6-1-1966

Marital interaction theory: some implications for research

Lucille S. Pugh
Portland State University

John C. Douglas
Portland State University

Eleanor M. Gadway
Portland State University

Jeanna C. Greenlee
Portland State University

Margaret D. McGill
Portland State University

See next page for additional authors

Author

Lucille S. Pugh, John C. Douglas, Eleanor M. Gadway, Jeanna C. Greenlee, Margaret D. McGill, Beverly S. Mackenzie, Marjorie H. Smith, and Violet S. Smith

MARITAL INTERACTION THEORY:
SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH

by

Lucille S. Pugh

John C. Douglas   Margaret D. McGill

Eleanor M. Gadway   Beverly S. Mackenzie

Jeanna C. Greenlee   Marjorie H. Smith

Violet S. Smith

Project Director
James L. Breedlove, D.S.W.

A GROUP RESEARCH PROJECT

Presented to the School of Social Work

of Portland State College

in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Social Work

June 1966

APPROVED:

████████████████████
. . . . . . ────────────────── . . . .
Associate Professor of Social Work

████████████████████████
. . ──────────────────────── . . . .
Dean of Graduate Studies

██████████████████
. . . . . ────────────────── . . . .
Dean of Graduate School

Date report is presented ...May 9, 1966..................

Typed by Maud Alexander

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

This project examines specific basic areas of marital interaction theory. Individual chapters are developed around the following themes: historical development of the theory of interaction; a theoretical discussion of selected concepts; personality as a determinant of inter-action; communication in marriage; marital interaction patterns; methodology pertaining to research findings; and finally some implications for research which became apparent as this project developed.

The project lays the conceptual groundwork for a series of empirical studies that will use the interactional approach as a theoretical base. The immediate purpose of this project therefore is to describe the important di-mensions of the interactional approach as these pertain to marital interaction. Interaction is defined as a recipro-cal relationship in which each person may produce effects upon the other. Here the essence of marriage is inter-action; thus marital interaction is critical in its effect on the spouses and the continuity of the marriage.

Some of the basic concepts of George Mead are described and it is suggested that they are essential ele-ments of the interactional approach. The major assumptions of this approach are that a) human behavior cannot be derived or inferred from nonhuman forms, b) the social act is the primary analytic unit for an understanding of society and the personality, c) the human infant is potentially social, and d) the human being is actor as well as reactor.

Personality is discussed as a determinant of the quality and quantity of marital interaction. The issue of personal competence is explored, particularly in respect to verbal ability. Communication, the process of influence, is defined for marital interaction and the consequent formation of patterns.

Identification and classification of marital interaction patterns are limited to a description of selected examples from family research and the observations of clinicians. Patterns tend to be defined in psychological terms although communicative behavior is stressed. The absence of common criteria and terminology is noted. Description of dysfunctional patterns predominates.

Two methods frequently used in recent studies of marital interaction are direct observation and analysis of reports from marital partners. It is suggested that a combination of these techniques could increase the quantity of information about marital interaction.

Research questions focus on the problem of adult socialization, its implications for the establishment of marital interaction patterns, and the need to deter-the relation between the interaction process and the functional or dysfunctional quality of the resultant pattern. An inseparable part of the aforementioned research areas is the function of communication. It is suggested that investigation of verbal communication might yield significant data for the understanding of the interaction process as it affects the personalities of the spouses and the formation of patterns.

PREFACE

This research project, entitled Marital Interaction
Theory: Some Implications for Research, began as a review
of recently published literature about marriage. The
International Index on Periodicals, The Cumulative Book
Index, Psychological Abstracts, and Bibliographic Index
were searched for relevant material published between
January, 1960 and March, 1965. As articles were reviewed,
each source of theoretical orientation was identified by
referring to the author's footnotes. In areas which seemed
most meaningful, more intensive reading was undertaken and
central ideas were traced back to their historic origins.

The theoretical framework of the interactional approach
with its concentration on the act as the basic unit of obser-
vation seemed to be the most useful way of looking at
marriage for the profession of social work. This report
provides a conceptual mapping of the important dimensions
of this approach. It is designed as the first of an on-
going series of studies. This report does not attempt to
extend theory but to describe a framework of existing
theory for future empirical studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MARITAL INTERACTION THEORY:
SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this project is to review the inter-
actional approach to the study of marriage. The project
first reviews the historical background of the inter-
actional approach. Present day interactional concepts
have emerged by means of an evolutionary process, as
found in the writings of Plato and other early philoso-
phers, then later found in the works of the social psy-
chologists of this century, and eventually in the works
of present day clinicians. The project presents a gener-
al review of a specific approach. It is not a review of
issues, nor is it evaluative: it is descriptive, with
some attempt to assess how this approach can be useful
in social work research. The project is designed as the
first phase in an ongoing series, and as such, it de-
velops a conceptual mapping of the important dimensions
of this interactional approach to the study of marriage.
The project examines basic areas of marital interaction
theory. Individual chapters are developed as follows:
historical development of the theory of interaction; a
theoretical discussion of selected concepts; personality
as a determinant of interaction;

communication as a factor in marriage; marriage inter-
actional patterns; methodology pertaining to research
findings; and finally, some implications for research
which became apparent as the project developed.

The link between the individual and society as a
whole is the basic social unit known as the family. If
social workers are to serve individuals effectively, they
must be well aware of the family as a system of interact-
ing personalities. It is one of the purposes of this
report to contribute to this awareness, which should lead,
in turn, to further study and research in closely related
areas and be of diagnostic value in the broad area of social
work.

The feasibility of viewing the family as an interact-
ing unity was suggested by Ernest Burgess forty years ago.
Burgess had been studying the patterns of personal relation-
ships in family life, and his study in that area led to his
concept of the family as "a unity of interacting persons"
(Burgess, 1926, p. 5). It was Burgess' contention that the
actual unity of family life should not be defined in legal
terms, but rather, in terms of the interaction of its
members. Burgess believed, then, that the very essence of
marriage is the interaction, and the family lives as long as
interaction is taking place.

The concept 'interactional' as used in this report is
exemplified by Sampson (1964):

> As a concept, interaction denotes the
> formation of a relationship between two
> or more persons, A and B, such that A's
> behavior serves both as a stimulus for
> B and as a response to B's behavior which
> in turn may serve as both a stimulus and
> a response for A.   Interaction, therefore,
> involves a reciprocal relationship in
> which each person may produce effects on
> the other (p. 51).

In addition to the interactional approach there are
four other approaches to the study of marriage and the
family: (1) the structural-functional, (2) the situ-
ational, (3) the institutional, (4) the developmental.
These approaches differ considerably in emphasis,
although similarities between them are readily discern-
ible.

The interactional approach emphasizes the signifi-
cance of personality determinants as these determinants
influence each human being's tendencies, or potentiali-
ties, for action. This approach focuses on the family
of interacting persons, and it concerns itself with
process. Overt behavior is primarily considered in terms
of specific interacts. Role analysis is of major impor-
tance, and this framework has also focused on such
problems as status relations (which leads to authority
patterns), processes of communication, conflict, decision-
making, and, in general, the continuum of interactive
processes from courtship to the divorce court (Hill and
Hansen, 1960).

The structural-functional approach views the family as a social system with emphasis on maintenance of the family system and, ultimately, of the social system (Hill and Hansen, 1960). Family structure is oriented toward boundary maintenance of the system, and behavior is studied in the context of its contribution to this maintenance. This approach is extremely versatile, as it really copes with three broad areas:

(1) the interaction of the individual family member with other individuals, and subsystems in the family with the full family system;

(2) the interplay of subsystems with other subsystems and with the full family system; and

(3) the transaction of the family with outside agencies and other systems in society, and with society (the social system) itself (Hill and Hansen, 1960, p. 304).

The situational approach focuses on the situation itself, or the individual's overt behavior in response to the situation. The family is seen as a unit of stimuli acting toward a focal point (a child, for example). However, the framework allows not only for analysis of the behavior of that focal point in the family situation, but also allows for study of the situation itself (Hill and Hansen, 1960).

The institutional approach emphasizes the family as

a social unit in which the individual and cultural values
are of central concern, and it deals best with social
change and family development over long spans of time. It
is concerned with transactions of the family institution
with other social or cultural structures, and only in
highly generalized fashion does it deal with interaction as
a process. The family institution is often referred to as
the most important of institutions (Hill and Hansen, 1960).

The developmental approach involves the concept of
stages of a family life cycle, with developmental needs and
tasks. It is concerned with the life cycle of the nuclear
family, and emphasizes the ever-changing internal structure
and development of the family over time. Like the inter-
actional approach, the developmental approach views the
family as a unity of interacting personalities, intricately
organized internally into certain paired positions (such as
wife-mother, daughter-sister). This small group has a
predictable natural history designated by logical stages,
progressing from the simple husband-wife pair to the
successively more complex stages as additional positions
are activated, then to the less complex as members depart
from the group, and it contracts to the husband-wife pair
again. The family changes as its member composition --
and their ages -- change. At the same time the quality
and type of the interaction also changes (Hill and
Hansen, 1960).

The Significance of the Interactional Approach

Interactional theory is a product of social psychology, and as such, addresses itself first of all to what Stryker (1959) refers to as 'socialization': "how the human organism acquires the ways of behaving, the values, norms and attitudes of the social units of which he is a part" (p. 111). The focus, then, is not on any static state, but on an on-going process which involves the human organism and its ever changing social environment.

Along with socialization, interactional theory addresses itself to personality, which Stryker (1959) defines as "the organization of persistent behavior patterns" (p. 112). Personality is considered in some detail in Chapter III.

Highly significant in the interactional approach is the fact that within this approach personal organization and personal disorganization are treated as different aspects of the same problem. From this position, answers to both can be provided without calling upon principles which lie outside of the theoretical scheme of this approach.

Historical Development of the Interactional Approach

Although the interactional approach to the study of marriage is recognized today as a direct outgrowth of

the work of George Herbert Mead and a group of University
of Chicago interactionists, its roots may be located in the
very gradual development of social thought, beginning with
the writings of Plato. Plato early emphasized that man
must be understood in his social environment rather than as
an isolated individual. He stressed his belief that not
only did man effect changes in his environment, but also,
he himself was subject to change by environmental influences
(Plato, 1937).

These writings constituted the first suggestion of
man as a really social being interacting with his fellow
man and with his environment. From that first suggestion,
the idea in one form or another was presented from time to
time. It was Aristotle, pupil of Plato, who introduced a
comparative method of studying social institutions, not
only demonstrating their relative value but also demon-
strating that, in order to meet changing social con-
ditions and social needs, institutions themselves must
change, and their change would in turn effect some modi-
fication of man's behavior (Aristotle, 1900).

These were the expressed early beginnings of interest
and concern for man as a social being. In the middle of
the nineteenth century more ideas were recorded in the
literature that appear to be additional precursors to
modern interactional theory. Gabriel Tarde developed
ideas in this area into a sociological theory, centered

around the process of imitation as practiced by man in adjust-
ing to his fellow man and to his environment. He stressed
three processes: repetition, opposition, and adaptation.
According to Tarde (1903) all social phenomena can, ulti-
mately, be reduced to the relation between two persons,
one of whom exerts influence upon the other.

At approximately the same time Tarde was developing
his theories in France, Georg Simmel in Germany was becom-
ing concerned with a different phase of interaction.
Simmel's sociological thought begins with the process of
social becoming. After a study of the descriptive data of
history in search of generalizations, it was his contention
that the social process in which man involves himself first
of all springs out of social interaction. Simmel (1950)
defined 'socialization' as "the growing into a unity"
(p. 10). To Simmel, sociology was essentially the science
of socialization, or of the forms of unity within which
people live.

In the evolutionary process which led eventually to
current interactional theory the next man of importance
was Charles Horton Cooley who made vital contributions to
the field of social psychology, of which the inter-
actional theory is a part. It was Cooley who formulated
the concept of The Looking Glass Self (Cooley, 1922).
This concept was derived from the assumption that even
a person's consciousness of himself is largely a direct

reflection of the opinions which he believes others hold about him (Cooley, 1922).

A contemporary of Cooley, George Herbert Mead, also contributed to sociological understanding about communication, language, the consciousness of meaning, and the meaning of self. Mead (1924) believed that each personality is definitely affected by contact with other personalities, and that an individual plays as many different roles as there are other individuals to whom he responds. According to Mead's theory of self, the self includes the ego, or 'I', which is an active agent, or activity itself. Self also includes an empirical self, or 'me', which is constructed out of one's experiences in the social environment.

Mead's work led directly to the interactional approach as it is known today, although a workable description of the conceptual framework seemed to be lacking until Hill and Hansen (1960) published their work. They present the family as a unity of interacting individuals,

> . . . each occupying a position(s)
> within the family to which a number
> of roles are assigned, i.e., the in-
> dividual perceives norms or role ex-
> pectations held individually or
> collectively by other family members
> for his attributes and behavior. In
> a given situation, an individual
> defines these role expectations

> primarily in view of their source
> (reference group) and of his own
> self-conception. Then he role-plays.
> Most immediately the family is
> studied through analysis of overt
> interacts (interaction of role-
> playing family members) cast in this
> structure (p. 302).

Relative Advantages of the Interactional Approach

Historically social psychologists have disagreed
about what Stryker (1959) terms "some metaphysical prior-
ity of society over the individual" (p. 112). Some main-
tain that society itself is the ultimate reality, while
others place emphasis and importance on the individual.
Either position, however, results in ambiguity. By
beginning its analysis with the social act itself, inter-
actional theory by-passes the disagreement. Interaction
is its basic unit of observation, and it is from inter-
action that both society and the individual derive
(Stryker, 1959).

This formulation allows a kind of communication
between sociology and social psychology that is not
readily available to the other four alternative frame-
works mentioned previously. Both sociology and social
psychology begin with social actions. From this be-
ginning, sociology goes toward "the behavior of col-
lectivities" (Stryker, 1959, p. 112) while psychology,
from the same base, goes toward the behavior of

individuals. Those who attempt to study the family find
that the problems involved bridge these two fields, and
in the interactional approach they are provided a frame-
work "facilitating movement from one level to the other,
allowing systematic transactions between the two levels"
(Stryker, 1959, p. 112).

Since the interactional approach assumes the family
to be a relatively closed system of interaction, it is
narrower in scope than the structure-function approach,
and some of the broad and rich ideas that emanate from the
structure-function approach are missing. The interaction-
al approach may be thought of as a microscopic approach.
This is viewed by some as a severe disadvantage.
Zimmerman, for example, disdainfully refers to the inter-
actional approach as a study of the "mechanics of marriage"
rather than a true family study (Zimmerman, 1935). Others
prefer to view the family in terms of macroscopic changes
of the institutional features, or within large cultural or
societal contexts. These people, too, are unhappy with
the interactional approach.

