

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted you will find a target note listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

8200973

SHANER, JAMES MICHAEL

PARENTAL EMPATHY AND FAMILY-ROLE INTERACTIONS AS  
PORTRAYED ON COMMERCIAL TELEVISION

*The University of North Carolina at Greensboro*

PH.D. 1981

University  
Microfilms  
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark .

1. Glossy photographs or pages \_\_\_\_\_
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print \_\_\_\_\_
3. Photographs with dark background \_\_\_\_\_
4. Illustrations are poor copy \_\_\_\_\_
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy \_\_\_\_\_
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page \_\_\_\_\_
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages
8. Print exceeds margin requirements \_\_\_\_\_
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine \_\_\_\_\_
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print \_\_\_\_\_
11. Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered \_\_\_\_\_. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages
15. Other \_\_\_\_\_

University  
Microfilms  
International

PARENTAL EMPATHY AND FAMILY-ROLE INTERACTIONS AS  
PORTRAYED ON COMMERCIAL TELEVISION

by

James Michael Shaner

A Dissertation Submitted to  
the Faculty of the Graduate School at  
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro  
1981

Approved by

  
Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser Mildred Johnson

Committee Members Barbara Clawson  
Robert H. Wells  
Walter F. Smith

June 16, 1981  
Date of Acceptance by Committee

June 16, 1981  
Date of Final Oral Examination

SHANER, JAMES MICHAEL. Parental Empathy and Family-Role Interactions as Portrayed on Commercial Television. (1981) Directed by: Dr. Mildred Johnson. Pp. 155.

Research studies have found that prosocial behaviors can be learned from viewing select television programs. In a time when the family has been thought of as disintegrating and has few role models for parenting, television could be of prime importance as a source for models of effective parenting and family life in general. This study was a preliminary examination of the potential for television to positively influence parents and future parents.

The purpose of this study was to describe television families portrayed on selected programs within the three program formats of Situation Comedies, Action Dramas, and Soap Operas. Data for this study were obtained from nine television programs, with three programs in each program format. Each program was videotape recorded for two consecutive episodes.

Two instruments were used as a means of systematically identifying the family behaviors under study. The first instrument, Empathy Measure (Stover, Guerney, & O'Connell, 1971), was used to collect information on the levels of parental empathy by systematically analyzing verbal and nonverbal communications between parents and children.

The second instrument, Family Role Interaction and Intentions Measure (Borke, 1967), was used to collect information on family interactions. Data were collected on the Initiator of the

communication, the Role of the person communicating, and the role of the person receiving the communication (Recipient), the direction of the intention of the communication (Going Toward, Going Against, Going Away), and the intention of the communication from the standpoint of the person in the family role (secondary mode).

Data were analyzed by using frequencies, percentages, means, chi-square, and the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by rank. Each program was compared with the others within program formats and across the nine subject programs.

The majority of television families were nuclear, middle-class, and young white Americans. An average of four children per family was portrayed with the majority of the children as teen agers. Individualism was stressed over familism.

The average levels of parental empathy indicated a mid-range value. There were significant differences in parental empathy levels between program formats. Situation Comedies displayed higher levels of parental empathy than did Action Dramas and Soap Operas.

Portrayals of family roles beyond the nuclear family were minimal. The nuclear families portrayed were highly sex-stereotyped. The husband-wife relationship appeared frequently with husband in the instrumental role and wife in the expressive role. The children portrayed were precocious and did not behave according to developmental stages. The secondary modes Shows Concern and Organizes were parental roles, where Seeks Support, Seeks Attention, and Seeks Gratification were predominantly portrayed by children.

Some implications of the study were: (1) family television programs could be used to educate real families by providing examples of effective and ineffective communications; and (2) additional study is needed to investigate specifically if families are cognizant of the conflict and reinforcement potential of television's portrayal of family roles.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his sincere gratitude to the members of his doctoral committee: Dr. Mildred Johnson, Chairperson, Dr. Dwight Clark, Dr. Barbara Clawson, and Dr. Richard Weller. Their time, energy, knowledge, and support were most valuable throughout the conduct of the study.

Appreciation is also expressed to Mel Schumaker, Director of the McNutt Center for Instructional Media. Her assistance in providing equipment and support greatly facilitated the research effort.

Last, the author would like to thank Dr. B. K. Roscoe and Lt. James Morris, his friends, for their unwavering support, encouragement, and humor throughout the entire process of writing this dissertation.

DEDICATION

Katrina

Cappy

Muriel

Sid

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE . . . . .	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iii
DEDICATION . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of Purpose . . . . .	5
Justification for the Study . . . . .	6
Definitions . . . . .	7
Basic Assumptions . . . . .	10
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	12
Empathy . . . . .	13
Family-Role Interaction . . . . .	22
Family Communication . . . . .	28
Summary . . . . .	33
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	35
Design . . . . .	36
Materials . . . . .	39
Rater-Reliability Estimates . . . . .	45
Procedures . . . . .	51

	Page
CHAPTER	
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	54
Family Demographic Variables . . . . .	56
Parental Empathy . . . . .	58
Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	69
V. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	97
The Problem . . . . .	97
Limitations . . . . .	98
Design of the Study . . . . .	98
Major Findings . . . . .	99
Implications . . . . .	105
Further Research . . . . .	106
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	107
APPENDICES	
A. Family-Role Interactions and Intentions Measure . .	119
B. Empathy Measure . . . . .	122
C. Empathy Measure Coding Sheet . . . . .	124
D. Family-Role Interactions Coding Sheet . . . . .	126
E. Family Demographic Coding Sheet . . . . .	128
F. Communication Intentions Between Role and Recipient.	130

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Subject Programs by Program Format . . . . .	39
2. Family-Role Interaction Rater Reliability . . . . .	48
3. Empathy Measure Rater Reliability . . . . .	49
4. Frequency and Percentage of Empathy Observations by Program Format and Program in Minutes . . . . .	59
5. Mean Levels of Empathy Across Three Scales by Programs . . . . .	60
6. Mean Levels of Empathy by Program and Program Format . . . . .	63
7. Frequency and Percentage of Initiators and Non-Initiators of Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	70
8. Frequency and Percentage of Initiator and Non-Initiator of Family-Role Interaction by Sex . . . . .	71
9. Frequency and Percentage by Role of Initiator and Non-Initiator . . . . .	73
10. Frequency and Percentage of Roles as Portrayed in Selected Programs . . . . .	76
11. Frequency and Percentage of Roles by Programs . . . . .	77
12. Frequency and Percentage of Recipient as Portrayed in Selected Programs . . . . .	
13. Family-Role Interaction: Frequency and Percentage by Secondary Mode . . . . .	

TABLE

	Page
12. Frequency and Percentage of Recipient as Portrayed in Selected Programs . . . . .	83
13. Family-Role Interaction: Frequency and Percentage by Secondary Mode . . . . .	85
14. Frequency and Percentage of Nuclear Family Interactions Within Major Categories . . . . .	88
15. Family-Role Interaction: Frequency and Percentage of Secondary Modes by Programs . . . . .	90
16. Family-Role Interaction: Frequency and Percentage of Secondary Modes by Sex . . . . .	93
17. Frequency and Percentage of Wife's Use of Secondary Modes With Husband as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	131
18. Frequency and Percentage of Husband's Use of Secondary Modes With Wife as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	132
19. Frequency and Percentage of Son's and Daughter's Use of Secondary Modes With Father as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	133
20. Frequency and Percentage of Son's and Daughter's Use of Secondary Modes With Mother as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	134
21. Frequency and Percentage of Father's and Mother's Use of Secondary Modes With Son as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	135
22. Frequency and Percentage of Father's and Mother's Use of Secondary Modes With Daughter as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	136

## TABLE

23.	Frequency and Percentage of Brother's and Sister's Use of Secondary Modes With Brother as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	137
24.	Frequency and Percentage of Brother's and Sister's Use of Secondary Modes With Sister as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	138
25.	Frequency and Percentage of Son-in-Law's and Daughter-in-Law's Use of Secondary Modes With Mother-in-Law as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	139
26.	Frequency and Percentage of Son-in-Law's and Daughter-in-Law's Use of Secondary Modes With Father-in-Law as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	140
27.	Frequency and Percentage of Mother-in-Law's Use of Secondary Modes With Daughter-in-Law as Recipient in Family-Role Interaction . . . . .	141
28.	Frequency and Percentage of Mother-in-Law's and Father-in-Law's Use of Secondary Modes With Son-in-Law as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	142
29.	Frequency and Percentage of Brother-in-Law's and Sister-in-Law's Use of Secondary Modes With Brother-in-Law as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	143
30.	Frequency and Percentage of Brother-in-Law's and Sister-in-Law's Use of Secondary Modes With Sister-in-Law as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	144

## TABLE

31.	Frequency and Percentage of Grandson's and Granddauthter's Use of Secondary Modes With Grandmother as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	145
32.	Frequency and Percentage of Granddaughter's Use of Secondary Modes with Grandfather as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	146
33.	Frequency and Percentage of Grandmother's and Grandfather's Use of Secondary Modes With Granddaughter as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	147
34.	Frequency and Percentage of Grandmother's Use of Secondary Modes With Grandson as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	148
35.	Frequency and Percentage of Uncle's Use of Secondary Modes With Nephew as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	149
36.	Frequency and Percentage of Aunt's Use of Secondary Modes With Niece as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	149
37.	Frequency and Percentage of Father's and Mother's Use of Secondary Modes With All Children as Recipients in Family-Role Interaction . . . . .	150
38.	Frequency and Percentage of Stepbrother's Use of Secondary Modes With Stepsister as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	151
39.	Frequency and Percentage of Stepmother's Use of Secondary Modes With Stepdaughter as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	152

## TABLE

40.	Frequency and Percentage of Stepson's Use of Secondary Modes With Stepfather as Recipient in Family-Role Interaction . . . . .	152
41.	Frequency and Percentage of Stepmother's and Stepfather's Use of Secondary Modes With Stepson as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	153
42.	Frequency and Percentage of Stepbrother's and Stepsister's Use of Secondary Modes With Stepmother as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	154
43.	Frequency and Percentage of Stepson's and Stepdaughter's Use of Secondary Modes With Stepmother as Recipient in Family-Role Interactions . . . . .	155

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

Television has great potential as a model for parenting and prosocial behaviors within families due to the combination of its ease of accessibility, its pervasive use in the United States, and its power of socialization. Miller and Reeves (1976) suggested that television, due to its ease of access and wide use, is probably the most powerful source for mediated information.

Television, as a form of communication, is ubiquitous and often taken for granted. Since 1948, when NBC began regular network programming, television has increased in use and popularity, with set ownership now incorporating 99 percent of the population, with 40 percent of the population multiple set owners (Bower, 1973; Comstock, Chaffee, Katzman, McCombs, & Roberts, 1978; Liebert, Neale, & Davidson, 1973).

Early in television's inception, Coffin (1948) found that television was perceived as practically a member of the family. Goldsen (1977) also referred to television as an electronic machine that was a regular family member. These "regular family members" are turned on for an average of 6.5 hours a day with an audience of 95 million during peak viewing periods. Daily viewing patterns indicated that nine percent of the American population tuned in to morning programs, 30 percent viewed evening programs, and 45 percent viewed

television in the later evening (8:00 PM - 10:00 PM), with a decline to 17 percent of the population viewing at midnight (Comstock et al., 1978). Only sleep and work consume more time than television viewing in the average family's day (Robinson, 1981). As a result of the time families spend observing television, it seems safe to conclude that television has some behavioral impact on families and individuals (DeFleur, 1964; Gumpert & Cathcar, 1979; Singer, 1980).

