

Pearson New International Edition

Family Therapy: Concepts and Methods

Michael P. Nichols

Tenth Edition



Pearson New International Edition

Family Therapy: Concepts and Methods
Michael P. Nichols
Tenth Edition

PEARSON®

Pearson Education Limited

Edinburgh Gate
Harlow
Essex CM20 2JE
England and Associated Companies throughout the world

Visit us on the World Wide Web at: www.pearsoned.co.uk

© Pearson Education Limited 2014

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying in the United Kingdom issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency Ltd, Saffron House, 6–10 Kirby Street, London EC1N 8TS.

All trademarks used herein are the property of their respective owners. The use of any trademark in this text does not vest in the author or publisher any trademark ownership rights in such trademarks, nor does the use of such trademarks imply any affiliation with or endorsement of this book by such owners.

PEARSON®

ISBN 10: 1-292-04188-9
ISBN 13: 978-1-292-04188-9

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Printed in the United States of America

Table of Contents

1. The Evolution of Family Therapy Michael P. Nichols	1
2. Basic Techniques of Family Therapy Michael P. Nichols	27
3. The Fundamental Concepts of Family Therapy Michael P. Nichols	53
4. Bowen Family Systems Therapy Michael P. Nichols	79
5. Strategic Family Therapy Michael P. Nichols	107
6. Structural Family Therapy Michael P. Nichols	133
7. Experiential Family Therapy Michael P. Nichols	159
8. Psychoanalytic Family Therapy Michael P. Nichols	183
9. Cognitive - Behavioral Family Therapy Michael P. Nichols	207
10. Solution Focused Therapy Michael P. Nichols	239
11. Narrative Therapy Michael P. Nichols	265
12. Comparative Analysis Michael P. Nichols	287
Index	313

The Evolution of Family Therapy

A Revolutionary Shift in Perspective

In this chapter, we explore the antecedents and early years of family therapy. There are two compelling stories here: one of personalities, one of ideas. You will read about the pioneers—visionary iconoclasts who broke the mold of seeing life and its problems as a function of individuals and their psychology. Make no mistake: The shift from an individual to a systemic perspective was a revolutionary one, providing those who grasped it with a powerful tool for understanding and resolving human problems.

The second story in the evolution of family therapy is one of ideas. The restless curiosity of the first family therapists led them to ingenious new ways of conceptualizing the joys and sorrows of family life.

As you read this history, stay open to surprises. Be ready to reexamine easy assumptions—including the assumption that family therapy began as a benevolent effort to support the institution of the family. The truth is, therapists first encountered families as adversaries.

The Undeclared War

Although we came to think of asylums as places of cruelty and detention, they were originally built to rescue the insane from being locked away in family attics. Accordingly, except for purposes of footing the bill, hospital psychiatrists kept families at arm's length. In the 1950s, however, two puzzling developments forced therapists to recognize the family's power to alter the course of treatment.

Therapists began to notice that often when a patient got better, someone else in the family got worse, almost as though the family *needed* a symptomatic member. As in the game of hide-and-seek, it didn't seem to matter who was "It" as long as someone played the part. In one case, Don Jackson (1954) was treating a woman for depression. When she began to improve,

From Chapter 1 of *Family Therapy: Concepts and Methods*, Tenth Edition.
Michael P. Nichols. Copyright © 2013 by Pearson Education. All rights reserved.

her husband complained that she was getting worse. When she continued to improve, the husband lost his job. Eventually, when the woman was completely well, the husband killed himself. Apparently this man's stability was predicated on having a sick wife.

Another strange story of shifting disturbance was that patients frequently improved in the hospital only to get worse when they went home.

CASE STUDY

In a bizarre case of Oedipus revisited, Salvador Minuchin treated a young man hospitalized for trying to scratch out his own eyes. The man functioned normally in Bellevue but returned to self-mutilation each time he went home. He could be sane, it seemed, only in an insane world.

It turned out that the young man was extremely close to his mother, a bond that grew even tighter during the seven years of his father's mysterious absence. The father was a compulsive gambler who disappeared shortly after being declared legally incompetent. The rumor was that the Mafia had kidnapped him. When, just as mysteriously, the father returned, his son began his bizarre attempts at self-mutilation. Perhaps he wanted to blind himself so as not to see his obsession with his mother and hatred of his father.

But this family was neither ancient nor Greek, and Minuchin was more pragmatist than poet. So he challenged the father to protect his son by beginning to deal directly with his wife, and then he challenged the man's demeaning attitude toward her, which had driven her to seek her son's protection. The therapy was a challenge to the family's structure and, in Bellevue, working with the psychiatric staff to ease the young man back into the family, into the lion's den.

Minuchin confronted the father, saying, "As a father of a child in danger, what you're doing isn't enough."

"What should I do?" asked the man.

"I don't know," Minuchin replied. "Ask your son." Then, for the first time in years, father and son began talking. Just as they were about to run out of things to say, Dr. Minuchin commented to the parents: "In a strange way, he's telling you that he prefers to be treated like a child. When he was in the hospital he was twenty-three. Now that he's returned home again, he's six."

What this case dramatizes is how parents sometimes use their children as a buffer to protect them from

intimacy. To the would-be Oedipus, Minuchin said, "You're scratching your eyes for your mother, so that she'll have something to worry about. You're a good boy. Good children sacrifice themselves for their parents."

Families are made of strange glue—they stretch but never let go. Few blamed the family for outright malevolence, yet there was an invidious undercurrent to these observations. The official story of family therapy is one of respect for the family, but maybe none of us ever quite gets over the adolescent idea that families are the enemy of freedom.

Small Group Dynamics

Those who first sought to understand and treat families found a ready parallel in small groups. **Group dynamics** were applicable to family therapy because group life is a complex blend of individual personalities and superordinate properties of the group.

In 1920, the pioneering social psychologist William McDougall published *The Group Mind*, in which he described how a group's continuity depends on boundaries for differentiation of function, and on customs and habits to make relationships predictable. A more scientific approach to group dynamics was developed in the 1940s by Kurt Lewin, whose *field theory* (Lewin, 1951) guided a generation of researchers and therapists. Drawing on the Gestalt school of perception, Lewin developed the notion that a group is more than the sum of its parts. The transcendent property of groups has obvious relevance to family therapists, who must work not only with individuals but also with family systems—and with their famous resistance to change.

Analyzing what he called *quasi-stationary social equilibrium*, Lewin pointed out that changing group behavior requires "unfreezing." Only after something shakes up a group's beliefs will its members be prepared to change. In individual therapy this process is initiated by the unhappy experiences that lead people to seek help. Once someone decides to meet with a therapist, that person has already begun to unfreeze old habits. When families come for treatment, it's a different story.



The first people to practice family therapy turned to group therapy for a model.

Family members may not be sufficiently unsettled by a symptomatic member's problems to consider changing their own ways. Furthermore, family members bring their own reference group with them, with all its traditions and habits. Consequently, more effort is required to unfreeze, or shake up, families before real change can take place. The need for unfreezing foreshadowed early family therapists' concern about disrupting family homeostasis, a notion that dominated family therapy for decades.

Wilfred Bion was another student of group functioning who emphasized the group as a whole, with its own dynamics and structure. According to Bion (1948), most groups become diverted from their primary tasks by engaging in patterns of *fight-flight*, *dependency*, and *pairing*. Bion's basic assumptions are easily extrapolated to family therapy: Some families skirt around hot issues like a cat circling a

snake. Others use therapy to bicker endlessly, never really contemplating compromise, much less change. Dependency masquerades as therapy when families allow therapists to subvert their autonomy in the name of problem solving. Pairing is seen in families when one parent colludes with the children to undermine the other parent.

The **process/content** distinction in group dynamics had a major impact on family treatment. Experienced therapists learn to attend as much to *how* people talk as to the content of their discussions. For example, a mother might tell her daughter that she shouldn't play with Barbie dolls because she shouldn't aspire to an image of bubble-headed beauty. The *content* of the mother's message is, "Respect yourself as a person." But if the mother expresses her point of view by disparaging the daughter's wishes, then the *process* of her message is, "Your feelings don't count."

Unfortunately, the content of some discussions is so compelling that therapists get sidetracked from the process. Suppose, for example, that a therapist invites a teenager to talk with his mother about wanting to drop out of school. Say the boy mumbles something about school being stupid, and his mother responds with a lecture about the need for an education. A therapist who gets drawn in to support the mother's position may be making a mistake. In terms of content, the mother might be right: A high school diploma can come in handy. But maybe it's more important at that moment to help the boy learn to speak up for himself—and for his mother to learn to listen.

Role theory, explored in the literatures of psychoanalysis and group dynamics, had important applications to the study of families. The expectations that roles carry bring regularity to complex social situations.

Roles tend to be stereotyped in most groups, and so there are characteristic behavior patterns of group members. Virginia Satir (1972) described family roles such as “the placator” and “the disagreeable one” in her book *Peoplemaking*. If you think about it, you may have played a fairly predictable role in your family. Perhaps you were “the good child,” “the moody one,” or “the rebel.” The trouble is, such roles can be hard to put aside.

One thing that makes role theory so useful in understanding families is that roles tend to be complementary. Say, for example, that a woman is a little more anxious to spend time with her boyfriend than he is. Maybe, left to his own devices, he'd call twice a week. But if she calls three times a week, he may never get around to picking up the phone. If their relationship lasts, she may always be the pursuer and he the distancer. Or take the case of two parents, both of whom want their children to behave themselves at the dinner table. The father has a slightly shorter fuse—he tells them to quiet down five seconds after they start getting rowdy, whereas his wife would wait half a minute. If he always speaks up, she may never get a chance. Eventually these parents may become polarized into complementary roles of strictness and leniency. What makes such reciprocity resistant to change is that the roles reinforce each other.