From the point of view of social work, however, the
interactional approach, viewing marriage, as it does, as a
constant socialization process, provides a unique opportun-
ity to look at individuals in their immediate context: as
members of a constantly changing system of interacting
personalities.

As the chapters in this report are presented, they approximate a frame of reference, with discussion of the major concepts involved. One of the reasons for this organization was the hope that the report might constitute a guide for future students who may wish to work in the general area of marital interaction.

CHAPTER II

THE INTERACTIONAL APPROACH
TO THE STUDY OF MARRIAGE

There are, perhaps, as many definitions of the word 'theory' as there are theorists. 'Theory' can be taken to mean a set of concepts which sensitizes one to certain aspects of behavior or a set of laws which describe certain phenomena. There are partial theories and there are "grand theories" such as one finds in some laws of physics which can explain most laws as well as most phenomena (Zetterberg, 1963). According to Hearn (1958), theory is an internally consistent body of verified hypotheses, the assumption being that verification is provisional rather than absolute.

Theory is important in any field because it explains phenomena. Concepts, the elements of theory, define what is to be observed. However, it is only when concepts are integrated into a logical scheme that theory emerges. If one is to study marriage from the interactional approach, to test the usefulness of the approach for understanding the complexities of marriage, a framework is necessary (Hill and Hansen, 1960).

Since the interactionist approach has not been developed into a systematic theory of marriage, this chapter will review previous efforts to define and study symbolic interaction, to review the fundamental

assumptions underlying the interactional approach and to
assess which concepts may be useful as a way of understand-
ing marriage, especially for the social worker.

Symbolic Interaction

The interactionist approach, according to Hill and
Hansen (1960), was first developed in sociology and social
psychology. The approach was an outgrowth of the work of
George Herbert Mead and the University of Chicago group of
symbolic interactionists.

According to English and English (1958) social psy-
chology is that branch of psychology which studies the
phenomena of social behavior, especially as it interacts
with the personal characteristics of individuals. They
point out that social psychology is actually a hybrid
discipline that inherits from both parents (psychology and
sociology) concepts, data, and problems.

Before looking at what various authors have to say
about interaction and symbolic interaction, the words
'interaction,' 'transaction', and 'symbolic interaction'
will be defined as they are used in this report.

A close relationship exists between the words
'transaction' and 'interaction' and there also exists
some tendency to use them interchangeably. 'Transaction'
is taken to mean a process which includes a two-phase,

cyclical exchange between two individuals in which there
is constant feedback which is largely self-regulating and
self-correcting and which modifies the subsequent response
of each individual (Dewey and Bentley, 1949). 'Inter-
action' implies the action of one person and the response
of another (Weiss and Monroe, 1959).

Individuals in responding to one another may be in-
volved in what Mead referred to as a "conversation of
gestures". Of this Stryker (1959) states:

> . . . they come to use early stages of
> another's acts as indicators of later
> stages. Such gestures have meaning.
> Vocal sounds can seem as gestures and
> they too have meaning. This meaning of
> a gesture (an early stage of an act) is
> the behavior that follows it (the later
> stages of the act): meaning is, by
> definition, behavior. Some gestures have
> an additional property. They may mean
> the same thing, imply the same set of
> subsequent behavior, to the organism which
> produces this gesture and that which per-
> ceives it. When this occurs, the gesture
> becomes a significant symbol . . .
> Language, basically, is a system of
> significant symbols . . . (p. 113).

'Symbolic interaction' means that symbols (a word or
gesture that stands for something else) in communication
(the concept of communication includes all those symbolic
processes by which people influence one another) (Reusch
and Bateson, 1951) are significant symbols or gestures.
According to Mead this means that:

> . . . the individual must know what he is
> about; he himself, and not merely those
> who respond to him, must be able to inter-
> pret the meaning of his own gesture.
> Behavioristically, this is to say that the
> biological individual must be able to call
> out in himself the response his gesture
> calls out in the other, and then utilize
> this response of the other for control of
> his further conduct. Such gestures are
> significant symbols . . .   (p. 27).

The calling out of the same response in both gives the necessary common content for community of meaning.

It is through interaction that symbols are invented. Language, a mode of interaction, involves at least two beings, a speaker and a hearer and it presupposes that both belong to an organized group from which they have acquired their habits of speech (Duncan, 1962).

Conventional interaction theories are derived from the assumption that action occurring between persons is reciprocal. The unit of action is the person. According to Sarbin (1954), the general formula is that when A initiates an action to B, B's response to A serves as a stimulus for A and so on.

Following this formula of interaction (which all sociological theories seem to imply implicitly or explicitly), in a marital action when a wife, for example, asks her husband a question, his response to her serves as a stimulus for her and hers for him and so on. But there is certainly more involved than simple responses.

How does each respond and why? How does each see himself?
How does each see the other? What goes into the response?
These are some of the questions which interaction theorists
seek to answer.

Stryker (1959) indicates that as a social psychological
theory, symbolic interaction is concerned first with the
question of socialization, that is, how the organism
acquires ways of behaving: the values, norms and attitudes
of the social units of which he is a part. Here, the focus
is on the development of what happens to the human over time.
Second, symbolic interaction is concerned with personality.
Here the focus is on the organization of persistent be-
havior patterns.

Kantor (1964) explains that symbolic interaction im-
plies that people act with reference to each other. Each
fits his conduct to the conduct of others by checking what
they are doing or what they mean to do. Each builds up his
own behavior on the basis of interpretations of the be-
havior of others. Group action occurs through the mutual
tailoring of individual lines of action. Such tailoring
assumes that there are predictable forms of social inter-
action which makes social relationships possible.

Regardless of whose interpretation one accepts or
refers to, it is important to define the words used by
interactionists as precisely as possible. Since the

interactional approach borrows, so to speak, from many disciplines, the vocabulary is colorful and sometimes confusing. In the process of presenting the assumptions and concepts of the theory terms will be clarified and defined, at least as they are used in the context of this project. Among those which will be defined, are socialization, personality, communication, symbols, the act, the social act, category, position, role, self, role-taking, generalized other, significant other, role conflict, thinking, volition, and self-consciousness.

However, before proceeding with the assumptions and concepts it might be well at this point to state that the participants of this project are in agreement with Mead's position as a social psychologist. While Mead's own position is "behavioristic," it is a social behaviorism (that is, that behavior is influenced by the behavior of other persons) and not an individualistic behaviorism (Mead, 1934). Mead's is not the position of the psychological behaviorist, who, by preference, studies learning and motivation in a non-social environment.

According to Morris (Mead, 1934), Mead answered the problem as how the human mind and self arise in the process of conduct in bisocial terms.

Mead avoided the extremes of both the traditional psychologist and social scientist by an appeal to an

ongoing social process of interacting biological organisms within which mind and self arise through the internalization of the conversation of gestures in the form of the verbal gesture.

English and English (1958) point out that the term mind ". . . has such a battered history that it can hardly be used clearly in technical writing . . ." (p. 328). They list five definitions for the word and it is the first definition which is most appropriate for this project. It states that the mind is ". . . organized totality or system of all mental processes or psychic activities, usually of an individual organism . . ." (p. 323). They state that the emphasis is upon relatedness of the phenomena; that mind in this sense does not commit one to a metaphysical position above the nature of these processes and this definition may be used by those who define psychology in terms of acts or behaviors; but is more congenial to those who recognize a category of processes such as feelings and cognitions, which though related to behavior are still distinct.

Morris goes on to say that the individual act is seen within the social act, that psychology and sociology are united on a biological basis, and social psychology is grounded in social behaviorism. It is in these terms that Mead's theory bridges the gap between impulse and rationality, by showing how certain biological organisms acquire

the capacity of self-consciousness, of abstract reasoning, of thinking, of purposive behavior; in other words he shows how man arose from an impulsive to a rational animal.

Mead believes that the human cortex and the temporal dimension of the nervous system (which provides the control of the gesture in terms of the consequences of making it) permits the human animal alone to pass from the level of the conversation of gestures to that of the significant language symbol and it is the absence of the first which "prevent the talking birds from talking . . ." (p. xxiii).

Assumptions

All theory must have assumptions, that is to say, judgments which one accepts as if true, in a train of reasoning, though they have not been proved. Stryker (1959) lists four assumptions upon which symbolic inter-action is based.

(1) The initial assumption is that man must be studied at his own level. Symbolic interactionists take the position that valid principles of human social psy-chological behavior cannot be derived or inferred from the study of non-human forms. According to Stryker (1959), this assertion rests on the principle of emergence. "Emergence suggests the existence of quali-tative differences as well as quantitative continuities

among the precipitates of the evolutionary process"
(p. 112).

If man is qualitatively different from other animal
forms, in some respects, it follows that principles
derived from other forms cannot completely account for his
behavior.

(2) A second assumption is that symbolic interaction
begins its analysis of society with the social act. Inter-
action is its basic unit of observation and from that action
both society and the self derive.

(3) A third assumption concerns the newborn infant.
The assumption here is that the human infant enters life
neither social nor antisocial but with potentialities for
social development.

For purposes of this project, this assumption is
expanded to include the following: The infant enters life
with potentialities for development of personality or self.
By personality is meant "The thinking, feeling, acting
human being who for the most part conceives himself as an
individual separate from other individuals and objects.
This human does not have a personality; he is a personal-
ity" (Witmer and Kotinsky, 1952, p. 3).

Personality consists of attitudes, ideas, and habits
of the individual. The concept implies that within a

person tendencies to act, or predispositions, exist prior to
and after the overt responses to which they give rise. Such
tendencies are designated as attitudes. Personality refers
to these tendencies in interaction with one another. Al-
though it is implied that personality develops through
learning and experience, the importance of biologically
inherited traits and characteristics is not denied.

(4) A last assumption is that the human being is an
actor as well as a reactor. The assumption that the human
being does not simply respond to stimuli occurring outside
himself leads to what Stryker (1959) refers to as the
fundamental principle of symbolic interaction: ". . .
the demand that the investigator see the world from the
point of view of the subject of his investigation"
(p. 112).

Major Concepts

An assumption of the theory is emergence and the
principal emergent at the human level is language behavior.

The starting point is with the act. The act is be-
havior by an organism which stems from an impulse requir-
ing some adjustment to relevant objects in an external
world. In a social act, the appropriate object is another
individual. Social acts involve at least two individuals
acting with reference to each other. Since acts occur over

time they have a history. This makes possible the appear-
ance of gestures, defined as "any part of the act which
stands for, or comes to be a sign of, those parts of the
act yet to occur" (Stryker, 1959, p. 113).

Categories, Position

Some symbols, called categories, represent general-
izations of behavior toward objects. To apply a class
term to a number of objects or to signify that for certain
purposes, different things are to be treated as the same
kind of thing is to categorize (Stryker, 1959). Classi-
fication is necessary because life would be too confusing
if one had to respond to every object as unique. Cate-
gories are symbols. They have meaning, are cues for, and
help organize behavior. According to Stryker (1959),
"Humans respond to a classified world, one whose salient
features are named and placed into categories indicating
their significance for behavior" (p. 114).

An important kind of category is one called
'position'. Gross, Mason and McEachern (1958) use the
term 'position' to refer to the "location of an actor or
class of actors in a system of social relationships"
(p. 48). Positions are then socially recognized cate-
gories of actors serving to classify persons such as
father, wife, paramour, and so on.

Such categories are significant since they serve to organize behavior toward categorized persons. By attaching a position designation to a person one is led to expect certain behavior from him and in turn behave toward him on the basis of these expectations (Stryker, 1959). Indeed, one cannot retain one's identity unless it is validated by others.

Role, Self, Development of Self

According to Stryker (1959), "To the expectations with regard to behavior attached to a position the term 'role' is given" (p. 114). In evaluating the definition of role used by various authors, including Linton who as an anthropologist stressed cultural patterns, Gross, Mason and McEachern (1958) came to the conclusion that most definitions of role are derived from the assumption that individuals behave with reference to expectations.

Under certain circumstances an actor may respond to himself as he responds to other people, by naming, defining and classifying himself. To engage in this kind of behavior is, according to Stryker (1959), to have a self. He believes it is useful to define the self in terms of categories one applies to himself, as a set of identifications.

Mead (1934) defines 'self' as

> . . . something which has a develop-
> ment; it is not initially there at
> birth, but arises in the process of
> social experience and activity, that
> is develops in the given individual
> as a result of his relations to that
> process as a whole and to other in-
> dividuals within that process
> (p. 135).

He stresses that self is that which arises as an object.
That is to say, that as one becomes aware of himself as an
object with specific characteristics, he develops self-
consciousness. Because he is conscious of himself, he can
reflect on his experiences and control his own actions.

Role-Taking, Generalized Other, Significant Other and Role Conflict

Mead stresses two stages in the development of the
self, those of play and the game. In play the child
assumes one role after another, of persons and animals
too, that have in some way entered his life. In this way,
he assumes the attitudes of others through role-taking or
taking the role of the other.

Stryker (1959) defines role taking as "anticipating
the responses of others implicated with one in the same
social act" (p. 115). Role-taking may involve the an-
ticipation of some particular other, that is to see one's
behavior as taking place in the context of a defined
system of related roles (Stryker, 1959).

Mead stressed that role-taking develops in playing of
the game. In the game, he pointed out that one "becomes"
all of the others involved in the common activity in order
to successfully play one's own part. Here the person does
not merely assume the role of a specific other (as in play)
but of _any_ other participating in the activity. In this
way he has generalized the attitude of role-taking and
taken the attitude or role of the "generalized other."

The concept of the "significant other" is also used
in symbolic interaction theory. This concept recognizes
that not all persons with whom one interacts have identi-
cal or even compatible perspectives. In order to proceed,
therefore, the individual must give greater priority to the
perspectives of particular others. In other words, certain
others occupy high rank on a continuum of importance for
any given individual (Stryker, 1959).

It has been pointed out that the concept of self is
developed as the child interacts with others and moves from
one social situation to another. In the socialization
process, the individual learns how to view and evaluate his
behavior and act with reference to himself as well as to
others (Stryker, 1959).

The individual occupies, concurrently and through
time and at the same time, a variety of positions in sets

of social relationships. He can do so because there is
continuity and organization among the behaviors of a given
individual (Stryker, 1959).

If meanings are shared with those persons with whom
one interacts, congruence (harmony or agreement) is likely.
When meanings are diverse among those with whom one inter-
acts, incongruities in expectations as well as personal
disorganization may result (Stryker, 1959).