Alistair Cooke, a well-known television producer, has been quoted as saying,

Television ranks next to mother and father--far ahead of school and church. Children watching television learn so much about the world that appeals immediately to their emotions, but I'm not sure it involves their intelligence, their judgment. (LeMasters, 1977, p. 154)

Concern about the effects of television date back to 1936 when a British social psychologist asked, "What difference will television make to our habits and mental attitudes?" (Pear, 1936, p. 17).

From 1936 to 1975, over 2500 articles have been generated in attempts to answer this question (Comstock et al., 1978).

The study of television's behavioral effects has been well documented in the form of studying the antisocial effects linked to viewing antisocial acts on television. This research peaked shortly after the publication of the report of the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior (1972).

The Surgeon General's study was clearly a turning point in the focus of television research (Comstock & Lindsey, 1975). This turning point was reflected in a decreased research interest in television's effects on antisocial behavior and on increased research

interest in television's effects on prosocial behavior. This movement reflected an acceptance that television was here to stay and attempted through research to understand better the social and psychological impact of television and on that basis to examine the need for improvement of its content.

This shift in research from antisocial to prosocial behavior possibly further indicated the researchers' beliefs that television influences behaviors other than aggression and violence and these behaviors could be positive and desirable. Related closely to the belief that television possibly influences positive and desirable behavior are the effects of television on role socialization. A search of the literature revealed limited research on how families are portrayed on television with regard to family-role structures and family-role interactions (Greenberg, 1980).

An investigation into the functions of television revealed that initially television was viewed solely as entertainment (Tannenbaum, 1980). Since its inception, its wide appeal has created a need to focus on television not only as another form of communication but more appropriately as a major force of socialization (Comstock et al., 1978; LeMasters, 1977; Liebert & Poulas, 1976; Postman, 1981). Television represents a part of the symbol-oriented world (Gerbner & Gross, 1976). It functions like other symbols of socialization by demonstrating to society, often through dramatic appeal, societal norms and values (Novak, 1979).

It is through the family that human beings pass and come into first contact with the symbols that give meaning and value to life

(Gordon, 1980). There are many communications contexts to be examined to understand symbols of socialization, but none so important or ubiquitous as the family (Bochner, 1976; Satir, 1972). Only through understanding of context or process can one understand communication (Bateson, 1972). The communications within families often form repetitive patterns of behavior (Bochner, 1976; Sorrels & Ford, 1969), with much behavior carefully defined as role behavior (Burr, 1971).

Empathy is a subset of behaviors within the larger context of family role. Carkhuff and Berensen (1967) traced the failings of our society to provide nurturance (empathy) to the increasing numbers of people seeking professional counseling services. The importance of empathy has been explored extensively in the counseling literature (Aspy, 1967; Carkhuff, 1967; Carkhuff & Truax, 1966; Rogers, Gendlin, Kiessler & Truax, 1967; Truax & Carkhuff, 1964, 1966). Foote and Cottrell (1955) suggested that empathetic behavior was conducive to the type of interpersonal relationship that leads to marital satisfaction. A review of the literature revealed limited research that related empathy to family variables and to parent and child relationships specifically.

Parents have too few role models to observe that are readily and fully available (Hill & Aldous, 1969; Mead, 1976; Weinraub, 1978). Margaret Mead (1943) observed that parents rear their children with "the sideways look," i.e., keeping a watching eye on other parents to get clues on how to raise their own children. This observation perhaps indicated the insecurity of parents in rearing children.

It appears that, given the large amount of time individuals and families spend viewing television, learning occurs. If one accepts this contention, then family members could be using television as an opportunity to view the interpersonal interactions of other families, interactions rarely seen in real life beyond childhood (Mead, 1976). It was essential then to examine this potential for learning about families, through the television portrayals of families. A preliminary step to assessing television's potential role socialization effects on families was to systematically identify the specific characteristics of the families being portrayed.

Foster (1964), in a pioneering content analysis of television's potential influence on social roles, examined the characteristics of an ideal father and the fathers portrayed on television. The study revealed a concern that as father role models declined due to "week-end" fathers and mother-only families, television fathers added to the problem of the lack of a father role model by presenting multiple images that diverged from the ideal father role. Foster (1964) concluded by suggesting more content analysis that focused on the way social roles were portrayed in family television series.

#### Statement of Purpose

Rue (1974) saw a "diagnostic glimmer" in television being used to spur discussions on values, love, marriage, and family life. To explore that "diagnostic glimmer" and the potential and possible current use of television as a model for family interactions, a content analysis of what television portrays as interacting families was proposed.

The purpose of this investigation was to describe families on television through the analysis of family role interactions and levels of parental empathy as portrayed in selected Situation Comedy, Action Drama, and Soap Opera programming formats. The specific objectives of this study were as follows:

1. To describe families as they appeared on television by determining the frequencies, directions, modes, and intentions of family-role interactions.
2. To analyze the levels of empathy as portrayed by parents toward children on television.
3. To determine the differences in family-role interactions and parental empathy among selected Situation Comedies, Action Dramas, and Soap Operas.
4. To collect demographic information on family structure of television families, specifically, size, pattern, approximate age of family members, and approximate socioeconomic status.

#### Justification for the Study

The present study was a preliminary attempt to determine the specific effects of television portrayals of families on existing families. It is restricted to the analysis of family-role interactions, family-role structures, and the specific behavior of parental empathy as a subset of the larger family-role interactions. The same social-learning theories used in television research to determine

television's influence on sex-role expectations (Atkin & Miller, 1975; Miller & Reeves, 1976), antisocial acts (Atkin, Murray, & Nayman, 1971; Bandura & Walters, 1963; Berkowitz, 1962; Liebert, Neale, & Davidson, 1973), and prosocial acts (Rubinstein, Liebert, Neale, & Poulas, 1974), also apply to learning family roles and the subset behavior, empathy. Family roles and specific role behaviors form the basis of the socialization process and can be viewed as a process engaged in, not just in childhood, but throughout our lives (Brim & Wheeler, 1966; Mead, 1976). The observation of television families could lead to direct imitation of these families or attitude changes resulting from the existence of differences between the television family and the family of procreation. It was believed that knowledge of the potential influence of television families on real families could be of practical significance to parents, educators, and those concerned about television content.

#### Definitions

The following terms were defined in accordance with their use in the present study:

Action Drama: The programming format incorporating episodic programs encompassing a human conflict, often violent acts, and the same characters over a period of time; generally not performed in front of a live audience.

All children: A family role coded when all children interact at once with another family member.

All family: A family role coded when all family members interact at once with another family member.

Antisocial behavior: Aggressive and violent behavior in situations deemed not to be appropriate (Comstock & Lindsey, 1975).

Channel: The medium in which a message is carried.

Child: A son, stepson, foster son, daughter, stepdaughter, or foster daughter of any age.

Communication: An exchange of information between two or more people.

Decoding: The use of sensory skills in the interpretation of groups of symbols structured to convey meaning.

Direction: The intentions of communications to approach another (Going Toward), to resist another (Going Against), or to retreat from another (Going Away).

Empathy level: The degree of empathy expressed on the empathy measure as developed by Stover and Guerney (1971).

Encoding: The expression of a group of symbols structured in a way meaningful to some other person.

Family: A group of individuals related by blood, marriage, or by law and considered to be bound by close ties.

Feedback: A receiver's reaction to the source's message that provides information to the source on the accuracy of the intended message.

Initiator: A person who introduces a new topic for discussion.

Interaction: A concept consisting of roles and communication in which a relationship between two or more people is formed and meaningful information is exchanged.

Major category: The three directions of communication intentions (Going Toward, Going Away, Going Against).

Message: The basic theme or significance of a transmitted communication.

Parental empathy: Behaviors displaying the Communication of Acceptance, Allowing Self-Direction, and the Involvement of parents, stepparents, or foster parents toward their children, stepchildren, or foster children.

Power: The control one family member has over other family members as measured by the frequency of Initiation.

Program: Any single televised broadcast.

Program format: The three broad categories of programs observed in this study (Situation Comedy, Action Drama, Soap Opera).

Prosocial behavior: Behavior that is situationally desirable when aggressive and violent behavior is not.

Receiver: The person to whom the communication is directed.

Recipient: The person or persons toward whom family-role interactions are directed.

Role: A sequence of patterned events performed by a person in an interaction situation (Sarbin, 1954).

Role interaction: The exchange of verbal cues between the occupants of family roles.

Secondary mode: The coded intentions of family-role interactions ranging in numerical value from one to twenty.

Situation Comedy: Episodic programs encompassing humorous treatments of human conflict with the same characters over a period of time, often performed in front of a live audience while being videotaped.

Soap Opera: Episodic programs encompassing a human conflict with the same characters over a period of time. Soap operas are similar in production format to situation comedies but are shown in the daytime hours, center around light to moderate drama, and continue the story line from episode to episode.

Source: The person or persons initiating a communication.

Subject program: The programs selected for analysis in the present study.

### Basic Assumptions

The following basic assumptions were made in relation to this study:

1. Theories of observational learning that have been formulated with children apply equally to individuals of all ages.
2. The analysis of television family-role interactions and parent-to-child empathy levels will yield useful and relevant information that may supply families with needed role models or may be used as an educational tool for families.

3. Family programs involve family members in a conflict resolution situation in which family interaction will yield opportunities for systematic observation of these interactions.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The impact of television on children has been the focus of much research as the use of television has continued to increase. Although a wide range of topics attempting to understand the potential effects of television on human behavior have been studied, little attention has been given to the content analysis of how television portrays families. Fundamental concepts that would aid in describing families as they appear on television programs include empathy, family-role interactions, and family communication . Therefore, as a basis for undertaking this study, these concepts were reviewed.

The review of literature that was relevant to the present study will be presented in three sections. In section one, the focus is on philosophical and theoretical accounts of empathy; in section two the focus will be on family-role interactions; and the third section focuses on communication theory. A summary of the importance of understanding family communication as it occurs in everyday and commonplace situations and the importance of viewing families in their own social, cultural, and historical environments concludes the chapter.

## Empathy

Gladding (1977) suggested that the lack of research in parent and child interactions in relation to empathy was due to the difficulty in defining empathy. The phenomenon of empathy is defined in several ways, as the literature review indicated, so it is important that in the present research context definitions be explored. The following topics are presented in this section: (1) the philosophical and theoretical development of empathy, (2) cognitive and affective orientations on empathy, (3) the measurement of empathy, and (4) the summary of empathy literature.

### Theory and Philosophy of Empathy

In Letter to His Father, Kafka (1966) poignantly captured the problem of the failure of others to provide empathy:

Dearest Father, You asked me recently why I maintain that I am afraid of you. I was a timid child. For all that, I am sure I was also obstinate, as children are, I am sure that Mother spoilt me too, but I cannot believe I was particularly difficult to manage; I cannot believe that a kindly word, a quiet taking by the hand, a friendly look, could not have got me to do anything that was wanted of me. Now you are, after all, at bottom a kindly and soft-hearted person . . . but not every child has the endurance and fearlessness to go on searching until it comes to the kindness that lies beneath the surface. (p. 339)

All of us hunger for empathy, perhaps in an attempt to not feel alone (Paul, 1970). Glasser (1965) believed that if a person did not have at least one other person that loved or at least minimally understood him, then that person was in psychic jeopardy.

Freud (cited in Strachey, 1957) was one of the first to investigate empathy. He saw it as a conscious process based on identification with other human beings. Thus, to Freud, empathy was firmly rooted in the ego and hence was instinctual in nature. Freud believed that by observances of "utterances and actions" one could infer by analogy the person's conscience and could then better understand other people's behavior (Strachey, 1957, p. 169). Psychoanalytic theory is concerned with the affective qualities of the empathetic process as they relate to the identification mechanism.

