*The Bowen Family Theory and Its Uses*

# Formal Organizations

C. Margaret Hall

# Table of Contents

# Formal Organizations

C. Margaret Hall

e-Book 2016 International Psychotherapy Institute

From *The Bowen Family Theory and Its Uses* by C. Margaret Hall

# FORMAL ORGANIZATIONS

It has long been recognized that emotions have a strong influence on behavior in organizations as well as on family interaction. A wealth of organization theories and management systems have been developed to assist managers in utilizing human emotions in constructive ways. However, these organization theories and management systems have conceptualized emotion as an intrapsychic phenomenon rather than as a systemic response to others and a network phenomenon. Bion (1948) and a few others (Bennis and Shepard 1956, Schutz 1958) have described emotional processes in groups, but their basic emphasis is still on individuals and couples and not on the "systemness" of the group as a whole. According to the individual or couple orientation, a single person under pressure does not respond "normally"; this premise does not imply that the whole system is anxious. Although many authors have noted the impact of stress on groups, these conditions and responses are usually discussed in individual terms.

If groups malfunction, the problem is usually believed to be the result of a specific organizational or social influence rather than the expected response of a group to emotional tension or trauma. Organization theories and strategies based on this segmented view of the system have frequently been unproductive. Managers are often faced with situations where individuals appear stable, where the norms and social structure seem viable, and where the organization and technology are similar to those of successful organizations elsewhere; but at the same time, these situations may manifest high levels of absenteeism, much turnover, alcoholism, conflict, and breakdowns in communications. The Bowen family theory, when applied as a systems theory to formal organizations, pinpoints emotional tendencies and processes in complex organizations and suggests ways to deal with them effectively. The following discussion describes several Bowen family theory propositions in terms of their usefulness for predicting behavior in formal organizations.

## Change in Emotional Intensity

Change in the emotional intensity of a group, the most significant component of all modification processes, occurs in a predictable

sequence of events. When one member of a given system shifts the functioning position of self in the group, a period of general disruption and reactive responses from other follows. These responses constitute a strong emotional pressure on the person differentiating self to change back to the former functioning level. If the individual trying to change self maintains the new functioning position and simultaneously remains in emotional contact with group members, the others eventually accept the person's new level of functioning and gradually change their way of relating to this person. Owing to the predictability of this sequence of events, a change in the functioning of one group member can modify the functioning level of the whole group.

The same predictable sequence of change can occur when an employee or a manager leaves a work group to undergo human relations training and then returns to the group after training. This person's attempts to relate more openly, more directly, or more independently to associates is likely to meet resistance, even if all members of the group intellectually approve of the employee's or manager's changed behavior. Others' reactions are frequently baffling to the trainee, who cannot understand what is happening when the

newly acquired skills fail at producing positive results.

The Bowen family theory as an emotional systems theory suggests that a member of a work group can expect resistance and negative reactivity to a changed posture and that this response may be followed by considerable disruption and dysfunction in the system as a whole. Other members need time to react, readjust, and adapt their own positions and relationships to the trainee and to each other. Maintenance of contact by the trainee is difficult because of the system ’s automatic tendency to develop cut-offs in relationships during periods of high anxiety.

Managerial skills cannot eliminate this strong emotional process, and they may also be unable to control it. The established patterns of behavior are blocked by the change of one organization member, and it takes time before an effective adaptation by the whole group can be achieved. In the interim period of adjustment, relationship anxiety usually overloads the system and precipitates conflict, dysfunction, or projection to the individuals perceived as “problems” by the more powerful members.

The degree of resistance to change or disruption following change in a work system or formal organization depends on the degree of fusion among group members. An emotionally intense work group, whose members are extremely involved with each other, experiences more disruption than a more loosely related work group. An organization's high level of anxiety and its accompanying characteristics of overly dependent relationships magnify the phenomena of "blocking" or "overload" precipitated by a change in a member's functioning.

Bowen's concept of fusion may be compared with the idea of group cohesiveness originally developed by field theorists (Lewin 1951) and extended by Festinger (1954) in his theory of social comparison processes. Kelman's (1961) idea of the identification process also suggests similar meaning elements. However, these ideas, which generally include a cognitive acceptance and enthusiasm for other members or for the goals of the group, are distinct from the Bowen concept of fusion. Bowen's emotional systems theory suggests that fusion in relationships is not recognized by participants in the togetherness and that fusion inhibits or restricts autonomy.

## Loss of a Key Member

When an organization experiences the loss of a significant member, the system frequently responds with unproductive behavior and relationship problems. The severity of these symptoms largely depends on the emotional importance to the whole of the person who has left the organization. Shock wave phenomena or interrelated sequences of disruptive behavior may occur in conditions of temporary as well as permanent loss.

In a formal organization, the loss of a key member through death, dismissal, or voluntary withdrawal frequently results in conflicts, inefficient production, or low morale among the remaining members. Organizational problems following reassignments of work responsibilities are frequently used as rationalizations for these dislocations in the system. Even if no overt organizational problems follow in the wake of a loss, however, conflict, inefficiency, or low morale tends to appear. These dislocations in the relationship system result whether the person the system loses was positively or negatively significant in the system.

The problem consequences of a loss in a formal organization may

be exacerbated by the timing of the loss. When the level of organizational strain is high, additional tension from a loss may easily result in disruption and dysfunction of the system that is markedly out of proportion to the objective reality of the situation.

Advance awareness of the probability of a loss, together with an application of effective managerial strategies, may minimize the impact of a loss. In some instances, it is possible to control the timing of a loss or to provide constructive ways of dissipating emotional tensions resulting from a loss.

