the above 5 concepts, which one(s) would you select?
- Which one(s) of these snippet quotes got your attention?
- Can you add personal examples/narratives to any of these?
- Do you see your unique place and role in the family of origin transfer to your present immediate family, close relationships, social life or workplace?
- How can you gain personal and/or professional benefits from your position and experience in the family of origin?

II. General Systems Thinking

The biologist **Ludwig von Bertalanffy** proposed that biological organisms are prototypes that exemplify a way to think about all of life. The interaction of organs in a living biological organism such as the endocrine or respiratory system, provides a systems perspective that equally applies to other realities. Social systems like a family consist of parts, family members in their particular positions and roles, parts that shape and are shaped by the structures and patterns of family process. Ideological systems like political or theological systems are built upon basic ideas that structure a system of thought that is actualized in practice. In parallel ways we can think of other systems as disparate as mechanical, psychological, economic, or cultural systems. A short way of defining general systems is that a system is a structure of elements in process, or parts that interact in a balanced whole.

For Bertalanffy to think ecologically means:

- to think ethically.
For organisms to be alive they need to be *open systems*, systems that respond actively and sensitively in the give and take interaction with their environment.
- to think wholistically.
For organisms to be alive they need to be *self-regulating*, to mobilize its separate parts in restoring its wholeness when off balance and liable to dysfunction.

- to think creatively.
For organisms to be alive they need to be *growth-seeking*, able to balance stability with change, security with adventure.

Bertalanffy was an early herald to the 1990's philosophy of *constructionism* by saying that the way we think about life can never be wholly objective or absolute but is shaped by our personal perspectives and active, creative participation:

*There are no facts flying around in nature as if they are butterflies that you put into a nice orderly collection. Our cognition is not a mirroring of ultimate reality but rather is an active process, in which we create models of the world. These models direct what we actually see, what we consider as fact.*⁷

General Systems Theory (GST) has been a major influence in family theory and therapy. It sponsors a non-blaming approach in the practice of spiritual care and family therapy on account of the systems principles that there is not one cause responsible for any particular dysfunction, and that there is not one way to be either a functional or dysfunctional family. Families cannot be reified into discrete entities but, rather, constitute centers of interpersonal interaction pulsing with multiple patterns and processes. Criteria of functionality relate to the *patterns* that organize family process. Rather than by intrinsic qualities, a pattern is functional or dysfunctional relative to how it fits a particular context or family situation.

Family therapist and research specialist **David Olson** has developed an elegant GST synopsis in the *Circumplex Model* of couple and family systems. It is a conceptual design based on the thesis that family functioning is a matter of balancing polar opposites. The model is set up along two major dimensions. With the dimension of *cohesion* or emotional bonding, families need to balance separateness and togetherness. With the dimension of *flexibility* or the ability to adapt to change, families need to balance stability and transition. In describing family functioning, Olson uses the metaphor of skiing: "A professional skier smoothly shifts his or her weight from one leg to another, whereas a novice skier tends to emphasize one leg or another. In balanced families, people are able to move in a more fluid manner... whereas unbalanced systems tend to be stuck at one extreme or the other and have a difficult time shifting..."⁸

From this perspective, family health is not predicated by a finite list of required qualities and necessary conditions. Optimally healthy families practice the art and agility of balancing the various polarities of life into infinite configurations that are unique and attuned to the constantly shifting terrain of their family experience in its developmental journey and cultural context.

III. A Balanced Whole

From the perspective of the *Circumplex Model*, family and couple relationships operate in a tension-filled field of polarities. Polarities are made up of seeming contradictions, such as being close *versus* being distant. Polarities, however, represent opposite ends that actually belong together and function as interdependent poles of “a balanced whole.”⁹ Indeed, mounting strength at one polar end empowers the actualization of the opposite pole: when close we are able to take distance from the other, and from a distance we can better see the other and experience our closeness.

The *Circumplex Model* proposes that all the various theoretical concepts that over the years have been generated to describe family and couple dynamics can be comprised in just two polarity dimensions: the one cohesion, the other flexibility. There is a third dimension, communication, which is not a separate domain but a facilitating condition for the other two dimensions.

