Dr Katarzyna Nosek-Kozłowska   https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6435-1545
Katedra Pedagogiki Ogólnej i Opiekuńczej
Wydział Nauk Społecznych
Uniwersytet Warmińsko–Mazurski w Olsztynie

Family – the basic unit of societal life seen through the prism of systemic theory

Rodzina – podstawowa forma życia społecznego w perspektywie teorii systemowej

Abstrakt: Rodzina jest specyficznym tworem społecznym, będącym fenomenem organizacyjnym, wyprzedzającym w tym względzie jakiekolwiek inne zorganizowane i sformalizowane struktury. Współczesne badania nad rodziną coraz częściej ujmują ją w ujęciu systemowym. Rodzina w perspektywie ujęcia systemowego stanowi zorganizowaną całość, która chociaż złożona z części, nie jest prostą ich sumą. System rodziny składa się z wielu podsystemów, które stanowią podsystem małżeński, podsystem rodzicielski, podsystem rodzeństwa. Podsystemy te wzajemnie na siebie oddziałują, a zmiana w którymkolwiek z nich pociąga za sobą zmiany w innych. W tym modelu rozumienia rodziny odnajdywano analogię do żywego organizmu.

Wszystko to, co dzieje się na świecie wymaga plastyczności w przystosowywaniu się, integracji i asymilacji tych zmian. Konieczna jest zmiana sposobu myślenia, innego ujmowania świata. W dużej mierze odpowiedzią na to wyzwanie jest ujęcie systemowe, które stanowi szczególny paradygmat naukowy. Ujęcie systemowe jest metodą spojrzenia na świat, metodą jego opisu, ale przy tym zakłada także, że świat posiada systemowe własności.

Słowa kluczowe: rodzina, życie społeczne, teoria systemowa

Abstract: A family is a specific societal creation, being an organizational phenomenon, overshadowing any other organized and formalized structures in that regard. Modern examinations of a family are increasingly more interested in approaching it in a systemic manner. In such a scenario, a family is an organized whole that consists of a number of parts, while at the same time not being a simple sum thereof. The familial system incorporates a number of subsystems, among which there are: marital, parental, and sibling-oriented subsystems. They affect each other and a notable change occurring in even one of them may affect the other ones. When it comes to such a model of family perception, the analogy to a living organism is frequently being opted for.

All events happening all over the world require flexibility for people to be able to adjust to them, as well as integration and assimilation. There is also the need to change the mode of thinking and the way of perceiving the world. The systemic approach seems to be a reasonable answer to the aforementioned challenge, which is a specific scientific paradigm. Many researchers are of the opinion that it is a way of seeing the world, describing it, and noticing its systemic aspects.

Keywords: family, social life, system theory.

Introductory

Family is a group of related individuals. It is the closest to every individual and is considered to be the most primal societal group. „It is the cradle of life and love, where people are being born and raised; it is the basic unit of every community (Majkowski, 2010,

p. 25)". Aristotle claimed that family is „a natural community creating strong bonds allowing for everyday co-existence (Aristoteles, 2003, p. 125)". A. Comte considered a family to be the most basic and constant element of social life, because family life allows to address natural needs of every human, among which there are: sexual, somatic, and mental needs. „A family is connected with the society with vital and organic bonds, as it is the basis of every society and constantly empowers it thanks to its task of serving life: a family is the cradle of citizens, who are taught basic societal virtues by its members; therefore families are vital for the existence and development of society as such (Majkowski, 2010, p. 29)". It can be stated that a society is modulated by a family, as the same individuals are members of a family and of a particular society. Due to the said fact, a family is believed to be the key element of every society.

A family is a specific societal creation, being an organizational phenomenon, overshadowing any other organized and formalized structures in that regard (Kuryś, 2011). The current interest in family-oriented issues seems to be interdisciplinary in character. The importance of a family, its societal rank, as well as criteria of caretaking and upbringing are being touched upon by numerous fields of science dealing with the widely understood notion of a family (ibidem). Due to said fact, there are numerous definitions of family proposed in the literature of the subject. M. Tyszkowa (1990) focuses on the institutional character of said societal unit and defines it as a social institution having a specific societal and legal status, with processes taking place within it to be subject to registration and regulation by the applicable legal norms (ibidem, p. 37).

F. Adamski (2002) refers to a family as to a small institutionalized group that has certain features of an organization that specify the process of its creation, existence, cessation, and dissolution (ibidem). Most modern works of Polish authors also point to the necessity of changing the scientific discourse oriented towards defining a family with the one focused on changes and transformations occurring within it (Slany, 2006, p. 21).