It was a short step from observing patients' reactions to other members of a group—some of whom might

act like siblings or parents—to observing interactions in real families. Given the wealth of techniques for exploring interpersonal relationships developed by group therapists, it was natural for some family therapists to apply a group treatment model to families. What is a family, after all, but a collective group of individuals?

From a technical viewpoint, group and family therapies are similar: Both are complex and dynamic, more like everyday life than individual therapy. In groups and families, patients must react to a number of people, not just a therapist, and therapeutic use of this interaction is the definitive mechanism of change in both contexts.

On closer examination, however, it turns out that the differences between families and groups are so significant that the group therapy model has only limited applicability to family treatment. Family members have a long history and, more importantly, a future together. Revealing yourself to strangers is safer than exposing yourself to members of your own family. There's no taking back revelations that might better have remained private—the affair, long since over, or the admission that a woman cares more about her career than about her husband. Continuity, commitment, and shared distortions all make family therapy very different from group therapy.

Therapy groups are designed to provide an atmosphere of warmth and support. This feeling of safety among sympathetic strangers cannot be part of family therapy because instead of separating treatment from a stressful environment, the stressful environment is brought into the consulting room. Furthermore, in group therapy, patients can have equal power and status, whereas democratic equality isn't appropriate in families. Someone has to be in charge. Furthermore, the official patient in a family is likely to feel isolated and stigmatized. After all, he or she is “the problem.” The sense of protection in being part of a compassionate group of strangers, who won't have to be faced across the dinner table, doesn't exist in family therapy.

The Child Guidance Movement

It was Freud who introduced the idea that psychological disorders were the result of unsolved problems of childhood. Alfred Adler was the first of Freud's

followers to pursue the implication that treating the growing child might be the most effective way to prevent adult neuroses. To that end, Adler organized child guidance clinics in Vienna, where not only children but also families and teachers were counseled. Adler offered support and encouragement to help alleviate children's feelings of inferiority, so they could work out a healthy lifestyle, achieving confidence and success through social usefulness.

Although child guidance clinics remained few in number until after World War II, they now exist in every city in the United States, providing treatment of childhood problems and the complex forces contributing to them. Gradually, child guidance workers concluded that the real problem wasn't the child's symptoms, but rather the tensions in families that were the source of those symptoms. At first there was a tendency to blame the parents, especially the mother.

The chief cause of children's problems, according to David Levy (1943), was *maternal overprotectiveness*. Mothers who had themselves been deprived of love became overprotective of their children. Some were domineering, others overindulgent. Children of domineering mothers were submissive at home but had difficulty making friends; children with indulgent mothers were disobedient at home but well behaved at school.

During this period, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann (1948) coined one of the most damning phrases in the history of psychiatry, the **schizophrenogenic mother**. These domineering, aggressive, and rejecting women, especially when married to passive men, were thought to provide the pathological parenting that produced schizophrenia.

The tendency to blame parents, especially mothers, for problems in the family was an evolutionary misdirection that continues to haunt the field. Nevertheless, by paying attention to what went on between parents and children, Levy and Fromm-Reichmann helped pave the way for family therapy.

John Bowlby's work at the Tavistock Clinic exemplified the transition to a family approach. Bowlby (1949) was treating a teenager and making slow progress. Feeling frustrated, he decided to see the boy and his parents together. During the first half of a two-hour session, the child and parents took turns

complaining, each blaming the other. During the second half of the session, Bowlby interpreted what he thought each of their contributions to the problem were. Eventually, by working together, all three members of the family developed some sympathy for each other's point of view.

Although he was intrigued by this conjoint interview, Bowlby remained wedded to the one-to-one format. Family meetings might be a useful catalyst but only as a supplement to the *real* treatment, individual psychotherapy.

What Bowlby tried as an experiment, Nathan Ackerman saw to fruition—family therapy as the primary form of treatment. Once he saw the need to understand the family in order to diagnose problems, Ackerman soon took the next step—family treatment. Before we get to that, however, let us examine parallel developments in research on schizophrenia that led to the birth of family therapy.

Research on Family Dynamics and the Etiology of Schizophrenia

Families with schizophrenic members proved to be a fertile area for research because their pathological patterns of interaction were so magnified. The fact that family therapy emerged from research on schizophrenia led to the hope that family therapy might be the way to cure this baffling form of madness.

■ Gregory Bateson—Palo Alto

One of the groups with the strongest claim to originating family therapy was Gregory Bateson's schizophrenia project in Palo Alto, California. The Palo Alto project began in the fall of 1952 when Bateson received a grant to study the nature of communication. All communications, Bateson (1951) contended, have two different levels—*report* and *command*. Every message has a stated content, for instance, "Wash your hands; it's time for dinner," but in addition, the message carries how it is to be taken. In this case the second message is that the speaker is in charge. This second message—**metacommunication**—is covert

and often unnoticed. If a wife scolds her husband for running the dishwasher when it's only half full, and he says OK but turns around and does the same thing two days later, she may be annoyed that he didn't listen to her. She means the message. But maybe he didn't like the metamessage. Maybe he doesn't like her telling him what to do as though she were his mother.

Bateson was joined in 1953 by Jay Haley and John Weakland. In 1954 Bateson received a grant to study schizophrenic communication. Shortly thereafter the group was joined by Don Jackson, a brilliant psychiatrist who served as a clinical consultant.

Bateson and his colleagues hypothesized that family stability is achieved by feedback that regulates the behavior of the family and its members. Whenever a family system is threatened—that is, disturbed—it endeavors to maintain stability, or **homeostasis**. Thus, apparently puzzling behavior might become understandable if it were seen as a homeostatic mechanism. For example, if whenever two parents argue, one of the children exhibits symptomatic behavior, the symptoms may be a way to stop the fighting by uniting the parents in concern. Thus, symptomatic behavior can serve the cybernetic function of preserving a family's equilibrium.

In 1956 Bateson and his colleagues published their famous report "Toward a Theory of Schizophrenia," in which they introduced the concept of the **double bind**. Patients weren't crazy in some meaningless way; they were an extension of a crazy family environment. Consider someone in an important relationship in which escape isn't feasible and response is necessary. If he or she receives two related but contradictory messages on different levels but finds it difficult to recognize or comment on the inconsistency (Bateson, Jackson, Haley, & Weakland, 1956), that person is in a double bind.

Because this concept is often misused as a synonym for paradox or simply contradiction, it's worth reviewing each feature of the double bind as the authors listed them:

1. Two or more persons in an important relationship
2. Repeated experience
3. A primary negative injunction, such as "Don't do X or I will punish you"

4. A second injunction at a more abstract level conflicting with the first, also enforced by punishment or perceived threat
5. A tertiary negative injunction prohibiting escape and demanding a response. Without this restriction the victim won't feel bound
6. Finally, the complete set of ingredients is no longer necessary once the victim is conditioned to perceive the world in terms of double binds; any part of the sequence becomes sufficient to trigger panic or rage

Most examples of double binds in the literature are inadequate because they don't include all the critical features. Robin Skynner (1976), for instance, cited: "Boys must stand up for themselves and not be sissies"; but "Don't be rough . . . don't be rude to your mother." Confusing? Yes. Conflict? Maybe. But these messages don't constitute a double bind; they're merely contradictory. Faced with two such statements, a child is free to obey either one, alternate, or even complain about the contradiction. This and many similar examples neglect the specification that the two messages are conveyed on different levels.

A better example is given in the original article. A young man recovering in the hospital from a schizophrenic episode was visited by his mother. When he put his arm around her, she stiffened. But when he withdrew, she asked, "Don't you love me anymore?" He blushed, and she said, "Dear, you must not be so easily embarrassed and afraid of your feelings." Following this exchange, the patient assaulted an aide and had to be put in seclusion.

Another example of a double bind would be a teacher who urges his students to participate in class but gets impatient if one of them actually interrupts with a question or comment. Then a baffling thing happens. For some strange reason that scientists have yet to decipher, students tend not to speak up in classes where their comments are disparaged. When the professor finally gets around to asking for questions and no one responds, he gets angry. ("Students are so passive!") If any of the students has the temerity to comment on the professor's lack of receptivity, he'll probably get even angrier. Thus, the students will be punished for accurately perceiving that the teacher really wants only his own ideas to be heard and admired. (This example is, of course, purely hypothetical.)

We're all caught in occasional double binds, but a schizophrenic has to deal with them continually—and the effect is maddening. Unable to comment on the dilemma, the schizophrenic responds defensively, perhaps by being concrete and literal, perhaps by speaking in metaphors. Eventually the schizophrenic may come to assume that behind every statement lies a concealed meaning.

The discovery that schizophrenic symptoms made sense in the context of some families may have been a scientific advance, but it also had moral and political overtones. Not only did these investigators see themselves as avenging knights bent on rescuing **identified patients** by slaying family dragons, but they were also crusaders in a holy war against the psychiatric establishment. Outnumbered and surrounded by hostile critics, the champions of family therapy challenged the assumption that schizophrenia was a biological disease. Psychological healers everywhere cheered. Unfortunately, they were wrong.

The observation that schizophrenic behavior seems to fit in some families doesn't mean that families cause schizophrenia. In logic, this kind of inference is called "Jumping to Conclusions." Sadly, families of schizophrenic members suffered for years under the assumption that they were to blame for the tragedy of their children's psychoses.

■ Theodore Lidz—Yale

Theodore Lidz refuted the notion that maternal rejection was the distinguishing feature of schizophrenic families. Frequently the more destructive parent is the father (Lidz, Cornelison, Fleck, & Terry, 1957a). After describing some of the pathological characteristics of fathers in schizophrenic families, Lidz turned his attention to deficits in the marital relationship. What he found was an absence of *role reciprocity*. In a successful relationship, it's not enough to fulfill your own role—that is, to be an effective person; it's also important to balance your role with your partner's—that is, to be an effective pair.