Diverging from the instinctual approach of Freud, McDougall (1920) described empathy as a primitive form of emotional contagion. McDougall preferred to call his theory on empathy a "primitive passive sympathy" and stated it as follows:

We must not say, as many authors have done, that sympathy is due to an instinct, but rather sympathy is founded upon a special adaptation of the receptive side of each of the principal instinctive dispositions, an adaptation that renders each instinct capable of being excited on the perception of the bodily expressions of the excitement of the same instinct in other persons. (1920, p. 98)

In contrast to this, Fenichel (1945) described empathy as involving two steps: (1) an imitation and identification with another person, and (2) an increase in the awareness of the other person's feelings. Ribot, in the Psychology of the Emotions (1897) referred to sympathy "as the foundation of all social existence" (p. 89). Ribot distinguished three forms of sympathy. The first was a primitive type that manifests itself through conditioned responses. The second stemmed from self-consciousness and was realized through reflection. The

third form of sympathy was an intellectual or cognitive sentiment much broader than the previous two. Ribot was among the first to question the dimensions of the behavior called empathy. This inquiry led to the expansion of the analysis of sympathy and climaxed in Scheler's research, Wesen und Formen der Sympathie (1923/1954).

Scheler's work was translated and published in 1954 by the Yale Press, and was entitled The Nature of Sympathy. Scheler's investigations led him to develop eight levels of sympathetic behavior. The first one was Einfühlung, which loosely translates to empathy. Tichener was credited with the first English translation of empathy (Stotland, Mathews, Sherman, Hansson, & Richardson, 1978). Scheler's first level of sympathetic behavior, Einfühlung, was originally a low-order form found in primitive reflexive processes. Since then, this lowest form has come to stand for all eight forms. The incorporation of all eight forms into a single concept was a loss to the study of empathy. In these eight forms, a distinction was made between sympathy and empathy. Sympathy occurred as a low-level concept and from the higher levels evolved a concept of empathy. The eighth and highest form of empathy refers to a mystical sympathy embodying the spirit in God.

Sullivan (1953) viewed empathy as being important in the socialization and development of children, and only through expressions of empathy toward children could children come to understand emotional expression. Sullivan concentrated, in part, on the assuagement of separation anxiety by the use of empathetic understanding. Sullivan

viewed the acceptance and rejection of children by significant other people as closely related to empathy. Sullivan (1953) believed that empathy was a form of emotional communication that could not be clearly understood. Unfortunately, Sullivan died in 1949, before his theory of empathy could be further classified.

#### Cognitive and Affective Orientation of Empathy

The cognitively oriented researchers view empathy as a form of social conditioning. Through the interactions in everyday life, children reach a stage of development in which non-egocentric considerations are expressed toward others (Borke, 1971; Iannotti & Meacham, 1974; Piaget, 1932).

Empathy, in the social sciences, is the intellectual understanding of another person's attitudes, emotions, intentions, or behavior (Dymond, 1950). Empathy is the accurate awareness of the behavioral aspects of another rather than a vicarious experience similar to another's experience. Klemmer and Smith (1975) defined empathy as being like sympathy, only in empathy one has more detachment and objectivity, but still has a concern for other people.

Stotland et al., (1978) defined empathy as "an observer reacting emotionally because he perceives that another is experiencing or about to experience an emotion" (p. 7). This definition of empathy accounts for any type of emotional response in the observer and breaks away from the cognitive view. It is crucial to understand that empathy is not a reproduction of another's experience (Scheler, 1923/1954). The relationship of the experiences between respondent

and observer can never be the same, but can only go in the same direction. Empathy viewed as a continuous variable can range hypothetically from a complete lack of understanding to a total understanding of the shared experience. Feshbach (1973) criticized the cognitive orientation toward empathy, because of the neglect of the affective dimensions involved.

Other approaches to empathy have been developed through the analysis of role behaviors in families. Mead's (1934) theory was the preeminent theory that focused on the role-taking ability of people. The greater the ability to take the role of others, the higher the levels of empathy (Burr, Hill, Nye, & Reiss, 1979). In the same area of research interest, others viewed empathy in terms of perceptual awareness and accuracy in the prediction of others' emotions and behaviors (Hatch, 1962; Kerr & Speroff, 1951; Rogers, 1951). Taguiri (1969) believed estimates of person's psychic adjustment could be made about that individual on the basis of how well they could predict behaviors in others. As before, the role-oriented approach neglects the affective component of empathy.

Smith (1966) defined empathy similarly, but with an added dimension of the similarity between people experiencing empathy. Smith viewed empathy as "the tendency of a perceiver to assume that another person's feelings, thoughts, and behavior are similar to his own" (1966, p. 83). Smith believed there were four fundamental processes of empathy:

- (1) Identification - when a person acts like another without encouragement.

- (2) Attraction - the greater the caring for another, the more we assume they are like us.
- (3) Generalization - when a person finds common characteristics with another, the tendency is to perceive having more common characteristics. We ascribe our traits to them and their traits to ourselves.
- (4) Familiarity - the longer we know someone, the more similarity to them we tend to assume. (1966, pp. 97-98)

Without the existence of these four processes in some amounts, empathy will not occur. Smith (1966) did not examine differences in abilities to empathize with others.

Kohlberg (1976) has pointed out from the role-taking stance that the affective component of role taking was referred to as empathy. The definition of role taking offered by Kohlberg includes taking the attitude of others and becoming aware of their emotions by putting oneself in their place. This concept of role taking is preferable to empathy because:

- (1) it emphasizes the cognitive as well as the affective side;
- (2) it involves an organized structural relationship between self and others;
- (3) it emphasizes that the process involves understanding and relating to all roles in the society;
- (4) it emphasizes that role taking goes on in all social interactions and communication situations, not merely in ones that arouse emotions of sympathy and empathy. (Kohlberg, 1976, p. 49)

Thus, Kohlberg combined the cognitive role-taking approach to empathy with the affective dimensions of empathy. This combining of cognitive and affective components that Kohlberg saw being the basis of empathy, allowed this approach to escape criticisms similar to those of Feshbach (1973).

Feshbach (1978) addressed the gulf that existed between the cognitive -oriented and affective-oriented researchers of empathy, and wrote that:

. . . superimposed upon this non-productive dichotomy between affective and cognitive approaches are the diverse phenomena to which the label empathy has been ascribed. For example . . . sympathy, kindness, compassion, projection, intuition, sentimentality, and emotionality. (p. 8)

The definition of empathy developed by Feshbach (1978) coincided with that of Stotland and Walsh (1963). This definition viewed empathy as being a parallel and affective process between subject and object (Feshbach, 1978), and requires assessment of the relationship between the two (Feshbach & Kuchenbecker, 1974). As part of an assessment of empathy that combined cognitive and affective elements, a three-component model of empathy was developed (Feshbach, 1975; Feshbach & Feshbach, 1972). Two of the three components were cognitive in nature and involved the ability to discriminate affective states in others and the ability to take the role of others; the last component was emotional capacity.

#### Measurement of Empathy

The problems of assessment of empathy are as numerous as the contrasting definitions. Empathy measurement has concentrated on adults and has focused predominantly on the cognitive concepts of empathy. Feshbach (1978) noted that there was a paucity of instruments that measured empathy as a multifaceted concept that combined the affective and cognitive elements of empathy.

Another approach to empathy is centered around the profession of counseling and therapy. These fields use observational methods to determine the amount of empathy displayed by a therapist in actual patient and therapist situations. The most widely used instrument is Truax's (1961) accurate empathy scale. This scale uses trained raters to code tape-recorded verbal interactions between patient and therapist. Truax's test was based on a unidimensional concept of empathy, and it was with this concept that critics have found most fault (Guerney, Stover, & DeMeritt, 1968; Zimmer & Anderson, 1968).

Stover, Guerney, and O'Connell (1971) developed an empathy measure to rate three major components of empathic behavior toward children. The three categories were (1) the communication of acceptance, (2) allowing self-direction, and (3) involvement with the child. This observational instrument evolved out of the efforts to assess the effectiveness in teaching filial therapy to parents. This measure utilized verbal and nonverbal dimensions. Although it had cognitive components within its scales, it was affective in design.

Other measures of empathy used self-report indexes (Zahn-Waxler, Radke-Yarrow, & King, 1979), instruments to measure physiological distress that accompanied psychological stress induced by movies showing others in physical pain (Lazarus, 1966), reaction times of subjects in alleviating electric shock to an experimental confederate (Geer & Jarmecky, 1973), and Q-sorts on other subjects by subjects (Mahoney, 1960). With the diversity of methods to measure empathy, the broad theoretical base and the paucity of replication studies, a thorough investigation of the concept of empathy is difficult.

### Summary on Empathy

Paul (1970) wrote that the parent and child relationship, and the family in general, were often without necessary empathy.

Murphy's (1947) definition of empathy as the "experiencing within ourselves what actually belongs to other perceived persons or objects" (p. 496), is particularly applicable to families. With high levels of parental empathy, a child could derive:

- (1) understanding of the other person from within;
- (2) a source of personal reassurance;
- (3) enjoyment from the satisfaction of being understood and accepted;
- (4) a correspondence of mood conveying total acceptance and security. (Katz, 1963, p. 7)

The importance of the study of empathy and the application of results to families are manifold. Studies have indicated that low empathy in the family is linked with social behavior problems (Chandler, 1973; Huckabay, 1971), while training in role-playing behavior and modeling of empathy have proven successful in enhancing empathy skills and reducing social behavior problems (Staub, 1971),

The review of literature related to empathy indicated ways in which empathy has developed as a concept, the methods of measurement, the current diversity in empathy research, and the importance of empathy within families. This was done by tracing empathy from its instinctual roots, through the cognitive approach, and finally through the combining of affective and cognitive approaches to the study of empathy.

### Family-Role Interaction

The following topics are presented in this section: (1) the history of family-communication research, (2) the family as a small group, (3) power in families, and (4) communication theory.

#### History of Family-Interaction Research

Historical accounts of the evolution of mankind provide a concept of people sharing personal space in an effort to gain protection from the physical environment. This banding together as families provides for the formative mechanism that is responsible for the protection and socialization of the young. Socialization occurs through interactions within families and, although interactions occur externally to the family, no other situation provides such dramatic input into the molding of personality and future family interactions.

Interaction is an important concept that consists of two components, role and communication (Howells, 1975), and evolves as a series of events and intentions. A relationship is formed, information and meaningful communication are formulated and passed between the persons in the relationship, the meanings are received and the relationship is altered. It is from this simple statement of family communication that the literature was reviewed.

Burgess (1926) published a paper in which the family as a "unity of interacting personalities" was discussed. Burgess was among the first to view the family as an interacting and dynamic system. After this paper, a paucity of information was published that viewed

families in this manner. In the early 1960's, a shift occurred in which families were viewed as integrated wholes or in which actual family interactions were observed. Hill and Hansen (1960) developed a framework consisting of five approaches that were used by researchers in their studies of the family. These five approaches were: (1) the institutional approach which focused on the origin of the family and its evolution as an organization through time; (2) the structural-functional approach that focused on the internal structure of the family, and also how the internal structure was related to the family's interactions with social institutions external to the family; (3) the interactional approach which developed around the concern of roles, role status, conflict, and decision making in families; (4) the situational approach which focused on the specific conditions in which each family existed daily, believing that family behavior could be better understood by examining environmental stimuli peculiar to each family; and (5) the developmental approach, with a major focus on stages of growth and change while families progressed through a life cycle.