Currently, the major point of interest of theoretical considerations and research analyses are alternative forms of family life. K. Slany notices that: „As a result of pluralization of family life, not the concept of a family but rather of families is brought up, with the tendency of opting for the notion of „post-familial" family". There is a departure from definitions showing a family as an institution in favor of those perceiving it as a societal group the members of which are bound with a certain agreement, not always a formal one, governed by marriage or blood ties. The center of attention is a couple, with the predominant focus being put on mutual relations, partnership, and the quality of bonds. Partnership should be mainly characterized by an intellectual union, similar goals and values, love, and sexual attractiveness (ibidem, p. 244).

Pedagogues still focus on a family in terms of an upbringing environment for a child, as well as an environment allowing for the development of all its members. B. Harwas–

Napierała (2003) points that „According to the currently dominant research approach, a family is treated predominantly as an environment fostering the development of all its members (both children and adults), with the correlation between the family and development being a mutual one". Entities making up a family develop thanks to it, for it is the unit allowing for basic activeness and makes it possible to try out certain societal roles. Entities in question affect their family, both with regard to its individual members and to the system.

1. Family seen through the prism of systemic approach

Modern examinations of a family are increasingly more interested in approaching it in a systemic manner. In such a scenario, a family is an organized whole that consists of a number of parts, while at the same time not being a simple sum thereof (Majkowski, 2010). The familial system incorporates a number of subsystems, among which there are: marital, parental, and sibling-oriented subsystems. They affect each other and a notable change occurring in even one of them may affect the other ones. When it comes to such a model of family perception, the analogy to a living organism is frequently being opted for. The followers of the aforementioned sociological concept highlight the significance of correlation between the relations between the individual elements of the system and functioning of the system as a whole. Various researchers have attempted to perceive familial subsystems to through the prism of their existence-related effect on a given family (ibidem).

The ontic focus of a person on a family is the manifest of his or her nature – not only societal, but also familial one. Even a person living alone is connected with a family, for he or she has been raised by one and is motivated to establish one as well. A family is the most functional environment facilitating achieving true happiness, as well as dealing with egoistic patterns of behavior and addictions. „Members of a family, while interacting with each other by showing positive emotions, create a proper environment allowing for the development of their personality. Without said positive emotions, their individual and societal development would be inhibited or even impossible, which can be proved by providing the example of emotionally broken families the children raised in which are frequently the representatives of social lows"(Poreba, 1981, p. 14).

Transformations in the modern world cover all walks of life and are, at one hand, the source of hope for a better future, and on the other hand – the source of anxiety connected with the possible destruction of the world and society as such. All events happening all over the world require flexibility for people to be able to adjust to them, as well as integration and assimilation. There is also the need to change the mode of thinking and the way of perceiving the world. The systemic approach seems to be a reasonable answer to the aforementioned challenge (Drożdżowicz, 1999, p. 9). The systemic model is a specific

scientific paradigm. Many researchers are of the opinion that it is a way of seeing the world, describing it, and noticing its systemic aspects.

A biologist and philosopher, Ludvik L. Von Bertalanffy, is considered to be the creator of the general system theory. Its major assumptions are as follows (Świętochowski, 2014, p. 22):

– system is a set of elements and dynamic relations between them that create a functioning whole;

– system is a whole, whereas objects and attributes being its parts can be perceived only from the perspective of the function they serve in said system;

– borders of the system specify its identity in time and space. One can distinguish open and closed systems.

The „system" word originates from Greek *systema* and means a „complex thing". The system definition assumes that it can be considered to be an ordered set of elements being a coherent whole. A distinctive feature of said whole is the fact that it is not just a sum of its parts (Simon, Stierlin, Wynne, 1985, p. 52). While describing the entire system, one has to remember that any change made to any of its element undoubtedly affects its other parts. Said state of affairs is connected with two principles of system functioning, namely - equipotentiality and equifinality. Equipotentiality means that causes having the same source may yield different results. The principle of equifinality in turn assumes that while starting with different sources, one may reach identical results. In combination, the principles show that there is no such thing as simple correlations between cause and effect.

The system theory is characterized by three major notions; comprehensiveness – the system is something more than just a simple sum of its parts; circularity – interactions between elements have the form of feedback and are not linear; and equifinality – various causes may yield an identical result (Kuryś, 2011).