Parsons (1951) defines incongruities in expectations
as a role conflict. He states, "By role conflict is meant
the exposure of the actor to conflicting sets of legiti-
mized role expectations such that complete fulfillment of
both is realistically impossible" (p. 280). Parsons went
on to say that in order to resolve role conflict it may
be necessary to compromise, to sacrifice some of both sets
of expectations, to choose an alternative and sacrifice
the other or to redefine the conflict.

Bateson (1961) proposed a classification of inter-
actions called 'double binds' in which there is confused
expectation. Usually an interaction will proceed accord-
ing to the expectation or label that has been placed upon
it. Double binds occur when a preceding contextual label
disagrees with the eventuality (Bateson).

A last set of concepts is what Stryker (1959)
describes as the "unashamed use" symbolic interaction

makes of mental concepts such as thinking, volition and
self-consciousness. These terms are defined operationally.
The internalized manipulation of language symbols is cate-
gorized as thinking. The process of selecting among
alternatives symbolically presented becomes volition. And,
the activity of viewing oneself from the standpoint of
others is called self-consciousness.

Which Concepts are Useful for Understanding Marriage?

This chapter is based on the belief that the inter-
actional approach is a useful way of looking at and under-
standing marriage. It was stated in the introduction that
concepts are elements of theory, they define what is to be
observed but only when they are integrated into a logical
scheme are they meaningful. Now that the concepts have
been set forth, how useful are they?

Using the model Hill and Hansen (1960) developed in
an interactional approach in family study, an interactional
conception of marriage could take these lines: The
marriage is a unit of two interacting individuals each
occupying a marital position(s) within the marriage to
which a number of roles are assigned. That is, the in-
dividual perceives norms or role expectations held by the
other as well as by himself for his attributes and

behavior. In a given situation, the individual defines these role expectations primarily in view of their source (reference groups--this includes generalized others and significant others) and of his own self-conception. Then he role plays, that is, he performs or enacts the role. The marriage is studied through analysis of overt inter-acts (interaction of role playing) cast in the marital structure.

The approach focuses on role and on such problems as position and interposition relations, which become the basis for authority patterns and initiative taking. Every position assumes some counterposition just as every role presumes some counter-role. For example, one cannot talk about the behavior of husband without reference to the position of the wife and so on. The approach also focuses on processes of communication, conflict, problem-solving, decision making and stress reaction; and other aspects of marital interaction from dating to divorce or death.

Of special significance for the social worker is that marriage offers a unique opportunity to study continuing socialization processes and personality with which symbolic interaction is primarily concerned.

Summary

This chapter reviews previous efforts to explicate symbolic interaction, defines some of the words used by symbolic interactionists, reviews the fundamental assumptions underlying the interactional approach and points out what in the concepts is useful as a way of conceptualizing and understanding marriage.

CHAPTER III

PERSONALITY AS A MAJOR DETERMINANT
IN MARITAL INTERACTION

The purpose of this chapter is first to describe the concept of personality as it has been used in the interactional approach to the study of marriage. The term personality will be defined in relation to Mead's theory and the social psychological approach as represented by Stryker, Burgess, Miyamoto, and Dornbusch. Second, personality will be examined as a component of marital interaction. It is suggested that personality is a major determinant in marital interaction and competence in marital interaction involves a person's capacity for response to the other. The focus will be on the social aspects of the personality since it is not within the scope of this chapter to do more than delineate some basic issues in determining the effect of personality on marital interaction. Interaction as used here refers to the reciprocal activity between two persons, hence, it is not possible to comprehend the action fully without some knowledge of the persons. Personality is an essential concern in the interactional approach.

The Problem of Definitions

Personality as a term has suffered much of the same abuse as other words whose meaning varies with context, tone of voice, and referent. Although 'personality' in popular usage can denote a quality such as sex appeal, here the basic denotation will be the persistent attitudes or predispositions of an individual.

In order to understand the term personality from the interactional point of view, it is necessary to restate Mead's approach to the person as seen in the development of the concept 'self'. Mead (1934) treats the self as the result of the social experiences of the individual and adheres to the argument of the impossibility of a person developing a self without an accumulation and integration of social experiences. He further states that,

> The unity and structure of the complete self reflects the unity and structure of the social process as a whole; and each of the elementary selves of which it is composed reflects the unity and structure of one of the various aspects of that process in which the individual is implicated. (Mead, 1934, p. 144).

In other words, Mead defines the self as the introjection by the person of various social experiences which in turn become an object not only for the person

but for others. The self is an organization of attitudes
of individuals and groups; Mead implies that personality
arises as this organization becomes defined.

Although Mead uses personality as synonomous with
the total organized self, it is necessary to point out
that he emphasizes the cognitive aspect of self. He
eliminates habits and affective qualities from consider-
ation as part of the self but leaves an opening for their
return by the use of the 'I' which becomes the initiator,
the actor, and the responder. The 'I' is the original
innovating, unpredictable quality of the person that
exists only in the present, since the moment the 'I' acts
it has passed into the 'me' or the objective self. The
'I' is the vitalizing agent and the 'me' is the structure.
"Taken together they constitute a personality as it appears
in social experience" (Mead, 1934, p. 178).

The philosophy of George Mead continues to influence
the interactional approach but it is not often made ex-
plicit. Burgess' (1926) discussion with its emphasis on the
unity of interacting personalities, implies the self as he
presents the social image as the basic reality for study.
The social image is defined as the conception of one's
role, which is the social reality of the personality. The
unity of interacting personalities in the family is

reminiscent of Mead's approach to the social process as a unity.

Stryker (1959) focuses on personality as one of two major concerns facing the interactionists. The other is socialization. His recognition of personality as an organization of persistent behavior patterns is consistent with Mead and Burgess. However, he challenges the social psychologist to account for the existence of this organization and its relationship to social processes. In attempting to define the self, Stryker struggles with the 'I' and 'me' concepts of Mead and settles for a combination of reflexive activity and a set of identifications.

In an early paper Miyamoto and Dornbusch (1956) emphasize the influence of others' responses on the self. Their findings serve to develop the interactional approach to the personality and to indicate the complexity and importance of self-conception in interaction. They found that the relevance of the attitude of the other to self-conception increases the more the response of the other was incorporated into the organization of the self. The actual response of the other was found to be less important than the subject's perception of that response or his opinion of the attitude of others toward him.

Personality as used in the interactional approach is significant for social process. It is an organized

structure which has resulted from interaction with others.

Personality is the developed psychological organization of the individual that includes his attitudes, ideas, and habits. Personality determines the individual's capacity for response, and is expressed in consistent behavior patterns.

Personality as a Determinant

Personality is an integral part of marital interaction. Its structure serves to set limits on the interaction. In Levinger's (1965) terminology marital cohesiveness is the product of the positive attractions within the marriage, the barriers to its dissolution, and the absence of attractions from other sources. When barriers dissolve and extramarital attractions become more accessible, the cohesiveness of a marriage depends on the strength of attraction within the relationship. Personality is a major source of attraction, and it is through skill in the interactional process that the attraction is maintained. The inability of one spouse to interact positively within the limits of his own and his spouse's personality affects the cohesiveness of the marriage. In the United States two persons generally marry because of a personal attraction to each other and expect to find some satisfaction through the other's ability to provide for

personal needs. Pincus (1960) stresses the relevance of
self-fulfillment to satisfaction in marriage and states
that self-fulfillment involves the expression of the
personality of each partner. Others agree by noting that
the structure and stability of the family depend upon the
interrelationship of the personalities of the husband and
wife (Lidz, 1963) (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1965).

Social psychological analysis accepts personality as
expressed in patterned responses and is concerned with its
totality. Mowrer and Mowrer (1961) state that the person-
ality of the spouse as a unity through time determines, by
its convergence with the personality of the marital partner,
the success or failure of the marriage. The fact that
specific traits are not considered as significant as the
personality as a whole again reflects the interactional
view of the self.

Personality contributes to the structure of the
marriage. Just as the unity of the self reflects the whole
social experience so does the social experience partake of
the personalities of the actors. Hess and Handel (1959)
state that the "structure of a family includes the intra-
psychic organization of its individual members" (p. 3).

Using the personality-interaction approach,
Huntington (1958) specified that the marital relationship
contains three elements. These were (a) the interaction

of the partners which included expressed needs, (b) the
needs aroused but inhibited, and, (c) the defenses used to
inhibit needs. He recognizes the complexity of inter-
action but states that interaction is more easily under-
stood through a study of the personalities of the inter-
actors. The use of his concepts permits a description
of marital relationships and a way of analyzing the inter-
action as it occurs.

Competence as an Issue

Since personality plays such an integral part in
interaction it is difficult to separate one from the other.
Nevertheless, the qualitative and quantitative aspects of
each are important to consider. In childhood the inter-
action greatly influences the development of the individu-
al personality. In marriage, however, the personality is a
well-defined unity that greatly influences the interaction.
It may be hypothesized that how the spouses respond in
marital interaction determines the degree of effectiveness
of the interaction as a means of personal satisfaction.

In this report competence in marriage is the ability
to meet one's own needs as well as those of one's spouse.
Foote and Cottrell (1955) describe six components of inter-
personal competence: health, intelligence, empathy,
autonomy, judgment and creativity. Their discussion focuses
on these components as capacities and abilities of the

person essential for effective interaction. They continue
by defining these six components as a more complete deline-
ation of Mead's concepts with intelligence, empathy and
judgment corresponding to 'me' and health, autonomy,
creativity, corresponding to 'I'.

The emphasis on the components as capacities and
abilities requires some attention to the developmental
aspects of competence. If Foote and Cottrell are con-
sistent with Mead then capacities and abilities would change
through the interaction process as the self responded to
the influence of the other. For example, the intelligence
component includes the capacity to symbolize experience
and to be articulate in communication. Although the person-
ality of the adult is more defined than that of the child,
change continues to occur through interaction. In this in-
stance a positive change would be increased skill in the
use of words.

Some recent studies have examined competence as it
occurs in the use of language. These are useful additions
to the interactional approach, since verbal communication
is a significant component of interaction. In a paper
describing the concept of verbal accessibility, Polansky
(1965) linked verbal accessibility to the social situ-
ation and the personality. His findings indicate that
verbal accessibility is relatively stable for individuals

over time even though wide variations in verbal accessibili-
ty are found by content and social situation. Thus, verbal
accessibility emerges as an important aspect of the person-
ality. In marital interaction verbal accessibility, as an
enduring part of the personality associated with the use of
symbols, has an essential function. Failure of one or the
other of the partners to express adequately his feelings or
attitudes could contribute to a more general failure in the
marital interaction. Competence in this area would appear
to be critical for the marriage.

Moreover, the adequacy of expression of feelings and
attitudes to the other is based on the predisposition of
the person for self-disclosure. Jourard and Lasakow
(1958) define self-disclosure as "the process of making the
self known to other persons" (p. 91). Their findings indi-
cate that married persons focus self-disclosure on the
spouse. Since the amount of self-disclosure varies among
males, females, and individuals, differences in self-
disclosure between spouses is apt to occur. Significant
unresolved differences between the marital partners could
also inhibit the effectiveness of the marital interaction.

Although verbal accessibility remains relatively
stable, development does occur in the use and understand-
ing of symbols. Vygotsky's (1962) thesis is that word
meanings develop over time. Using data from experimental

studies he presents a conception of the relationship of thought to word that stresses process.

> The relation of thought to word is not
> a thing but a process, a continual
> movement back and forth from thought to
> word and from word to thought. In that
> process the relation of thought to word
> undergoes changes which themselves may
> be regarded as development in the
> functional sense (p. 125).

Vygotsky's thesis poses an interesting question for marital interactionists. If word meanings do develop in such a manner, how significant are discrepancies between the spouses in this development for effective interaction?

The ability to use words is critical to the personality not only in the expression of the self but also in the development of the self. Inadequacies in the use of words would seem to limit the individual's capacity for response to the other by limiting his understanding of the full sense of the other's symbols. A person whose word meanings had undergone limited development would not comprehend the richness of the more fully developed symbol of the other.

Summary

The interactional approach has been concerned with personality as a major part in the interaction process since the philosophical development of the concept 'self'

by George Mead. In the study of the family, social psychologists have continued to emphasize and further define the meaning of personality, its structure and function, in interactional terms. The overall unity of the personality and the resultant patterns of behavior are more pertinent to this approach than particular traits. The ideas of Mead are implicit in these later definitions. Since personality determines and is determined by social interaction, interpersonal competence emerges as a central issue in marital interaction. Foote and Cottrell's categories of health, intelligence, empathy, autonomy, judgment and creativity emerge as capacities integral to effective interaction. More useful to the symbolic interactionist, however, are hypotheses about the use of language and its impact on the success or failure of the interaction process as conceptualized by Polansky and Vygotsky.

CHAPTER IV

COMMUNICATION IN MARRIAGE

This chapter reviews the concept of communication in
marriage as presented in recent research literature.
First, the various definitions of communication and the
definition accepted by this project as a basis for develop-
ment are reviewed. The concept of power as it is related
to communication in the marital relationship is discussed.
Finally the determinants of communication, functions of
communication, and the patterns of communication are
presented.

Communication Defined

Although communication ". . . as a subject for con-
templation has a history almost as long as that of writing"
(Birdwhistell, 1962, p. 194), it has been a focus for
scientific research, with a few notable exceptions, since
just before World War II. There has been a steady increase
of interest in communication in several fields including
those of marriage and family research, social work, and
psychotherapy. Various disciplines, including sociology,
psychology, and social psychology, have studied communi-
cation. Many definitions and theories have developed.
Thayer (1963) discusses the problems of theory building
around the concept of communication pointing out that in a

recent six year period more than 25 ". . . conceptually different referants", (p. 219) had been offered for this term.   In 1961 Cherry wrote

> . . . the various aspects of communi-
> cation, as they are studied under the
> different disciplines, by no means
> form a unified study; there is certain
> common ground which shows promise of
> fertility, nothing more (p. 2).

The definitions of communication reported in this chapter represent only a token sample and reveal consider- able conceptual differences.   These definitions are offered as a first step toward analyzing the importance of communication in the marital relationship, the primary concern of this chapter.

Cherry (1961) described communication as ". . . essentially a social affair" (p. 3), and offered a broad definition as

> ,. ,. . the establishment of a social
> unit from individuals by the use of
> language or signs. The sharing of
> common sets of rules, for various
> goal seeking activities (p. 303).

Blau and Scott (1962) have linked interaction and communication to

> . . . refer to the same processes but
> to different aspects of them. The
> concept of social interaction focuses
> principally upon the formal character-
> istics of social relation: such terms

> as frequency, initiative, super-
> ordination, and reciprocity indi-
> cates its dimensions. The concept
> of communication . . . directs
> attention to the meaningful content
> conveyed in the encounter, and its
> characteristics are described by
> such terms as flow of messages, ob-
> stacles, positive and negative
> reactions, and exchange (p. 336).