This module presents the *Core Dimensions of Family Functioning Model*.¹⁰ It expands the scope from two to seven polarities by incorporating the various perspectives of the major family and relational therapies:

The primary polarity is one of *integrity* and *accommodation*, addressing the system’s identity. This polarity is basic to understanding systems functioning and holds a theology of life and death. Applied to the family, each pole in isolation represents one kind of death: the one the xenophobic extreme of *judgmental exclusiveness* by which the outer world is excluded, the “death of mere self-identity,” the other the promiscuous extreme of *indiscriminate inclusiveness* by which the outer world overwhelms the family or the couple, the “death of mere self-alteration.”¹¹ Systems can die either by being too closed or by being too open: two opposite styles of dysfunction and death. Relational and personal health is found in the process of balancing these two poles: to secure an inner center and to engage outside influences and relationships that grow the center’s essence and potential.

This first polarity plots the systemic interactions by which the family or couple defines itself. This relational identity can be further delineated by focusing on three areas of family functioning: its *political dynamic*, its *emotional system*, and its *spiritual presence*. Each of these three domains – behavioral, emotional, and spiritual – contains two sets of polarities.

- 1) The system’s **political dynamic** relates to its structure and the use of power.
 - Olson’s *circumplex* model defines the power structure in terms of *family flexibility* as the amount of *change in its leadership, role relationships, and relationship rules*. The extreme polar opposites are *rigidity* (too much structure) and *chaos* (too little structure).
 - The Beavers’ model of optimal family functioning¹² describes the use of power as the overt expression of relatively equal power in the experience of

intimacy. In order to avoid competitive tensions and conflicts, Beavers emphasizes the need for complementarity in the use of power that “encompasses difference, not an inferior/superior dynamic.”¹³ The extreme ends of this polarity are *coercion over others* and *undifferentiated symmetry* in the use of power.

- 2) The concept of the **emotional system** stands out in the literature of family theory.
 - The *Circumplex Model*'s term *family cohesion* summarizes an abundance of theoretical terms describing emotional bonding among family members. In Bowen natural systems theory the emotional process is regulated by the interplay of two counterbalancing life forces: “a force that inclines people to follow their own directives, to be independent” and “a force that inclines them to respond to directives from others, to be connected.”¹⁴ These are counterbalancing life forces that govern relationships, while health is to be found in the precarious balance of the two. *Self-differentiation* points to a state of perfect balance, something to aspire to though never to be fully achieved.
 - Salvador Minuchin (1974) graphically depicts family emotional connections through interpersonal *boundaries*: if boundaries are inappropriately rigid there is *disengagement*, if boundaries are diffuse there is *enmeshment*. On the continuum between these two extremes is the mid-range of clear boundaries where family members can be close yet maintain a sense of personal identity and agency.
 - The concept of boundaries takes on special significance in family therapy when applied to generational distinctiveness. Some of the most destructive family interactions take place in intergenerational alliances violating boundaries that protect the integrity and safety of children or the solidarity of the parental/couple relationship. Perverse triangles portray a parent-child alliance pitted against the other parent, often posing *split loyalty* (Boszormenyi-Nagy & Krasner, 1986) conflicts for the child where the love of the one parent comes at the cost of discounting the other parent. In contrast, when boundaries are overly restrictive and prohibitive, interpersonal connections are also impaired, often experienced in a sense of isolation and alienation.
- 3) A **spiritual presence** in the family is a more elusive concept in systems theory. It presupposes a belief system with significant transcendent values that emotionally charge and lend meaning to the life of the family and its members. This spiritual orientation becomes present in its functioning in the everyday interpersonal relationships of the family.
 - The power of a caring and loving presence is noted in Beavers's¹⁵ description of optimal families: “Empathy for each other's feelings, interest in what each other has to say, and expectation of being understood encourage members to

respond to each other with concern and action.” This sentence rightly balances giving care to others (empathy for feelings and interest in listening) with claiming care for self (expectation of being understood). These polar ends of responsibility towards others and rights for oneself are prominent in the theory of *Contextual Therapy*.¹⁶ It is the ethics of justice that seeks a balance between give and take, grounded in the interpersonal bond of covenant trustworthiness.