The notion of a system is subjective in nature, because elements being parts of a particular system may also be included in a different one. The environment of a given system is considered to be a fragment of reality that is not a system per se, but may still affect and interact with it. Systems notably differ, especially in terms of openness level (Bertalanffy, 1984, p. 28). A closed system does not accept any external stimuli and has a tendency to become disorganized. Such systems operate within their own boundaries, which cannot be crossed by either energy or information. Open systems exchange their energy with the environment, as their boundaries are to at least some extent open. All living systems are claimed to be open systems. They always exist in a specific environment, which means that they co-exist with other systems. Together with all the other ones, they create an ordered system hierarchy. Elements making up a particular system affect each other and keep a dynamic balance. What is more, said elements, together with relations between them, are the structure of a given system. The aforementioned structure specifies system's functions

and limitations. To maintain its identity, the system has to keep a certain stability of its structure. However, both the changing environment and changes inside the system call for flexibility and accommodation. A properly behaving system maintains a satisfactory balance, which is dynamic in character. Small changes in the structure of the system result in changes in behavioral patterns of the system (Drożdżowicz, 1999, p. 12).

A good example of a system keeping a dynamic balance is a family. All patterns of behavior occurring during human interactions can be treated as feedback loops. The behavior of one party of a given interaction affects the other one, but is additionally modified by him or her. Furthermore, a family can be also perceived as a specific subsystem being a part of a greater whole (a society) while at the same time incorporating elements that may by themselves create highly complex systems (Slany, 2006).

The human world is ordered in a hierarchic manner. All biological and social systems are organized and operate on each and every of seven hierarchically ordered levels (Goldenberg, 1980, p. 34). Those are as follows: cells, organs, organisms, groups (families, communities), organizations, societies or nations, and international societies. The hierarchical ordering of systems means that every higher level of the system incorporates all the lower systems and becomes an environment for all of them (Drożdżowicz, 1999).

A general system theory serves the integration-oriented function in various fields of science. A tendency aiming at attempting to describe various phenomena and events with a single language to make them a coherent whole seems to be sensible, but it is exceptionally problematic. Despite that, individual fields of science have been looking for their own specific regularities by taking advantage of the systemic approach (ibidem). The system theory has become a basis for a number of concepts explaining processes occurring in marriage and family. Nevertheless, there have not been many attempts to integrate said concepts in a single, coherent model that would have a factual use in the case of empirical examinations to be found in the literature of the subject. One of a few attempts to do so is the circumplex model, namely – the Circumplex Model of Marital and Family System, created by David H. Olson et. al. In the discussed model, three central dimensions within the scope of which family functioning is characterized are distinguished (Radochoński, 2000, p. 173):

1) dimension of cohesion, defined as an emotional bond connecting individual members of a family and the level of autonomy they experience. While assessing the level of cohesion, the following aspects are taken into account: emotional bonds, independence, boundaries, coalitions, time, space, friends, decision-making processes, fields of interest, and free time.

2) dimension of adaptation, defined as the ability of a marital of familial system to change its power structure, role assignment, and basic principles in response to developmental and situational stress. In the said scenario, the following aspects are analyzed: power structure within a family, negotiation styles, role and principle assignment,

as well as negative and positive feedback loops. The assumption that such a system requires both change and stability is of vital importance here.

3) dimension of communication, understood as a dominating mode of communication distinguishable while observing relations between family members. This dimension helps examining the two initial ones thanks to a skillful sending of coherent and comprehensible messages by family members, information exchange, and empathy.

A family is a type of a primal group formed spontaneously, out of personal and informal causes. The structure of a family reflects family life in its various forms. The structure is then seen as a mode of arrangement and connection between elements making up a coherent whole (Lipiec, 1972, p. 113). The structure of small groups, a family is one of which „is perceived as a network of emotional bonds, a network of communication, an organization based on functional roles, a structure and environment of power, including group standards, aspirations, and willingness to stay together (Tyszka, Wachowiak, 1997, p. 44)”. „The societal structure of a family covers positions its members take in relation to each other. The most important aspects of familial structure are: principle of power dilution and the rule of work distribution. They result in setting role paradigms allowing husbands to take certain tasks, wives to perform some other ones, and partners together to be engaged in different ones entirely”(ibidem).