## Concept of Responsibility

If a significant group member functions responsibly, other members of the group become correspondingly responsible for self in their feelings, thoughts, and actions. In Bowen's family theory, the concept of responsibility refers to behavior consistent with inner beliefs and convictions and motivated by personally selected goals. A responsible person maintains meaningful contact with as many group members as possible. Responsible behavior is characteristic of a differentiated individual, and to some extent this concept of

responsibility for self may be compared with Maslow's concept of self actualization (1954) and Riesman's idea of inner directedness (Reisman, Glazer and Denney 1950).

The Bowen definition of responsibility provides an alternative to the concept of responsibility used in most management literature. Traditionally, management at least partly defines responsibility for self in terms of accepting responsibility for the behavior of others. from the viewpoint of emotional systems theory, this kind of behavior is considered overresponsibility and consequently irresponsible. Feeling responsible for others enmeshes them in tight dependency relationships that diminish their opportunities to act autonomously in any given situation.

Emotional systems theory, when applied to organizations, essentially predicts that managers will be more effective if they relinquish their emotional control over others. A manager provides guidance to others through the example of responsible behavior rather than through transmitting emotional pressures to other members of the organization. Under these conditions, subordinates are allowed to be more responsible for self. The automatic spread of responsible

action in a group is endemic to an emotional system. The decreased emotional involvement of a manager with subordinates allows all members of the system to mobilize emotional energy previously used to maintain dependent relationships. When emotional demands on others are minimized, overall productivity is increased. The goals of an organization and an individual are not necessarily in conflict (McGregor 1960). In the absence of dependency bonds, the worker's behavior will be more goal-directed and oriented to both organizational and personal objectives. Managers must maintain meaningful emotional contact with subordinates to maximize responsible behavior in an organization.

## Triangles

When there is conflict between two members of the same group, a third person is triangled into the twosome to lower the level of anxiety in the relationship. In most triangles, or three- person relationship systems, feelings are invested primarily between two of its members. When there is conflict between the *Formal Organizations* 175 two members of the feeling-invested twosome, the preferred and more comfortable position in the triangle is that of the outsider. When

the twosome manifests intense positive feelings, the emotionally preferred position in that triangle is generally that of a participant in the fused twosome. However, the outsider is consistently more autonomous than either of the feeling-invested twosome. An individual is able to function more effectively in the outsider position than in the intense twosome, regardless of whether the feelings in the twosome are positive or negative.

If the inclusion of a third person in the emotional field of a dyadic conflict does not effectively reduce the level of tension in the relationship system, a fourth person is brought into the emotional field. If there continues to be no effective resolution of differences or conflicts between the two key members of the emotional field, the surplus anxiety may be projected to the third person who becomes scapegoated or victimized, or the tension is internalized by one of the original two parties. The person who internalizes the stress tends to become dysfunctional in relation to the group.

This triangling process and the related adjustments to undifferentiation and anxiety frequently surface in an organization. People are unable to keep tension to themselves in families or in other

social contexts and automatically involve others in the tension, especially when anxiety is high.

The person in the outsider position of a triangle may or may not see self as more autonomous than members of the twosome. Individuals who become too involved with each other face the serious risk of overloading their 'relationship, especially when emotional tension in the broader relationship network is high. Undifferentiated individuals are frequently draw n into conflict dyads as they are particularly responsive to emotional tension, and automatically satisfy the emotional demands of others. Young members of a work team, new members, women, or other dependent members in the system are most apt to be caught in the emotional entanglements of others.

Projection occurs when parties to an unresolved conflict "victimize" an individual who is in the lower ranks of the administrative hierarchy. Projection frequently occurs without awareness on the part of the one who is being scapegoated. If two executives are unable or unwilling to work out a conflict, the most uncomfortable one in the twosome directs anxiety and anger to an unsuspecting and less important member of the system. Whenever the

conflict between the executives intensifies, feelings are projected to the more vulnerable member of the system, who is low in the hierarchy. As a result, several junior members may mysteriously quit, they may be fired, or they may manifest chronic symptoms of emotional distress. These circumstances evolve in ways disproportionate to the external realities of the jobs of the individuals concerned.

Effective triangling and multitriangling may sufficiently reduce relationship tensions to prevent them from developing into overload, dysfunction, and projection. A supervisor who is aware of a work system ’s tendency to triangle and to project anxiety to others under stress can deliberately triangle self into a conflictual twosome. If the supervisor refrains from taking sides in the conflict, tensions are lessened and the probability that one of the conflicting members internalizes the anxiety, becomes dysfunctional, or projects tension to a third party is effectively decreased.

## Repetition of Behavior Patterns

Past patterns of behavior in an organization, such as the different

ways in which the group has dealt with seniority, sex, and race, have a strong impact on present patterns of behavior in the same organization. Individuals can begin to neutralize or even to reverse the strong automatic influence of past patterns of emotional dependency by becoming aware of them and by consciously counteracting them through modified emotional inputs in the system.

Traditional management and human relations theory view stress phenomena as emanating from individuals. However, the Bowen family theory suggests that once behavior patterns become established in an organization, they are automatically perpetuated by the participation of all group members. Even when new people join the organization, they generally respond cooperatively to the strong emotional pressures to conform to the organization's established patterns of interaction.

The perpetual inclination of groups to reinforce past patterns of behavior in the present influences the resistance to change in organizations, such as changes in the position of women or blacks. Strong resistance continues to occur, even when all members of an organization affirm that they are intellectually receptive to change.