- The interpersonal psychoanalytic theory of *Self Psychology*¹⁷ proposes a polar structure for the self in relationship with a significant other. Kohut (1971) developed a double axis theory based on two reciprocal human relational needs: 1. to be affirmed by significant others as special and, 2. to have a significant one to admire and take comfort in. These two poles constitute the *bipolar self*. These two relational needs stand out in early childhood when the child strives for recognition and looks to the parent as an object to be idolized and imitated. In a perfect family scenario the child’s grandiose self is transformed into healthy ambitions and the idealized parent is internalized as ideals and values. In reality the two polar needs are never fully satisfied, not even under the best circumstances, but persist through time. This is demonstrated when others continue to be recruited in our lives as *selfobjects*, to perform the ongoing functions of *mirroring* (i.e. validating the self) and *idealizing* (i.e. soothing the self).

This polar structure of the self accentuates the spiritual dimension in human nature. The need to idealize points to the need to transcend one’s individual identity and limitations and merge with someone or something larger than the self to comfort as well as to inspire and guide. The need for mirroring is the need to be confirmed in one’s special giftedness, purpose and vocation in life. Idealizing and mirroring are relational pathways towards a *cohesive self* (Kohut, 1971) and a meaningful place in the world. Ideally both idealizing and mirroring are present, but in the absence of one the other can still facilitate the development of the self. When these two relational needs are arranged as polar ends - one assigning greatness to the self, the other assigning greatness to the other – the potential for absolutizing one or the other becomes apparent. In the context of the family there is the possibility of the extremes of either a *family clan*, where the ethnocentric ideals, values, history or religion of the family become the dominant reality, or a *person cult*, where the narcissistic needs and aspirations of the star of the family or the claims of privileged status of a family member structure the family.

The following *CDF* diagram embraces and highlights seven universal principles or values of family health to be pursued in a lifetime of balancing its polar ends. This approach acknowledges the constantly shifting terrain that families and family members need to negotiate in defining themselves in their daily lives.

CORE DIMENSIONS OF FAMILY FUNCTIONING

FOCUS	POLARITY	EXTREMES		PRINCIPLE
family: -identity	1.integrity and accommodation	Judgmental exclusiveness	indiscriminate inclusiveness	family/couple definition
-political dynamic	2.structure and flexibility	rigidity in roles and rules	chaos in rules and leadership	system change
	3.power and equality	coercive control over others	undifferentiated symmetry	relationship intimacy
-emotional system	4.attachment and separateness	clinging and dependency	reactiveness and disengagement	self differentiation
	5.affiliation and boundaries	triangles and split loyalties	isolation and alienation	generation distinctiveness
-spiritual presence	6.responsibilities and rights	no caring for self	no caring for others	covenant trustworthiness
	7.idealizing and mirroring	a family clan	a person cult	vocation confirmation

Applications

The *CDF* diagram can be incorporated as an internal map of orientation for a systems analysis in spiritual care. It is intended as a safeguard against the more absolutizing and pathologizing tendencies in clinical care and therapy. To extend the use of the *CDF* table, it can become a psychoeducational assessment tool to be shared in the practice of care.

Questions

Do you see

- a difference thinking in *polarities* as distinct from thinking in *absolutes*?
- polarities and absolutes mutually exclusive?
- *balanced whole* as a spiritual experience or theological concept?
- the *CDF* diagram as a workable outline for a family/couple case study?
- the *CDF* diagram as a workable outline for a systems analysis of a congregation/synagogue/mosque or health care institution?

A CASE STUDY

The Story

In the British movie *Shirley Valentine*, based on Willy Russell's (1991) play, Shirley's husband Joe comes home one day from work to find a note pinned on the kitchen door: *Gone to Greece. Back in two weeks*. His wife has been persuaded by her girlfriend to come along on a vacation to Greece. While in Greece Shirley gets reconnected with a part of herself that got lost in some twenty years of being a wife and a mother. The two-week vacation stretches into months, with no end in sight. The distraught husband is in crisis, feeling cheated, abandoned, and increasingly unable to function on his own in England. In spite of ever more desperate phone calls and thoughts that she will be remembered by her children as "the mother who went on a holiday and never came back," Shirley holds on to her new life in Greece. With the family torn apart across continents, with all the symptoms of a typically "dysfunctional" family, the movie scripts a narrative where, to the contrary, Shirley emerges as the redemptive centre of transformation, for herself as well as for her marriage and family.