These five approaches aided the family research field by organizing wide and diverging research into the five conceptual frameworks. Prior to Hill and Hansen's (1960) work, Jackson's work with families helped move family research toward viewing the entire family as a whole (Bochner, 1976). Jackson (1957) developed the concept of family homeostasis, and viewed families as a closed information system in which feedback was given to each member to correct behavior, to ensure conformity within the family, and to enable the family to maintain its equilibrium.

Bateson, Jackson, Haley, and Weakland (1956), in a study of childhood schizophrenia, encouraged other clinical workers to view families as an interacting unit, and if they manifested psychiatric problems, it was through the failure to adapt and regain equilibrium. This work is now a classic in family therapy and communication theory. In this work the theory of double binding was postulated. Double binding is an instance of faulty communication in which an individual will be disapproved of for performing a given act and equally disapproved of for not performing it.

A distinct difference has evolved between the sociologists, anthropologists, and the family therapists. Sociologists and anthropologists viewed their major purpose as the understanding of family groups (Hill, 1964; Parsons & Bales, 1955; Straus, 1968; Strodtbeck, 1951), while the latter saw their purposes as the development of therapeutic techniques to enhance the treatment of dysfunctional family units (Drechsler & Shapiro, 1961, 1963; Framo, 1965, 1972; Satir, 1967, 1972).

Although research interest in the family as a total unit was minimal before 1960, between 1965 and 1972, more than 10,000 studies of marriage and family relationships were published (Aldous & Dahl, 1974). Bochner (1976) pointed out that relatively little research has been conducted by communication researchers interested in communications within the family. This separate existence of large amounts of overlapping research has only recently been addressed by combining family studies and communication research (Powers & Hutchinson, 1979).

### Family as a Small Group

Within this area of research, key concepts are decision making, power, role, function, and structure. Turner (1970) conceptualized families as different from other small groups due to their permanence which is a result of patterns of interactions over the years.

Parsons and Bales (1955) have been influential in viewing the family as a small group. In their research, a theory of family socialization was developed in which role structures were divided in two qualities, instrumental and expressive. These two categories are sex-linked, with instrumental being the male role and expressive being the female role. Bales (1951) developed a systematic method of data gathering and analysis related to the theory of family interaction and family socialization (Parsons & Bales, 1955). Bales' instrument, Interaction Process Analysis (IPA), has been the most widely used instrument in the study of family interaction (Riskin & Faunce, 1972). Since its introduction many modifications have been made on the instrument and methods for data analysis (Caputo, 1963; Mishler & Waxler, 1968; O'Rourke, 1963; Schuham, 1967). At first Bales' theory was supported in small-group research (Slater, 1955), but was not supported when applied to family research (Burke, 1968; Framo, 1965; Raush, Barry, Hertel, & Swain, 1974). The IPA has been challenged on reliability and the multi-dimensionality of its categories (Waxler & Mishler, 1971; Winter & Ferreira, 1967).

The Simulated Family Activity (SIMFAM) technique developed by Straus (1966) reflected the influence of Bales in its development.

This technique is suited for families with small children, and focuses on verbal and nonverbal interaction generated by playing a game. In Strodtbeck's Revealed Differences Technique (1951), Bales' influence is seen again. In Strodtbeck's technique, family interactions are generated in the family being studied by discussing simulated problems that are typical problems for families. Also used frequently is the similar instrument, Inventory of Marital Conflicts (IMC) (Olson, 1969).

In each of the aforementioned observational techniques, members of the family engage in simulated family experiences that they would confront in actual life. These observational techniques provided a systematic method for also observing child-to-parent influences during simulated problem-solving conditions.

Bales and Strodtbeck (1951) tested decision-making hypotheses with small groups that simulated family activities in which group consensus was required. From this study, three phases of problem solving were identified: (1) orientation toward the problem in which identification of the problem was a major focus; (2) evaluation of the problem to determine the complexity; and (3) control which developed as intensified pressure to secure an agreement. Turner (1970), writing on the Bales and Strodtbeck study, noted that even though the study did not deal with families, the three phases probably occur in family decision making. Turner emphasized that control played a disproportionately large part in family decision-making interaction. It was viewed in the sense that family consensus would

occur most often in a family that had a highly developed sense of understanding of individual values. Families that have a high understanding of individual values should have high-quality communication, demonstrated by the amount of importance assigned to communications by the family (Turner, 1970).

Turner (1970) defined the control issue by using the term accommodation as follows:

More common (than consensus) is the kind of decision in which some members give assent to allow a decision to be reached and not because they are privately convinced that the decision in question is best. (p. 98).

Goffman (1959) addressed the consensus achieved in family interaction in decision making as follows:

Together the participants contribute to a single overall definition of the situation which involves not so much a real agreement as to what exists but rather a real agreement as to whose claims concerning what issues will be temporarily honored. Real agreement will also exist concerning the desirability of avoiding open conflict of definitions of the situation. (p. 10)

### Power

The early work on power was generally restricted to decision-making outcomes and plagued by conceptual and methodological problems (Bochner, 1976; Safilios-Rothschild, 1970; Turk, 1974). Both clinical and nonclinical researchers have researched power, and it is one of a few concepts compatible to both orientations.

Using observational techniques for data gathering, Murrell and Stachowiak (1965) investigated family decision making and confirmed part of Parsons and Bales' (1955) theory that stated family power is ascribed to the parents and not the children. Murrell and

Stachowiak (1967) reported that for effective family leadership, the parents must have the greater influence, should act in a mutually supportive manner, and cooperate with one parent alternating in different situations as the dominant leader.

Definitions of power appear to be arbitrary and range from highly technical to those of general usage. Farina (1960) counted the frequency of acts of participation as a sign of power. Murrell and Stachowiak (1967) defined power as each family member's number of received verbal units in relation to other members. Kenkel (1957) used the number of leadership acts, and Caputo (1963) defined power as the ratio of instrumental acts to the number of instrumental acts that were directive in nature. Others defined power as who wins an argument, participation rates, attention control, statement lengths, and an ability to modify other family members' behavior (Mishler & Waxler, 1968; Riskin & Faunce, 1970).

### Family Communication

This section focuses on the process of communication within the family. The importance of communication can be seen when one analyzes what communication is, and how it affects families in everyday life.

#### Communication Defined

A simple definition of communication is an exchange of meaningful information between two or more people. This definition allows for more technical definitions of communication based upon theories of communication. Bienvenu (1967) defined communication as:

the process of transmitting feelings, attitudes, facts, beliefs, and ideas between living beings . . . interpersonal communication may include all the means by which individuals influence and understand each other. (p. 3)

Lasswell (1948) proposed five questions that he believed were important in understanding communication: "(1) Who? (2) Says what? (3) In which channel? (4) To whom? and (5) With what effect?" (p. 37). In their efforts to develop a model for a nonhuman information system, Shannon and Weaver (1949) developed a linear model. Communications or the messages were sent along a single line from the sender to the receiver. Out of the development of cybernetics, an addition was added to that simple linear model. The addition of feedback to the system allowed for positive reinforcement for successful action and negative reinforcement for unsuccessful actions (Wiener, 1954). Thus, Wiener viewed communications as a circular concept with feedback being most important in human communications. Buchanan's (1961) definition of communication incorporated the concept of feedback. "Communication is a two-way reciprocal process of relating oneself to others . . . any action or actions by which meanings are shaped, implicitly or explicitly " (Buchanan, 1961, p. 14).

A discussion of the structural components alone leaves the understanding of communication without substance. A key to this understanding is given in the parts of the definition alluding to process. The communication theorist, David Berlo (1960), stated:

Communication theory reflects a process point of view . . . you cannot talk about the beginning or the end of communication or say that a particular idea came from one specific source, that communication occurs in only one way, and so on . . . . (pp. 24-28)

Berlo (1960) suggested that in the analysis of communication, basic elements and behaviors should be investigated. Included are elements of communication such as who, why, to whom, and behaviors such as the production of messages, what are the intentions, what is the style, and how do people react to the messages sent, and what are the channels used to get the message understood.

Haley (1963) wrote, "the ultimate descriptions of relationships will be in terms of patterns of communication in a theory of systems" (p. 4). The rules of behavior between people are established by the manner in which they respond to one another. Therefore, it is important to analyze not only what is said but how it is said.

Haley, similarly to Lasswell (1948) and Berlo (1960), analyzed communication at four basic levels: "(1) I, (2) am saying something, (3) to you, (4) in this situation" (Haley, 1963, p. 89). Haley believed the only way to avoid a relationship was to deny one of these four levels. Thayer (1968) believed that people cannot stop communicating or being communicated with, but communications can become dysfunctional. The intentions here are not to step into the clinical realm of dysfunctional communications and "abnormal families," but much of the work involved with families stems from the writings of family clinicians such as Haley (1960, 1963, 1971), Jackson (1957, 1967), Jackson and Satir (1961), and Satir (1967, 1972).

The essence of existence evolves around the vital process of social interaction.

Communication processes are crucial processes which both enable and determine the conditions, operations, and the

interrelationships of all living systems. The essence of being human is thus communicating-to and being communicated-with. (Thayer, 1968, p. 118)

Berlo's (1960) model for communication incorporated the emphasis on process and the structural components of communications. The model was as follows: (1) communication source, (2) encoder, (3) message, (4) channel, (5) decoder, (6) communication receiver, and (7) feedback. Each of these elements of communication will be analyzed briefly in the context of family interactions.

Source. Borke (1967) referred to the source of the communication as the initiator. All communications have a source and a reason for being communicated. The source of the initiator will influence to a large degree the patterns of the message and the feedback. Berlo (1960) believed that the source and the receiver must be similar systems, and that if they are not, communication cannot occur.

Encoder. The source has a purpose or intention in the communication, and the message is formed with these intentions as guidelines. The source brings to this message the collections of all their life experiences (Rogers, 1951), and these form the basis for encoding the message. Berlo (1960) defined the encoding "as any group of symbols that can be structured in a way that is meaningful to some person" (p. 5).

Message. The expressed form of a message is based upon the components of the source and encoder. The message can take many forms, but is based upon the source's experience. In human beings, communication takes two forms, verbal (digital) and nonverbal (analogic). Much of human communication is verbal, but meanings of messages are

conveyed by nonverbal behavior. Ruesch (1956) divided nonverbal communication into three categories:

- (1) Sign language, which includes words, numbers, and punctuation signs which have been replaced by a gesture. This can range from an obscene gesture to a complete and sophisticated language system.
- (2) Action language, incorporates all moves that do not intentionally communicate, e.g., walking, smoking, and drinking.
- (3) Object language, which is comprised of displays of material things.

Channel. This term is widely abused in communication literature. It refers directly and solely to a carrier of the message. For example, in face-to-face communications, the sound waves produced must travel through the air, and hence, the air is the channel. This point is not to be belabored since this study was primarily concerned with vis-a-vis communications.

Decoder. The receiver of the message like the source relies upon his or her personal perceptions developed from life experiences to make sense of the message. It is in this sequence of the communication process that similarities in systems between source and receiver are essential. The degree of personal perception clearly influences what is perceived from the message. What the person perceives is what was actually communicated regardless of the intentions of the source (Foley, 1974).

Receiver. For communication to occur, there must be a receiver, and that receiver must be similar to the source or communication will not occur. Haley's (1963) concept of communication concurred with this, and introduced the concept of incongruity between source and receiver.

Feedback. Receiver reaction is an important process that provides information for the source on how successful the message encoded the intention of the communication. Feedback that provides information reflecting degrees of accuracy influence all future communications (Haley, 1963).