The organization has an automatic emotional tendency to try to maintain the old system of comfortable established relationships and secure equilibrium.

Managers are more effective if they are aware of the repeated patterns of behavior in their organizations. Emotional dependencies and interactions between young and old, men and women, blacks and whites, and professionals and nonprofessionals should be observed and diagramed wherever possible. Managers can also profitably realize that changing the structure or policies of the organization does not substantially modify established emotional patterns. The system persists in its efforts to perpetuate the given emotional equilibrium, despite whatever innovations are introduced. People still continue to respond more or less the same way toward each other, whether or not job titles or reporting channels are changed.

Conscious efforts to modify the emotional inputs given to an organization are necessary to facilitate change. The emotional relationships of at least one member of the organization must be effectively changed, or the system will persist in its established relationship patterns for many generations of corporate life.

Changes in the emotional inputs to an organization may have a temporarily disturbing effect upon general productivity and satisfaction. If women, blacks, or young people in an organization initiate changed dependencies and behavior, this shift may disrupt traditional patterns and may precipitate some degree of emotional distress. Instigators of the changes may be pressured to return to their former functioning by the resistance of other members of the system.

Changes in the core groups of an organization, where members are the most emotionally involved with each other, are more instrumental in bringing about changes in the whole group than changes in peripheral groups or in groups that are low in the established hierarchy. A sustained change anywhere in the system eventually affects all members of the organization, as long as emotional contact with the whole is maintained by the changing individual or group.

## Conclusion

A conceptualization of formal organizations as emotional systems opens up numerous avenues for investigation. This new frame of

reference focuses on the nature and intensity of emotional relationships within an organization, as well as on the dependencies and coalitions that develop in small groups and wider networks. The influence of losses in the organization, the isolation of certain groups through cut-offs in the communication system, and tensions resulting from incompatibilities between the goals of the larger group and individual members' goals are some of the many potential areas of research for family systems theory and applications. The emotional consequences of change in organizations could also be explored.

Emotional systems theory begins to articulate a prediction of the degree of resistance to individual and group change and also suggests a means to minimize resistance. These concepts also further an understanding of those who resist change in a variety of formal organizations and other social settings.

Among the more specific contributions of the Bowen family theory and the emotional systems orientation to formal organizations are conceptualizations of superordinate and subordinate relationships, the influence of seniority in organizations, the difficulties a member encounters in becoming autonomous in relation

to the group, and patterns of problem solving, training, evaluation, and informal communication. from a systems perspective many organizational conflicts and tensions are considered particular manifestations of the two major emotional forces of togetherness and individuation.

Emotional systems theory suggests that the frequency of interaction within organizations heightens their emotional intensity. The goals, policies, and structures of an organization are frequently manipulated in response to pressures from the emotional system, even though administrative moves are usually described in terms of furthering the “rational” goals of the organization. Emotional systems theory can be used to delineate some of the rationalizations that disguise the reactiveness of the underlying emotional system of an organization. The Bowen theory can also be used to cope with an organization’s resistance to new goals or policies and structural changes. However valid and necessary these modifications are, they pose a threat to the emotional equilibrium of the system.

Emotional systems theory offers a “person-centered” rather than an “object-centered” approach to management. The concepts can

enhance administrators' understanding of their organizations. Problems such as conflict, absenteeism, productivity slowdowns, low morale, and individual inadequacies are viewed as system characteristics rather than as individual behavior. Since any member of an organization can influence changes, emotional systems theory provides managers with a useful new conceptual instrument with which to influence action in their organizations.

# REFERENCES


Ackerman, N. W. (1971). The growing edge of family therapy. *Family Process* 10:143-156.

Adams, B. N. (1968). *Kinship in an Urban Setting.* New York: Markham.

_____(1970). Isolation, function, and beyond: American kinship in the 1960s. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 32:575-591.

Aldous, J. (1970). Strategies for developing family theory. *Journal o f Marriage and the Family* 32:250-257.

Aldous, J., and Hill, R. (1967). *International Bibliography o f Research. Marriage and the Family, 1960-1964.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Alexander, J. F. (1973). Defensive and supportive communications in family systems. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 35:613-617.

Anderson, M. (1971). Family structure in nineteenth century Lancashire. Cambridge Studies in Sociology, no. 5. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Andres, F.D., and Lorio, J.P., ed. (1974). *Georgetown Family Symposia,* Vol. 1 (1971-1972). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Medical Center.

Ardrey, R. (1966). *The Territorial Imperative: a Personal Inquiry into the*

*animal Origins of Property and Nations.* New York: Atheneum.

_____(1968). *African Genesis.* New York: Atheneum.

Argyle, M. (1958). *Religious Behavior.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Athos, A., and Coffey, R. (1968). *Behavior in Organizations, a Multidimensional View.* New York: Prentice-Hall.

Bales, R.F. (1950). *Interaction Process analysis.* Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.

Barakat, H. (1969). Alienation: a process of encounter between utopia and reality. *British Journal of Sociology* 20:1-10.

Bartell, G. D. (1971). *Group Sex.* New York: Peter H. Wyden.

Barzun, J. (1941). *Darwin, Marx, Wagner— Critique of a Heritage.* Boston: Little, Brown.

Beard, B. B. (1949). Are the aged ex-family? *Social Forces* 27:274-279.

Bell, C. R. (1968). *Middle Class Families.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bennis, W. G., and Shepard, H. A. (1956). A theory of group development. *Human Relations* 9:415-437.