The vacation stages the story of Shirley's life stretching from a rebellious and lonely schoolgirl who becomes a devoted wife and mother. Her son and daughter have recently left home, as yet loosely connected to the adult world. The daughter, with all her belongings stuffed in bags, returns to mother when conflict erupts with her roommate. Greece is part of an extended geography in Shirley's life. As a girl she was excited about the prospect of exploring the world but in school got the message that she would "never get far in life." She married early. We see Shirley and Joe as a young couple painting the kitchen walls. After a few playful spatters thrown at each other, a wild face-splashing chase ends up with both in the bathtub. Joe tells his wife: "A nut-case you are. I love you Shirley Valentine." Over the years the couple settles in with work and family responsibilities. After launching their children, Shirley and Joe regroup as a couple, this time without the playfulness. Shirley says of her husband: "He loved me because I was a nut-case, now he just thinks I am a nut-case." Shirley begins to talk to the kitchen as she drinks white wine preparing dinner.

A critical event occurs when Joe comes home and tea is not ready. Worse, it is Thursday and, rather than the customary steak, Shirley serves chips and egg due for the Tuesday menu. Joe is enraged, screaming: "I think you are going around the bend." Shirley responds: "I hope so. I have always loved to travel." As routines and schedules constrain her in the kitchen, provoking the old adolescent rebelliousness, the wine beckons her to the land "where the grape is grown." On the inside of the kitchen closet is a large poster of Greece, on a door straddling two worlds.

The movie ends with Joe and Shirley meeting again, this time not at the kitchen table but in Greece at a beach table with a bottle of wine. This final image leaves us with the paradox that the absence leads the way to a new presence.

A Systems Analysis

This family context gives Greece a meaning different from the one generated by a moralistic or individualistic focus on Shirley as the “identified patient,” a middle-aged “nut-case” abandoning her marriage and family for a romantic adventure in the sun on an exotic island. The timing of this Greek “madness” links the children leaving home with Shirley left in the confines of her kitchen. The presenting challenge from this family life cycle perspective is leaving home.

Following the CDFP outline:

1. *Identity*: Shirley married young, before she had time to establish a cohesive sense of herself. Prematurely her personal identity merged with the marriage and, soon after, a family. Her family involvement included the loss of personal friends except the one girlfriend, a person recently divorced and in search of a new life, and in the story Shirley’s companion on the journey to Greece. The family has launched the two children. With the children gone, Shirley finds that the marriage also is gone. In terms of the identity polarity, the extreme of exclusive family involvement raises the urgency of connecting with a world beyond the kitchen door.
2. *Political Dynamic*: The story accentuates a rigid structure dramatized in oppressive rules about when to drink tea, and what to eat on what day. When Shirley changes the menu she faces Joe’s outrage and abuse. There is a parallel reality with Joe – running his shop is a harrowing and isolating experience for him. Joe and Shirley come across as two disempowered people, the one confined in the shop, the other in the kitchen. In sharing their powerlessness, their intimacy gets lost in an escalating struggle for personal control. From a larger perspective of social constructionism, there is the impact of a patriarchal society with gender inequality, sexist attitudes and oppressive work pressures with no play time.
3. *Emotional System*: Shirley becomes aware as her children leave home that psychologically she has never left home. Greece is the symbol of a world she has never known and that now beckons her. The story of the two children dramatizes the polar ends of attachment and separation. The daughter, even though gone, still clings to her mother and readily regresses to child dependency. She is enraged when her mother is leaving, and in her feeling of abandonment she allies with her father in insisting that Shirley’s role is to be the caretaker at home. In contrast to his younger sister, the son has left home and relates to his parents as fellow adults. He confronts the father for living a boring life, tied to a small world of work and home, not able to meet his wife in a new world. In this sibling story, clear boundaries and strength of self-differentiation are contrasted with emotional triangles.
4. *Spiritual Presence*: Shirley acts out the anger of grieving the losses that have accumulated over the years. It starts with telling Joe to go away and read the paper when there is no tea and dinner is late. The episode foreshadows that she will not just be late, but not be there at all. In the movie the absence of tea progresses to an absent

steak and culminates in an absent Shirley. Their covenant arrangement and trust is broken. The balance of caring has been too long in favor of Joe and the family. In addressing the imbalance, she is drawn into an extreme position: claiming her own life at the cost of her marriage and family.