#### Summary

To this point no mention was made of more than two people involved in communication. A family of two or more members has a highly complex communication system with which to cope. The perceptual ability of the receiver to decode the message, the ability of the receiver to provide specific and accurate feedback to the source, and the ability of the source to accurately encode the message intended is the crux to the study of family communication. Satir (1972) viewed communication as "the largest single factor determining what kinds of relationships he makes with others and what happens to him in the world about him" (p. 30).

In the study of family communication, researchers have examined clarity of communications, dominance, affect, and conflict (Jacob,

1975). Bochner (1976) believed that once this was all stripped away, the basic elements left were how families deal with autonomy and interdependence. Kantor and Lehr (1975) viewed this problem as distance regulation, and the predominant activity to regulate this information was communication. Kantor and Lehr (1975) wrote that "we shall understand families when we understand how they conduct themselves and interact in the familiar every-day surrounding of their own household" (p. ix).

To study families in their own familiar habitat, Henry (1971) pursued naturalistic observations of five families by either participating as a family member from dawn to bedtime, or by participating as a full-time family member. Henry, like Kantor and Lehr (1975), concluded that space or the balancing of autonomy and interdependence was the essential component within families, and that this shifting balance was maintained only through communication. Henry (1971) suggested that families should be viewed not only for style of communication, but also for thematic or content variables, that a focus should be given to what families say about daily issues such as love, death, aspiration, hope, and illusion. Henry (1971) suggested further that to study families is useless unless one knows:

What the underlying values of culture and family are, whether parents and children love one another and the quality of that love, what the feeling is about death and what a person aspires and hopes for, for his self and his children. We must also know what the attitude toward children is--whether they are valued and whether it is expected of them to identify with--resemble their parents. (p. 342)

## CHAPTER III

## METHODOLOGY

In view of the limited research on the portrayals of families on television, and television's potential to influence role socialization, an investigation of specific behaviors of families on television was undertaken. Family-role interactions and parental empathy toward children were deemed essential components in describing family behavior as portrayed on television. The purpose of this investigation was to analyze the family-role interactions and levels of parental empathy toward children as portrayed by television families.

The specific objectives were as follows:

1. To describe families as they appear on television by determining the frequencies, directions, modes, and intentions of family-role interactions.
2. To analyze the levels of empathy as portrayed by parents toward children on television.
3. To determine the differences in family-role interactions and parental empathy between selected Situation Comedies, Action Dramas, and Soap Operas.
4. To collect demographic information on family structure of television families, such as size, pattern, approximate age of family members, and approximate socioeconomic status.

This chapter is divided into four major sections consisting of:  
(1) design, (2) subjects, (3) materials, and (4) procedures.

### Design

This study was descriptive in nature and had as its central concern the describing of family-role interactions and parental empathy toward children on television in the three program formats. Since this was descriptive research, no attempt was made to control or manipulate a variable as in experimental research (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1972).

### Subject Programs

In keeping with the purposes of descriptive research, the following plan was developed to systematically collect the essential information. Three programs were selected within each of the programming formats of Situation Comedies, Action Dramas, and Soap Operas. To provide continuity within the programming formats, two consecutive episodes of each program were analyzed. This yielded 16 hours of videotaped programs spread across each of the three program formats and also across the three major networks.

Programs were selected within each program format according to their rating by the A. C. Nielsen Company (1981). Only programs in the top ten within each program format were included in this study. This insured that the programs being analyzed attracted large audiences.

To analyze television program content that portrays interacting families, three criteria for subject program selection were established and applied. All programs were classified according to the three program formats, Situation Comedy, Action Drama, and Soap Opera. All programs portrayed a family that met the definition of a family developed for this study. The last criterion established and applied was to determine the relative rating of each program, meeting the above criteria, in relation to other programs within each of the three program formats.

#### Classification

The classification of television programs has long been a problem in the study of television content (Baggaley & Duck, 1978; Cantor, 1980). The selection of the three program formats of Situation Comedies, Action Dramas, and Soap Operas developed from the classification problem and the concern to analyze program content that attracted a large viewing audience consisting largely of adult viewers (Bower, 1973).

Each program was classified by using the program descriptions available in the current TV Guide (1981) and by viewing those programs that could not be classified by reading about them in the TV Guide. Each program was then viewed for three consecutive programs to determine if a family was consistently involved in the program, and if that family met the definition of family developed for purposes of this study.

### Family

The selection of programs on the basis of their portrayals of families was carried out by viewing the programs classified in the three program formats. This eliminated the viewing of classified programs that did not consistently portray families, children's programming, news coverage, documentaries, special programs, variety programs, game shows, sports programs, and public television programming. Only those programs regularly portraying families were selected as potential subject programs.

### Ratings

To select popular programs that had high viewer selection, the program ratings by the A. C. Nielsen Company (1981) were used. The A. C. Nielsen Company developed individual program ratings that were statistical projections based on a nationally representative sample of 1160 participating homes (Cantor, 1980). Attached to each of the 1160 televisions was an audimeter that recorded the time and the channel being watched. This record of viewing was recorded on a film which was changed every two weeks by the participating set owner. From this film record, sample ratings of television programs were compiled. The Nielsen ratings from the week of March 20, 1981, were used in this study to select programs with large audiences. Three programs were selected from the top ten by rank order within each of the three program categories.

The use of ratings as selection criteria was arbitrary due to the rapid fluctuations of program popularity within program formats.

Due to the similarity of program content within program formats, ratings were useful in subject program selection (Nielsen, 1981).

### Program Selection

Nine programs met the three criteria of classification, family, and ratings. Table 1 presents the subject programs in their respective program formats.

Table 1  
Subject Programs by Program Format

Situation Comedies	Action Dramas	Soap Operas
Happy Days	Dallas	All My Children
Eight is Enough	The Waltons	The Young and the Restless
I'm a Big Girl Now	Little House on Prairie	One Life to Live

### Materials

The section on materials is subdivided into three topics. The first two topics incorporate a discussion of the instruments selected for analyzing family-role interactions and parental empathy. The third topic is a brief description of the video equipment used to videotape each of the subject programs.

### Family-Role Interaction Measure

The instrument used to measure family-role interaction was developed by Borke (1967) (see Appendix A), as a systematic method to observe family interactions. This observational method was developed using the tape-recorded observations of normal families in contrived decision-making situations. To analyze family interactions, the classification system used was developed by Borke (1967), and was based on four premises: (1) the unit of communication was defined as any verbalization that the observer judged as an attempt to communicate with another family member; (2) each verbalization was analyzed from the perspective of the role occupied by the family member, and focused on the intent of that communication; (3) to view each verbalization in total context, all verbalizations were viewed in relation to the intentions of the preceding or following verbalizations; and (4) Initiators of communications were those role occupants that introduced a new topic for whatever reason. To further break down the analysis into a manageable system, Borke (1967) utilized Horney's (1945) classification of interpersonal behavior. This placed all family interaction into the three broad categories of Going Toward, Going Against, and Going Away from others.

Communication intentions were developed within each of three major interpersonal behavior categories. These communication intentions, the eight primary and the 20 secondary modes within the three major categories (Horney, 1945), were developed by using verb and adverb combinations to classify verbalizations. This classification system grouped the verbalizations into nominal categories.

The wedding of the three major categories of behavior with the primary and secondary modes of behavior yielded an observation instrument that analyzed communication intents at three levels. Spread across the three major categories were eight primary modes and 20 secondary modes.

Section one of the instrument contained the category of Going Toward others. The behavior in this category had the intention of establishing or maintaining relationships by approaching others and involving oneself in the interactions. Behavior in this category was classified as contributing, supporting, showing concern, petitioning, directing, or accepting from other(s).

Section two contained the category of Going Against others. The intentions of behavior classified in this section were to oppose others. This opposition to others was either through resisting behavior or attacking behavior.

Section three of the instrument contained the category of Going Away from others. This category classified behavior that displayed the primary intention of removing oneself from the communication situation by physical or psychological withdrawal or methods of evasion.

The reliability estimates for this instrument were determined across all three components of the classification scheme. The three major classifications of interpersonal behavior yielded  $r = .89$ , the eight primary modes were  $r = .66$ , and the secondary intent modes yielded  $r = .63$  (Borke, 1967). Other investigations utilizing an observation system to collect complex information and to make

judgments report comparable findings in the  $r = .60$  and  $r = .70$  range (Borke, 1967). No information was provided on the ability of this instrument to predict future behavior.

### Interaction Analysis

The analysis of the interactions was performed in two stages. The purpose of the first was to identify and number each communication, and to determine who initiated and to whom the communication was directed. The purpose of the second stage was to analyze the meaning or intention of each communication. Assuming the role of the person who was communicating, the investigator determined what was the intent of the person communicating. The intention of the communication was then coded for the direction as Going Toward, Going Against, or Going Away. The primary and secondary modes were then selected by determining which category reflected best the intentions of the person communicating.

### Empathy Measure

The instrument to measure empathy developed by Stover, Guerney, and O'Connell (1971) evolved out of the need to accurately assess empathy in Rogerian play therapy. (See Appendix B.) The instrument divides empathy into three separate variables with five-point scales to measure each variable at the ordinal level.

The first variable, Communication of Acceptance, evolved directly from Roger's (1957) work, which developed the idea that acceptance and rejection of children by adults were the basic components in the

expression of empathic behavior. This dimension was not believed to occur in large amounts, but was a major component for developing an understanding of others (Stover & Guerney, 1967; Truax, 1961).

The second variable, Allowing Self-Direction, measured the adult's willingness to follow the child's lead rather than attempt to control the child's behavior. Stover, Guerney, and O'Connell (1971) suggested that this scale had great utility when used for developmental studies and natural adult-child communication.

The third variable, Involvement, could have been positive or negative, but focused on the adult's commitment to the child when the adult and child were in a situation requiring interaction. Involvement of the wrong kind could have been restrictive. This variable, as others were, was situationally defined.

The empathy measure had high reliability for each of the three scales as reported by Stover, Guerney, and O'Connell (1971): inter-rater reliability across six pairs of coders yielded an  $r = .84$  for Communication of Acceptance,  $r = .79$  for Allowing Self-Direction, and  $r = .88$  for Parental Involvement. The coefficients on all three scales were significant ( $p > .05$ ). Correlations between scales showed a moderate relationship with Communication of Acceptance significantly correlated with Allowing Self-Direction ( $r = .33$ ,  $p > .02$ ), and Involvement ( $r = .48$ ,  $p > .001$ ). This indicated that the individual scales could be used separately or combined to yield an overall empathy measure.

Evidence for concurrent and construct validity was given in the same study by Stover, Guerney, and O'Connell (1971). Concurrent

validity was determined by examining the relationship of the present measure to an empathy measure formerly developed (Guerney, Stover, & DeMeritt, 1968). The two measures correlated ( $r = .85$ ,  $p > .005$ ). Evidence for construct validity was given by examining pre-post changes in parent behavior after a training period to be more accepting, to allow more self-direction, and to display greater involvement with their children. The pre-post changes for all three scales were significant ( $p > .025$ ). The significant changes reported indicated that the three scales are sensitive measures of empathetic behavior.