In focusing on the failure to arrive at cooperative roles, Lidz identified two types of marital discord (Lidz, Cornelison, Fleck, & Terry, 1957b). In the first, **marital schism**, husbands and wives undermine each other and compete openly for their children's affection. Their marriages are combat zones. The second pattern,

marital skew, involves serious character flaws in one partner who dominates the other. Thus one parent becomes passive and dependent while the other appears to be a strong parent figure, but is in fact a pathological bully. In all these families, unhappy children are torn by conflicting loyalties and weighed down with the pressure to balance their parents' precarious marriages.

■ Lyman Wynne—National Institute of Mental Health

Lyman Wynne's studies of schizophrenic families began in 1954 when he started seeing the parents of hospitalized patients in twice-weekly sessions. What struck Wynne about these disturbed families was the strangely unreal qualities of their emotions, which he called *pseudomutuality* and *pseudohostility*, and the nature of the boundaries around them—*rubber fences*—apparently flexible but actually impervious to outside influence (especially from therapists).

Pseudomutuality (Wynne, Ryckoff, Day, & Hirsch, 1958) is a facade of harmony. Pseudomutual families are so committed to togetherness that there's no room for separate identities. The surface unity of pseudomutual families obscures the fact that they can't tolerate deeper, more honest relationships or independence.

Pseudohostility is a different guise for a similar collusion to stifle autonomy (Wynne, 1961). Although apparently acrimonious, it signals only a superficial split. Pseudohostility is more like the bickering of situation-comedy families than real animosity. Like



Lyman Wynne's studies linked communication deviance in families to thought disorder in schizophrenic patients.

pseudomutuality, it undermines intimacy and masks deeper conflict, and like pseudomutuality, pseudo-hostility distorts communication and impairs rational thinking.

The **rubber fence** is an invisible barrier that stretches to permit limited extrafamilial contact, such as going to school, but springs back if that involvement goes too far. The family's rigid structure is thus protected by its isolation. The most damaging feature of the rubber fence is that those who most need outside contact to correct family distortions are the ones allowed it least. Instead of being a subsystem of society (Parsons & Bales, 1955), the schizophrenic family becomes a sick little society unto itself.

Wynne linked the new concept of *communication deviance* to the older notion of *thought disorder*. He saw communication as the vehicle for transmitting thought disorder, the defining feature of schizophrenia. Communication deviance is a more interactional concept, and more readily observable. By 1978 Wynne et al. had studied over 600 families and gathered incontrovertible evidence that disordered communication is a distinguishing characteristic of families with young adult schizophrenics.

■ Role Theorists

The founders of family therapy gained momentum for their fledgling discipline by concentrating on communication. Doing so may have been expedient, but focusing exclusively on this one aspect of family life neglected individual intersubjectivity as well as broader social influences.

Role theorists, like John Spiegel, described how individuals were differentiated into social roles within family systems. This important fact was obscured by simplistic versions of systems theory, in which individuals were treated like cogs in a machine. As early as 1954, Spiegel pointed out that the system in therapy includes the therapist as well as the family (an idea reintroduced later as **second-order cybernetics**). He also made a valuable distinction between "interactions" and "transactions." Billiard balls *interact*—they collide but remain essentially unchanged. People *transact*—they come together in ways that not only alter each other's course but also bring about internal changes.

R. D. Laing's analysis of family dynamics was more polemical than scholarly, but his observations helped popularize the family's role in psychopathology. Laing (1965) borrowed Karl Marx's concept of **mystification** (class exploitation) and applied it to the "politics of families." Mystification means distorting someone's experience by denying or relabeling it. An example of this is a parent telling a child who's feeling sad, "You must be tired" (*go to bed and leave me alone*). Similarly, the idea that good children are always quiet breeds compliant but lifeless children.

Mystification distorts feelings and, more ominously, reality. When parents mystify a child's experience, the child's existence becomes inauthentic. Because their feelings aren't accepted, these children project a *false self*. In mild instances, this produces a lack of authenticity, but when the real self/false self split is carried to extremes, the result is madness (Laing, 1960).

Marriage Counseling

For many years there was no apparent need for a separate profession of marriage counselors. People with marital problems talked with their doctors, clergy, lawyers, and teachers. The first centers for marriage counseling were established in the 1930s. Paul Popenoe opened the American Institute of Family Relations in Los Angeles, and Abraham and Hannah Stone opened a similar clinic in New York. A third center was the Marriage Council of Philadelphia, begun in 1932 by Emily Hartshorne Mudd (Broderick & Schrader, 1981).

At the same time these developments were taking place, a parallel trend among some psychoanalysts led to conjoint marital therapy. Although most analysts followed Freud's prohibition against contact with a patient's family, a few broke the rules and experimented with therapy for married partners.

In 1948, Bela Mittleman of the New York Psychoanalytic Institute published the first account of concurrent marital therapy in the United States. Mittleman suggested that husbands and wives could be treated by the same analyst and that by seeing both it was possible to reexamine their irrational perceptions of

each other (Mittleman, 1948). This was a revolutionary notion: that the reality of object relationships might be at least as important as their intrapsychic representations.

Meanwhile in Great Britain, where **object relations** were the central concern of psychoanalysts, Henry Dicks and his associates at the Tavistock Clinic established a Family Psychiatric Unit. Here couples referred by the divorce courts were helped to reconcile their differences (Dicks, 1964). Subsequently, Michael and Enid Balint affiliated their Family Discussion Bureau with the Tavistock Clinic, adding that clinic's prestige to their marital casework and indirectly to the field of marriage counseling.

In 1956, Mittleman wrote a more extensive description of marital disorders and their treatment. He described a number of complementary marital patterns, including aggressive/submissive and detached/demanding. These odd matches are made, according to Mittleman, because courting couples see each other's personalities through the eyes of their illusions: She sees his detachment as strength; he sees her dependency as adoration.

At about this time Don Jackson and Jay Haley were exploring marital therapy within the framework of communications analysis. As their ideas gained prominence, the field of marital therapy was absorbed into the larger family therapy movement.

Many writers don't distinguish between marital and family therapy. Therapy for couples, according to this way of thinking, is just family therapy applied to a particular subsystem. We tend to agree with this perspective, and therefore you will find our description of various approaches to couples and their problems embedded in the discussions of the models considered in this text. There is, however, a case to be made for considering couples therapy a distinct enterprise (Gurman, 2008).

Historically, many of the influential approaches to couples therapy came before their family therapy counterparts. Among these are cognitive-behavioral marital therapy, object relations marital therapy, and emotionally focused couples therapy.

Beyond the question of which came first, couples therapy differs from family therapy in allowing a more in-depth focus on the experience of individuals. Sessions with the whole family tend to be noisy affairs.

While it's possible in this context to talk with family members about their hopes and fears, it isn't possible to spend much time exploring the psychology of any one individual—much less two. Doing therapy with couples, on the other hand, permits greater focus on both dyadic exchanges and the underlying experience of intimate partners.

From Research to Treatment: The Pioneers of Family Therapy

We have seen how family therapy was anticipated by developments in hospital psychiatry, group dynamics, interpersonal psychiatry, the child guidance movement, research on schizophrenia, and marriage counseling. But who actually started family therapy? Although there are rival claims to this honor, the distinction should probably be shared by John Elderkin Bell, Don Jackson, Nathan Ackerman, and Murray Bowen. In addition to these founders of family therapy, Jay Haley, Virginia Satir, Carl Whitaker, Lyman Wynne, Ivan Boszormenyi-Nagy, Christian Midelfort, and Salvador Minuchin were also significant pioneers.

■ John Bell

John Elderkin Bell, a psychologist at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts, who began treating families in 1951, occupies a unique position in the history of family therapy. He may have been the first family therapist, but he is mentioned only tangentially in two of the most important historical accounts of the movement (Guerin, 1976; Kaslow, 1980). The reason for this is that although he began seeing families in the 1950s, he didn't publish his ideas until a decade later. Moreover, unlike the other parents of family therapy, he had few offspring. He didn't establish a clinic, develop a training program, or train well-known students.

Bell's approach (Bell, 1961, 1962) was taken directly from group therapy. *Family group therapy* relied primarily on stimulating open discussion to help families solve their problems. Like a group therapist, Bell intervened to encourage silent participants to speak up, and he interpreted the reasons for their defensiveness.

Bell believed that family groups go through predictable phases, as do groups of strangers. In his early work (Bell, 1961), he carefully structured treatment in a series of stages. First was a *child-centered phase*, in which children were encouraged to express their wishes and concerns. In the *parent-centered stage*, parents typically complained about their children's behavior. During this phase, Bell was careful to soften the harshest parental criticisms in order to focus on problem solving. In the final, or *family-centered*, stage, the therapist equalized support for the entire family while they continued to improve their communication and work out solutions to their problems. The following vignette illustrates Bell's (1975) directive style of intervening:

After remaining silent for a few sessions, one father came in with a great tirade against his son, daughter, and wife. I noticed how each individual in his own way, within a few minutes, was withdrawing from the conference. Then I said, "Now I think we should hear what Jim has to say about this, and Nancy should have her say, and perhaps we should also hear what your wife feels about it." (p. 136)

• • •

Three specialized applications of group methods to family treatment were *multiple family group therapy*, *multiple impact therapy*, and *network therapy*.

Peter Laqueur developed **multiple family group therapy** in 1950 at Creedmoor State Hospital in New York (Laqueur, 1966, 1976). Multiple family group therapy involved four to six families seen together for weekly sessions of ninety minutes. Laqueur and his cotherapists conducted family groups like traditional therapy groups with the addition of encounter-group and psychodrama techniques. Structured exercises were used to increase the level of interaction and intensity of feeling, and families served as cotherapists to help confront members of other families from a more personal position than a therapist could take. Although multiple family therapy lost its most creative force with Peter Laqueur's untimely death, it is still occasionally used, especially in hospital settings, both inpatient (McFarlane, 1982) and outpatient (Gritzer & Okum, 1983).