Homans (1950) points out that the " . . . word communi-
cation is neither general enough in one sense nor specific
enough in another" (p. 37). People tend to think of communi-
as a process taking place only through words. Homans in-
cludes both verbal and nonverbal communication under inter-
action. He states that communication

> . . . may mean the content of the
> message, signal or 'communication'
> being transmitted, or the process
> of transmission itself, as when
> people speak of 'methods of com-
> munication', or to the sheer fact,
> aside from content or process of
> transmission, that one person has
> communicated with another (p. 37).

Schachter (1960) succinctly defines the term:
". . . communication, the process of one person talking to
another, as the mechanism of induction, i.e., the means
by which influence is exerted" (p. 275).

Virginia Satir (1964) indicates that communication
"can mean interaction or transaction" and that it gener-
ally refers to both verbal and nonverbal behavior within

a social context. "Communication also includes all those symbols and clues used by persons in giving and receiving meaning" (p. 63).

Verbal, nonverbal, and a combination of both are modes of communication throughout life (Ehrenwald, 1963, c). Communication can be viewed as a " . . . dynamic process in a totally integrated individual with expressive activity observable in his overt behavior" (Barbara, 1963, p. 166). Communication can be healthy or not. "People are always in the process of communication--speaking, gestures, how we move, how we dress, a sense of touch, and all those other ways of expressing one's self" (Barbara, 1963, p. 167).

Mead (1934) made some important observations about communication. He pointed out that ideal communication occurs when "the individual would affect himself as he affects others in every way" (p. 327).

Bonner (1953) expressed a similar thought when he stated that communication is more than the transmission of abstract ideas but is also " . . . the act of putting oneself in the place of another person's attitude, where-in the symbol that affects another affects the individual himself in the same manner" (p. 69).

Karlsson (1963) in speaking specifically of communi-cation in marriage states that this is not primarily one of

transmission of symbols but ". . . rather a problem of transmitting in some cases certain items of information, namely characteristics of role-expectations, intentions, feelings of love and respect, etc., and in other cases not transmitting them" (p. 38).

Ruesch and Bateson (1951), whose definition of com-munication is referred to in Chapter II, state

> . . . communication does not refer to
> verbal, explicit and intentional
> transmission of messages alone; as
> used in our sense, the concept of com-
> munication would include all those
> processes by which people influence one
> another (p. 5 & 6).

Communication has been described in broad as well as narrow concepts. It has been used by some interchangeably with interaction. It has been described as the content of the message or signal being transmitted. Communication has also been described as ". . . the act of putting one-self in the place of another person's attitude" so that ". . . the symbol that affects another affects the indivi-dual himself and in the same manner" (Bonner, 1953, p. 69). For the purpose of this writing, Ruesch and Bateson's definition of communication will be used. Within this framework, communication will be described as a single act. For example, when A makes a statement to B, the process produces change in A and in B. Communication is

that part of the total process of interaction which has been described by Huntington (1958) as ". . . the way the actions of each person repeatedly influence those of the other in an unfolding sequence" (p. 45). Ruesch and Bateson's definition seems fitting for the purpose of this project since it includes all forms of communication and also provides the possibility of analyzing change.

Levels of Communication

Ruesch and Bateson (1951) discussed four levels or networks of communication which can influence any relationship, including that of marriage. These levels are Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, Group, and Culture.

The intrapersonal communication network is distinguished by a single participant, the individual himself, with both the origin and destination of the messages located within the sphere of one organism. Error correction is difficult, since the system of codification cannot be examined directly by more than one person (Ruesch and Bateson, 1951). What the individual brings to marriage is at least partially determined by his inner communication system.

Interpersonal communication, one to one, is characterized by an exchange of receiving, transmitting, and evaluating messages. Correction of information is possible since both the origin and destination of the

message may be known to the sender and receiver. This per-
mits information items as they are transmitted and received
to complement each other, ". . . but the complementation is
never complete. . . . The human individual can never per-
ceive himself perfectly in relation to others" (Ruesch and
Bateson, 1951, p. 280). This assumption is important in
the marriage relationship particularly in the perception
of one's own role and the role of the partner.

Group network communication is characterized in two
ways: first, by "one person to many," or primarily as a
one-way flow of messages from the center to the periphery;
or one more active in transmission with many concerned with
receiving. Second, by "many persons to one," or a one-way
flow of messages toward the center (Ruesch and Bateson,
1951). The marital relationship can thus be influenced by
others outside the marital pair--kin, friends, employer-
employee, fellow employees, and all other groups. How this
influence affects the marital pair will in turn affect
their own communication system and roles.

The fourth communication network, cultural is also an
important communication influence to the two persons who
constitute a given marriage. This network is described as
the "unperceived system." The individual does not recog-
nize the source or destination of messages with both source
and destination unknown. The communication moves from

"many to many." People are often unaware of being either receivers or senders of messages. "Rather the messages seem to be an unstated description of their way of living" (Ruesch and Bateson, 1951, p. 281-2). From this cultural network come messages about symbolization, language, ethics, tradition, child rearing practices, trade customs, ceremonies, and theories of man's relationship to the universe and to his fellow man. All of these cultural components are communicated to each person in whatever culture he may originate and live. All influence the individual's personality and to a considerable degree determine the elements which he brings to any relationship including that of marriage.

Lidz (1963) writes about language as one of the important means of communication, pointing out that ". . . language is an inherent part of the culture and in itself forms a major determinant of how a person thinks" (p. 79). He adds that language ". . . permits and delimits the way in which one thinks so completely, that one can scarcely grasp that persons raised in other cultures have very different, but equally valid ways of experiencing and of thinking according to other systems of logic" (p. 79). Lidz, in his statement, has added a dimension to Ruesch and Bateson's position as stated above.

Power

Communication is the expression of power. Blau (1964) describes power as the ability of an individual to get what he wants without having to modify his own conduct. This definition, because it is comprehensive, will be used in this chapter.

Briar (1964) points out that each family has to solve the problem of authority and power with many patterns developing. The more powerful members of a family set the style and ". . . predominate in the pattern of interactions" (Murrell and Stachowiak, 1965, p. 17). The power is usually interpersonal and comes from ". . . alliances and deals, and certainty of power" (p. 17). The individual in the family holding the most power is the person who can award favors, withhold recognition, and offer criticism or rejection.

Heer (1963) lists five possible bases of family power:

> (1) external social control, (2) the
> prior internalization of norms, (3)
> discrepancy between actual return and
> return expected under an alternative
> to the existing marriage or family,
> (4) relative competence, (5) relative
> involvement (p. 139).

Since the amount of power determines authority in decision making, power is a relevant factor in pattern formation as the rules for interaction are established

between the marital pair. Power, as a control factor, exists to the degree that ". . . it is perceived or accepted by those to whom it is directed" (Yelaja, 1965, p. 516).

Function of Communication

The functions of communication described by various authors vary almost as widely as do the definitions of communication itself. The functions of communication include the maintenance of everyday relationships between individuals, groups, and nations. Communication machinery is utilized in making decisions. Communication is also the instrument for ". . . socializing new members of society" (Schramm, 1963, p. 13-15). Communication is coming to know ourselves through others' responses to us. Communication can also be the means of supplying entertainment.

Communication maintains everyday relationships between individuals, groups, and nations by engineering change and keeping strain at a tolerable level. It also satisfies the basic need for humans ". . . to get close to one another" (Polansky, 1965, p. 1), through the channel of the spoken word. Schramm (1963) also expresses this thought when he says that we need communication

> . . . simply to maintain the every
> day relationships of human beings
> who must live in proximity and must
> adjust to each other's needs and
> quirks and maintain a remarkably
> efficient and rewarding existence
> (p. 15).

The above statements are adaptable to the marital relationship in describing the essential function of communication between husband and wife. "A great part of the daily interaction of marriage partners is talk or other forms of communication" (Folsom, 1958, p. 113).

Communication is an essential tool of decision making. To reach a decision it is necessary to perceive incoming signals; to evaluate ". . . which involves memory and the retention of past experiences" (Ruesch and Kees, 1956, p. 6); and then to transmit and express the decision and the information upon which the decision was based. Decision making is a basic element of all interpersonal and group relationships.

Karlsson (1963) discusses socialization as transmitting through linguistic communication ". . . the fruits of experience from generation to generation, gradually accumulating and institutionalizing techniques of coping with the environment and for living together that each child must acquire" (p. 78). Through this process, the individual learns how to view and evaluate his behavior and act with reference to himself and to

others.

The concept of one's self is communicated to him from others' responses (Stryker, 1959). This process, both gradual and continual, begins with the earliest moments of life, and has major influence on the developing personality, and continues through all of life's stages, including that of the marital relationship.

Karlsson (1963) in considering the marital relationship lists the functions of communication as letting the spouse know of role expectation which in turn notifies each marital partner of the adjustments each is required to make; letting each spouse know from the other the feeling of love and tender emotions each has for the other; and transmitting feelings of respect and admiration. Communicating dissatisfactions enables the other spouse to minimize them and is a prerequisite for all adjustment.

Entertainment, to amuse and direct (Babcock, 1958), is an important influence whether this communication comes through individual contemplation, or from the written or spoken word addressed to one or to many. Entertainment can turn one's thoughts to the past, to the present, or to the promise of tomorrow. Such communication can be very personal, and may evoke emotional response which can influence behavior.

"Man's concept of the world is acquired through social action and communication, and these acquired views are the

foundations upon which will rest the future organization
of his surroundings" (Ruesch and Bateson, 1951, p. 35).
Communication may not always achieve "healthy" goals. Com-
munication and interaction are processes which are vulner-
able to distortion and abuse. The next chapter describes
this form of dysfunction in detail.

Communication Determinants

Communication will be discussed with respect to three
general determinants of effective communication: person-
ality, social, and cultural factors.

Personality

Personality, the subject of Chapter III, is discussed
here only in relationship to communication. Ehrenwald
(1963c) points out that man's communicative behavior
". . . must have started when and where he made his first
appearance: in the family" (p. 191). The mother-infant
relationship begins to shape the personality of the infant.
The child's early communication is preverbal or nonverbal.
The mother's response to the infant plays a significant
part in how the child learns to communicate.

Ackerman (1958) has described personality as ". . .
the product of the interaction and merging of the indi-
vidual organism and its environment. . . ." (p. 48)

Mowrer and Mowrer (1961) write about personality
". . . in terms of the role of the individual in the
group" (p. 30) pointing out that this conception of person-
ality began in part with William James' statement that the
"'. . . individual has as many selves as there are persons
who recognize him and carry an image of him in their
minds'" (p. 30). Personality develops over time and with
each experience from infancy to adulthood.

Luckey (1964) describes the marriage relationship as
largely depending upon ". . . what a person thinks he is and
what he thinks the other person is" (p. 136). Understanding
and communication are based on these perceptions, and are
factors in marital satisfaction.

Barbara (1963) indicates that the healthier person-
ality and the individual with more awareness is also the
person who creates the most accurate map of himself, most
realistically sees himself, and is the person who is able to
". . . verbalize facts, situations, or feelings as they are
and not as they should be" (p. 173). Personality is thus
thought of as a determinant of communication and provides a
focus for Harper's (1958) ". . . first prerequisite for
genuine communication of feelings" in marriage in "an
atmosphere of safety. The spouse . . . must feel it safe
to say how he or she really feels" (p. 109). Such safety
comes from a spouse's "self-confidence, self-respect, and
self-love; . . . strength of ego; conception of (the mate's)

personality; . . . prizing of forthrightness; . . .
conviction of strength of (the spouse's) love . . . "
(p. 109).

In harmony with Harper's statement is Polansky's
(1965) observation that individuals with ". . . unre-
solved problems in the Schizoid spectrum" (p. 35) can
not tolerate closeness with another human being nor permit
themselves to trust. These persons would not be able to
communicate that which would threaten their personal in-
volvement and thus would not be able to form a close
relationship in marriage, nor to communicate adequately
on an interpersonal level.

Social

Wolfe and Snoek (1964) point out that social position
is ". . . essentially a relational concept, indicating the
person's relationship with a social system and with other
members of that system" (p. 431). An individual can have
several social positions, each with a different social
system and with other, or sometimes with the same, indi-
viduals. A person's behavior in any given position will
be determined by internalized influences such as his own
background, training, personal needs, aspirations, and
goals as well as by forces originating in the environment.

Social position is a determinant in communication.
Social position prescribes to a considerable degree with
whom and in what manner one should communicate. Communi-
cation can also be affected by both internal and external
forces. This, in turn, can affect the relationship of all
the individuals, directly and indirectly, concerned. In
other words, a man's position in a business firm will not
only serve as a clue as to how and with whom he communi-
cates but will also affect his wife's communication
patterns.

Cultural

Lidz (1963) points out that one of the cardinal
functions of the family is ". . . the transmission of the
basic adaptive techniques of the culture to the children"
(p. 112). Language has a central role in the parents'
"nurturing and directing the child's linguistic abilities."
Language is used by man ". . . to transmit and assimilate
the instrumentalities and institutions of the culture"
(Lidz, 1963, p. 113) which man needs for adaptation. Man
is also ". . . dependent upon learning useful and valid
meanings to enable him to be adaptable to new conditions"
(Lidz, 1963, p. 113).

Culture becomes a personal component transmitted to
each individual from the particular environment and circum-
stances of his own life. For instance, words not only

represent ". . . the culture's language and their shared
meanings" but words also take on particular meanings
through "an individual's idiosyncratic experiences with
the symbol and with what it denotes" (Lidz, 1963, p. 88).

Communication Patterns: Some Relevant Concepts

Various authors have tried to conceptualize marriage
interactional patterns in a number of theoretical ways.
The concepts used include roles, need complementarity,
homogamy, homeostasis, and cohesiveness. These concepts
will be described within the framework of communication as
this is discussed in the literature.

Roles

Karlsson (1963) states that there are two positions in
marriage with each spouse having his particular role expec-
tation. There are four basic role differences in each
marriage: the husband and his role and how he sees his
wife's role; the wife and her role and how she sees the
husband's role. Marital satisfaction comes from two
sources: the roles each partner plays and the expectation
of roles of the spouse. Karlsson (1963) states that com-
munication is a basic process in marriage, and that com-
munication about role-expectations, intentions, and feel-
ings of love and respect must occur. Burgess (1926)

points out that ". . . every person has, with more or less awareness, a conception of his role, not only in society, but in all the groups of which he is a member. He has a conception of his own role in the family and of what roles each family member should have" (p. 5).