Bernard, J. (1971). *Women and the Public Interest.* Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.

_____(1973). My four revolutions: an autobiographical history of the ASA. *American Journal of Sociology* 78:773-791.

Berne, E. (1967). *Games People Play.* New York: Random House.

Bertalanffy, L. von (1967). *Robots, Men, and Minds.* New York: George Braziller.

_____(1968). *General Systems Theory.* New York: George Braziller.

Bezdek, W., and Strodtbeck, F. L. (1970). Sex-role identity and pragmatic action. *American Sociological Review* 36:491-502.

Bion, W. R (1948). Experience in groups. *Human Relations* 1:314-320.

Bittner, E. (1963). Radicalism and the organization of radical movements. *American Sociological Review* 28:928-940.

Blood, R.O., and Wolfe, D. M. (1960). *Husbands and Wives.* New York: Free Press.

Bobcock, R.J. (1970). Ritual: civic and religious. *British Journal o f Sociology* 21:285-297.

Boszormenyi-Nagy, I., and Spark, G. M. (1973). *Invisible Loyalties.* New York: Harper.

Bott, E. (1957). *Family and Social Network.* London: Tavistock.

Boulding, K. E. (1956). General systems theory—the skeleton of a science. *Management Science* 2:197-208.

Bowen, M. (1959). Family relationships in schizophrenia. In *Schizophrenia—an Integrated approach,* ed. A. Auerback, pp. 147-178. New York:

Ronald Press.

_____(1960). A family concept of schizophrenia. In *The Etiology o f Schizophrenia*, ed. D. Jackson, pp. 346-372. New York: Basic Books.

_____(1961). Family psychotherapy. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 31:40-60. (1965a). Intra family dynamics in emotional illness. In *Family, Church, and Community,* ed. A. D'Agostino, pp. 81-97. New York: P. J. Kennedy and Sons.

_____(1965b). Family psychotherapy with schizophrenia in the hospital and in private practice. In *Intensive Family Therapy*, ed. I. Boszormenyi-Nagy and J. L. Framo, pp. 213-243. New York: Harper.

_____(1966). The use of family theory in clinical practice. *Comprehensive Psychiatry* 7:345-374.

_____(1971a). Family and family group therapy. In *Comprehensive Group Psychotherapy,* ed. H.T. Kaplan and B.J. Sadock, pp. 384-421. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins.

_____(1971b). Principles and techniques of multiple family therapy. In *Systems Therapy,* ed. J.D . Bradt and C. J. Moynihan, pp. 388-404. Washington, D.C.: Groome Child Guidance Center.

_____(1972). On the differentiation of self. In M. Bowen, *Family Therapy in Clinical Practice,* pp. 467-528. New York: Jason Aronson, 1978.

_____(1973). Cultural myths and realities of problem solving. Paper presented at Environmental Protection Research Symposium on alternative Futures and Environmental Quality, March. 280

_____(1974). Societal regression: viewed through family systems theory. In *Energy: Today's Choices, Tomorrow's Opportunities,* ed. A.B. Schmalz. Washington, D.C.: World Future Society.

Bowen, M., Dysinger, R.H., and Basamania, B. (1959). The role of the father in families with a schizophrenic patient. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 115:117-120.

Bradt, J.O ., and Moynihan, C.J., ed. (1971). *Systems Therapy.* Washington, D.C.: Groome Child Guidance Center.

Britton, J. H., and Britton, J.O. (1971). Children's perceptions of their parents: a comparison of Finnish and American children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 33:214-218.

Broderick, C. B. (1971). Beyond the five conceptual frameworks: a decade of development in family theory. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 33:139-159.

Broom, L., and Selznick, P. (1963). *Sociology.* 3rd ed. New York: Harper.

Bry, A. (1972). *Inside Psychotherapy.* New York: Basic Books.

Buckley, W. (1967). *Sociology and Modern Systems Theory.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

_____(1968). *Modern Systems Research for the Behavioral Scientist—a Sourcebook.* Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Bultena, G. L. (1969). Rural-urban differences in the familial interaction of the aged. *Rural Sociology* 34:5-15.

Burger, R. E. (1969). Who cares for the aged? *Saturday Review* 52:14-17.

Burgess, E. W., Locke, H. J., and Thornes, M. M. (1971). *The Family: from Traditional to Companionship.* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Burns, T., and Stalker, G. (1961). *The Management of Innovation.* London: Tavistock.

Caplow, T. (1968). *Two against One: Conditions in Triads.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Christensen, H.T. (1964). Development of the family field of study. In *Handbook of Marriage and the Family,* ed. H.T. Christensen. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Cohen, M.G. (1973). *Proceedings and debates of the Ninety-third Congress,* first session, 119 (174). Washington, D.C.

Congressional Research Service (1975). Publication HJ2005 U.S., 75-60E, February 24.

Cooper, D. (1970). *The Death of the Family.* New York: Pantheon.

Cotgrove, S. (1967). *The Science of Society.* New York: Barnes and Noble.

Croog, S., Lipson, a., and Levine, S. (1972). Help patterns in severe illness. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 34:32-41.

Darwin, C. (1871). *The Descent of Man and on Selection in Relation to Sex.* London: John Murray.

_____(1896). *The Origin of the Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life.* New York: Appleton.

DeJong, P.Y., Brawer, M.J., and Robin, S.S. (1971). Patterns of female intergenerational occupational mobility: a comparison with male patterns of intergenerational occupational mobility. *American Sociological Review* 36:1033-1042.