Robert MacGregor and his colleagues at the University of Texas Medical Branch in Galveston developed **multiple impact therapy** as a way to maximize their impact on families who came from all over Texas (MacGregor, 1967, 1972). Team members met with various combinations of family members and then assembled in a group to make recommendations. Although multiple impact therapy is no longer practiced, its intense but infrequent meetings prefigured later developments in experiential therapy and the Milan model.

Network therapy was developed by Ross Speck and Carolyn Attneave for assisting families in crisis by assembling their entire social network—family, friends, neighbors—in gatherings of as many as fifty people. Teams of therapists were used, and the emphasis was on breaking destructive patterns of relationship and mobilizing support for new options (Ruevini, 1975; Speck & Attneave, 1973).

Speck and Attneave (1973) described breaking a network into problem-solving subgroups in one case in which they assigned a group of friends to watch over an adolescent who was abusing drugs and another group to arrange for him to move out of his parents' house.

■ Palo Alto

The Bateson group stumbled onto family therapy more or less by accident. Once they began to interview schizophrenic families in 1954, hoping to decipher their strange patterns of communication, project members found themselves drawn into helping roles by the pain of these unhappy people (Jackson & Weakland, 1961). Although Bateson was the scientific leader of the group, Don Jackson and Jay Haley were most influential in developing family treatment.

Jackson rejected psychodynamic concepts and focused instead on the dynamics of interchange between persons. Analysis of communication was his primary instrument. Jackson's concept of **family homeostasis**—families as units that resist change—was to become the defining metaphor of family therapy's early years. In hindsight, we can say that the emphasis on homeostasis overestimated the conservative properties of families. At the time, however, the recognition that families resist change was enormously productive for understanding what keeps patients from improving.

In “Schizophrenic Symptoms and Family Interaction” (Jackson & Weakland, 1959), Jackson illustrated how patients’ symptoms preserve stability in their families. In one case a young woman diagnosed as catatonic schizophrenic had as her most prominent symptom a profound indecisiveness. When she did act decisively, her parents fell apart. Her mother became helpless and her father became impotent. In one family meeting, her parents failed to notice when the patient made a simple decision. Only after listening to a taped replay of the session *three times* did the parents finally hear their daughter’s statement. This woman’s indecision was neither crazy nor senseless; rather, it protected her parents from facing their own difficulties. This is one of the earliest published examples of how even psychotic symptoms can be meaningful in the family context. This paper also contains the shrewd observation that children’s symptoms are often an exaggerated version of their parents’ problems.

Another construct important to Jackson’s thinking was the distinction between *complementary* and *symmetrical* relationships. (Like many of the seminal ideas of family therapy, this one was first articulated by Bateson.) **Complementary relationships** are those in which partners are different in ways that fit together, like pieces of a jigsaw puzzle: If one is logical, the other is emotional; if one is weak, the other is strong. **Symmetrical relationships** are based on similarity. Marriages between two people who both have careers and share housekeeping chores are symmetrical. (Incidentally, if you actually find a couple who

shares responsibilities equally, you’ll know you’re not in Kansas, Dorothy!)

Jackson’s (1965) **family rules** hypothesis was based on the observation that within any committed unit (dyad, triad, or larger group), there are redundant behavior patterns. Rules (as students of philosophy learn when studying determinism) can describe regularity, rather than regulation. A corollary of the rules hypothesis was that family members use only a fraction of the full range of behavior available to them. This seemingly innocent fact is what makes family therapy so useful.

Jackson’s therapeutic strategies were based on the premise that psychiatric problems resulted from the way people behave with each other. In order to distinguish functional interactions from those that were dysfunctional (*problem maintaining*), he observed when problems occurred and in what context, who was present, and how people responded to the problem. Given the assumption that symptoms are homeostatic mechanisms, Jackson would wonder out loud how a family might be worse off if the problem got solved. An individual might want to get better, but the family may need someone to play the sick role. Even positive change can be a threat to the defensive order of things.

A father’s drinking, for example, might keep him from making demands on his wife or disciplining his children. Unfortunately, some family therapists jumped from the observation that symptoms may serve a purpose to the assumption that some families *need* a sick member, which, in turn, led to a view of parents victimizing **scapegoated** children. Despite the fancy language, this was part of the time-honored tradition of blaming parents for the failings of their children. If a six-year-old misbehaves around the house, perhaps we should look to his parents. But a husband’s drinking isn’t necessarily his wife’s fault, and it certainly wasn’t fair to imply that parents were responsible for the schizophrenic symptoms of their children.

• • •

The great discovery of the Bateson group was that there’s no such thing as a simple communication; every message is qualified by a different



Don Jackson described problematic patterns of communication in ways that are still useful today.

message on another level. In *Strategies of Psychotherapy*, Jay Haley (1963) explored how covert messages are used in the struggle for control that characterizes many relationships. Symptoms, he argued, represent an incongruence between levels of communication. The symptomatic person does something, such as touching a doorknob six times before turning it, while at the same time denying that he's *really* doing it. He can't help it; it's his illness. Meanwhile, the person's symptoms—over which he has no control—have consequences. A person who has a compulsion of such proportions can hardly be expected to hold down a job, can he?

Since symptomatic behavior wasn't reasonable, Haley didn't reason with patients to help them. Instead, therapy became a strategic game of cat and mouse.

Haley (1963) defined his therapy as a directive form of treatment and acknowledged his debt to Milton Erickson, with whom he studied hypnosis. In what he called *brief therapy*, Haley zeroed in on the context and possible function of a patient's symptoms. His first moves were designed to gain control of the therapeutic relationship. Haley cited Erickson's device of advising patients that in the first interview there will be things they may be willing to say and other things they'll want to withhold, and that these, of course, should be withheld. Here, of course, the therapist is directing patients to do precisely what they would do anyway and thus subtly gaining the upper hand.

The decisive technique in brief therapy was the use of *directives*. As Haley put it, it isn't enough to explain problems to patients; what counts is getting them to *do* something about them.

One of Haley's patients was a freelance photographer who compulsively made silly blunders that ruined every picture. Eventually he became so preoccupied with avoiding mistakes that he was too nervous to take pictures at all. Haley instructed the man to go out and take three pictures, making one deliberate error in each. The paradox is that you can't accidentally make a mistake if you are doing so deliberately.

In another case, Haley told an insomniac that if he woke up in the middle of the night he should get out

of bed and wax the kitchen floor. Instant cure! The cybernetic principle here: People will do anything to get out of housework.

Another member of the Palo Alto group who played a leading role in family therapy's first decade was Virginia Satir, one of the great charismatic healers. Known more for her clinical artistry than for theoretical contributions, Satir's impact was most vivid to those lucky enough to see her in action. Like her confreres, Satir was interested in communication, but she added an emotional dimension that helped counterbalance what was otherwise a relatively cool and calculated approach.

Satir saw troubled family members as trapped in narrow roles, such as *victim*, *placator*, *defiant one*, or *rescuer*, that constrained relationships and sapped self-esteem. Her concern with freeing family members from the grip of such life-constricting roles was consistent with her major focus, which was always on the individual. Thus, Satir was a humanizing force in the early days of family therapy, when others were so enamored of the systems metaphor that they neglected the emotional life of families.

Satir was justly famous for her ability to turn negatives into positives. In one case, cited by Lynn Hoffman (1981), Satir interviewed the family of a local minister, whose teenage son had gotten two of his classmates pregnant. On one side of the room sat the boy's parents and siblings. The boy sat in the opposite corner with his head down. Satir introduced herself and said to the boy, "Well, your father has told me a lot about the situation on the phone, and I just want to say before we begin that we know one thing for sure: We know you have good seed." The boy looked up in amazement as Satir turned to the boy's mother and asked brightly, "Could you start by telling us your perception?"

■ Murray Bowen

Like many of the founders of family therapy, Murray Bowen was a psychiatrist who specialized in schizophrenia. Unlike the others, however, he emphasized theory, and to this day Bowen's theory is the most fertile system of ideas in family therapy.

Bowen began his clinical work at the Menninger Clinic in 1946, where he studied mothers and their schizophrenic children. His major interest at the time was mother–child symbiosis, which led to his concept of **differentiation of self** (autonomy and levelheadedness). From Menninger, Bowen moved to NIMH, where he developed a program to hospitalize whole families with schizophrenic members. This project expanded the focus on mother–child symbiosis to include the role of fathers and led to the concept of *triangles* (diverting conflict between two people by involving a third).

Beginning in 1955, when Bowen started bringing family members together to discuss their problems, he was struck by their **emotional reactivity**. Feelings overwhelmed reason. Bowen felt families' tendency to pull him into the center of this **undifferentiated family ego mass**, and he had to make a concerted effort to remain objective (Bowen, 1961). The ability to remain neutral and attentive to the process, rather than the content, of family discussions is what distinguishes a therapist from a participant in a family's drama.

To control the level of emotion, Bowen encouraged family members to talk to him, not to each other. He found that it was easier for family members to avoid becoming reactive when they spoke to the therapist instead of to each other.

Bowen discovered that therapists weren't immune to being sucked into family conflicts. This awareness led to his greatest insight: Whenever two people are struggling with conflict they can't resolve, there is an automatic tendency to involve a third party. In fact, as Bowen came to believe, a **triangle** is the smallest stable unit of relationship.

A husband who can't stand his wife's habitual lateness but is afraid to tell her so may start complaining to his children. His complaining may let off steam, but the very process of complaining to a third party makes him less likely to address the problem at its source. We all complain about other people from time to time, but what Bowen realized was that this triangling process is destructive when it becomes a regular feature of a relationship.

Another thing Bowen discovered about triangles is that they spread out. In the following case, a family became entangled in a whole labyrinth of triangles.