Marriage partners maintain relationships outside the marriage. These include such relationships as employer-employee, kin, friends, business, and social agencies; in fact, any occasion which brings about any form of communication between two or more people. Each spouse carries a variety of roles depending upon the interaction of the moment. Roles and role expectations alter with time and events. The ability to modify role to meet change determines the effects of each crisis. "Inadequate methods of meeting change multiply until the family members are unable to adequately satisfy the interpersonal needs of members" (Murrell and Stachowiak, 1965, p. 15).

Complementarity

Another pattern, promoted especially by Winch (1952), is "need complementarity" in mate selection and marriage. This theory is based on the premise that each individual seeks ". . . within his or her field of eligibles for that person who gives the greatest promise of providing him or her with maximum need gratification" (Winch, p. 406). Ktsanes (1955) explains that this theory covers at least

two possible types of complementary patterns between married couples: first, a theory based on the difference in the intensity of identical needs; and second, a theory based on the difference in the kind of need.

Rosow (1957) points out that most of the studies of need complementarity theory are limited since they do not take into consideration the changing needs of the partners.

Homogamy

Homogamy can be defined as the tendency for "like to seek like in mate choice." This suggests selection in the direction of self image with similarity in such characteristics as ". . . biological, temperament, social and cultural background, age, race, ethnic group, previous marital status, interests, religion, and intelligence" (Kernodle, 1959, p. 149). Communication would be an essential process in the transmittal of these characteristics between the marital pair.

Homeostasis

Homeostasis is equated with "control theory" by Jackson (1959, p. 126) and is described by Meissner (1964) as follows: "Family behavior is perceived of as circular rather than linear as governed by homeostatic patterns of interaction which operate within the transaction system to

preserve the balance of forces and needs" (p. 23).
Montalvo (1963) refers to communication as a means of main-
taining homeostasis in that this is used as the method of
feedback which can affect behavior or outcome so that the
agreed upon balance is maintained. This can serve in
healthy as well as dysfunctional families. Titchener,
et al., (1963) points out that homeostasis is balance or
equilibrium achieved through adaptation of family members
both as individuals and as members of the family unit.
Communication, organization, control, and perception are
essential elements in the adaptive process.

Cohesiveness

Marital cohesiveness or the strength of the marital
relationship can be considered as the ". . . direct
function of the attractions within and the barriers around
marriage, and an inverse function of such attractions and
barriers from other relationships" (Levinger, 1963, p. 19).
There are many cohesive forces. Among these are emotional
attachments, meeting of individual needs within the system,
and valuing the system of marriage itself. Disruptive
forces are those opposite to the ones referred to as cohesive.
Both cohesive and disruptive forces can occur from within
and from outside the system. (Karlsson, 1963).

A major factor of cohesiveness is the ability of the marital partners to communicate their thoughts, feelings, plans, and hopes to each other. People vary in their ability to communicate. This can be true of individual members of a family as well as individuals within a particular socio-economic culture (Komarovsky, 1964). When communication is not free, the marriage may become less cohesive. The marital partners are then more likely to look to children, relatives, friends, employment, and other individual pursuits as a major means of satisfaction. In other words, communication, particularly through the spoken word allows humans, marriage partners, to "get close" (Polansky, 1965, p. 1).

Summary

Communication, that is, the process of influence, is a vital part of the life of every individual. Communication influences the development of personality, and affects all interpersonal relationships. Communication makes it possible ". . . to know what we are through others' responses to us" (Stryker, 1959, p. 116). Communication in marriage is an essential quality in developing marital patterns. The cohesiveness of the marriage depends to considerable extent on the ability of the spouses to communicate. Communication can serve not only to establish "healthy" marital patterns but can also

produce disruptive forces. The next chapter considers
this statement in some detail.

CHAPTER V

MARITAL INTERACTION PATTERNS

The present chapter examines what is actually happening in marriage and how some of the interactionists have been able to identify patterns, how these were classified, and the interrelationship of patterns identified by some clinicians. By patterns is meant repetitive sequences of actions, somewhat automatic, which are used by families in adaptation (Titchener et al, 1963). Current patterning will be placed in context by a brief history of some early awareness of group and family behavior and some early attempts to categorize behavior into patterns.

Early Recognition of Behavior Patterns

From the literature it appears that behavior patterns in large groups were recognized earlier than those in families. In this respect the more bizarre phenomena caught the imagination of writers. As early as 1832, J. F. K. Hecker (1859), in Epidemics of the Middle Ages, attempted to show how the individual was bound to the group by imitation and compassion. He described many epidemics of mental disorders.

In 1841, Charles Mackey (1932) pointed out in Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions an interesting delusion which occurred during the Crusades when hundreds of thousands of people acted on a shared belief, irrespective

of the groups involved with maneuvering, power struggles, or other material gains.

In 1877, Lasègue and Falret (1964) published their work on <u>folie à deux</u>. This term applies to a mental disorder (usually paranoid) which occurs at the same time in two close associates. This happens most frequently between a parent and child, husband and wife, or two sisters.

In the 1890's family breakdowns were considered in terms of 'intra-family' rather than in terms of 'interaction'. What clinicians now regard as symptoms (drunkenness, laziness, etc.) were seen as causes, and attempts were made to change the families through personal influence and persuasion. Diagnostic thinking then turned to preventive measures such as social reform in housing, working conditions, and health care (Rich, 1956).

By the 1920's social workers had become more knowledgeable concerning social and psychological variables. Emphasis was placed on interaction within the family following Burgess' (1926) article on "The Family as a Unity of Interacting Personalities." This article was a conscious effort to view the unity, growth and change of the family as a product of its interaction.

During the depression years there was a growing awareness of the need to identify the role of family interaction in the family's ability to withstand crises.

In an effort to classify the families who could withstand
the ordeal of economic loss with the least strain, Robert
Cooley Angell (1936) studied fifty families who had
received public assistance for a year. The families were
divided into four primary types: 1. Integrated, highly
adaptable; 2. Integrated, moderately adaptable; 3.
Integrated, unadaptable; 4. Unintegrated. By 'integrated'
Angell meant ". . . bonds of coherence and unity running
through family life, of which common interests, affection
and a sense of economic interdependence are perhaps the most
prominent" (p. 15). By 'adaptability' he meant the flexi-
bility of the family as a unit. He concluded that even a
moderate degree of adaptability would pull families with any
integration through all but the worst crises.

In a study of families' adjustments to crises due to
war-time separation and reunion, Reuben Hill (1949) found
that

> . . . the families with good marital
> adjustment made the best adjustment
> to separation, the families with poor
> marital adjustment made the next best
> adjustment (by the closing-of-ranks
> technique) and the families with fair
> marital adjustment made the poorest
> adjustment to separation. . . . In
> the reunion we find a similar pattern
> (p. 233).

Hill listed six "ingredients" for patterns which pre-
dicted family success in adjusting, and which seem directly

or indirectly related to interaction:

> . . . the recognition of inter-
> dependence of all members upon one
> another, the satisfaction of play-
> ing one's roles in the family what-
> ever they are, the sharing of home
> management duties among all members,
> the flexibility of the family when
> facing new situations, the adequacy
> of intra-family communication, and
> the opportunities for growth and
> development in the family milieu
> (p. 322).

Some patterns of behavior which were identified very early have been highlighted, as well as the progression in diagnostic thinking of social workers from intra-family causes of family breakdown through extra-family pressures and to interaction within the family. During the depression many studies attempted to discover the effect of particular situations on a family's adjustment. Much theorizing and research continues in the area of identification of the variables which operate in patterns of marital and family interaction.

Framework For Understanding Interaction Patterns

Each person enters marriage with the hope that the relationship will surpass all others in intimacy and permanence. Each brings personality traits and other determinants which affect the capacity for adjusting or coping. These determinants may be thought of as

resources which one brings to the marriage. They include many things which each has incorporated into his 'self,' such as pattern of the like-sex parent, psycho-social defenses, expectations, ethnic background, religion and depth of commitment, constitutional factors, and social class. Marriage, in reality, becomes a fitting together of the two personalities and other determinants brought to the marriage.

Conceptualization of some variables which operate in marital interaction have been discussed in previous chapters. The difference in the use of each variable determines the type of interaction pattern which develops. The pattern may be functional, which means that there is an effective means of problem-solving, or dysfunctional, which indicates an ineffective means of problem-solving.

Interaction is more easily understood and analyzed within a framework. Such a framework developed by Hess and Handel (1959) considers five basic processes in a family. These involve individual effort and, at the same time, considerable interaction between family members. All five processes seem relevant for even the most laissez-faire family or marriage and form a framework of patterns toward which families strive either consciously or unconsciously. They are:

1. "Establishing a pattern of separateness and connectedness."

2. "Establishing a satisfactory congruence of images through the exchange of suitable testimony."

3. "Evolving modes of interaction into central family concerns or themes."

4. "Establishing the boundaries of the family's world of experience."

5. "Dealing with significant biosocial issues of family life, as in the family's disposition to evolve definitions of male and female and of older and younger" (p. 4).

In analyzing the interaction of five 'typical' families, Hess and Handel considered that performance in these processes gave shape to the families' lives.

A description of the way a marital interaction pattern is formed can be better understood by considering the striving toward separateness and connectedness that is involved. In the beginning stages of a marriage, there is exploration of the new roles of husband and wife and how they fit together. Each partner expects to have his individual needs met and these expectations are extended into the interaction which ensues. Each partner attempts to understand the other and to establish some consensus in the idealized 'world of their own' which is in the making.

In striving for connectedness, however, one or both is faced with a threat to his autonomy. The concept of consensus may be modified because of role strain, and a

decision concerning the amount of separateness and connectedness in the marriage is made by the partner with the most power. In other areas of the marriage the same variables operate in the interaction process. Through repetition interaction patterns eventually evolve.

The concepts of 'separateness' and 'connectedness' have subjective meanings to each individual, and each couple develops its own patterns in its own manner. In observing many marriages it seems apparent that patterns resulting from this particular process range the whole continuum from emotional relaxation and creativity on the functional end to autistic or psychotic behavior on the dysfunctional end (Hess and Handel, 1959).

In this framework the five processes are not discrete; each is carried on simultaneously with the others. The myriad ways of accomplishing them complicate the identification of resulting interaction patterns in a marriage.

Marital Interaction Patterns

Most of the literature concerning patterns of marital interaction comes from clinicians, psychotherapists, and others who base their pattern classifications on experience and knowledge gained from direct contact with people who have marriage problems. They have analyzed and organized their findings in order to have some way of

looking at and working with what is happening in a marriage.
Organization of experience into patterns provides a basis
for actual diagnosis and treatment. For this reason, empha-
sis on dysfunctional patterning has taken priority over the
functional in the literature.

Patterns are identified in broad and general terms.
They are only descriptive, as it is extremely difficult to
grasp the large number of variables and at the same time
evaluate the use a marital couple makes of these variables
in their own pattern. Clinicians need to examine the
process of interaction as a whole in order to focus on par-
ticular areas of conflict.

Determinants of Disturbance in Marriage

Some authors use their own particular criteria in
determining when a marriage is disturbed, before identify-
ing the dysfunctional pattern of interaction. Sarwer-
Foner (1963) finds that

> One of the major determinants of a
> reasonable, versus an unreasonable
> marriage, is the amount of mutual
> criticism and derogation with which
> the marital partners assault each
> other. Without this mutual
> destructiveness and with mutual
> support for the partner's de-
> fenses--the marriage remains
> relatively stable despite gross
> pathologic traits (p. 38).

Mathews and Mihanovich (1963) suggest that empirically

> . . . the two most important areas of
> disturbance in unhappy marriages con-
> cern the fulfillment of each other's
> needs and the kind of interaction
> which prevails between the spouses
> if basic needs are not satisfied
> (p. 304).

Ackerman (1958) says that marital disorders are demonstrated clinically as ". . . (1) failure of reciprocity of satisfactions and (2) conflict" (p. 154).

Other writers distinguish between function and dysfunction in marital interaction from the point of view of homeostasis, equilibrium, or balance. Montalvo's (1963) "homeostatic transactions" in dysfunctional families ". . . are truly adaptive in their operation, but . . . the 'sameness' that they try to maintain is that which has been established, rather than the transaction that will allow them to grow" (p. 116). The Spiegel-Kluckhohn transactional approach, as it is discussed by Spiegel and Bell (1959), differentiates 'sick' from 'well' families by their handling of role and value conflicts. In 'sick' families a too rapid attempt to change too many values results in ". . . a disequilibrium in their relations with each other, with their children, with relatives, and others" (p. 140). They find, however, that

> There is . . . no sharp dichotomy
> between the 'sick' and the 'well'
> families. 'Sick' families have
> some areas of adequate conflict
> resolution, and 'well' families
> have some areas of pathological
> equilibrium. . . . all families
> are involved to some extent in
> neurotic interaction, and all
> family members in both groups
> show mixtures of neurotic and
> healthy personality mechanisms
> (p. 141).

Ackerman (1958) states succintly that "Effective adaptation requires a favorable balance between the need to protect sameness and continuity and the need to accommodate to change" (p. 85).

Ehrenwald's Patterns

Jan Ehrenwald (1963a) identified five major patterns of interaction. He developed these from a study using An Inventory of Traits and Attitudes "contained in a broad spectrum of more or less habitual ways of relating" (1963b, p. 121) which were observed in members of family groups. The patterns range from functional interaction, in what could be considered a well-adjusted family or marriage, to dysfunctional interaction, to the point of breakdown, failure, or psychosis. The patterns start at the functional end of the continuum and extend to the dysfunctional: (1) Sharing, characterized by a giving-supportive-affectionate relationship; (2) Contagion, described as "a sharing of sick, neurotic or other

interpersonal attitudes" (Ehrenwald, 1963a, p. 12); (3)
Complementary, including the sadomasochistic, dominant-
submissive, controlling-compliant relationships; (4)
Rebellion and resistance, used in response to con-
trolling, domineering or rigid authoritarian attitudes
in families; (5) Incompatibility, where there are
practically no functional interrelationships (Ehrenwald,
1963a).

Ehrenwald (1963b) considers contagion to be the
". . . maladaptive counterpart to patterns of sharing"
(p. 126). He found in the study of one family that this
pattern was responsible for the spread of neurotic dis-
turbances both horizontally and vertically through
several generations. Contagion was identified as a
pattern in obsessive-compulsive families and those with
psychopathology such as alcoholism, delinquency, homo-
sexuality, and incest. He concluded that it was not the
nosological entity which was transmitted but the patterns
of interpersonal relationships.