The structure of a family is specified by a number and type of ties between family members (number of children, number of other relatives), specificity of positions and societal roles serves, spatial arrangement, strength of institutional and mental bonds connecting individual family members and pointing to a greater or lesser closeness of the family, division of tasks to be performed, the inter-family structure of power and authorities that is strictly connected with societal positions, inter-family love distribution, and the network of inter-familial communication (ibidem, p. 46).

The institutional aspect of the family is also connected with its functions. They are taken advantage of to analyze a family in action and are strongly correlated with its structure, namely – with the division of roles and social positions, specificity, and configuration of interpersonal relations. Functions of a family can be treated as tools allowing to analyze its forms and actions. Individual functions of the family are one of the most important bases for specifying familial bonds, as well as relations with the societal environment. Experts have distinguished eleven types of familial bonds based on functions served by a family (ibidem, p. 55): economic, caretaking-related, blood, sexual, control-related, class, socialization and education-related, cultural, religious, social, as well as emotional and expressive ones. A strong connection between types of functions and types of bonds points to a remarkable correlation between familial structure and its functions, as well as between the group-based and institutional aspect of a family. The familial system can be also identified with its structure, as it is oriented towards mutual relations between the

individual members of the family, mutual structural and functional bonds, as well as mutual connections between the structure and function (ibidem).

A properly developed family is a group of reference for an individual, with whom he or she strongly identifies as a member and representative. Such a member co-creates it, accepts its views, follows its behavioral patterns, customs, and methods of dealing with certain issues. The frequency of mutual relations is dependent on personality traits of a person, patterns of behavior of other family members, material and cultural living conditions, as well as on external factors. Personality-specific and societal traits of an individual also affect a family, its lifestyle, and inter-familial relations (ibidem, p. 57).

The structure of a family is a network of mutual expectations specifying the way its individual members interact with each other. Recurring interactions solidify certain behavioral schemes, which in turn regulates the behavior of family representatives in the long run. Family members are perceived as elements of a group, within which the behavior of a given entity notably affects all its other members. Each family can therefore be considered to be a psycho-social system, which is also the context of both life and further development of consecutive generations. There are two major systems maintaining familial principles. One of them is the system of universal rules regarding the manner of family organization. The second one maintaining the constant nature of inter-familial principles is the system of rules the members of a given social unit should comply with. Thanks to them, it is possible to keep family's identity intact. The structure of the family must undergo certain changes, as new life-specific situations emerge that require adaptation. Inter-familial changes that do not threaten its identity are accepted and tolerated, whereas those that may become dangerous activate certain mechanisms aiming at the reversal of the previous order and regaining the overall balance (de Barbaro, 1947, p. 47).

The family-oriented system has its subsystems including all of its members, as well as individual groups created as a result of certain circumstances and functions to be served. Subsystems are being developed with regard to generations, sex, tasks, to be performed, and fields of interest. Each family member is included in several such subsystems at once. A given person may serve various roles and be engaged in various relations connected with specific subsystems. For a family to function properly, boundaries between subsystems have to be established. They should allow the members of particular subsystems to perform their tasks and serve their roles in a proper manner. Basic family-oriented subsystem are as follows (ibidem, p. 49-50):

–   Marital subsystem

Two people deciding to establish a family have to develop a model of mutual relations. They have to learn how to cooperate, divide certain tasks and functions among themselves, as well as tolerate their differences, allow for privacy, and do not hinder

independence. The marital subsystem may be the source of development and self-realization for the partners. It should be also capable of establishing certain boundaries that would allow it to be protected against the excessive interference of the environment.

– Parental subsystem

The structure of a family changes after the birth of the first child. Partners have to accept new responsibilities, especially – taking care of and upbringing their child. Parenthood becomes a challenging task, requiring parents to understand the needs of their young ones and to face the never-ending impact of the environment.

– Sibling subsystem

Sibling subsystem is the very first environment in which children can interact with their peers. They learn how to befriend others and to deal with those who are unfriendly to them. Children try to cooperate, as well as fight for leadership.

In a family, there may also be two specific subsystem types created in very unique situations to achieve certain goals. Those are alliances and coalitions. They are characterized by strong bonds between the individuals involved in them, who want to spend time with each other, cooperate with each other, as well as express support and loyalty towards each other. Alliances can be formed between family members connected with strong bonds, but their aim is not to act against other members. Coalitions connect people following similar worldviews who would like to support each other in conflicts with other family members. Coalitions and alliances may differ in terms of goals they are to serve and their duration (Świętochowski, 2014, p. 31).