CASE STUDY

One Sunday morning "Mrs. McNeil," who was anxious to get the family to church on time, yelled at her nine-year-old son to hurry up. When he told her to "quit bitching," she slapped him. At that point her fourteen-year-old daughter, Megan, grabbed her, and the two of them started wrestling. Then Megan ran next door to her friend's house. When the friend's parents noticed that she had a cut lip and Megan told them what had happened, they called the police.

One thing led to another, and by the time the family came to therapy, the following triangles were in place: Mrs. McNeil, who'd been ordered out of the house by the family court judge, was allied with her lawyer against the judge; she also had an individual therapist who joined her in thinking she was being hounded unfairly by the child-protective workers. The nine-year-old was still mad at his mother, and his father supported him in blaming her for flying off the handle. Mr. McNeil, who was a recovering alcoholic, formed an alliance with his sponsor, who felt that Mr. McNeil was on his way to a breakdown unless his wife started being more supportive. Meanwhile Megan had formed a triangle with the neighbors, who thought her parents shouldn't be allowed to have children. In short, everyone had an advocate—everyone, that is, except the family unit.

In 1966 an emotional crisis in Bowen's family led to a personal voyage of discovery that turned out to be as significant for Bowen's theory as Freud's self-analysis was for psychoanalysis.

As an adult, Bowen, the oldest of five children from a tightly knit rural family, kept his distance from his parents and the rest of his extended family. Like many of us, he mistook avoidance for emancipation. But as he later realized, unfinished emotional business stays with us, making us vulnerable to repeat conflicts we never worked out with our families.

Bowen's most important achievement was detriangling himself from his parents, who'd been accustomed to complaining to him about each other. Most of us are flattered to receive such confidences, but Bowen came to recognize this triangulation for what it was. When his mother complained about his father, he told his father: "Your wife told me a story about

you; I wonder why she told me instead of you.” Naturally, his father mentioned this to his mother, and naturally, she was not pleased.

Although his efforts generated the kind of emotional upheaval that comes of breaking family rules, Bowen’s maneuver was effective in keeping his parents from trying to get him to take sides—and made it harder for them to avoid discussing things between themselves. Repeating what someone says to you about someone else is one way to stop triangling in its tracks.

Through his efforts in his own family Bowen discovered that *differentiation of self* is best accomplished by developing personal relationships with as many members of the family as possible. If visiting is difficult, letters and phone calls can help reestablish relationships, particularly if they’re personal and intimate. Differentiating one’s self from the family is completed when these relationships are maintained without becoming emotionally reactive or taking part in triangles.

■ Nathan Ackerman

Nathan Ackerman was a child psychiatrist whose pioneering work with families remained faithful to his psychoanalytic roots. Although his focus on psychodynamic conflict may have seemed less innovative than the Palo Alto group’s communications theory, he had a keen sense of the overall organization of families. Families, Ackerman said, may give the appearance of unity, but underneath they are split into competing factions. This you may recognize as similar to the psychoanalytic model of individuals who, despite apparent unity of personality, are actually minds in conflict, driven by warring drives and defenses.

Ackerman joined the staff at the Menninger Clinic and in 1937 became chief psychiatrist of the Child Guidance Clinic. At first he followed the child guidance model of having a psychiatrist treat the child and a social worker see the mother. But by the mid-1940s, he began to experiment with having the same therapist see both. Unlike Bowlby, Ackerman did more than use these conjoint sessions as a temporary expedient; instead, he began to see the family as the basic unit of treatment.

In 1955 Ackerman organized the first session on family diagnosis at a meeting of the American Orthopsy-

chiatric Association. At that meeting, Jackson, Bowen, Wynne, and Ackerman learned about each other’s work and joined in a sense of common purpose. Two years later Ackerman opened the Family Mental Health Clinic of Jewish Family Services in New York City and began teaching at Columbia University. In 1960 he founded the Family Institute, which was renamed the Ackerman Institute following his death in 1971.

Although other family therapists downplayed the psychology of individuals, Ackerman was as concerned with what goes on inside people as with what goes on between them. He never lost sight of feelings, hopes, and desires. In fact, Ackerman’s model of the family was like the psychoanalytic model of individuals writ large; instead of conscious and unconscious issues, Ackerman talked about how families confront some issues while avoiding others, particularly those involving sex and aggression. He saw his job as bringing family secrets into the open.

To encourage families to relax their emotional restraint, Ackerman himself was unrestrained. He sided first with one member of a family and later with another. He didn’t think it was necessary—or possible—to always be neutral; instead, he believed that balance was achieved in the long run by moving back and forth, giving support now to one, later to another family member. At times he was unabashedly blunt. If he thought someone was lying, he said so. To critics who suggested this directness might generate too much anxiety, Ackerman replied that people get more reassurance from honesty than from false politeness.

■ Carl Whitaker

Even among the iconoclastic founders of family therapy, Carl Whitaker stood out as the most irreverent. His view of psychologically troubled people was that they were alienated from feeling and frozen into devitalized routines (Whitaker & Malone, 1953). Whitaker turned up the heat. His “Psychotherapy of the Absurd” (Whitaker, 1975) was a blend of warm support and emotional goading, designed to loosen people up and help them get in touch with their experience in a deeper, more personal way.

Given his inventive approach to individual therapy, it wasn’t surprising that Whitaker became one of the first to experiment with family treatment. In

1943 he and John Warkentin, working in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, began to include spouses and eventually children in treatment. Whitaker also pioneered the use of cotherapy, in the belief that a supportive partner helped free therapists to react without fear of countertransference.

Whitaker never seemed to have an obvious strategy, nor did he use predictable techniques, preferring, as he said, to let his unconscious run the therapy (Whitaker, 1976). Although his work seemed totally spontaneous, even outrageous at times, there was a consistent theme. All of his interventions promoted flexibility. He didn't so much push families to change in a particular direction as he challenged them to open up—to become more fully themselves and more fully together.

In 1946 Whitaker became chairman of the department of psychiatry at Emory University, where he continued to experiment with family treatment with a special interest in schizophrenics and their families. During this period Whitaker organized a series of forums that eventually led to the first major convention of the family therapy movement. Beginning in 1946 Whitaker and his colleagues began twice-yearly conferences during which they observed and discussed each other's work with families. The group found these sessions enormously helpful, and mutual observation, using one-way vision screens, became one of the hallmarks of family therapy.

Whitaker resigned from Emory in 1955 and entered private practice, where he and his partners at the Atlanta Psychiatric Clinic developed an *experiential* form of psychotherapy, using a number of provocative techniques in the treatment of families, individuals, groups, and couples (Whitaker, 1958).

During the late 1970s Whitaker seemed to mellow and added a greater understanding of family dynamics to his shoot-from-the-hip interventions. In the process, the former wild man of family therapy became one of its elder statesmen. Whitaker's death in April 1995 left the field with a piece of its heart missing.

■ Ivan Boszormenyi-Nagy

Ivan Boszormenyi-Nagy, who came to family therapy from psychoanalysis, was one of the seminal thinkers in the movement. In 1957 he founded the Eastern

Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute in Philadelphia, where he attracted a host of highly talented colleagues. Among these were James Framo, one of the few psychologists in the early family therapy movement, and Geraldine Spark, a social worker who collaborated with Boszormenyi-Nagy on *Invisible Loyalties* (Boszormenyi-Nagy & Spark, 1973).

Boszormenyi-Nagy went from being an analyst, prizing confidentiality, to a family therapist, dedicated to openness and accountability. One of his most important contributions was to add ethical accountability to the usual therapeutic goals and techniques. According to Boszormenyi-Nagy, neither pleasure nor expediency is a sufficient guide to human behavior. Instead, he believed that family members have to base their relationships on trust and loyalty and that they must balance the ledger of entitlement and indebtedness. He died in 2008.

■ Salvador Minuchin

When Minuchin first burst onto the scene, it was the drama of his clinical interviews that people found captivating. This compelling man with the elegant Latin accent would seduce, provoke, bully, or bewilder families into changing—as the situation required. But even Minuchin's legendary flair didn't have the same galvanizing impact as the practical simplicity of his structural model.

Minuchin began his career as a family therapist in the early 1960s when he discovered two patterns common to troubled families: Some are **enmeshed**—chaotic and tightly interconnected; others are **disengaged**—isolated and seemingly unrelated. Both lack clear lines of authority. Enmeshed parents are too entangled with their children to exercise leadership; disengaged parents are too distant to provide effective support.

Family problems are tenacious and resistant to change because they're embedded in powerful but unseen structures. Take, for example, a mother futilely remonstrating with a willful child. The mother can scold, punish, reward with gold stars, or try leniency; but as long as she's enmeshed (overly involved) with the child, her efforts will lack force because she lacks authority. Moreover, because the behavior of one family member is always related to that of others, the

mother will have trouble stepping back as long as her husband remains disengaged.

Once a social system such as a family becomes structured, attempts to change the rules constitute what family therapists call *first-order change*—change within a system that itself remains invariant. For the mother in the previous example to start practicing stricter discipline would be first-order change. The enmeshed mother is caught in an illusion of alternatives. She can be strict or lenient; the result is the same because she remains trapped in a triangle. What's needed is *second-order change*—a change in the system itself.

Minuchin worked out his ideas while struggling with the problems of juvenile delinquency at the Wiltwyck School for Boys in New York. Family therapy with urban slum families was a new development, and publication of his discoveries (Minuchin, Montalvo, Guerney, Rosman, & Schumer, 1967) led to his being invited to become the director of the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic in 1965. Minuchin brought Braulio Montalvo and Bernice Rosman with him, and they were joined in 1967 by Jay Haley. Together they transformed a traditional child guidance clinic into one of the great centers of the family therapy movement.