### Scoring

For each one-minute interval in which a parent and a child were present, a score was assigned on all three scales of the empathy measure. This measure was originally based upon intervals of three-minutes' duration. The change to one-minute intervals was based on attempts to control for the rapidity of change in television programming. This shift to shorter intervals allowed the analysis of more intervals and helped to account for the rapid shifts in characters' emotions and rapid shifts in scenes. The coder recorded the rating on a score sheet (see Appendix C). Scoring occurred after viewing each of the one-minute segments. The lowest score for the interval was recorded, except for Communication of Acceptance in which the highest and lowest scores were assigned for each one-minute interval. The scores for Communication of Acceptance were averaged to yield a subtotal score that was then added to the averaged subtotal scores from the remaining two scales, Allowing Self-Direction and

Involvement. The empathy score was obtained by totaling all three subtotals from the scales. This provided an empathy measure ranging from one to five, matching the three scales' ranges. The lower the averaged number, the higher the level of empathy portrayed.

Each of the three variables was measured with a five-point scale, ranging from highest to lowest levels of empathy. Across all three scales, the highest score for empathy would be achieved when the adult was fully cognizant of the child's behavior, accepted openly the child's expression of feeling, and expressed approval to the child, so that the child was encouraged and supported in making decisions. The lowest scores for empathy across all three scales would be achieved when the adult was isolated from the child, verbally rejected the child, and was highly directive in the child's behavior.

#### Equipment

To videotape the subject programs for ease of coding, a JVC KV360 videotape recorder, coupled with a Concord VTR monitor was used. This system was capable of black-and-white video recording only.

#### Rater-Reliability Estimates

All rater-reliability estimates were calculated through the use of Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient ( $r$ ). In each section where reliability estimates are given, the amount of rater agreement will be reported by  $r$ .

### Training of Raters

Two raters were trained to conduct observations using the Family Role Interaction Instrument (Borke, 1967), and the empathy measure developed by Stover, Guerney, and O'Connell (1971). The raters were doctoral students, one in family studies and the other in counselor education; both were certified counselors; and both were heavy viewers of television. Their role was to establish rater-reliability with the investigator; however, the latter did the major portion of the coding of the role interactions, empathy, and structural variables.

Training procedures consisted of a discussion of the observation instruments and the family-structural variables coding schedule. The scoring criteria for each item of behavior denoted within the instruments were analyzed, followed by the coding of two one-hour sessions and one thirty-minute session of videotaped programs.

The three videotaped training programs were selected using the same criteria as the subject programs. Each training program was classified into a program format of Situation Comedy, Action Drama, or Soap Opera, and had a family as its central focus. One training program per format was selected. On the third criterion, ratings, those programs that were next on the rank-by-order popularity list (Nielsen, 1981), after the subject programs, were selected for training purposes. Selection of nonsubject programs for training, while meeting two of the three program selection criteria, allowed training on highly similar programming without the potential for contamination of the actual subject programs.

Interrater Reliability:  
Family-Role Interaction

Interrater reliabilities for the family-role interaction instrument were checked on the structural components (e.g., Initiator, Role, Recipient), major category (e.g., Going Toward, Going Against, Going Away), and the primary and secondary modes. In the pilot testing of the instrument, 795 interactions were scored and averaged interrater agreements of  $r = .95$  were achieved for Initiator,  $r = .93$  for Role, and  $r = .89$  for Recipient. Interrater agreements for the major category yielded  $r = .86$ , for primary mode  $r = .85$ , and for secondary mode  $r = .81$  (see Table 2). Disagreements among raters were evenly distributed across the structural components, major category, primary and secondary modes, and across all three of the training programs, regardless of program format.

Empathy Measure: Rater Reliability

All sequences of one-minute duration in which a parent and child were present were coded for empathy level on all three dimensions of the empathy measure, with 51 separate intervals coded across the videotaped training programs. Interrater reliabilities for the empathy measure were  $r = .81$  for Communication of Acceptance,  $r = .80$  for Allowing Self-Direction, and  $r = .82$  for Involvement (see Table 3). Disagreements among raters were evenly distributed across all three scales, within the empathy measure, and across all three of the programs regardless of program format.

Table 2  
Family-Role Interaction Rater Reliability

Rater	Situation Comedy						Action Drama						Soap Opera					
	I	RA	R	M/C	P/M	S/M	I	RA	R	M/C	P/M	S/M	I	RA	R	M/C	P/M	S/M
1 and 2	.97	.98	.99	.83	.93	.91	.95	.91	.90	.83	.86	.83	.97	.45	.95	.91	.89	.86
1 and 3	.94	.92	.85	.87	.13	.14	.98	.89	.81	.86	.88	.80	.96	.98	.96	.86	.80	.81
2 and 3	.94	.95	.81	.82	.91	.89	.90	.88	.86	.91	.83	.85	.94	.93	.82	.80	.81	.74
	.95	.95	.91	.84	.86	.79	.93	.89	.86	.87	.86	.84	.96	.96	.91	.86	.84	.80

Initiator = .95  
 Role = .93  
 Recipient = .89  
 Major Category = .86  
 Primary Mode = .85  
 Secondary Mode = .81

Table 3

Empathy Measure Rater Reliability

Raters	Communication of Acceptance			Allowing Self-Direction			Involvement		
	S/C	A/D	S/O	S/C	A/D	S/O	S/C	A/D	S/O
1 and 2	.91	.83	.86	.86	.79	.79	.79	.78	.89
1 and 3	.86	.86	.73	.73	.86	.84	.76	.79	.80
2 and 3	.72	.74	.81	.81	.78	.72	.83	.84	.88
	.83	.81	.77	.80	.81	.78	.79	.80	.86

Communication of Acceptance = .81  
 Allowing Self-Direction = .80  
 Involvement = .82

$\bar{x} = .81$

### Interrater Reliability: Family-Structural Variables

For the scoring of family-structure variables, averaged rater agreements across the three categories of name and role of family member, family member age, and socioeconomic status of the family were relatively high,  $r = .95$ . In the three videotaped training programs, along with the three families serving as major characters, five other families were presented and coded on the family-structure variables. Interrater reliability for name and role of family member was  $r = .98$ , for age of family member  $r = .88$ , and for socioeconomic status  $r = 1.00$ . No patterns of disagreement developed among raters across the three categories of the three program formats.

### Intrarater Reliability

As a further check for reliability, one month after the initial coding, three original programs, one from each program format, were selected, coded, and compared with the original coding of four weeks previous. The results of this intrareliability check were comparable to the original coding. For the family-role interaction measure,  $r = .97$  was achieved for Initiator,  $r = .92$  for Role, Recipient of communication yielded  $r = .86$ , major category was  $.86$ , primary mode was  $.87$ , and the secondary mode yielded a correlation of  $.80$ . No pattern of discrepancy was detected, with errors spread across all categories of the instrument and across all program formats.

Reliability estimates for the empathy measure yielded results similar to the previous estimate on the training programs. On the first scale, Communication of Acceptance,  $r = .83$  was achieved,

Allowing Self-Direction was  $r = .82$ , whereas Involvement yielded a correlation of  $.86$ . As on the other instrument, no pattern of errors was detected either within the instrument or across the program formats.

Family structure variables interrater agreement remained virtually unchanged. The interrater agreement on the category of age of family member was  $r = .92$ , name and role of family member was  $r = .98$ , and socioeconomic status of the family was  $r = 1.0$ .

### Procedures

#### Family-Role Interaction

The analysis of family-role interactions was performed in two steps. The first step was the identification and numbering of the communications with the number comprised of a sequential communication and tape footage number combined (i.e., 52/406). At the end of a single communication unit, the tape was stopped while coding ensued. During the first step of coding, only structural components of the communication were coded. This entailed coding who initiated the communication and to whom it was directed (see Appendix D).

The second step in coding family-role interactions concentrated on the meanings attributed to the communications unit. Each communication was viewed from the perspective of the role occupied by the family member. At the end of each single communication, the tape was stopped and the meaning was coded for its major category as Going Toward, Going Against, Going Away, primary mode, and secondary mode in accordance with the family-role interaction measure.

### Empathy Measure

The measure of empathy between parents and children was performed in three steps. The first step entailed a review of all subject programs. The purpose of this review was to identify and label each situation in which a parent and child were presented in a situation in which interaction could freely occur. These segments were numbered by sequence of interval and tape footage.

The second step consisted of timing each segment to establish one-minute intervals. Audio-dubbing was used to record on the tape a high-pitched tone to indicate the beginning of the one-minute interval, while a low-pitched tone indicated the end of the one-minute interval.

With the rapid fluctuations in behavior on television, when coding the lowest level of empathy seen in three-minute intervals, the number of observations were few and the rating skewed toward low levels of empathy. To compensate for this, one-minute intervals were selected for this study, diverging from the three-minute interval used to develop the instrument.

The third step was the actual coding of the behavior observed within each one-minute interval, demarcated by the high- and low-pitched tones. Each one-minute interval was viewed in its entirety, and then the coder assigned a rating in accordance with each of the scales of the empathy measure. The coder assigned both a highest and lowest score for the Communication of Acceptance, while assigning the lowest score observed for Allowing Self-Direction and Involvement.

### Family Demographic Variables

The gathering of demographic information as a last step was essential to become familiar with the subject programs. Each subject program was reviewed in its entirety, and the coding sheets for the family demographic variables were used (see Appendix E). For each family viewed, whether they were regularly on the program or not, a coding sheet was completed. The roles of the television family members were recorded, and an approximation of the role-occupant's age was estimated and recorded. By observation of the surroundings and possessions, the socioeconomic status was estimated and recorded. This estimate was a gross attempt to determine a family's place in the lower , middle or upper-socioeconomic level.

### Analysis of Data

The collected data were entered on a computer disk and subjected to statistical computations. Results were examined using descriptive statistics (means, frequencies, percentages), chi-square analysis, and the Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance by ranks procedure, and a corresponding nonparametric multiple comparison technique developed by Dunn (1964). Nonparametric statistics were employed, because the measures used to collect the empathy interactions and family-role interactions were ordinal and nominal level measures.

CHAPTER IV  
ANALYSIS OF DATA

The major objectives of this study were as follows:

1. To describe families as they appear on television by determining the frequencies, directions, modes, and intentions of family-role interactions.
2. To analyze the levels of empathy as portrayed by parents toward children on television.
3. To determine the differences in family-role interactions and parental empathy between selected Situation Comedies, Action Dramas, and Soap Operas.
4. To collect demographic information on family structure of television families, such as size, pattern, approximate age of family members, and approximate socioeconomic status.

Two instruments were used to systematically gather the information. The measure used for family-role interactions was designed to collect information on the initiator of the communication, the role of the person communicating, the role of the person receiving the communication, the direction of the intention of the communication (Going Toward, Going Against, Going Away), and the intention of the communication from the standpoint of the person in the family role. The other measure used to collect information on the levels of parental empathy was designed to analyze interactions, both verbal and nonverbal, between parents and their children.

To more completely fulfill the objective of describing families as they were portrayed on television, it was essential to address the styles of family communications. Incorporated into the content analytical discussion was a discussion with the emphasis placed on the suggestion of Bales (1951) that "all communication should be viewed in the context of ongoing interaction processes" (p. 114). An essential part of understanding the communications within families was to have knowledge of the content, on one hand, while on the other, to focus on a family's style of communication.

An attempt was made to address these two concepts and place the contextual family variables observed on television back into a construct that completed the whole and made conceptual sense. Some researchers believed that there were some styles of family communication that were so pervasive throughout most families that knowledge of content was not essential (Goldstein, Judd, Rodnick, Alkire, & Gould, 1968; Goldstein, Gould, Alkire, Rodnick, & Judd, 1970; Lennard & Bernstein, 1969). In the analysis and discussion of families as portrayed on television, a part was based upon the content data collected, and this served as a point of departure for the second part, an impressionistic analysis in which the discussion incorporated the two to provide insight into the styles of family communications. Although program formats were of primary concern, in certain instances, elaboration on specific programs has been included to describe more clearly families as portrayed on television.