In identifying major patterns of family or marital
interaction, Ehrenwald uses psychological rather than
interactional terms. An example of the pattern of con-
tagion defined in interactional terms seems, however, to
indicate a meaning similar to Ehrenwald's definition:

> . . . social interaction in which
> a recipient's behavior changes to
> become more like that of another
> person, and where this change has
> occurred in a social interaction
> in which the initiator (other
> person) has not communicated
> intent to influence the be-
> havior of the recipient
> (Grosser, Polansky, &
> Lippitt, 1951, p. 115).

Mittleman's Neurotic Complementary Patterns

Bela Mittleman (1956) classified the dynamics of neurotic interrelations into five complementary patterns:

(1) Sado-masochistic.

(2) ". . . emotional detachment on the part of one partner (usually the man) with an intense, open demand for love on the part of the other (usually the woman)" (p. 82).

(3) ". . . mutual attempt at domination, coupled with a violent defense" (p. 83).

(4) "Neurotic illness with a plea of helplessness on the part of one mate and an attempt at extreme considerateness on the part of the other . . ." (p. 83).

(5) ". . . a syndrome where periods of helplessness and suffering are followed by periods of intense self-assertion on the part of one mate, and periods of shouldering responsibility followed by a disappointed desire for love and support on the part of the other" (p. 84).

Mittleman (1956) stresses the tendency of couples to ". . . complement each other in such a way as to perpetuate their pathological reactions through an intrapsychic vicious circle of reactions" (p. 87).

Although Mittleman's patterns generally can be included
in or are comparable to Ehrenwald's complementary patterns,
pattern two, "emotional detachment" coupled with a "demand
for love", and pattern three, "mutual attempt at domination",
might be considered as rebellion and resistance or varying
degrees of incompatibility, depending on the amount of con-
flict present.

"Marital Schism" and "Marital Skew"

In families with schizophrenic patients, the Lidz
group (Lidz et al., 1957) found "marital schism" and
"marital skew" in family interaction. Schism is dis-
tinguished by parents' threats to separate, coercion,
recrimination, and derogation; in skew, family relation-
ships center around a dominant parent's pathology ". . .
accepted or shared by the other" (p. 248). Schism is
akin to Ehrenwald's rebellion and resistance pattern, or,
again, to a degree of incompatibility. Skew is similar
to the pattern of contagion.

Berne's 'Games'

Eric Berne (1961) is among those who are developing
apparently new methods of psychotherapy described in
interactional rather than personality terms. In his
structural analysis, which is close to traditional

psychiatry, Berne identifies three ego states in each person, Parent, Adult, and Child, any one of which may be used as a base for interaction. The 'Games' identified in transactional analysis are patterns of transaction or interaction between individuals who are in one or another of the ego states, involving hidden or ulterior motives or maneuvers for personal gain. The 'Games' used in marriages and the way in which they are played determine the degree of dysfunction in any marital interaction. A common marital 'Game' is called "If It Weren't For You" (p. 101), by which a partner can gain control of the marriage and protection against having personal inadequacies or problems revealed.

Haley's Communicative Behavior Patterns

Jay Haley (1963) defines an interpersonal relationship as ". . . an exchange of communicative behavior between two or more people" (p. 5). This type of behavior can be observed as opposed to individual processes which must be inferred; therefore, the emphasis is on the relationship, not the individual. All relationships are defined and controlled by communicative behavior, which Haley has classified into three broad pattern groups: symmetrical, complementary, and metacomplementary. In the symmetrical pattern two people exchange the same type of behavior, striving for equality, which can become competitive. The

complementary pattern includes different types of behavior
on a superior-inferior basis. Maneuvering for control of
the relationship is metacomplementary. Haley defines a
pathological relationship as one in which one person tries
to gain control while denying that he is doing so. The
type of communication used in this maneuver is termed a
'Paradox'.

Haley, a communication analyst, developed his ideas
from the work of the research group who explored the
nature of communication and developed the concept of the
"double bind" (similar to Haley's Paradox) in relation to
schizophrenia. After noting the lag in the development
of terminology other than that used to describe the indi-
vidual, Haley predicts that ". . . the ultimate description
of relationships will be in terms of patterns of communi-
cation in a theory of circular systems" (p. 4).

Some Comments on Patterns

Marital interaction patterns have been identified
independently by a number of clinicians. General simi-
larities in some of the patterns support the assumption
that these patterns are valid. Some patterns are de-
scribed in terms of the personality, others in termi-
nology descriptive of interaction. By remembering that
the process of marital interaction involves and occurs

between two personalities it is possible to see through the confusion caused by different terminology to the similar elements. Patterns of 'interrelationship' or of 'family relationships' imply interaction, and these elements in patterns are apparent, regardless of how they are described.

Few functional interaction patterns are identified. Emphasis has been placed on dysfunctional patterns because of the need for knowledge in treating disturbed marriages. It would be of value for practitioners to know what functional interaction patterns are, not only for comparison with the dysfunctional but also as guides in helping couples modify their own interaction patterns.

Complementary patterns seem to be the most generally noted. Those described in the literature are predominantly dysfunctional because of the clinicians' experience in problem areas of marital interaction. Complementary patterns, however, can also be functional, where the expectations and needs of each partner are satisfied by the other. Even in marriages where there is neuroticism or a degree of pathology in one or both partners a complementary pattern of interaction can make the marriage stable.

Mittleman (1956) and the Lidz group (Lidz et al, 1957) are among those who have identified patterns concentrated on certain types of interaction. Others, including

Ehrenwald (1963), Berne (1961), and Haley (1963), have taken a broad approach to interaction in classifying patterns ranging from functional to dysfunctional. Each uses a different method of viewing interaction: Ehrenwald uses the effect of personality traits and attitudes on family relationships, Berne employs a combination of psychoanalysis and methods of communicating, and Haley uses 'communicative behavior.' The similarities in patterns, as noted, are apparent.

There is no generally accepted set of criteria used to develop the classification of interaction patterns. That so many have identified complementary patterns, for instance, does not seem to be coincidental, but whether or not the criteria or methods used are essentially the same is unknown. Concepts concerning interaction patterns and criteria used in classification need to be compared and evaluated for common factors. The development of a common interactional language would facilitate the identification and acceptance of these criteria.

The interrelationship of communication and interaction, or communication as interaction, does not seem to be recognized in some pattern classifications. Those of Ehrenwald (1963) and Mittleman (1956) appear to be based on the behavior or attitudes of couples or families as they affect interaction. Berne (1961) in his 'Games' and

particularly Haley (1963) consider communication as an

integral part of interaction, as is noted in some defi-

nitions in Chapter IV. The 'communicative behavior'

described by Haley has the advantage of being observable

rather than inferential and may prove valuable in research

as a means of adding to knowledge about pattern formation.

In spite of what has not been done and what needs to

be done, patterns classified from clinical experience are

valuable. Hess and Handel (1959) support the necessity

for an alliance between experience and conceptualization:

> Case studies have a particular useful-
> ness when they deal with problems at
> the forward edge of an area of investi-
> gation. They make it possible to
> illustrate in detail the referents of
> new concepts and to think about their
> ramifications. . . . Formal definitions
> of concepts seldom suffice to locate
> them appropriately; indeed such defi-
> nitions often are possible, not to say
> fruitful, only after prolonged
> acquaintance with the phenomena from
> which they issue. A group of cases
> serves to keep concepts closely re-
> lated to the events we wish to
> understand (p. v, vi).

Summary

The classification of marital interaction patterns

is comparatively recent, as is the interactional approach.

Knowledge of this approach and of patterns is as useful

for social workers as it is for clinicians, and its use
in practice gives an additional dimension to therapy for
marital partners who have problems in the area of inter-
personal relationships.

CHAPTER VI

SOME MEASUREMENT ISSUES
FOR MARITAL INTERACTION STUDIES

Empirical studies of marital interaction are under-

taken to determine its dimensions or to validate some

hypothesis about it. Two methods frequently used in

recent studies are direct observation of marital inter-

action in a laboratory setting and analysis of reports

obtained from marital partners. This section of the

report will discuss the usefulness of a general style

of inquiry, but no attempt will be made to evaluate

individual studies.

Problems of Measurement

Measurement of marital interaction shares all the

problems of other studies of behavior. Selltiz et al

(1960) summarize by saying:

> Whatever the purpose . . . four broad
> questions confront the investigator:
> (1) What should be observed? (2)
> How should observations be recorded?
> (3) What procedures should be used
> to try to assure the accuracy of ob-
> servation? (4) What relationship
> should exist between the observer
> and the observed, and how can such a
> relationship be established (p. 205).

To add to the problems, a large proportion of marital

interaction is private and personal.

A form of marital activity which is most readily available for recording and subsequent analysis is verbal interaction. Several authors suggest why it is worthy of study. Stryker (1959) feels that language is a peculiarly human emergent. As such it reflects how society structures its environment. Ruesch and Bateson (1951) assert that communication, which is necessary for a person to know himself or to know about relationships, is dependent on well-defined symbols among which language is the most important. Satir (1964) underlines the necessity of communication for marital interaction.

> Whenever a person communicates he is
> not only making a statement, he is
> also asking something of the receiver
> . . . The receiver, in turn, must
> respond, because people cannot not
> communicate. Even if the receiver
> remains silent, he is still communi-
> cating (p. 78).

Polansky (1965) believes that verbal communication has high value in human relationships.

> My own feeling is that just as sub-
> human anthropoids can proceed so
> far, and no farther by means of pre-
> linguistic thinking, so in therapy
> patients can move only so far by
> nonverbal methods (p. 44).

Direct Measurement of Marital Interaction

Direct measurements are concerned with observing

and describing actions. In order to observe marital interaction investigators present a husband and wife with some task on which they are requested to work together. This both initiates activity and limits its extent. The task must be one that seems important to both partners and one which gives both partners equal opportunity for participation. The conditions under which this activity takes place can be more easily controlled in a laboratory setting than in the home environment.

The great advantage of direct observation is the chance to record action as it happens. People's reports of what they do are often inaccurate. This is shown in the Kenkel and Hoffman (1956) study where participants' reports about their actions in a test situation did not correlate highly with what they actually did.

Direct observation can note actions other than verbal exchanges. People are probably less likely to distort their actions than their reports about actions. The limitations imposed by a test situation give a good basis for comparison between couples on performances. This means that each couple is presented with the same task and that observations are made and interpreted in the same way each time.

There are some disadvantages to direct observation

of marital interaction in a test situation. The duration of
the action is limited to a short time, and the observed
action may not be representative of a spontaneous, un-
structured situation.

Haley (1964) felt that family or marital interaction
could best be evaluated by direct observation. This avoids
the distortions of participant perceptions. He recognized
the difficulties in interpretation of unstructured family
activity in the natural home setting and also the possible
bias a structured, laboratory setting introduced. He
chose conversational interchanges as the most normal means
of communication. Family groups of father, mother, and
one child were given fairly neutral questions to discuss
on which presumably each member would have equal right to
speak. The sequence of responses -- which person spoke
following which other -- was recorded mechanically through
separate microphones for each individual. The resulting
patterns were compared to completely random response
patterns. The author concluded that a family comprises
an organization because patterns of response differed
significantly from randomness. The degrees to which
families differ could be compared, and families in which
no member was receiving psychiatric treatment were found
to respond in a more nearly random manner. Haley sug-
gested that such randomness of response indicated greater

flexibility in communication.

Though Parsons and Bales (1955) did not report origi-
nal studies of marital interaction, the inferences they
drew from work with small groups and in particular the
classification developed for categorizing action (Parsons,
Bales, and Shils, 1953) have had far-reaching influence.
They saw all human interactions as partaking in varying
degrees of instrumental qualities (task accomplishing or
task deterring) and expressive qualities (promoting
pleasant or unpleasant sentiments). They defined the
nuclear family as a specialized subsystem of a culture
with characteristics such as role fulfillment by indi-
vidual members, similar to small groups. They hypothe-
sized that husbands tend to specialize in instrumental
activities and wives in expressive activities (Parsons
and Bales, 1955).

Strodbeck (1951) devised a test situation where the
interaction of husbands and wives could be studied
directly. The couple was presented various situations
with which they were equally familiar and asked to register
opinions separately. They then compared their answers
and were required to decide on a mutually agreeable re-
sponse for each question. Measurement was made of the
number and direction of reconciliations as an index of
each partner's influence. An observer also utilized the

Bales' system (Parsons, Bales, and Shils, 1953) to categorize the types of actions employed in reaching a decision.

Goodrich and Boomer (1963) set up a test of how husbands and wives reach agreement using charts of color gradations. Deliberate variations in the numbering on individual charts created confusion. The observed interaction was categorized along lines of involvement, accomplishment of the task, and maintenance of esteem.

Loveland, Wynne, and Singer (1963) devised a more complicated test situation in which areas of agreement must be reached. They included a child with the married couple in a family Rorschach. After previously completing individual Rorschachs, family members were asked to find areas of agreement on ink blot interpretations. An observer behind a one-way screen described nonverbal actions and recorded comments on the total actions. Conversation was tape recorded.

Elbert et al (1964) suggested a plan for studying family interaction which elaborates on the family Rorschach. To elicit projective material they employed a series of picture cards with concrete family situations. These were viewed by individual family members and then discussed in a group. The family also discussed six questions ranging from very neutral subjects to very

loaded subjects such as description of a family fight.
There was one nonverbal task -- the duplication of a
wooden model. All actions were recorded by a concealed
observer.

Kenkel and Hoffman (1956) and Kenkel (1959, 1961)
engaged couples in reaching a decision about spending a
sum of money. They felt that this task was sufficiently
interesting and familiar to elicit representative inter-
action. In addition they varied the sex of the observer,
obtained information on values held by the marital
partners, and had the participants record their per-
ceptions of their own activities in the test situation.
The tasks were carried on in the presence of an observer
who recorded actions using Bales' categories.

Indirect Measurement of Marital Interaction

Indirect measurement of marital interaction is con-
cerned with how the situation appears to the participant.
It is dependent on self-report by the participant. This
report is verbal and makes use of either interview,
questionnaire or projective material.

This method of observation has the advantage of
access to material which is not directly observable. A
person's view of a situation is very real to that person.

Information obtained by questionnaire is limited to

written responses to set questions. It tends to assure the respondent of anonymity and give him time to consider his answer. Information obtained by an interviewer can include observations of behavior as well as answers to questions. Interviews can be used to obtain information from people who find a questionnaire too complicated or too much trouble to complete. Projective methods obtain information without revealing to the respondent what information is being sought. The subject's responses to some stimulus like an ink blot or a picture are interpreted by the investigator. This avoids the problems of a person's willingness or ability to reveal himself. The adequacy of projective material is determined by the quality of the interpretation.

There are some limitations on the nature of information which can be obtained by self-report. A person must be willing to make the report. He might not report something damaging about himself. He must be able to make the report. He might be unaware of some things about himself.