Shirley has been serving the needs of her family for over 20 years of family loyalty, yet not gained personal affirmation and recognition. Her story illustrates the feminist critique that women have been assigned the one-way vocation of being there for others. In Greece she enjoys a brief romantic interaction, meets people, makes friends and finds a job. Greece symbolizes that Shirley has found her place in the world. Greece also signifies the place where Joe and Shirley need to meet if there is to be a new beginning and a new life for them as a couple and as a family.

For Reflection

The Shirley Valentine family dynamics centers around the “leaving home” dynamics.

- Do you see this dynamic as a universal theme in all families?
- Can you identify this theme in your own family of origin?
- How does this dynamic present itself in your current relational system?
- What other perennial themes in family dynamics can you think of?
- Which one can be documented in a personal family narrative?

For Practice

Following the CDFD as an orientation guide, practice with a peer one of the following intake interviews:

- Taking a family history
- Taking a religious history

Film Resources

A sample of engaging movies on families:

- *Around the Bend*. Writer/Director Jordan Roberts
- *Hannah and her Sisters*. Woody Allen
- *In Country – The Story of an American Family*. Norman Jewison
- *Moonstruck*. Norman Jewison
- *Once Around*. Lasse Hallstrom

References and Sources

Biological Systems Theory

- Goleman, D. 1995. *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam
- Hendrix, H. 1988. *Getting the love You Want*. New York: Harper & Row
- Kerr, Michael E. & Bowen, Murray. 1988. *Family Evaluation*. New York: Norton.
- Kerr, Michael E., "Chronic Anxiety and Defining a Self" in *The Atlantic Monthly*, September 1988.
- Richardson, Ronald W. 1984 *Family Ties that Bind - A Self-Help Guide to Change through Family of Origin Therapy*. Self-Counsel
- Wilson, E.O. 1975. *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap

General Systems Theory

- Beavers, W. & Hampson, R. 1993, "Measuring Family Competence: The Beavers Systems Model," in F.Walsh (Ed.), *Normal Family Processes*, 73-104.
- Boszormenyi-Nagy, Krasner.1986. *Between Give & Take*. New York: Brunner/Mazel
- Davidson, M.1983. *Uncommon sense: The life and thought of Ludwig von Bertalanffy*. Los Angeles: J.P.Tarcher.
- Minuchin, S. 1974. *Families and Family Therapy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nichols, M., Schwartz, R. 2001. "General Systems Theory" in Family Therapy: Concepts and Methods- Allyn and Bacon.
- Olson, D. 1993. "Circumplex Model of Marital and Family Systems: Assessing Family Functioning," in F.Walsh (Ed.), *Normal Family Processes*, 104-137.
- Pattison, M. 1977. *Pastor and Parish – A Systems Approach*. Fortress.
- Tillich, P. 1951. *Systematic Theology*, Vol.1. Chicago: Universtiy of Chicago
- Tillich, P. 1963. *Systematic Theology*, Vol.3. Chicago: Universtiy of Chicago
- Von Bertalanffy, I. 1968. *General System Theory*. New York: George Braziller.
- Walsh, F. (Ed.), *Normal Family Processes*. 2003. New York:Guilford.

Relational Psychodynamic Theory

- Elson, M. 1986. *Self Psychology in Clinical Social Work*. New York:Norton
- Kohut, H. 1971. *The Analysis of the Self*. New York: International Universities

ENDNOTES

¹ Howard Clinebell. 1996, 26,27.

² Kerr & Bowen. 1988, 31

³ Ibid.,32

⁴ Ibid., 94

⁵ Friedman. 1985, pp.19-39.

⁶ See Module IV,ii.

⁷ Nichols & Schwartz. 2001. 116. Quoted from Davidson,. 1983,214.

⁸ 1993,3

⁹ Tillich, 1951

¹⁰ The CDFE model was first published in *The Journal of Pastoral Care*, Fall 1997, and later adapted in Peter L. VanKatwyk, 2003. *Spiritual Care and Therapy*, Ch.8. Waterloo: WLU Press.

¹¹ Tillich, 1963. See module III,ii

¹² Beavers & Hampson. 1990

¹³ Ibid., 82.

¹⁴ Kerr & Bowen, 1988, 61

¹⁵ 1993, 83

¹⁶ Boszormenyi-Nagy, Krasner. 1986

¹⁷ Kohut, 1971, Elson, 1986