Demerath, N.J., III (1965). *Social Class in American Protestantism.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Demerath, N.J., III, and Hammond, P.E. (1969). *Religion in Social Context.* New York: Random House.

Demerath, N.J., III, and Peterson, R.A., ed. (1967). *System, Change, and Conflict — a Reader on Contemporary Sociological Theory and the Debate over Functionalism.* New York: Free Press.

Dennis, N. (1962). Secondary group relationships and the preeminence of the family. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 3:80-90.

Dinkel, R. (1944). Attitudes of children toward supporting aged parents. *American Sociological Review* 9:370-379.

Dohrenwend, B., and Chin-Shong, E. (1967). Social status and attitudes toward psychological disorder: the problem of tolerance of deviance. *American Sociological Review* 32:417-433.

Durkheim, E. (1947). *The Division of Labor in Society.* Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

Dysinger, R. H., and Bowen, M. (1959). Problems for medical practice presented by families with a schizophrenic member. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 116:514-517.

Eckhardt, a. R. (1954). The new look at American piety. In *Religion, Society, and the Individual,* ed. J. M. Yingar. New York: Macmillan.

Edgell, S. (1972). Marriage and the concept of companionship. *British Journal of Sociology* 23:432-461.

Elliott, K., ed. (1970). *The Family and Its Future.* London: J. And a. Churchill.

Ellwood, C. (1972). Preparation for the year 2000. *Adult Education* 45:27-31.

Epstein, C. F. (1973). Positive effects of the multiple negative: explaining the success of Black professional women. *American Journal of Sociology* 78:912-935.

Etzioni, A. (1975). Alternatives to nursing homes. *Human Behavior* 4:10-11.

Farber, B. (1964). *Family: Organization and Interaction.* San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Ferm, D. W.(1971). *Responsible Sexuality— Now.* New York: Seaburg Press.

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations* 7:117-140.

Fichter, J. H. (1972). The concept of man in social science: freedom, values, and second nature. *Journal for the Scientific Study o f Religion* 11:109-121.

Finnegan, R. (1970). The kinship of ascription of primitive societies: actuality or myth? *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 11:171 -194.

Fletcher, R. (1962). *The Family and Marriage.* Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.

Freilich, M. (1964). The natural triad in kinship and complex systems. *American Sociological Review* 29:529-540.

Gibson, G. (1972). Kin family network: overheralded structure in past conceptualizations of family. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 34:13-23.

Glock, C. Y. (1960). Religion and the integration of society. *Review o f Religious Research* 2:49-61.

_____(1962). On the study of religious commitment. *Review of Recent Research Bearing on Religious and Character Formation,* research supplement to *Religious Education,* S98-S110.

Goode, E. (1968). Class styles of religious sociation. *British Journal of Sociology* 19:1-16.

Goode, W. J. (1963a). The process of role bargaining in the impact of urbanization and industrialization on family systems. *Current Sociology* 12:1-13.

_____(1963b). *World Revolution and Family Patterns.* New York: Macmillan.

_____(1971). Force and violence in the family. *Journal of Marriage and the*

*Family* 33:624-636.

Goody, J. (1973). Evolution and communication: the domestication of the savage mind. *British Journal of Sociology* 24:1-12.

Gouldner, A.W. (1970). *The Coming Crisis in Western Sociology.* New York: Basic Books.

Gove: W.R., and Howell, P. (1974). Individual resources and mental hospitalization: a comparison and evaluation of the societal reaction and psychiatric perspectives. *American Sociological Review* 39:86-100.

Gray, R. M., and Kasteler, J.m. (1967). Foster grandparents and retarded children. Research Report, Utah Foster Grandparent Project, Salt Lake City.

Gurman, a. S. (1973a). The effects and effectiveness of marital therapy: a review of outcome research. *Family Process* 12:145-170.

_____(1973b). Marital therapy: emerging trends in research and practice. *Family Process* 12:45-54.

Gursch, W.E. (1967). Quarterly Narrative Report: Foster Grandparent Project. Denton State School.

Hall, C.M. (1971). *The Sociology of Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809-65).* New York: Philosophical Library.

_____(1972). The aged and the multigenerational cut-off phenomenon. Paper presented at Georgetown University PreSymposium on Family

Psychiatry, Washington, D.C., November.

_____1973). *Vital Life: Questions in Social Thought.* North Quincy, Massachusetts: The Christopher Publishing House.

_____(1974). Efforts to differentiate a self in my family of origin. In *Georgetown Family Symposia*, vol. 1 (1971-1972), ed. F. D. Andres and J. P. Lorio. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Medical Center.

_____(1976). Aging and family processes. *Journal of Family Counseling* 4:28-42.

Hall, C. M., and Sussman, M. B. (1975). Aging and the family: alternatives to institutional care. American Sociological association annual Meeting, report and recommendations of Committee on Public Issues and the Family.

Hammond, M.A. (1963). Effects of the foster grandparent project upon the Oral Language Development of Institutionalized Mental Retardates. Ph.D. Dissertation, North Texas State University.

Hammond, P. E. (1963). Religion and the "informing of culture." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 3:97-106.

Hare, P. (1962). *Handbook of Small Group Research.* New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Harper, R. A. (1974). *Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy—36 Systems.* New York: Jason Aronson.

Harris, C.C. (1969). *The Family.* London: Allen and Unwin.

HEW (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) (1972). AOA projects to test alternatives to institutionalization of aged. *Aging*, No. 215-216. Administration on aging.