The following group of studies of marital interaction investigated participant perceptions of themselves, of their partners, and of the marriage relationship.

Karlsson (1963) employed questionnaires administered by an interviewer to marital partners separately to obtain their assessments of satisfaction in the marriage and also

individual sets of personality characteristics. He found that traits a member of the marriage perceived in the partner gave a better index of satisfaction than traits discovered by tests. His book is also very descriptive of communication within marriage and of ". . . adaptability, which was tentatively defined as the ability to adjust without difficulties to different situations" (Karlsson, 1963, p. 79-80).

Rollins (1962), by methods which are not described in the abstract, studied marital stability and found cohesion more strongly correlated with perception by marital partners that they hold similar values than by actual consensus in values.

Winch, Ktsanes, and Ktsanes (1954) obtained information on the personalities of married pairs through interviews, case histories and projective tests. Their subjects were recently married and childless so that marital interaction would have had relatively little influence on their personalities. The authors proposed the idea that couples simultaneously satisfy individual needs which are different or of different intensities. They found greatest substantiation for this view through needs discovered at a conscious level by interviews.

In a test of Winch's findings, Murstein (1961) administered a variety of individual tests in questionnaire form to childless couples married a short time and to

couples married more than ten years. He found that there
was no simple dichotomy of needs in marriage. Among the
newlyweds he did not find that the complementarity between
the married pairs differed greatly from men and women from
the sample group matched randomly. In couples married a
long time, he found a homogamous pattern of needs.

Buerkle and Badgley (1959) at Yale presented marital
partners separately with questionnaires detailing marital
conflict situations and offering a choice of four solutions.
Solutions ranged from benefiting self to benefiting the
partner and elaborated varying degrees of awareness of the
partner's feelings. The authors arrived at a composite
score for the couple. It was a high score if there was
agreement on the resolution of the situations even if
mates were unequal in sympathy. They found that altruism --
the tendency to favor the other -- varied with the situ-
ation involved.

Hobart and Klausner (1959) attempted to measure com-
munication and ability to anticipate the spouse's answer
by use of individual questionnaires concerning barriers
to communications and self-spouse ratings on a variety of
characteristics. Mutual recognition of taboo subjects
was found to be associated with marital adjustment. In-
sight into spousal self-rating on personal performance
appeared to be more important than insight into spousal
self-rating on marital roles performance.

Levinger (1963) studied a family group through a combination of procedures. He observed performance on a variety of tasks, obtained parent assessment of family members by means of questionnaire, and obtained external judgments about family members from a counselor or teacher who was familiar with the family. The author gives a very thoughtful and illuminating discussion of the limitations of any one line of inquiry and of the value of combining techniques. He also gives a brief historical review of studies on marriage.

Summary

This chapter has considered two general styles of measurement for marital interaction -- direct and indirect.

Direct observation is most useful for discovering and describing characteristics of marital interaction. It has the advantage of immediate access to a sample of behavior undistorted by the participant's perceptions. However, observations could be biased by the subject's awareness that he is being watched, or by the unrepresentativeness of the test situation.

Indirect methods of observation which rely on participant self-report are most useful for discovering what seems important to the individual member of the marriage. An individual's perception of a situation is the most compelling

reality for that person. Information obtained through questionnaires and interviews reveals feelings about the marital interaction and has been useful in predicting cohesion in marriage. However, such material can be distorted by the respondent either willfully or unwillfully, and such material cannot reveal anything of which the respondent is not aware.

Valuable information could be obtained by reports from people who know the members of the marriage well and who will provide such a report. The Levinger (1963) study is one example of the use of this type of information.

A combination of techniques can provide information unavailable from use of a single technique. Findings in the Levinger (1963) study suggest that parental actions toward a child can be predicted from their attitudes toward him. It is likely that information about marital interaction could be greatly enriched by employment of a combination of techniques in a single study.

CHAPTER VII

SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH

Interaction, a complex phenomenon, is difficult to define, yet the everyday interaction of marital partners is so routine and commonplace that the participants are hardly aware of this continuing process.

In marriage two people come together bringing with them certain resources. These two independently motivated beings must organize their actions so that their contributions produce some mutual gratifications of each other's needs. The constant exchange of information with attempts to influence the other gradually results in a patterning of responses. These typical responses become the basic interaction pattern of the married couple. The patterning indicates an implied consensus when each spouse accepts the response of the other as appropriate.

The stability shown by the existence of patterns does not preclude change. Throughout the marriage patterns must be confirmed, modified, altered, or replaced when conditions change and new needs arise.

This project attempts to describe the dimensions of the interactional approach in order to lay the conceptual groundwork for a series of empirical studies. A discussion of research implications in this context is limited to general questions that either need to be answered or are best

answered by the interactionist. Specific hypotheses will not be proposed but the discussion will focus on two major issues on the interactional approach with some consideration of questions regarding personality, patterns, and communication. The aforementioned issues are the problems presented by the interactional definitions and the meaning of socialization in the interaction process.

The Problem of Definitions

The interactional approach is burdened with theoretical concepts whose definitions have not been made operational. The philosophical approach of George Herbert Mead is a provocative and stimulating tool for the interactionist. It provides a base that is sufficiently broad to support a variety of studies of the personality and the interaction process. Some studies have yielded significant findings using Mead's concepts. The difficulty lies in transposing the theoretical definitions into operational ones. Such concepts as the self and generalized other must be made much more explicit. As noted by Hill and Hansen (1960), research cannot proceed without a sound conceptual framework. This need for a sound structure is most pertinent to the interactional approach since the process studied is extremely complex and as yet only broadly defined.

The Problem of Socialization

The interactionist must concede the validity of Stryker's (1959) statement regarding the relevance of socialization to the interactional approach. The process of socialization begins with infancy and progresses throughout life. Through socialization the individual learns to adjust his behavior so it conforms more or less to the others' expectations. The individual must be able to predict how others will react to him if he is to behave appropriately. He must also learn the role of the other, or anticipate the other's response from his own behavior and examine and evaluate his own performance.

Early socialization cannot fully prepare a person for later roles although socialization in later years builds on previously acquired attitudes and skills. Each person must be able to adapt to changed expectations of a modern, complex society. The limits of socialization in later life are related to the interaction of the biological capacities of the individual and the effects of learning or lack of it with the level of technology achieved by the society in its socialization methods (Brim, 1966).

The issue for the interactionist is to determine more precisely the relation between the interaction process and the socialization process. It is necessary to know when and why adult socialization occurs and to distinguish the

types of interaction that are conducive to this change.

Personality

Personality is shaped and developed in part through interpersonal relationships. Although personality is a relatively stable component of marital interaction, change does occur as the individual adapts to new situations and roles. Research results are not conclusive as to the continuity of personality. There are very few studies of adult socialization which deal with the process by which society influences individual roles and in turn personality.

Becker (1964) points out that the degree of commitment has a relationship to personality change and that change may be transitory in nature, an adjustment to meet a particular situation.

Competence, as earlier described, has been defined as the ability to meet one's own needs as well as those of one's spouse. Commitment and competence can be powerful contributions by each spouse to the marital interaction. It would be important to define the effect of each of these factors on the personalities of the marital pair since satisfaction in marriage is related to the interrelationship of the personalities of the husband and wife.

Marital Interaction Patterns

Marriage is a unique unity, the dynamic relationship between husband and wife. Each brings to the marriage an individual identity gained from his particular socializing experience.

In early stages of marriage, ways of acting and reacting to each other apparently eventually develop into stable patterns. These interaction patterns may be functional or dysfunctional to the individual, the couple, their children or society. As an example, there have been many studies of families of schizophrenic children which indicate serious psychopathology in the parents. Ehrenwald (1963) cites studies of patterns of obsessions and compulsions which have been repeated in several subsequent generations. These patterns appear to be part of the socialization process of these families. It appears then that faulty interaction of these families hinders the healthy personality development of the children who then carry on these faulty interaction patterns into their own marriages. The significance for society is evident.

Society also affects the interaction patterns within a family. Migration, urbanization, industrialization, all have brought about the isolation of the nuclear family. This causes changes in socialization of the children and of

the adults. More marital strain may result as additional
needs of the marital partners must be provided by each
other.

It seems clear that marital interaction is affected
by changes of society which in turn is affected by the
patterns of marital interaction. In this circular re-
lationship, dysfunction in any area can adversely affect
individual lives, marital relationships and society itself.

The interactional approach is concerned with how
effective interactional patterns are established; how
agreement is reached; and how the individual behavior
patterns result in various types of marital interaction.
Each of these factors demands further research if the
process of interaction is to be fully understood. The pre-
cise determinants which regulate whether these patterns
are to be functional or dysfunctional are not sufficiently
clear.

Communication

Communication, defined to include all those symbolic
processes by which people influence one another (Ruesch &
Bateson, 1951), is of major importance in examining inter-
action.

Verbal communication is the most measurable, the most
accessible, and the most uniquely human way of expressing
meaning. The product of communication is not merely the

modification of the listeners' attitudes or behaviors, but the establishment of some degree of consensus. Since verbal communication can be less ambiguous and more complex than nonverbal communication, it serves as a medium for clarifying issues and misunderstandings between the marital pair.

Polansky's (1965) verbal accessibility studies have provided some interesting, though sometimes inconclusive, results. There is much research yet to be undertaken to test the validity of assumptions made. Among the factors requiring further research are the variations in accessibility among different attitudes; the relationship of verbal accessibility to personality structure; and the relationship of verbal accessibility to family patterns, subcultures, and defense mechanisms.

The significance of verbal communication for marriage is incompletely understood; thus research questions should focus on the quality and quantity of messages and their impact on the personality, the interaction process, and the formation of patterns.

Conclusion

The greatest challenge for research, based on the interactional approach, is to clarify the existing concepts so that a consistent, useful framework emerges. The relation of socialization, personality, patterns, and communication to the interaction process is loosely defined; however, it is

through study of the specific interact that information concerning these areas is most obtainable. The complexity of the marriage relationship requires precise analysis if various components are to be properly understood.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ackerman, Nathan W. The psychodynamics of family life.
    New York, Basic Books, 1958. 379 p.

2. Angell, Robert Cooley. The family encounters the
    depression. New York, Scribner, 1936. 309 p.

3. Aristotle. Politics. Tr. by B. Jowett. New York,
    P.F. Collier, 1900. 208 p.

4. Babcock, C. Merton. Purposeful communication. In:
    C. Merton Babcock's Ideas in process. New York,
    Harper, 1958. p. 309-363.

5. Barbara, Dominick A. Nonverbal communication. The
    Journal of Communication 13:166-173. 1963.

6. Bateson, Gregory. Formal research in family structure.
    In: Nathan W. Ackerman, Frances L. Beatman, and
    Sanford N. Sherman's Exploring the base for family
    therapy, New York, Family Service Association of
    America, 1961. p. 136-140.

7. Becker, Howard S. Personal change in adult life.
    Sociometry 27:40-53. 1964.

8. Berne, Eric. Transactional analysis in psychotherapy.
    New York, Grove Press, 1961. 270 p.

9. Birdwhistell, Ray L. An approach to communication.
    Family Process 1:194-201. 1962.

10. Blau, Peter M. Exchange and power in social life.
    New York, John Wiley, 1964. 352 p.

11. Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott. Formal organi-
    zations: a comparative approach. San Francisco,
    Chandler, 1962. 312 p.

12. Bonner, Hubert. Social psychology: an interdiscipli-
    nary approach. New York, American Book, 1953. 439 p.

13. Briar, Scott. The family as an organization: an
    approach to family diagnosis and treatment. The Social
    Service Review 38:247-255. 1964.

14. Brim, Orville G. Jr. and Stanton Wheeler. Social-
    ization after childhood, two essays. New York,
    John Wiley, 1966. 116 p.

15. Buerkle, Jack V. and Robin F. Badgley. Couple role-
    taking: the Yale marital interaction battery.
    Marriage and Family Living 21:53-58. 1959.

16. Buerkle, Jack V., Theodore R. Anderson and Robin F.
    Badgley. Altruism, role conflict, and marital ad-
    justment: a factor analysis of marital interaction.
    Marriage and Family Living 23:20-26. 1961.

17. Burgess, Ernest W. The family as a unity of interact-
    ing personalities. The Family 7:3-9. 1926.

18. Cherry, Colin. On human communication. New York,
    Science Editions, 1961. 333 p.

19. Cooley, Charles Horton. Human nature and the social
    order. New York, Scribner, 1922. 184 p.

20. Dewey, John and Arthur F. Bentley. Knowing and the
    known. Boston, Beacon, 1949. 334 p.

21. Duncan, Hugh Dalziel. Communication and social
    order. New Jersey, Bedminster Press, 1962. 475 p.

22. Ehrenwald, Jan. Neurosis in the family and
    patterns of psychosocial defense: a study of
    psychiatric epidemiology. New York, Harper-Row,
    1963. 203 p.

23. _____ Family diagnosis and mechanisms of
    psychosocial defense. Family Process 2:121-131.
    1963.

24. _____ Family dynamics and communication
    theory. The Journal of Communication 13:191-198.
    1963.

25. Elbert, Shirley et al. A method for the clinical
    study of family interaction. American Journal of
    Orthopsychiatry 34:885-894. 1964.

26. English, Horace B. and Ava C. English. A comprehensive
    dictionary of psychological and psychoanalytical
    terms. New York, Longmans Green, 1958. 594 p.

27. Folsom, Joseph K. Communication in marriage and marriage counseling. Marriage and Family Living 20:113-116. 1958.

28. Foote, Nelson N. and Leonard S. Cottrell Jr. Identity and interpersonal competence. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1955. 305 p.

29. Goodrich, D. Wells and Donald S. Boomer. Experimental assessment of modes of conflict resolution. Family Process 2:15-24. 1963.

30. Gross, Neal Crasilneck, Ward S. Mason and Alexander W. McEachern. Explorations in role analysis. New York, John Wiley, 1958. 379 p.

31. Grosser, Daniel, Norman Polansky and Ronald Lippitt. A laboratory study of behavioral contagion. Human Relations 4:115-142. 1951.

32. Haley, Jay. Strategies of psychotherapy. New York, Grune and Stratton, 1963. 204 p.

33. _____ Research on family patterns: an instrument measurement. Family Process 3:41-65. 1964.

34. Harper, Robert A. Communication problems in marriage and marriage counseling. Marriage and Family Living 20:107-112. 1958.

35. Hearn, Gordon. Theory building in social work, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1958. 83 p.

36. Hecker, Justus Friedrich Karl. The epidemics of the middle ages. 3d ed. London, Scribner, 1859. 360 p.

37. Heer, David M. The measurement and bases of family power; an overview. Marriage and Family Living 25:133-139. 1963.

38. Hess, Robert D. and Gerald Handel. Family worlds: a psychosocial approach to family life. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1959. 305 p.