In 1981 Minuchin moved to New York and established what is now known as the Minuchin Center for the Family, where he pursued his dedication to teaching family therapists from all over the world. He also continued to turn out a steady stream of the most influential books in the field. His 1974 *Families and Family Therapy* is deservedly the most popular book in the history of family therapy, and his 1993 *Family Healing* contains some of the most moving descriptions of family therapy ever written.

■ Other Early Centers of Family Therapy

In New York, Israel Zwerling and Marilyn Mendelsohn organized the Family Studies Section at Albert Einstein College of Medicine and Bronx State Hospital. Andrew Ferber was named director in 1964, and later Philip Guerin, a protégé of Murray Bowen's, joined the section. Nathan Ackerman served as a consultant, and the group assembled an impressive array of family therapists with

diverse orientations. These included Chris Beels, Betty Carter, Monica McGoldrick, Peggy Papp, and Thomas Fogarty. Philip Guerin became director of training in 1970 and shortly thereafter founded the Center for Family Learning in Westchester, where he and Thomas Fogarty developed one of the finest family therapy training programs in the nation.

As we mentioned previously, Robert MacGregor and his colleagues in Galveston, Texas developed *multiple impact therapy* (MacGregor, 1967). It was a case of necessity being the mother of invention. MacGregor's clinic served a population scattered widely over southeastern Texas, and many of his clients had to travel hundreds of miles. Therefore, to have maximum impact in a short time, MacGregor assembled a team of professionals who worked intensively with the families for two full days. Although few family therapists have used such marathon sessions, the team approach continues to be one of the hallmarks of the field.

In Boston the two most significant early contributions to family therapy were both in the experiential wing of the movement. Norman Paul developed an *operational mourning* approach designed to resolve impacted grief, and Fred and Bunny Duhl set up the Boston Family Institute, where they developed *integrative family therapy*.

In Chicago, the Family Institute of Chicago and the Institute for Juvenile Research were important centers of the early scene in family therapy. At the Family Institute, Charles and Jan Kramer developed a clinical training program, which was later affiliated with Northwestern University Medical School. The Institute for Juvenile Research also mounted a training program under the leadership of Irv Borstein, with the consultation of Carl Whitaker.

The work of Nathan Epstein and his colleagues, first formulated in the department of psychiatry at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, was a problem-centered approach (Epstein, Bishop, & Baldarin, 1981). The McMaster model goes step by step—elucidating the problem, gathering data, considering alternatives for resolution, and assessing the learning process—to help families understand their own interaction and build on their newly acquired coping skills. Epstein later relocated to Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island.

Important developments in family therapy also occurred outside the United States: Robin Skynner (1976) introduced psychodynamic family therapy at the Institute of Family Therapy in London; British psychiatrist John Howells (1971) developed a system of family diagnosis as a necessary step for planning therapeutic intervention; and West German Helm Stierlin (1972) integrated psychodynamic and systemic ideas for treating troubled adolescents. In Rome, Maurizio Andolfi worked with families early in the 1970s and founded, in 1974, the Italian Society for Family Therapy; Mara Selvini Palazzoli and her colleagues founded the Institute for Family Studies in Milan in 1967.

We conclude this section by mentioning the contributions of Christian Midelfort. Even more than was the case with John Bell, Midelfort's pioneering work in family therapy was slow to gain recognition. He began treating families of hospitalized patients in the early 1950s, delivered what was probably the first paper on family therapy at a professional meeting in 1952 at the American Psychiatric Association Convention, and published one of the first books on family therapy in 1957. Nevertheless, as a staff psychiatrist in LaCrosse, Wisconsin, he remained isolated from the rest of the family therapy movement.

• • •

Now that you've seen how family therapy emerged in several different places at once, we hope you haven't lost sight of one thing: There is a tremendous satisfaction in seeing how people's behavior makes sense in the context of their families. Meeting with a family for the first time is like turning on a light in a dark room.

The Golden Age of Family Therapy

In their first decade, family therapists had all the bravado of new kids on the block. "Look at this!" Haley and Jackson and Bowen seemed to say when they discovered how the whole family was implicated in the symptoms of individual patients. While they were struggling for legitimacy, family clinicians emphasized their common beliefs and downplayed their

differences. Troubles, they agreed, came in families. But if the watchword of the 1960s was "Look at this"—emphasizing the leap of understanding made possible by seeing whole families together—the rallying cry of the 1970s was "Look what I can do!" as the new kids flexed their muscles and carved out their own turf.

The period from 1970 to 1985 saw the flowering of the classic schools of family therapy as the pioneers established training centers and worked out the implications of their models. The leading approach to family therapy in the 1960s was the communications model developed in Palo Alto. The book of the decade was *Pragmatics of Human Communication*, the text that introduced the systemic version of family therapy. The model of the 1980s was strategic therapy, and the books of the decade described its three most vital approaches: *Change* by Watzlawick, Weakland, and Fisch¹; *Problem-Solving Therapy* by Jay Haley; and *Paradox and Counterparadox* by Mara Selvini Palazzoli and her Milan associates. The 1970s belonged to Salvador Minuchin. His *Families and Family Therapy* and the simple yet compelling model of *structural family therapy* it described dominated the decade.

Structural theory seemed to offer just what family therapists were looking for: a simple yet meaningful way of describing family organization and a set of easy-to-follow steps to treatment. In hindsight we might ask whether the impressive power of Minuchin's approach was a product of the method or the man. (The answer is probably a little of both.) But in the 1970s the widely shared belief that structural family therapy could be easily learned drew people from all over the world to what was then the epicenter of the family therapy movement: the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic.

The strategic therapy that flourished in the 1980s was centered in three unique and creative groups: MRI's brief therapy group, including John Weakland, Paul Watzlawick, and Richard Fisch; Jay Haley and Cloe Madanes, codirectors of the Family Therapy Institute of Washington, DC; and Mara Selvini Palazzoli and her colleagues in Milan. But the leading influence

¹Although actually published in 1974, this book and its sequel, *The Tactics of Change*, were most widely read and taught in the 1980s.

on the decade of strategic therapy was exerted by Milton Erickson, albeit from beyond the grave.

Erickson's genius was much admired and much imitated. Family therapists came to idolize Erickson the way we as children idolized Captain Marvel. We'd come home from Saturday matinees all pumped up, get out our toy swords, put on our magic capes—and presto! *We* were superheroes. We were just kids and so we didn't bother translating our heroes' mythic powers into our own terms. Unfortunately, many of those starstruck by Erickson's legendary therapeutic tales did the same thing. Instead of grasping the principles on which they were predicated, many therapists just tried to imitate his "uncommon techniques." To be any kind of competent therapist, you must keep your psychological distance from the supreme artists—the Minuchins, the Milton Ericksons, the Michael Whites. Otherwise you end up aping the magic of their styles, rather than grasping the substance of their ideas.

Part of what made Haley's strategic directives so attractive was that they were a wonderful way to gain control over people—for their own good—without the usual frustration of trying to convince them to do the right thing. (Most people know what's good for them. The hard part is getting them to *do* it.) So, for example, in the case of a person who is bulimic, a strategic directive might be for the patient's family to set out a mess of fried chicken, french fries, cookies, and ice cream. Then, with the family watching, the patient would mash up all the food with her hands, symbolizing what goes on in her stomach. After the food was reduced to a soggy mess, she would stuff it into the toilet. Then when the toilet clogged, she would have to ask the family member she resented most to unclog it. This task would symbolize not only what the person with bulimia does to herself but also what she puts the family through (Madanes, 1981).

What the strategic camp added to Erickson's creative approach to problem solving was a simple framework for understanding how families got stuck in their problems. According to the MRI model, problems develop from mismanagement of ordinary life difficulties. The original difficulty becomes a problem when mishandling leads people to get stuck in more-of-the-same solutions. It was a perverse twist on the old adage, "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again."

The Milan group built on the ideas pioneered at MRI, especially the use of the therapeutic double bind, or what they referred to as *counterparadox*. Here's an example from *Paradox and Counterparadox* (Selvini Palazzoli, Boscolo, Cecchin, & Prata, 1978). The authors describe a counterparadoxical approach to a six-year-old boy and his family. At the end of the session, young Bruno was praised for acting crazy to protect his father. By occupying his mother's time with fights and tantrums, the boy generously allowed his father more time for work and relaxation. Bruno was encouraged to continue doing what he was already doing, lest this comfortable arrangement be disrupted.

The appeal of the strategic approach was pragmatism. Making use of the cybernetic metaphor, strategic therapists zeroed in on how family systems were regulated by negative feedback. They achieved results simply by disrupting the interactions that maintained symptoms. What eventually turned therapists off to these approaches was their gamesmanship. Their interventions were transparently manipulative. The result was like watching a clumsy magician—you could see him stacking the deck.

Meanwhile, as structural and strategic approaches rose and fell in popularity, four other models of family therapy flourished quietly. Though they never took center stage, *experiential*, *psychoanalytic*, *behavioral*, and *Bowenian* models grew and prospered. Although these schools never achieved the cachet of family therapy's latest fads, each of them produced solid clinical approaches.

Summary

Family therapy has a short history but a long past. For many years therapists resisted the idea of seeing members of a patient's family in order to safeguard the privacy of the therapeutic relationship. Freudians excluded the real family to uncover the unconscious, introjected family; Rogerians kept the family away to provide unconditional positive regard; and hospital psychiatrists discouraged family visits because they might disrupt the benign milieu of the hospital.

Several converging developments in the 1950s led to a new view—namely, that the family was a living

system, an organic whole. Hospital psychiatrists noticed that often when patients got better, someone else in the family got worse. Thus it became clear that change in any one person changes the whole system. Eventually, it became apparent that treating the family might be the most effective way to help the individual.