2. Family life cycle, coherence, and flexibility of a family – basic assumptions of the system theory

In the case of systemic approach to families, all patterns of behavior and interactions between people may be considered as feedback loops. Nevertheless, knowledge on family functioning based on said phenomena does not sufficiently explain complex processes occurring within such societal units. While taking into account the development of research on family-oriented systems, two major periods can be distinguished. During the very first of them, the focus was put on aspects allowing to keep the system constant and stable, as well as to prevent changes. Jackson explained relations between stability and change by opting for the notion of homeostasis (Jackson, 1957). Some researches postulated for using the notion of structure. Homeostasis makes it possible for the system to keep its identity, causing it be protected against external pressure. One has to note, however, that both the system and its environment coexist, constantly adjusting to each other. The "adjustment" term seems to

be more useful while explaining the manner of system functioning. Changes in the familial system resulting in its transformation were the subject of examination during the next phase of research on the development of the system theory. One of the sources of such changes is the development of a family in time that is also referred to as the family life cycle. In its course, the family has to adjust to events that are typical for development, including: the birth of a child, maturing of individual family members, and their passing away. One may also point to events that are specific for a particular family, such as job loss or a harsh illness. They affect the entire societal unit, frequently completely reorganizing its life. In the case of the system theory, said events are considered as information that negatively affect the balance of the system and cause feedback loop-specific mechanisms to emerge. Then, the system may undergo a radical transformation or revert to its original state. It has to be remembered, however that morphogenetic capabilities of the familial system are limited. The structure of the familial system may be notably changed, but it cannot change its basic organization. A family can and should change its structure to adequately adjust itself to a specific phase of life. Nevertheless, there has to be balance between change phases (Drożdżowicz, 1999, p. 16).

The dynamics of family life is shaped by natural development processes that are also referred to as family life cycles. Therefore, it has to be claimed that a family is a system that changes in time, which has been the starting point for many scientific analyses and considerations. In the 50s, sociologists were predominantly interested in the notion of family development. System-based examinations on families were then connected with analyses on societal systems in animals. They allowed for identifying similarities and differences with regard to the development of various species that in turn opened the way for understanding typically human problems. It was claimed that a family as a system develops, which means that it changes while at the same time having the tendency for keeping balance. Said pursuit of homeostasis is utilized as a protective mechanism that makes it possible to keep family's own identity intact. Reaching every consecutive phase of the family life cycle can be achieved when all of the previous phases have been completed. In other cases, there may be disturbances that may cause individual family members to develop various illness-related symptoms.

According to M. Radochoński (1988), as a family progresses through the consecutive stages of its developmental cycle, the needs of its individual members change. As a result, it has to adjust functioning methods to the constantly changing conditions in order to fulfill the complex set of frequently conflicting needs. Each development phase is characterized by specific requirements and expectations of members towards the family (ibidem).

The development of a family should be considered in categories typical for systemic and biographical approaches. Each family has its own biography that is not simply a sum of biographies of its members, but rather the biography of a system they create. It also changes

throughout their life. The moment that initiates the history of a family frequently is a biographically relevant event being of vital importance for its members. Oftentimes, parenthood it one of such events (Kuryś, 2011).

The coherence of a family is defined as "an emotional bond connecting family members and the level of individual autonomy they experience (Radochoński, 1987, p. 48)". The coherence of a family is the main variable when it comes to familial life. „Specific indicators of the level of coherence in a family are, inter alia: emotional closeness of individual family members, quality of psychological boundaries between them, the existence of coalitions, amount of time spent together, mutual interests and forms of recreation, the number of mutual friends, and the extent to which one's decisions are consulted with other family members (Margasiński, 2009, p. 12)". Three levels of familial coherence have been identified: separateness, balanced coherence, and entanglement. The level of coherence is predominantly dictated by the quality of psychological boundaries. A boundary is the most basic research category when it comes to family perceived as a system. From the point of view of a single person, a border refers to the outcome of the process of his or her individualization, which is the process during which a person becomes aware of his or her own separate nature, as well as own comprehensiveness. The family system is therefore a specific form of organization, within which individuals set their own boundaries, creating individual subsystems. Said individuals also engage in certain interactions, relations, and collaborations, creating subsystems that are characterized by their own boundaries. They in turn are surrounded by macro systems as a response to which they create unique boundaries as well. Boundaries between subsystems are predominantly principles specifying who belongs to what system. A properly functioning family requires clear boundaries between systems to be set. They should allow for an efficient communication and information exchange while at the same time granting family members the opportunity of performing their roles in an efficacious manner (Kuryś, 2011). „Families differ in terms of flexibility and boundary-specific permeability. Boundaries that are too strong may make it difficult for family members to adjust to new situations. In families where boundaries are too lose, individuals from outside the system may interfere, whereas impermeable boundaries result in limited interactions with the outside world (Radochoński, 1988)". The basic unit when it comes to the analysis of the structure of a family-based group is the notion of a boundary that specifies the hierarchical order of subsystems making up a particular family. To quote after Minuchin „boundaries of a system or a subsystem are in fact principles specifying who is involved in it and to what extent. Families differ from one another when it comes to the flexibility and permeability of their boundaries (ibidem)". Boundaries are invisible borders that encapsulate the entire family, regulating the extent of its contacts with other systems. Their predominant goal is to protect independence and autonomy of individual subsystems.