_____(1972b). *Cost Benefit Profile of the Foster Grandparent Program.* Booz, Allen Public administration Service.

Heidensohn, F. (1968). The deviance of women: a critique and an enquiry. *British Journal of Sociology* 19:160-175.

Henderson, L. J. (1935). *Pareto's General Speiology.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Herberg, W. (1960). *Protestant-Catholic-Jew.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

Hochschild, A. R. (1973). Communal life-styles for the old. *Society* 10:50-57.

Hollingshead, A., and Redlich, F. (1958). *Social Class and Mental Illness.* New York: Wiley.

Homans, G. (1950). *The Human Group.* New York: Harcourt Brace.

_____(1964). Bringing men back in. *American Sociological Review* 29:809-818.

Humphreys, L. (1970). *Tearoom Trade: Impersonal Sex in Public Places.* Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Huxley, J. S. (1942). *Evolution: The Modern Synthesis.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Ibsen, C.A., and Klobus, P. (1972). Fictive kin term use and social relationships: alternative interpretations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 34:615-620.

Jaco, E.G. (1957). Attitudes toward an incidence of mental disorder: a research note. *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* 38:27-38.

Jacobs, J. (1971). from sacred to secular: the rationalization of Christian theology. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 10:1-9.

Johnson, W.T. (1971). The religious crusade: revival or ritual? *American Journal of Sociology* 76:873-890.

Jones, N.F., and Kahn, M.W. (1964). Patient attitudes as related to social class and other variables concerned with hospitalization. *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 18:403-408.

Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and social organization: a study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. *American Sociological Review* 33:499-517.

Kanter, R. M., ed. (1973). *Communes: Creating and Managing the Collective Life.* New York: Harper.

Kaplan, A. (1964). *The Conduct of Inquiry.* San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Kaplan, H.I., and Sadock, B.J., ed. (1971). *Comprehensive Group Psychotherapy.* Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins.

Kaplan, J. (1972). An editorial: alternatives to nursing home care, fact or

fiction? *The Gerontologist* 12:114.

Keller, a. G. (1931). *Societal Evolution— a Study of the Evolutionary Basis of the Science of Society.* New York: Macmillan.

Kelman, H. (1961). Process of opinion change. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 25:57-78.

Kenkel, W. F. (1966). *The Family in Perspective.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Kent, D. P., and Matson, M. B. (1972). The impact of health on the aged family. *The Family Coordinator* 21:29-36.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1964). *Foundations of Behavioral Research.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Ketcham, W., Sack, a., and Shore, H. (1974). Annotated bibliography on alternatives to institutional care. *The Gerontologist* 14:34-36.

Kirkendall, L. A., and Whitehurst, R. N. (1971). *The New Sexual Revolution.* New York: Donald W. Brown.

Kistin, H., and Morris, R. (1972). Alternatives to institutional care for the elderly and disabled. *The Gerontologist* 12:139-142.

Lacey, W. K. (1968). *The Family in Classical Greece.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Laumann, E. O. (1969). The social structure of religious and ethnoreligious groups in a metropolitan community. *American Sociological*

*Review* 34:182-197.

Lawrence, P. R., and Seiler, J. A. (1965). *Organizational Behavior and Administration.* Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc. and The Dorsey Press.

Lawrence, P. R., and Lorsch, J.W. (1967). Organization and environment: managing differentiation and integration. Cambridge: Division of Research, Harvard Business School.

Lee, G. R. (1974). Marriage and anomie: a causal argument. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 36:523-532.

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics. *Human Relations* 1:5-41.

_____(1951). *Field Theory in Social Sciences.* New York: Harper.

Lindenthal, J.J. et al. (1970). Mental states and religious behavior. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 9:143-149.

Litwak, E. (1960a). Geographical mobility and extended family cohesion. *American Sociological Review* 25:385-394.

_____(1960b). Occupational mobility and extended family cohesion. *American Sociological Review* 25:9-21.

Litwak, E., and Szelenyi, I. (1969). Primary group structures and their functions: kin, neighbors, and friends. *American Sociological Review* 34:465 481.

Litwak, E., Hollister, D., and Meyer, H.J. (1974). Linkage theory between

bureaucracies and community primary groups—education, health, political action as empirical cases in point. Paper presented at the annual Meeting of the American Sociological association, Montreal.

Litwin, G., and Stringer, R.A. (1968). *Motivation and organizational climate.* Cambridge: Division of Research, Harvard Business School.

Lorenz, K. (1954). *Man Meets Dog.* London: Methuen.

_____(1963). *On aggression.* Trans. M. K. Wilson. New York: Harcourt Brace.

_____(1965). *Evolution and Modification of Behavior.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____(1971). *Studies in animal and Human Behavior*, vol. 3, Trans. Robert Martin. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Loudon, J. B. (1961). Kinship and crisis in South Wales. *British Journal of Sociology* 12:333-350.

Lowenthal, M.F., and Boler, D. (1965). Voluntary versus involuntary social withdrawal. *Journal of Gerontology* 20:363-371.

Luckman, T. (1967). *The Invisible Religion.* New York: Macmillan.

Lundberg, G. A. (1947). *Can Science Save Us?* New York: David McKay.

Lynd, R.S. (1939). *Knowledge for What?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lyness, J. L., and Lipetz, M. E. (1972). Living together: an alternative to marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 34:305-311.

Marciano, T. D. (1975). Variant family forms in a world perspective. *The Family Coordinator* 24:407-420.

Martin, R.J. (1974). Cultic aspects of sociology: a speculative essay. *British Journal of Sociology* 25:15-31.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality.* New York: Harper.