Although practicing clinicians in hospitals and child guidance clinics prepared the way for family therapy, the most important breakthroughs were achieved in the 1950s by workers who were scientists first, healers second. In Palo Alto, Gregory Bateson, Jay Haley, Don Jackson, and John Weakland discovered that schizophrenia made sense in the context of pathological family communication. Schizophrenics weren't crazy in some meaningless way; their behavior made sense in their families. At Yale, Theodore Lidz found a striking pattern of instability and conflict in the families of schizophrenics. Marital schism (open conflict) and marital skew (pathological balance) had profound effects on the development of children. Murray Bowen's observation of how mothers and their schizophrenic offspring go through cycles of closeness and distances was the forerunner of the pursuer–distancer dynamic. By hospitalizing whole families for observation and treatment, Bowen implicitly located the problem of schizophrenia in an undifferentiated family ego mass and even extended it beyond the nuclear family to three generations. Lyman Wynne linked schizophrenia to the family by demonstrating how communication deviance contributes to thought disorder.

These observations launched the family therapy movement, but the excitement they generated blurred the distinction between what the researchers observed and what they concluded. What they observed was that the behavior of schizophrenics fit with their families; what they concluded was that the family was the cause of schizophrenia. A second conclusion was even more influential. Family dynamics—double binds, pseudomutuality, undifferentiated family ego mass—began to be seen as products of a system, rather than features of persons who share certain qualities because they live together. Thus was born a new creature, the family system.

Who was the first to practice family therapy? This turns out to be a difficult question. As in every field, there were visionaries who anticipated the

development of family therapy. Freud, for example, treated “Little Hans” by working with his father as early as 1909. However, such experiments weren't sufficient to challenge the hegemony of individual therapy until the climate of the times was receptive. In the early 1950s family therapy was begun independently in four different places: by John Bell at Clark University, Murray Bowen at NIMH, Nathan Ackerman in New York, and Don Jackson and Jay Haley in Palo Alto.

These pioneers had distinctly different backgrounds. Not surprisingly, the approaches they developed were also quite different. This diversity still characterizes the field today. Had family therapy been started by a single person, as was psychoanalysis, it's unlikely that there would have been so much creative competition so soon.

In addition to those just mentioned, others who made significant contributions to the founding of family therapy were Lyman Wynne, Virginia Satir, Carl Whitaker, Ivan Boszormenyi-Nagy, Christian Midelfort, and Salvador Minuchin.

What we've called family therapy's golden age—the flowering of the schools in the 1970s and 1980s—was the high-water mark of our self-confidence. Armed with Haley's or Minuchin's latest text, therapists pledged allegiance to one school or another and set off with a sense of mission. What drew them to activist approaches was certainty and charisma. What soured them was hubris. To some, structural family therapy—at least as they had seen it demonstrated at workshops—began to seem like bullying. Others saw the shrewdness of the strategic approach as manipulative. The tactics were clever but cold. Families were described as stubborn; they couldn't be reasoned with. You don't tell a cybernetic machine what you really believe. Therapists got tired of that way of thinking.

In the early years, family therapists were animated by a tremendous sense of enthusiasm and conviction. Today, in the wake of postmodern critiques, managed care, and biological psychiatry, we're less sure of ourselves. Today's family therapists have managed to synthesize creative new ideas with some of the best of the earlier models. But, some good ideas have been unwisely neglected.

All the complexity of the family field should not obscure its basic premise: The family is the context of human problems. Like all human groups, the family has emergent properties—the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Moreover, no matter how many and varied the explanations of these emergent properties are, they all fall into two categories: structure and process. The structure of families includes triangles,

subsystems, and boundaries. Among the processes that describe family interaction—emotional reactivity, dysfunctional communication, and so on—the central concept is circularity. Rather than worrying about who started what, family therapists understand and treat human problems as a series of moves and countermoves in repeating cycles.

PRACTICE TEST

The following questions will test your application and analysis of the content found within this chapter. For additional assessment, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating chapter content with practice, visit **MySearchLab**.

1. What was the original purpose of insane asylums? What two developments occurred in the 1950s that changed therapists' opinions of a family's role in helping a patient?
2. What was Lewin's philosophy in regards to small group dynamics? How did this differ from McDougall?
3. What idea did Alfred Adler believe in, and how did he pursue his beliefs?
4. What is the concept of double bind? What are the features of this concept?
5. Who proposed the idea of family therapy? What were his/her contributions to the field?
6. What was the most significant approach in family therapy in the 1960s? How did this compare to the 1970s and 1980s?
7. What theory grew tremendously in the 1980s? Who were the proponents of this theory?
8. Which decade was most influential to family therapy? Why was it so influential?

MYSEARCHLAB CONNECTIONS

Reinforce what you learned in this chapter by studying videos, cases, documents, and more available at www.MySearchLab.com.

Watch and Review

Watch These Videos

Engaging in Research Informed Practice
Contracting with the Client to Select an
Evidence Based Therapy

Read and Review

Read These Cases/Documents

- Δ **The Making of a Family Therapist (case study)**
 - Δ The Salazars' Family Therapy
 - Δ Clinical Practice with Children and Adolescents
 - Δ The Impact of Childhood Trauma on Development
-

Explore and Assess

Explore these Assets

Slvador Minuchin
Don Jackson
Carl Whitaker
Nathan Ackerman

Assess Your Knowledge

Conclude your chapter study by completing the chapter exam.

—
^ = Family Therapy Asset

Δ = Case Study

Glossary

complementary relationship Based on differences that fit together, where qualities of one make up for lacks in the other; one is one-up while the other is one-down.

concurrent therapy Treatment of two or more persons, seen separately, usually by different therapists.

conjoint therapy Treatment of two or more persons in sessions together.

content What families talk about.

differentiation of self Bowen's term for psychological separation of intellect and emotions and independence of self from others; opposite of fusion.

double bind A conflict created when a person receives contradictory messages on different levels of abstraction in an important relationship and cannot leave or comment. between two persons or objects: Johnny shoplifts to get his mother's attention.

emotional reactivity The tendency to respond in a kneejerk emotional fashion, rather than calmly and objectively.

enmeshment Loss of autonomy due to a blurring of psychological boundaries.

family rules A descriptive term for redundant behavioral patterns.

group dynamics Interactions among group members that emerge as a result of properties of the group rather than merely their individual personalities.

homeostasis A balanced steady state of equilibrium.

identified patient (IP) The symptom-bearer or official patient as identified by the family.

marital schism Lidz's term for pathological overt marital conflict.

marital skew Lidz's term for a pathological marriage in which one spouse dominates the other.

metacommunication Every message has two levels: report and command; metacommunication is the implied command or qualifying message.

multiple family group therapy Treatment of several families at once in a group therapy format; pioneered by Peter Laqueur and Murray Bowen.

multiple impact therapy An intensive, crisis-oriented form of family therapy developed by Robert MacGregor in which family members are treated in various subgroups by a team of therapists.

mystification Laing's concept that many families distort their children's experience by denying or re-labeling it.

network therapy A treatment devised by Ross Speck in which a large number of family and friends are assembled to help resolve a patient's problems.

object relations Internalized images of self and others based on early parent-child interactions that determine a person's mode of relationship to other people.

paradox A self-contradictory statement based on a valid deduction from acceptable premises.

pseudohostility Wynne's term for superficial bickering that masks pathological alignments in schizophrenic families.

pseudomutuality Wynne's term for the facade of family harmony that characterizes many schizophrenic families.

rubber fence Wynne's term for the rigid boundary surrounding many schizophrenic families, which allows only minimal contact with the surrounding community.

scapegoat A member of the family, usually the identified patient, who is the object of displaced conflict or criticism.

schizophrenogenic mother Frieda Fromm Reichmann's term for aggressive, domineering mothers thought to precipitate schizophrenia in their offspring.

second-order cybernetics The idea that anyone attempting to observe and change a system is therefore part of that system.

symmetrical relationship In relationships, equality or parallel form.

triangle A three-person system; according to Bowen, the smallest stable unit of human relations.

undifferentiated family ego mass Bowen's early term for emotional "stuck-togetherness" or fusion in the family, especially prominent in schizophrenic families.