Depending on types of borders, familial systems may socially function in various ways, assume various tasks, and deal in various ways with critical situations.

Closing remarks

In a family perceived as a system, there are constant changes thanks to which the system in question can develop. It results in the creation of a unique family-specific biography and every family has its unusual identity.

Nowadays, it becomes increasingly more sensible to perceive the development of a family in systemic terms. Each family has its biography which is not a simple biography of its members, but rather a biography of the system created by said members.

The system theory has become the basis for many concepts explaining the mode of family functioning. All the processes occurring within a family, relations between its members, communication, and relations with the outside world have been the subject of considerations of many authors seeing a family as a system. Nevertheless, there have not been many attempts to create a single systemic model, which calls for further examinations and developing new concepts touching upon the notion in question.

Bibliography:

Adamski, F. (2002). *Rodzina. Wymiar społeczno–kulturowy*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Arystoteles, (2003). Polityka, (w:) *Dzieła wszystkie*, t. I, L. Piotrowicz (tłum.), Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Bertalanffy, von L. (1984). *Ogólna teoria systemów*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Drożdżowicz, L. (1999). Ogólna teoria systemów, (w:) B. de Barbaro (red.), *Wprowadzenie do systemowego rozumienia rodziny*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Goldenberg, I., Goldenberg, H. (1980). *Family Therapy: an overview*, California: Brooks Cole.

Harwas–Napierała, B. (2003). *Rodzina, a rozwój człowieka dorosłego*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

Jackson, D.D. (1975). The question of family homeostasis, *Psychiatric Quarterly Supplement, 31,* 79-90.

Kuryś, K. (2011). *System rodzinny wobec zmian rozwojowych*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

Lipiec, J. (1972). *Podstawy ontologii społeczeństwa*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Majkowski, W. (2010). *Rodzina Polska w kontekście nowych uwarunkowań*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Księży Sercanów.

Margasiński, A. (2009). *Skale oceny Rodziny. Polska adaptacja FACES IV – Flexibility and Cohesion Evaluation Scales Davida H. Olsona*, Warszawa: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych Polskiego Towarzystwa Psychologicznego.

Poręba, P. (1981). *Psychologiczne uwarunkowania życia rodzinnego*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo PAX.

Radochoński, M. (1987). *Choroba, a rodzina. Adaptacja systemu rodzinnego do sytuacji stresowej wywołanej chorobą somatyczną*, Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej.

Radochoński, M. (1988). Strategiczna terapia rodzinna, *Problemy Rodziny*, 2, 35-41.

Radochoński, M. (2000). *Osobowość antyspołeczna*, Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.

Simon, F.B., Stierlin,H., Wynne, L.C. (1985). *The language of Family Therapy,* New York: Family Process Press.

Slany, K. (2006). *Alternatywne formy życia małżeńsko–rodzinnego w ponowoczesnym świecie*, Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy NOMOS.

Świętochowski, W. (2014). Rodzina w ujęciu systemowym, (w:) I. Janicka, H. Liberska (red.), *Psychologia rodziny*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Tyszka, Z., Wachowiak, A. (1997). *Podstawowe pojęcia i zagadnienia socjologii rodziny*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Akademii Rolniczej im. Augusta Cieszkowskiego.

Tyszkowa, M. (1990). Rodzina, doświadczenie i rozwój jednostki. Paradygmat teoretyczny badań, (w:) M. Tyszkowa (red.), *Rodzina, a rozwój jednostki: praca zbiorowa*, Poznań: Centralny Program Badań Podstawowych CPBP.