The data for this study were obtained from the coded communications of three television program formats (Situation Comedies ( $n_1 = 3$ ), Action Dramas ( $n_2 = 3$ ), and Soap Operas ( $n_3 = 3$ )), and the impressions developed while viewing the subject programs. This resulted in 2814 separate communication units for the analysis of family-role interactions, and 309 observation intervals for the analysis of parental empathy. The data obtained were analyzed and presented as follows: Family Demographic Variables, Parental Empathy, and Family-Role Interactions. In making quantitative and qualitative comments comparing families, great caution should be used. Riskin and Faunce (1972) referred to this problem as a "thorny matter;" basic differences in developmental stage (Hill, 1965), and in psychological set (Ferreira & Winter, 1965) could confound any results derived from a comparison.

#### Family Demographic Variables

Demographic data from the nine subject programs observed indicated that the total number of families portrayed was 17. Within these 17 families, 71 children were depicted. There were 39 parents with an average of four children per family. Some families portrayed had only one child (I'm a Big Girl Now), to a maximum of eight children (Eight Is Enough). Of the 71 children, 36 female and 35 male, the sex distribution in the families portrayed was equal.

The average age of the children in the subject programs was in the 13 to 19-year age bracket, ranging from an infant to 45 years, with few children under eight years of age. The parents portrayed

had an average age in the 36 to 50 year bracket, with father older than mother.

Five families were headed by parents in which both parents had been married previously; three families were recorded in which one of the parents had been married previously, two of which had children by the previous marriage. In all, 12 families were nuclear families, three were extended families by one generation, and two families were headed by a single parent. Only one program, The Waltons, portrayed interaction of aunts and uncles, nieces and nephews, and this portrayal was peripheral. Families in all stages of the life cycle were portrayed, except the aging family. The oldest people portrayed were approximately 60 years old, but a youthful 60.

No families representing ethnic minorities were portrayed in the subject programs. The majority of families portrayed were in the middle-socioeconomic status (76 percent). The next most frequent was the upper-socioeconomic status (18 percent), with lower-socioeconomic status appearing the least (six percent).

A cautionary note is due on the information collected on family demographics. The intent of the collection of this information was more for stage setting than intended to be a "tight" representation of all television families. The difficulty in making judgments about family relationships for a limited number of observations is manifold. Only if one were thoroughly familiar with the television program under study could this information be totally accurate. In personal communications with heavy viewers (30 hours a week), the present investigator found a wide range of disagreement across all subject programs, except Happy Days, on the family relationships.

The family demographic information must be seen clearly as a reflection of the families as they appeared in two consecutive programs. If other patterns of relationship existed, but did not appear in the sample programs, they were not coded. All of the reported family demographic variables emerged out of the interactions from observing two consecutive programs of the nine subject programs.

### Parental Empathy

In the analysis of empathy levels displayed by parents toward children on television, 210 one-minute observation intervals, across all three program formats, were identified and coded. In Table 4, the frequency of observations for each subject program, the percentage of the observations in relation to the total minutes of all programs combined, the percentage of the observations in relation to the total minutes for each program, and the percentage of observations within each program format are identified.

Twenty-three percent of the total minutes of all nine programs were coded for empathy. Of this 23 percent, 28 percent of the observation intervals coded were in Situation Comedies, with 45 percent in Action Dramas, and 27 percent of the observation intervals occurring in the program format, Soap Opera.

In Table 5, the means of the empathy levels on all three scales of the measure shown by individual programs, all programs combined, and the average empathy score across all three scales for each program are shown. This analysis yielded a grand mean ( $\bar{X} = 2.20$ ) empathy level across all three scales of the empathy measure and

Table 4

Frequency and Percentage of Empathy Observations  
by Program Format and Program in Minutes

Program Format and Subject Programs	Frequency of Observation	Program Total Minutes	Percent of Total Program Total Minutes	Percent of Program Total Minutes	Percent of Program Total Minutes by Program Format
Situation Comedy					28
Eight Is Enough	25	120	3	21	
Happy Days	10	60	1	17	
I'm a Big Girl Now	24	60	3	40	
Action Drama					45
Dallas	30	120	3	25	
Little House	31	120	3	26	
Waltons	34	120	4	28	
Soap Opera					27
All My Children	28	120	3	23	
One Life to Live	7	120	1	6	
Young and the Restless	21	120	2	18	
Totals	210	960	23		100

Table 5  
 Mean Levels of Empathy Across Three Scales  
 by Program

Program	Communication of Acceptance	Allowing Self-Direction	Involvement	Program Mean
Eight Is Enough	1.73	1.88	1.95	1.85
Happy Days	2.50	2.30	1.70	2.17
I'm a Big Girl Now	2.08	1.60	1.80	1.83
Dallas	2.84	2.42	2.46	2.74
Little House on the Prairie	1.94	1.93	1.91	1.93
The Waltons	2.06	2.34	1.82	2.07
All My Children	2.86	2.55	2.62	2.68
One Life to Live	2.40	2.30	2.03	2.41
The Young and the Restless	2.08	2.32	2.00	2.13
Mean	2.33	2.18	2.09	2.20*

\*Grand Mean.

three program formats. All three scales range from one to five, with the highest level of empathy indicated by a score of one, and the lowest level of empathy indicated by a score of five. The grand mean for all scales and all programs was a mid-range value indicating the empathy levels displayed by parents toward their children on television were neither high nor low.

The means of each scale averaged across all nine subject programs reflected the structure of television programs. The subject programs were clearly oriented to verbal expression and consequently the scale, Communication of Acceptance, was coded most often on verbal expressions. The scale, Allowing Self-Direction, indicated the amount of verbal and nonverbal control parents had over their child on television. The majority of the children were in the age bracket 13 to 19 years, and displayed high degrees of independence with the parent often taking the child's lead in conversation or other activities. In the third and last scale of the empathy measure, Involvement, the degree of involvement reflected a high level of attention by the parent to the child ( $\bar{X} = 2.09$ ).

Yet, with this scale, as with the others, when placed back into context, different meanings emerge. The selection of observation intervals in which parents and children were the central focus must be seen in the context of the purpose of the television program. No intervals were coded in which no verbal interaction occurred or an event did not evolve. Television stories are centered around action, crisis, and conflict. For example, no intervals were coded with father reading the newspaper while giving occasional directions

to his child playing on the floor. Instead, on television, when the parent and child are portrayed in a scene together, they have a purpose in being there, and this purpose is generally related to the events unfolding in the plot, which is based upon personal crisis.

The empathy levels of the individual programs were averaged across the program formats (Situation Comedies, Action Dramas, Soap Operas), and identified in Table 6. This analysis revealed that Situation Comedies ( $\bar{X} = 1.95$ ) displayed higher levels of parental empathy than Action Dramas ( $\bar{X} = 2.26$ ) or Soap Operas ( $\bar{X} = 2.41$ ). To determine the significance of these differences across the program formats, a Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance by ranks was performed on the data. This nonparametric test was selected to compare the three groups that were measured at the ordinal level. This test statistic is based on a chi-square distribution and determines if the sums of ranks are so widely dispersed that it is unlikely to have come from the same sample (Daniel, 1978). The application of this statistic with a critical value of  $X^2$  for  $df = 2$ , 5.991 for  $\alpha = .05$ , revealed an  $X^2 = 7.02$ , significant with a P value between .05 and .025. Since the Kruskal-Wallis test revealed that the sample populations of empathy level were significantly different, it was necessary to apply a nonparametric method for multiple comparisons to determine which samples were different. The multiple comparison technique selected used ranked sums (Dunn, 1964), and adjusted for an inflated  $\alpha$  by selecting an experimentwise error rate of  $\alpha = .15$ . From the data, the results of the multiple comparisons indicated that Situation Comedies displayed significantly higher levels of parental

Table 6  
 Mean Levels of Empathy by Program  
 and Program Format

Programs	Situation Comedy	Action Drama	Soap Opera
Eight is Enough	1.85		
Happy Days	2.17		
I'm a Big Girl Now	1.83		
Dallas		2.74	
Little House on the Prairie		1.93	
The Waltons		2.07	
All My Children			2.68
One Life to Live			2.41
The Young and the Restless			2.13
Mean	1.95	2.25	2.41

empathy ( $p < .05$ ) than did Action Dramas and Soap Operas. No significant differences were detected between Action Dramas and Soap Operas.

To determine if homogeneity existed within program formats, a chi-square test was performed on the raw data. This statistical test found no significant differences between programs within program formats ( $\chi^2 = 1.4$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $p > .10$ ).

#### Empathy in Situation Comedies

The parental display of empathic behavior on Situation Comedies was at higher levels than in the other program formats and accounted for 28 percent of the total observation intervals. The children in this program format, as in all others, were precocious and quick with retorts. If one could categorize them, it could be said they were all "13 going on 29." All of the quick responses were for the purposes of humor, but were carrying other messages. The expression of displeasure by children was most often through humorous retorts. The parents in these situations responded to these expressions generally without regard to the method of expression. They seemed to readily understand these messages packaged in humorous overtones, separate them out, and respond in a serious manner to the child's message. Only in the climax sequences was there less use of humorous and quick retorts. In these ephemeral sequences lasting only one minute, parent-to-child empathy was high with direct and accurate communications of feelings both verbally and nonverbally.

The give and take of interactions between parent and child was presented at such a rapid pace that often even the short one-minute intervals were not appropriate for observation. In one minute, high levels of empathy were displayed, shifting 30 seconds later to isolation and withdrawal, and then immediately shifting back to high levels of empathy.

Throughout the duration of each Situation Comedy, cues were sent on how to respond to specific family interactions by the sounds of a live studio audience or a "canned" studio audience, "oohing, aahing, and laughing" on appropriate scenes. Some of the highest levels of empathy observed, however, did not coincide with the verbal cues sent. When the parent and child were having a discussion with the child taking the lead, and the parent giving support, no verbal cues from the "studio" audience were given.

In the parent and child interactions, verbal cues suggesting sensitivity were heard only upon the display of physical affection. Mention of the verbal cuing by the studio or canned audience is made due to the potential reinforcing effect on the television audience. It sanctions and approves the displayed emotions as if the viewers were surrounded by an audience themselves.

Physical contact conveying support was apparent in the empathy observations in Situation Comedies with parents often touching and sitting with their children. The difference between father and mother in the display of empathy was minimal, with father displaying as much physical contact as mother with the children.

### Empathy in Action Dramas

The empathy interactions for Action Dramas constituted 45 percent of the total observation intervals. Empathy displayed by parents toward their children in this program format was confounded by the program Dallas. This program, for style of family communication, fits more appropriately into the program format of Soap Opera. The apparent differences between Dallas, The Waltons, and Little House on the Prairie were from the scriptwriters' desks. In Dallas, there were clearly identified bad people, devious people, people who were good and bad, and good people. These distinctions were not clearly shown in the other two programs in the Action Drama program format. The human behaviors were shown with their full complexity in The Waltons and Little House on the Prairie. By shifting Dallas out of the Action Drama program format, the significant differences between Situation Comedies and Action Dramas' portrayal of parental empathy disappeared.

Because of this categorization problem, the Dallas program was addressed separately. The amount of parental empathy displayed on Dallas was lower than all of the other eight programs ( $\bar{X} = 2.47$ ). The portrayal of kind and caring parents was not an essential component of this type of program. The only reason empathy scores were not much worse was due to the easily identified, non-villain parents who portrayed high levels of empathy, and hence, drove down the overall empathy score for this program.