Mawson, A. R. (1970). Durkheim and contemporary social pathology. *British Journal of Sociology* 21:298-313.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mills, C. W. (1959). *The Sociological Imagination.* London: Oxford University Press.

Mills, T. M. (1954). Coalition pattern in three-person groups. *American Sociological Review* 19:657-667.

Mishler, E.G., and Wazler, N.E. (1968). *Interaction in Families.* New York: Wiley.

Moberg, D. (1962). *The Church as a Social Institution.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Muncy, R. L. (1973). *Sex and Marriage in Utopian Communities—19th Century America.* Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Musil, J. (1971). Some aspects of social organization of the contemporary Czechoslovak family. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 33:196-206.

Myers, J., and Bean, L. (1968). *A Decade Later: a Follow-up of Social Class and Mental Illness.* New York: Wiley.

Nelson, H. M., and Allen, H.D. (1974). Ethnicity, Americanization, and religious attendance. *American Journal of Sociology* 79:906-922.

Nelson, H. M., Yokley, R. L., and Madron, T. W. (1973). Ministerial roles and societal actionist stance: Protestant clergy and protest in the sixties. *American Sociological Review* 38:375-386.

Neugarten, B. L. (1973). Patterns of aging: past, present, and future. *Social Service Review* 47:571-572.

Nimkoff, M. F., ed. (1965). *Comparative Family Systems.* New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Noble, T. (1970). Family breakdown and social networks. *British Journal of Sociology* 21:135-150.

Noelker, L. (1975). Intimate relationships in a residential home for the elderly. Ph.D. dissertation, Case Western Reserve University.

Olson, D. H. (1972). Marriage of the future: revolutionary or evolutionary change? *The Family Coordinator* 21:383-393.

O'Neill, N., and O'Neill, G. (1972). Open marriage: a synergic model. *The Family Coordinator* 21:403-409.

Orden, S.R., and Bradburn, N.M. (1968). Dimensions of marriage happiness. *American Journal of Sociology* 73:715-731.

_____(1969). Working wives and marriage happiness. *American Journal of Sociology* 74:392-407.

Osofsky, J. D., and Osofsky, H .J. (1972). Androgyny as a life style. *The Family Coordinator* 21:411-418.

Paden-Eisenstark, D. (1973). Are Israeli women really equal? Trends and patterns of Israeli women's labor force participation: a comparative analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 35:538-545.

Parsons, T. (1943). The kinship system of the contemporary U.S. *American anthropologist* 45:22-38.

_____(1966). *Societies—Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

_____(1967). Christianity and modern industrial society. In *Sociological Theory, Values, and Sociocultural Change,* ed. E. Tiryakian. New York: Harper.

_____(1971). *The System of Modern Societies.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Parsons, T., and Bales, R.F., eds. (1955). *Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process.* New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Payne, G. (1973). Comparative sociology: some programs of theory and method. *British Journal of Sociology* 24:13-29.

Pechman, J.A., and Timpane, P.M., ed. (1975). *Work Incentives and Income*

*Guarantees.* Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Petroni, F. (1969). Significant others and illness behavior: a much neglected sick role contingency. *Sociological Quarterly* 10:32-41.

Queen, S., and Habenstein, R. (1967). *The Family in Various Cultures.* New York: Lippincott.

Ramey, J.W. (1972). Communes, group marriage, and the upper middle class. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 34:647-655.

Riesman, D., Glazer, N., and Denney, R. (1950). *Lonely Crowd: a Study of the Changing American Character.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Riley, M. W. (1968). *Aging and Society, Vol. One: an Inventory o f Research Findings.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Roberts, B. S. (1968). Protestant groups and coping with urban life in Guatemala City. *American Journal of Sociology* 73:753-767.

Roethlisberger, F.J. (1953). Administrators skill: communication. *Harvard Business Review* 31:55-62.

Rogers, C. R. (1961). *On Becoming a Person.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Rose, A.M. (1968). The subculture of aging: a topic for sociological research. In *Middle age and aging*, ed. B. L. Neugarten. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rose, A. M., and Peterson, W. A., ed. (1965). *Older People and Their Social World.* Philadelphia: F. A. Davis Co.

Rosenberg, G.S. (1967). *Poverty, aging, and Social Isolation.* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Research.

Rosow, I. (1967). *Social Integration of the aged.* New York: The Free Press.

Rosser, C., and Harris, C. C. (1965). *The Family and Social Change.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Rubin, Z. (1968). Do American women marry up? *American Sociological Review* 33:750-760.

Ruitenbeek, H.M., ed. (1963). *Varieties of Classic Social Theory.* New York: Dutton.

Schlesinger, B. (1970). Family life in the kibbutz of Israel: utopia gained or paradise lost? *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 11:251-271.

Schneider, D. M., and Smith, R.T. (1973). *Class Differences and Sex Roles in American Kinship and Family Structure.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Schorr, A. (1960). *Filial Responsibility in the Modern American Family.* Washington, D.C.: Social Security administration Report.

Schutz, W.C. (1958). *FIRO: a Three-Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior.* New York: Rinehart.

Scott, W. G., and Mitchell, T. R. (1972). *Organization Theory: A Structural and Behavioral analysis.* Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc. And The Dorsey Press.

Shanas, E. (1961). *Family Relationships of Older People: Living Arrangements, Health Status, and Family Ties.* New York: Health Information Foundation.