References

- Bateson, G. 1951. Information and Codification: A Philosophical Approach. In *Communication: The Social Matrix of Psychiatry*, J. Ruesch and G. Bateson, eds. New York: Norton.
- Bateson, G., D. D. Jackson, J. Haley, and J. Weakland. 1956. Toward a Theory of Schizophrenia. *Behavioral Sciences* 1:251–64.
- Bell, J. E. 1961. *Family Group Therapy*. Public Health Monograph No. 64. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Bell, J. E. 1962. Recent Advances in Family Group Therapy. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 3:1–15.
- Bell, J. E. 1975. *Family Group Therapy*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Bion, W. R. 1948. Experience in Groups. *Human Relations* 1:314–29.
- Boszormenyi-Nagy, I., and G. L. Spark. 1973. *Invisible Loyalties: Reciprocity in Intergenerational Family Therapy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bowen, M. 1961. Family Psychotherapy. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 31:40–60.
- Bowlby, J. P. 1949. The Study and Reduction of Group Tensions in the Family. *Human Relations* 2:123–38.
- Broderick, C. B., and S. S. Schrader. 1981. The History of Professional Marriage and Family Therapy. In *Handbook of Family Therapy*, A. S. Gurman and D. P. Kniskern, eds. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Dicks, H. V. 1964. Concepts of Marital Diagnosis and Therapy as Developed at the Tavistock Family Psychiatric Clinic, London, England. In *Marriage Counseling in Medical Practice*, E. M. Nash, L. Jessner, and D. W. Abse, eds. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Epstein, N. B., D. S. Bishop, and L. M. Baldarin. 1981. McMaster Model of Family Functioning. In *Normal Family Problems*, F. Walsh, ed. New York: Guilford Press.
- Fromm-Reichmann, F. 1948. Notes on the Development of Treatment of Schizophrenics by Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy. *Psychiatry* 11:263–74.
- Gritzer, P. H., and H. S. Okum. 1983. Multiple Family Group Therapy: A Model for All Families. In *Handbook of Family and Marital Therapy*, B. B. Wolman and G. Stricker, eds. New York: Plenum Press.
- Guerin, P. J. 1976. Family Therapy: The First Twenty-Five Years. In *Family Therapy: Theory and Practice*, P. J. Guerin, ed. New York: Gardner Press.
- Gurman, A. S. 2008. *Clinical Handbook of Couple Therapy*, 4th ed. New York: Guilford Press.
- Haley, J. 1963. *Strategies of Psychotherapy*. New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Hoffman, L. 1981. *Foundations of Family Therapy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Howells, J. G. 1971. *Theory and Practice of Family Psychiatry*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Jackson, D. D. 1954. Suicide. *Scientific American* 191:88–96.
- Jackson, D. D. 1965. Family Rules: Marital Quid Pro Quo. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 12:589–94.
- Jackson, D. D., and J. H. Weakland. 1959. Schizophrenic Symptoms and Family Interaction. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 1:618–21.
- Jackson, D. D., and J. H. Weakland. 1961. Conjoint Family Therapy, Some Considerations on Theory, Technique, and Results. *Psychiatry* 24:30–45.
- Kaslow, F. W. 1980. History of Family Therapy in the United States: A Kaleidoscopic Overview. *Marriage and Family Review* 3:77–111.
- Laing, R. D. 1960. *The Divided Self*. London: Tavistock.
- Laing, R. D. 1965. Mystification, Confusion and Conflict. In *Intensive Family Therapy*, I. Boszormenyi-Nagy and J. L. Framo, eds. New York: Harper & Row.
- Laqueur, H. P. 1966. General Systems Theory and Multiple Family Therapy. In *Handbook of Psychiatric Therapies*, J. Masserman, ed. New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Laqueur, H. P. 1976. Multiple Family Therapy. In *Family Therapy: Theory and Practice*, P. J. Guerin, ed. New York: Gardner Press.
- Levy, D. 1943. *Maternal Overprotection*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lewin, K. 1951. *Field Theory in Social Science*. New York: Harper.
- Lidz, T., A. Cornelison, S. Fleck, and D. Terry. 1957a. Intrafamilial Environment of the Schizophrenic Patient. I: The Father. *Psychiatry* 20:329–42.
- Lidz, T., A. Cornelison, S. Fleck, and D. Terry. 1957b. Intrafamilial Environment of the Schizophrenic Patient. II: Marital Schism and Marital Skew. *Psychiatry* 114: 241–248.
- MacGregor, R. 1967. Progress in Multiple Impact Theory. In *Expanding Theory and Practice in Family Therapy*, N. W. Ackerman, F. L. Bateman, and S. N. Sherman, eds. New York: Family Services Association.
- MacGregor, R. 1972. Multiple Impact Psychotherapy with Families. In *Family Therapy: An Introduction to Theory and Technique*, G. D. Erickson and T. P. Hogan, eds. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Madanes, C. 1981. *Strategic Family Therapy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McFarlane, W. R. 1982. Multiple-Family Therapy in the Psychiatric Hospital. In *The Psychiatric Hospital and the Family*, H. T. Harbin, ed. New York: Spectrum.
- Minuchin, S. 1974. *Families and Family Therapy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Minuchin, S., B. Montalvo, B. G. Guerney, B. L. Rosman, and F. Schumer. 1967. *Families of the Slums*. New York: Basic Books.

-
- Minuchin, S., and M. P. Nichols. 1993. *Family Healing*. New York: Free Press.
- Mittleman, B. 1948. The Concurrent Analysis of Married Couples. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 17:182–97.
- Parsons, T., and R. F. Bales. 1955. *Family, Socialization and Interaction Process*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Ruevini, U. 1975. Network Intervention with a Family in Crisis. *Family Process* 14:193–203.
- Satir, V. 1972. *Peoplemaking*. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.
- Selvini Palazzoli, M., L. Boscolo, G. Cecchin, and G. Prata. 1978. *Paradox and Counterparadox*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Singer, M. T., L. C. Wynne, and M. L. Toohey. 1978. Communication Disorders and the Families of Schizophrenics. In *The Nature of Schizophrenia*, L. C. Wynne, R. L. Cromwell, and S. Matthysse, eds. New York: Wiley.
- Skygger, A. C. R. 1976. *Systems of Family and Marital Psychotherapy*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Speck, R. V., and C. A. Attneave. 1973. *Family Networks*. New York: Pantheon.
- Stierlin, H. 1972. *Separating Parents and Adolescents*. New York: Quadrangle/New York Times Books.
- Watzlawick, P. A., J. H. Beavin, and D. D. Jackson. 1967. *Pragmatics of Human Communication*. New York: Norton.
- Whitaker, C. A. 1958. Psychotherapy with Couples. *American Journal of Psychotherapy* 12:18–23.
- Whitaker, C. A. 1975. Psychotherapy of the Absurd: With a Special Emphasis on the Psychotherapy of Aggression. *Family Process* 14:1–16.
- Whitaker, C. A. 1976. A Family Is a Four-Dimensional Relationship. In *Family Therapy: Theory and Practice*, P. J. Guerin, ed. New York: Gardner Press.
- Whitaker, C. A., and T. P. Malone. 1953. *The Roots of Psychotherapy*. New York: Balkiston.
- Wynne, L. C. 1961. The Study of Intrafamilial Alignments and Splits in Exploratory Family Therapy. In *Exploring the Base for Family Therapy*, N. W. Ackerman, F. L. Beatman, and S. N. Sherman, eds. New York: Family Services Association.
- Wynne, L. C., I. Ryckoff, J. Day, and S. I. Hirsch. 1958. Pseudomutuality in the Family Relationships of Schizophrenics. *Psychiatry* 21:205–20.
-

Photo Credits

Credits are listed in the order of appearance

World History Archive/Alamy
Michael Newman/PhotoEdit

Courtesy of S.H. McDaniel, University of Rochester
Medical Center
Courtesy of Don Jackson

Basic Techniques of Family Therapy

From Symptom to System

Getting Started

■ The Initial Telephone Call

The goal of the initial contact is to get an overview of the presenting problem and arrange for the family to come for a consultation. Listen to the caller's description of the problem and identify all members of the household as well as others who might be involved (including the referral source and other agencies). Although the initial phone call should be brief, it's important to establish a connection with the caller as a basis for engagement. Then schedule the first interview, specifying who should attend (usually everyone in the household) and the time and place.

While there are things you can learn to say to encourage the whole family to attend, the most important consideration is attitudinal. First, understand and respect that the worried mother who wants you to treat her child individually or the unhappy husband who wants to talk to you alone has a perfectly legitimate point of view, even if it doesn't happen to coincide with your own. But if you expect to meet with the entire family, at least for an initial assessment, a matter-of-fact statement that that's how you work will get most families to agree to a consultation.

When the caller presents the problem as limited to one person, a useful way to broaden the focus is to ask how the problem is affecting other members of the family. If the caller balks at the idea of bringing in the family or says that a particular member won't attend, say that you'll need to hear from everyone, at least initially, in order to get as much information as possible. Most people accept the need to give their point of view; what they resist is the implication that they're to blame.

From Chapter 2 of *Family Therapy: Concepts and Methods*, Tenth Edition.
Michael P. Nichols. Copyright © 2013 by Pearson Education. All rights reserved.



The initial phone contact should be relatively brief to avoid developing an alliance with just one family member.

When a child is the identified patient, parents may be reluctant to include siblings they don't see as part of the problem. Like the uninvolved husband who is "too busy" to attend, nonsymptomatic brothers and sisters may be important to help broaden the focus from the identified patient's failings to relationship issues in the family. It isn't necessary to suggest that everyone is involved in the problem. (It may help to mention that you're not implying that.) What is important is getting everyone to work together toward a solution.¹

¹Not all therapists routinely meet with the whole family. Some find that they have more room to maneuver by meeting first with individuals or subgroups and then gradually involving others. Others attempt to work with the *problem-determined system*, only those people directly involved. Still others try to determine who are the "customers," those who seem most concerned. The point to remember is that family therapy is more a way of looking at things than a technique that always requires seeing the entire family together.

Finally, because most families are reluctant to sit down and face their conflicts, a reminder call before the first session helps cut down on the no-show rate.

■ The First Interview

The goal of the first interview is to build an alliance with the family and develop a hypothesis about what's maintaining the presenting problem. It's a good idea to come up with a tentative hypothesis (in technical terms, a hunch) after the initial phone call and then test it in the first interview. (Remain open to refuting, not just confirming, your initial hypothesis.) The point isn't to jump to conclusions but to start actively thinking.

The primary objectives of a consultation are to establish rapport and gather information. Introduce yourself to the contact person and then to the other adults. Ask parents to introduce their children. Shake hands and greet everyone. Orient the family to the room (observation mirrors, videotaping, toys for children) and to the format of the session (length and purpose). Repeat briefly what the caller told you over the phone (so as not to leave others wondering), and then ask for elaboration. Once you've acknowledged that person's point of view ("So what you're saying is...?"), ask the other members of the family for their viewpoints.

One of the things beginning therapists worry about is that bringing in the whole family may lead to a shouting match that will escalate out of control. The antidote to arguing is insisting that family members speak one at a time. Giving everyone a chance to talk and be heard is a good idea in every case; with emotionally reactive families, it's imperative.

Most families are anxious and uncertain about therapy. They're not sure what to expect, and they may be uncomfortable discussing their concerns with the entire family present. And above all, most people are afraid that someone is going to blame them or expect them to change in ways they aren't prepared to. For these reasons, it's imperative to establish a bond of sympathy and understanding with every member of the family.

A useful question to ask each person is, "How did you feel about coming in?" This helps establish the therapist as someone willing to listen. If, for example, a child says "I didn't want to come" or "I think it's stupid," you can say "Thanks for being honest."