39. Hill, Reuben. Families under stress; adjustment to the crisis of war separation and reunion. New York, Harper, 1949. 443 p.

40. Hill, Reuben and Donald A. Hansen. The identification of conceptual frameworks utilized in family study. Marriage and Family Living 22:299-311. 1960.

41. Hobart, Charles W. and William J. Klausner. Some social interactional correlates of marital role disagreement, and marital adjustment. Marriage and Family Living 21:256-263. 1959.

42. Homans, George C. The human group. New York, Harcourt-Brace, 1950. 484 p.

43. Huntington, Robert M. The personality-interaction approach to study of the marital relationship. Marriage and Family Living 20:43-46. 1958.

44. Jackson, Don D. Family interaction, family homeostasis, and some implications for conjoint psychotherapy. In: Jules H. Masserman's Science and psychoanalysis-individual and familial dynamics, vol. II. New York, Grune and Stratton, 1959. p. 122-141.

45. Jones, Dorothy. Binds and unbinds. Family Process 3:323-334. 1964.

46. Jourard, Sidney M. and Paul Lasakow. Some factors in self-disclosure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 56:91-98. 1958.

47. Kantor, Robert E. Schizophrenia and symbolic interaction. Family Process 3:402-414. 1964.

48. Karlsson, Georg. Adaptability and communication in marriage. 2d rev. ed. New Jersey, Bedminster Press, 1963. 89 p.

49. Kenkel, William F. Traditional family ideology and spousal roles in decision making. Marriage and Family Living 21:334-339. 1959.

50. _____ Sex of observer and spousal roles in decision making. Marriage and Family Living 23:185-186. 1961.

51. Kenkel, William F. and Dean K. Hoffman. Real and conceived roles in family decision making. Marriage and Family Living 18:311-316. 1956.

52. Kernodle, Wayne. Some implications of the homogamy-complementary needs theories of mate selection for sociological research. Social Forces 38:145-152. December 1959.

53. Komarovsky, Mirra. Blue-collar marriage. New York, Random House, 1964. 395 p.

54. Ktsanes, Thomas. Mate selection on the basis of personality type: a study utilizing an empirical typology of personality. American Sociological Review 20:547-551. 1955.

55. Lambert, William W. and Wallace E. Lambert. Social psychology. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1964. 120 p.

56. Lasègue, Ch. and J. Falret. La folie à deux ou folie communiquée. Annales Médico-Psychologiques 18:321. 1877. (Translated in supplement to American Journal of Psychiatry 121:1-23. 1964).

57. Levinger, George. Supplementary methods in family research. Family Process 2:357-366. 1963.

58. _____. Marital cohesiveness and dissolution: an integrative review. Journal of Marriage and the Family 27:19-28. 1965.

59. Lidz, Theodore. The family and human adaptation. New York, International Universities Press, 1963. 120 p.

60. Lidz, Theodore et al. The intrafamilial environment of the schizophrenic patient: II. Marital schism and marital skew. American Journal of Psychiatry 114:241-248. 1957.

61. Linton, Ralph. The cultural background of personality. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1945. 157 p.

62. Loveland, Nathene T., Lyman C. Wynne and Margaret T. Singer. The family Rorschach: a new method for studying family interaction. Family Process 2:187-215. 1963.

63. Luckey, Eleanor Braum. Marital satisfaction and its concomitant perceptions of self and spouse. Journal of Counseling Psychology 11:136-145. 1964.

64. Mackey, Charles. Extraordinary popular delusions and the madness of crowds (a verbatim reprint, with reproductions of original illustrations, of the edition of 1852). Boston, L.C. Paige, 1932. 724 p.

65. Mathews, Vincent D. and Clement S. Mihanovich. New orientations on marital maladjustment. Marriage and Family Living 25:300-304. 1963.

66. Mead, George H. Mind, self, and society. Charles W. Morris (ed.) Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1934. 401 p.

67. _____ The philosophy of the act. Charles W. Morris (ed.) Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1938. 696 p.

68. Meissner, W.W. Thinking about the family - psychiatric aspects. Family Process 3:1-40. 1964.

69. Mittleman, Bela. Analysis of reciprocal neurotic patterns in family relationships. In: Victor W. Eisenstein's Neurotic interaction in marriage. New York, Basic Books, 1956. p. 81-100.

70. Miyamoto, S. Frank and Sanford M. Dornbusch. A test of interactionist hypotheses of self-conception. American Journal of Sociology 61:399-403. 1956.

71. Montalvo, F.F. Homeostasis in functional and dysfunctional family systems. Based on a paper submitted for a Seminar on Family Group Treatment, University of California, Berkeley: Homeostasis and general systems -- their relevance to family theory and treatment. July 1963. p. 113-125.

72. Mowrer, Ernest R. and Harriet Mowrer. The social psychology of marriage. American Sociological Review 16:27-36. 1961.

73. Murrell, Stanley A. and James G. Stachowiak. The family group: development, structure, and therapy. Journal of Marriage and the Family 27:13-18. 1965.

74. Murstein, Bernard I. The complementarity need hypothesis in newlyweds and middle-aged couples. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 63:194-197. 1961.

75. Parsons, Talcott. The social system. Glencoe, Free Press, 1951. 575 p.

76. Parsons, Talcott and Robert F. Bales. Family social-ization and interaction process. Glencoe, Free Press, 1955. 422 p.

77. Parsons, Talcott, Robert F. Bales and Edward A. Shils. Working papers in the theory of action. Glencoe, Free Press, 1953. 269 p.

78. Pincus, Lily (ed.) Marriage: studies in emotional conflict and growth. London, Methuen, 1960. 259 p.

79. Plato. Dialogues. Tr. by B. Jowett. vol. I New York, Random House, 1937. 879 p.

80. Polansky, Norman A. The concept of verbal accessi-bility. Smith College Studies in Social Work 36:1-48. October 1965.

81. Rapoport, Rhona and Robert Rapoport. Work and family in contemporary society. American Sociological Review 30:381-394. 1965.

82. Rich, Margaret E. A belief in people; a history of social work. New York, Family Service Association of America, 1956. 190 p.

83. Rollins, Boyd Carter. Values, consensus and co-hesion in the husband-wife dyad. (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts 22:4112. May 1962).

84. Rosow, Irving. Issues in the concept of need-complementarity. Sociometry 20:216-233. 1957.

85. Ruesch, Jurgan and Gregory Bateson. Communication: the social matrix of psychiatry. New York, Norton, 1951. 314 p.

86. Ruesch, Jurgan and Weldon Kees. Nonverbal communi-cation: notes on the visual perceptions of human relations. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1956. 205 p.

87. Sampson, Edward E. (ed.) Approaches, contexts and problems of social psychology; a book of readings. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1964. 576 p.

88. Sarbin, Theodore R. Role theory. In: Gardiner Lindzey's Handbook of social psychology. vol. I. Cambridge, Addison-Wesley, 1954. p. 223-250.

89. Sarwer-Foner, G. J. Patterns of marital relationships. American Journal of Psychotherapy 17:31-44. 1963.

90. Satir, Virginia. Conjoint family therapy; a guide to theory and technique. Palo Alto, Science and Behavior Books, 1964. 196 p.

91. Schachter, Stanley. Deviation, rejection and communication. In: Lorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander's Group dynamics, research and theory. New York, Harper-Row, 1960. p. 260-285.

92. Schramm, Wilbur (ed.) Communication research in the United States for The science of human communication. New York, Basic Books, 1963. 158 p.

93. Selltiz, Claire et al. Research methods in social relations. New York, Henry Holt, 1960. 622 p.

94. Shibutani, Tamotsu. Society and personality. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1961. 630 p.

95. Simmel, Georg. The sociology of Georg Simmel. Tr. by Kurt H. Wolff (ed.) Glencoe, Free Press, 1950. 445 p.

96. Spiegel, John P. and Norman W. Bell. The family of the psychiatric patient. In: Silvano Arieti's American handbook of psychiatry. vol. I. New York, Basic Books, 1959. p. 114-149.

97. Strodtbeck, Fred L. Husband-wife interaction over revealed differences. American Sociological Review 16:468-473. 1951.

98. Stryker, Sheldon. Symbolic interaction as an approach to family research. Marriage and Family Living 21:111-119. 1959.

99. Tarde, Gabriel de. The laws of imitation. Tr. from the 2d French edition by Elsie Clews Parsons. New York, Henry Holt, 1903. 404 p.

100. Thayer, Lee O. On theory-building in communication: some conceptual problems. Journal of Communication 13:217-235. 1963.

101. Titchener, James L. et al. Family transactions and derivation of individuality. Family Process 2:95-120. 1963.

102. Vygotsky, L.S. Thought and language. Tr. by Eugenia Haufman and Gertrude Vaker (eds.) Cambridge, M.I.T. Press, 1962. 168 p.

103. Weiss, Viola and R.R. Monroe. A framework for understanding dynamics: part I. Social Casework 40:3-9. 1959.

104. Winch, Robert F. The modern family. New York, Henry Holt, 1952. 522 p.

105. _____ The theory of complementary needs in mate selection: a test of one kind of complementariness. American Sociological Review 20:52-56. 1955.

106. Winch, Robert F., Thomas Ktsanes and Virginia Ktsanes. The theory of complementary needs in mate selection: an analytic and descriptive study. American Sociological Review 19:241-249. 1954.

107. Witmer, Helen Leland and Ruth Kotinsky (eds.) Personality in the making. New York, Harper, 1952. 454 p.

108. Wolfe, Donald M. and J. Diedrick Snoek. A study of tensions and adjustments under role conflict. In: Warren G. Bennis' et al. Interpersonal dynamics: essays and readings on human interaction. Illinois, Dorsey Press, 1964. p. 431-439.

109. Yelaja, Shanker A. The concept of authority and its use in child protective service. Child Welfare 44:514-524. 1965.

110. Zetterberg, Hans L. On theory and verification in sociology. New Jersey, Bedminster Press, 1963. 84 p.

111. Zimmerman, C.C. and M.E. Frampton. Family and society: a study of the sociology of reconstruction. New York, Van Nostrand, 1935. 611 p.

GLOSSARY

The act - behavior by an organism which stems from an impulse requiring some adjustment to relevant objects in an external world.

Adaptation - reciprocal relationship between the organism and its environment.

Assumptions - judgments accepted as true without demonstrated proof.

Cohesiveness - the total field of forces which act on members to remain in the group.

Communication - all those processes by which people influence one another. For this paper: when A makes a statement to B, the process produces change in A and in B. A single act as a part of the process of interaction.

Concept - an abstraction of characteristics common to a group of objects or events.

Congruence - agreement.

Double bind - "The 'double bind' is a communication mode in which contradictory injunctions are expressed on different levels of abstraction, and where something is shifted from one level of abstraction to another in order to conceal or disguise its meaning" (Dorothy Jones, 1964, p. 323).

Dysfunction - ineffective means of problem solving.

Emergence - phenomenon that cannot be predicted from its constituent parts.

Equilibrium - a state of balance produced by the counteraction of two or more forces.

Family - "A unity of interacting persons" (Burgess, 1926, p. 5).

Feedback - action by an individual which is recognized by another individual as a response to his own previous action.

Homeostasis - "Those intricate processes occurring within a family which are made up of patterned inter-relationships among family members and result in maintaining the conditions for family integration that were previously arrived at by members of the family" (Montalvo, 1963, p. 114).

I - George Herbert Mead's concept of the original, initiating quality of the personality.

Influence - art or power of producing an effect without apparent force or direct authority.

Interaction - a reciprocal relationship in which each person may produce effects on the other.

Interaction, Expressive - actions reuniting family members including expressions of affection for each other, warmth, and a symbolization of common membership through supportive, accepting behavior.

Interaction, Instrumental - actions focused on achieve-ment of tasks often dispersing family members for such achievement.

Interaction, Symbolic - symbols in communication which are significant or mutually meaningful for each person involved.

Interpersonal Competence - acquired ability to interact with other people effectively according to some criterion which is not necessarily satisfaction of the individuals. Principal components: health, intelligence, empathy, autonomy, judg-ment, creativity.

Language - human speech or the written symbols for speech.

Marriage - ". . . a process of interaction between two people, a man and a woman, who have fulfilled certain legal requirements and have gone through a wedding ceremony or are otherwise accepted as married by the law. . . . We do not refer to the pair of persons involved by marriage but to the set of their acts which are mutually dependent upon each other, i.e., which constitutes inter-action" (Karlsson, 1963, p. 12).

Me - George Herbert Mead's concept of objective self or the
          organized attitudes of others within the person-
          ality.

Mind - ". . . organized totality or system of all
          mental processes or psychic activities,
          usually of an individual organism . . ."
          (English and English, 1958, p. 323).

Other, Generalized - a reference group whose responses an
          actor must be able to anticipate in order that
          he may know how to behave. "To take the role
          of the generalized other is to see one's be-
          havior as taking place in the context of a
          defined system of related roles" (Stryker,
          1959, p. 115).

Other, Significant - person an individual perceives as
          having value or influence.

Pattern - "A sequence of actions involving two or more
          family members which is repetitive, has some
          degree of automaticity, and is employed as
          part of the adaptive function of the family
          system" (Titchener et al, 1963, p. 113).

Perception - awareness or the process of becoming aware by
          means of sensory processes and under the in-
          fluence of set and of prior experiences.

Personality - the developed psychological organization of
          the individual that includes his attitudes,
          ideas, and habits.

Position - the location of an actor or class of actors in
          a system of social relationships.

Power -   ability of an individual to get what he wants
          without having to modify his own conduct.

Role - the part played by an actor; behavior that is
          characteristic and expected.

Role Conflict - exposure of the actor to conflicting sets
          of legitimized expectations such that complete
          fulfillment of both is realistically
          impossible.

Role Expectation - characteristics that determine whether
          a person will be satisfied with a role or not.

Role Taking - anticipation of the response of others involved in the same social act.

Self - that which arises as an object within the personality. Self is developed in the give and take of social relations.

Self-consciousness - the activity of oneself from the standpoint of others.

Social Psychology - that branch of psychology which studies the phenomena of social behavior.

Socialization - process by which the individual learns how to view and evaluate his behavior and act with reference to himself as well as others.

Symbol - an object used to represent something else.

Theory - an internally consistent body of verified hypotheses when verification is provisional rather than absolute.

Thinking - the internalized manipulation of language symbols.

Transaction - a two-phase, cyclical exchange between two individuals in which there is constant feedback which is largely self-regulating and self-correcting and which modifies the subsequent response of each.

Volition - selection among alternatives symbolically present.