Shanas, E., and Streib, G.F., ed. (1963). *Social Structure and the Family: Generational Relations.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Shanas, E., and Sussman, M. B. (1975). *Older People, Family and Bureaucracy.* Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Shands, H.C. (1969). Integration, discipline and the concept of shape. *Annals of the New York academy of Sciences* 174:578-589.

Sheper, J. (1969). Familism and social structure: the case of the kibbutz. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 31:567-573.

Shepherd, C. R. (1964). *Small Groups: Some Sociological Perspectives.* San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Sherif, M., and Sherif, C. (1953). *Groups in Harmony and Tension.* New York: Harper.

Shore, H. (1974). What's new about alternatives? *The Gerontologist* 14:6-11.

Simpson, G. G. (1949). *The Meaning of Evolution.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Simpson, I.H., and McKinney, J.C ., ed. (1966). *Social aspects o f Aging.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Slater, P. E. (1963). On societal regression. *American Sociological Review* 28:339-364.

Solomon, B. (1967). Social functioning of economically dependent aged. *The Gerontologist* 7:213-217.

Speck, R., and Attneave, C. (1973). *Family Networks.* New York: Pantheon.

Sprey, J. (1969). The family as a system in conflict. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 31:699-706.

Streib, G. (1958). Family patterns in retirement. *Journal of Social Issues* 14:46-60.

_____(1965). Intergenerational relations: perspectives of the two generations of the older parent. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 27:469-476.

Stryker, S., and Psathas, G. (1960). Research on coalitions in the triad: findings, problems, and strategy. *Sociometry* 23:217-230.

Sussman, M.B. (1953). The help pattern in the middle class family. *American Sociological Review* 18:22-28.

_____(1955). Activity patterns of post-parental couples and their relationship to family continuity. *Marriage and Family Living* 17:338-341.

Sussman, M. B., and Burchinal, L. (1962). Kin family network: unheralded structure in current conceptualizations of family functioning. *Marriage and Family Living* 24:320-332. Also in *Kinship and Family Organization,* ed. B. Farber. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Sussman, M.B., and Cogswell, B. E. (1972). The meaning of variant and experimental marriage styles and family forms in the 1970s. *Family Coordinator* 21:375-381.

Szasz, T. S. (1963). *Law, Liberty, and Psychiatry.* New York: Macmillan.

Taietz, P., and Larson, O. F. (1956). Social participation and old age. *Rural Sociology* 21:229-238.

Talmon, Y. (1959). The case of Israel. *Human Relations* 12:121-146.

_____(1972). *Family and Community in the Kibbutz.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Tarnowiesky, D. (1973). The changing success ethic. *American Management association Survey Report.*

Taylor, I., and Walton, P. (1970). Values in deviancy theory and society. *British Journal of Sociology* 21:362-374.

Teilhard de Chardin, P. (1970). *Let Me Explain.* Trans. R. Hague et al. London: Collins.

Thompson, G. (1961). *The Inspiration of Science.* London: Oxford University Press.

Tolman, E.C. (1932). *Purposive Behavior in animals and Men.* New York: Appleton-Century.

Toman, W. (1972). *Family Constellation.* New York: Springer.

Townsend, P. (1957). *The Family Life of Old People.* Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

Tremmel, W.C. (1971). The converting choice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 10:17-25.

Troll, L. E. (1971). The family of later life: a decade review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 33:263-290.

Turner, R.H. (1969). The theme of contemporary social movements. *British Journal of Sociology* 20:390-405.

_____(1970). *Family Interaction.* New York: Wiley.

United States Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (1975). Nurse Training and Health Revenue Sharing and Health Services Act. Calendar no. 29, report no. 94-29. Washington, D.C.

Weintraub, D., and Shapiro, M. (1968). The traditional family in Israel in the process of change—crisis and continuity. *British Journal of Sociology* 19:284-299.

Weitzman, L.J. (1972). Sex-role socialization in picture books for pre-school children. *American Journal of Sociology* 77:1125-1150.

Wells, R. A. et al. (1972). The results of family therapy: a critical review of the literature. *Family Process* 11:189-207.

White House Conference on aging (1971). *Toward a National Policy on aging.* Final Report, vol. 2, Washington, D.C.

Whitehurst, R. N. (1972). Some comparisons of conventional and counter-culture families. *The Family Coordinator* 21:395-401.

Williams, W. (1957). Class differences in the attitudes of psychiatric patients. *Social Problems* 4:240-244.

Wilson, B. (1969). *Religion in Secular Society: a Sociological Commentary.* Baltimore: Penguin.

Winer, L.R. (1971). The qualified pronoun count as a measure of change in family psychotherapy. *Family Process* 10:243-247.

Winter, G. (1961). *The Suburban Captivity of the Churches.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

Woof, W. B. (1959). Organizational constructs: an approach to understanding organization. *Journal of the academy o f Management*, April.

Wolff, K.H., ed. And trans. (1950). *The Sociology of Georg Simmel.* New York: The Free Press.

*Work in America* (1972). A report of a special task force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Young, M., and Willmott, P. (1962). *Family and Kinship in East London.* Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Pelican.

Zelditch, M., Jr. (1955). Role differentiation in the nuclear family: a comparative study. In *Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process,* ed. T. Parsons and R. F. Bales. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Zetterberg, H.L. (1965). *On Theory and Verification in Sociology.* Totowa, New Jersey: The Bedminster Press.

Zimmerman, C. C. (1972). The future of the family in America, *Journal o f Marriage and the Family* 34:323-333.

Zinberg, N. (1970). The mirage of mental health. *British Journal o f Sociology* 21:262-272.