The programs Little House on the Prairie and The Waltons portrayed high levels of parental empathy, and showed a greater

complexity in human behaviors than did Situation Comedies. The empathy displayed by parents was more like what one would expect in real life. The development of complex human behaviors provided special insights into how people think and act without stereotyping behavior like the program Dallas and the programs in the Soap Opera program format.

The portrayals of parental empathy were spontaneous and based equally on responding to nonverbal cues, as well as verbal ones. Humor was used in these programs, but was not "double-edged" in meaning. The empathy communications were quite direct and showed clearly defined models of parental empathy. These situations were more complex displaying a wide range of emotions. The portrayals of parental empathy were longer in Action Dramas than in Situation Comedies. This was certainly related to program length. The ultimate human conflict was present in Action Dramas; it just took more time to built up to it.

Substituted for verbal cues was background music, cuing moods of different intensities with changes in tempo. Like Situation Comedies, intervals displaying higher levels of empathy were not cued by music.

Physical contact between parents and children in the programs Little House on the Prairie and The Waltons was less than in Situation Comedies, but still sensitive and appropriate. No quantitative or qualitative differences emerged in the way fathers and mothers displayed empathy.

### Empathy in Soap Operas

The three programs in the program format Soap Opera accounted for the lowest amount of empathy observations ( $n = 27$ ), and the lowest levels of empathy ( $\bar{X} = 2.41$ ). The programs observed in this program format were generally homogenous in the analysis of empathy.

As in Dallas, there were clearly divided roles found between the bad people, devious people, people who were good and bad, and good people. The episodic structure of these programs slowed the pace of the family interactions often to a near stop. But even with their slow pace, the complexity of human behavior seen in Action Dramas or real life was not developed. In the Soap Operas, once a character's personality was narrowly identified, that role was maintained consistently until trauma changed the character.

The interactions between parents and children were often awkward and carried multiple meanings. Many situations were presented that were classic textbook cases of marital schism, marital skew, double binding, and parental perplexity. All were extremely poor situations in which to seek models of parental empathy.

The empathy levels between parents and children, as before, would have been much lower if not offset by the good people, non-villain parents. Some of these empathy interactions displayed quite high levels of empathy by both mothers and fathers when offering care to infants and young children. Even with this, it was difficult to see the positive due to the overshadowing of the negative.

As in the previous two program formats, the cuing of scenes was given by melodramatic music verging on histrionics. The musical

cuing had no relationship to parental empathy. Most of the cuing was given on the last scene before a commercial break and was generally loud and exaggerated. It functioned as a convenient means of notifying this investigator to prepare to edit out the advertisements while recording.

### Family-Role Interactions

In the analysis of family-role interactions as portrayed on television, individual units of communication were coded for the following: who initiated the communication, the role occupied by the person sending the communication (e.g., father, mother, brother), the role occupied by the person receiving the communication (e.g., wife, sister, aunt), the direction of the communication (Going Toward, Going Against, Going Away), and the intention of each communication (e.g., Offers Information, Seeks Information, Evades). For the 16 hours of videotaped television programming, 2814 separate communication units were identified and coded.

### Initiators of Communications

This category was analyzed to determine the frequency of initiation, the frequency of initiation by sex, and the frequency of initiation of communication for each family role. This category was coded for each new communication that changed the topic and for the family role of the Initiator of the communication.

For the 2814 communications, 21.3 percent were initiated as new units of communication. Rounding this off to 21 percent, then 79

percent of non-initiated communication emerged or centered around the 21 percent that was initiated. Another way to view this is that for each new communication unit sent to the recipient, nearly four communication units evolved in response (see Table 7).

Table 7  
Frequency and Percentage of Initiators and  
Non-initiators of Family-Role  
Interactions

	Frequency	Percent
Initiator	598	21.3
Non-initiator	<u>2216</u>	<u>78.7</u>
Totals	2814	100.0

Research on family power has focused on the number of communication units initiated, sent, and received by each family member as evidence of power (Murrell & Stachowiak, 1967). Mishler and Waxler (1968) referred to power as "attention and control strategies" in which they examined who spoke to whom, the frequency of participation, and the duration of the speech of communication delivered, while others analyzed the frequency of interaction by role to make statements about the center of power in the family (Turk & Bell, 1972).

In the analysis of Initiator, the application of the research idea that power can be determined by analyzing the frequency of initiation indicated that the female roles possessed more power than the male roles. This may be interpreted as females controlling the family communications or merely fulfilling their expressive role. When Initiator was collapsed into female and male categories, females initiated 376 times while males initiated 222 times. A chi-square test indicated that the differences existing were significant ( $X^2 = 14.68$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .0001$ ) (See Table 8).

Table 8  
Frequency and Percentage of Initiator and  
Non-initiator of Family-Role  
Interaction by Sex

	Male	Female
Initiator	222 (7.9%)	376 (13.4%)
Non-initiator	1019 (36.2%)	1196 (42.5%)
Totals	1241 (44.1%)	1572 (55.9%)

$X^2 = 14.68$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p .0001$ .

A further breakdown of the Initiator of communications by the role position held by the Initiator is given in Table 9. The husband was the Initiator in 14.2 percent of the cases with wife initiating 16.4 percent, followed by mother (14.4 percent), daughter (10.5 percent), sister (10.5 percent), father (6.9 percent), and brother (3.7 percent). With a nearly equal distribution of male and female children in all 17 of the families observed, this discrepancy in initiation rates perhaps reflects an uneven distribution of power skewed toward females in the subject programs analyzed. The frequency of initiation for the 19 remaining roles was few, which reflects the predominance of nuclear families portrayed in the subject programs and the peripheral positions played by those few instances in which extended family members were involved.

The nuclear family roles (father, mother, husband, wife, daughter, son, sister, brother) served as initiators 487 times for 81.4 percent of the total initiated communications. In comparison, all of the remaining roles combined initiated 111 times for 18.6 percent of the initiated communication units.

#### Family Roles

Family roles were analyzed to determine the frequency of their occurrence. Although 17 families were identified in the subject programs, the predominant roles observed were those that reflected the traditional nuclear family. The 27 family roles accounted for 2814 communications, 2236 of which were generated by nuclear family roles. The family role (father, mother, husband, wife, daughter,

Table 9  
Frequency and Percentage by Role of  
Initiator and Non-Initiator

Role	Initiator	Non-Initiator
Husband	85 (14.2)	339 (15.3)
Wife	98 (16.4)	333 (15.0)
Son	29 ( 4.8)	114 ( 5.2)
Daughter	63 (10.5)	236 (10.7)
Father	41 ( 6.9)	199 ( 9.0)
Mother	86 (14.4)	218 ( 9.9)
Brother	22 ( 3.7)	140 ( 6.3)
Sister	63 (10.5)	230 (10.4)
Mother-In-Law	26 ( 4.3)	52 ( 2.3)
Father-In-Law	8 ( 1.3)	38 ( 1.7)
Brother-In-Law	5 ( 0.8)	9 ( 0.4)
Sister-In-Law	12 ( 2.0)	53 ( 2.4)
Grandmother	9 ( 1.5)	2 ( 0.1)

Table 9 (Continued)

Role	Initiator	Non-Initiator
Stepmother	2 ( 0.3)	6 ( 0.3)
Stepson	2 ( 0.3)	6 ( 0.3)
Stepdaughter	0 ( 0.0)	3 ( 0.1)
Stepfather	1 ( 0.2)	1 ( 0.0)
Son-In-Law	10 ( 1.7)	56 ( 2.5)
Daughter-In-Law	12 ( 2.0)	42 ( 1.9)
Stepbrother	15 ( 2.5)	105 ( 4.7)
Stepsister	3 ( 0.5)	8 ( 0.4)
All Family	0 ( 0.0)	2 ( 0.1)
Grandson	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 0.0)
Granddaughter	1 ( 0.2)	11 ( 0.5)
Grandfather	3 ( 0.5)	9 ( 0.4)
Uncle	1 ( 0.2)	0 ( 0.0)
Aunt	1 ( 0.2)	0 ( 0.0)
Column Totals	598 (21.3)	2213 (78.7)

son, brother, sister) represented 79.5 percent of all roles observed in comparison to the remaining 20 roles occurring 578 times for only 20.5 percent of the total. As shown in Table 10, the predominant roles occurring were: wife, 15.4 percent; husband, 15.1 percent; mother, 10.8 percent; daughter, 10.6 percent; sister, 10.4 percent; father, 8.5 percent.

Some roles which were frequently observed, but not as often as the nuclear family roles, were the in-law roles. Mother-in-law was observed in 2.8 percent, daughter-in-law in 1.9 percent, father-in-law in 1.6 percent, and brother-in-law in only .5 percent of the communications.

The small occurrence of some roles beyond the nuclear family suggests the peripheral nature of these roles and the lack of importance assigned to them by television scriptwriters on the subject programs observed. In some instances, these roles were so infrequent (grandmother, .4 percent; uncle, .03 percent; grandfather, .4 percent) that they were only observed in the role or recipient category but not in both. Niece and nephew were not reported in the family-role category, because they appeared only as recipients of communications and not senders. The reverse situation occurred for the family roles of aunt and uncle.

In Table 11, the frequencies and percentages of Roles are presented as they occurred in each of the nine programs. A chi-square was performed across the nine programs for the eight roles constituting the nuclear family, which indicated highly significant differences existed between the occurrences of these roles on the subject programs ( $\chi^2 = 481.3$ ,  $df = 16$ ,  $p < .0001$ ).

Table 10  
 Frequency and Percentage of Roles as  
 Portrayed in Selected Programs

Role	Frequency	Percent
Husband	424	15.1
Wife	432	15.4
Son	143	5.1
Daughter	299	10.6
Father	240	8.5
Mother	304	10.8
Brother	162	5.8
Sister	294	10.4
Mother-In-Law	79	2.8
Father-In-Law	46	1.6
Brother-In-Law	14	0.5
Sister-In-Law	65	2.3
Grandmother	11	0.4
Stepmother	8	0.3
Stepson	8	0.3
Stepdaughter	3	0.1
Stepfather	2	0.1
Son-In-Law	66	2.3
Daughter-In-Law	54	1.9
Stepbrother	120	4.3
Stepsister	11	0.4
All Family	2	0.1
Grandson	1	0.0
Granddaughter	12	0.4
Grandfather	12	0.4
Uncle	1	0.0
Aunt	1	0.0
Totals	2814	100.0

Table 11

## Frequency and Percentage of Roles by Programs

Role	Dallas	Eight is Enough	Happy Days	I'm a Big Girl Now	Little House on the Prairie	Waltons	One Life To Live	Young and the Restless	All My Children	Row Total
Husband	62 (17.6)	9 (3.2)	9 (4.6)	0 (0.0)	52 (16.3)	71 (16.4)	22 (13.8)	111 (26.4)	88 (20.5)	424 (15.1)
Wife	62 (17.6)	8 (2.8)	8 (4.1)	0 (0.0)	44 (13.8)	68 (15.7)	36 (22.6)	111 (26.4)	95 (22.1)	432 (15.4)
Son	37 (10.5)	19 (6.7)	29 (14.9)	2 (0.9)	16 ( 5.0)	20 ( 4.6)	0 ( 0.0)	7 ( 1.7)	13 ( 3.0)	143 ( 5.1)
Daughter	20 ( 5.7)	5 (1.8)	21 (10.8)	82 (36.9)	39 (12.2)	44 (10.2)	45 (28.3)	19 ( 4.5)	24 ( 5.6)	299 (10.6)
Father	27 ( 7.6)	19 (6.7)	49 (25.3)	60 (27.0)	22 ( 6.9)	1 ( 0.2)	56 (35.2)	1 ( 0.2)	4 ( 0.9)	239 ( 8.5)
Mother	37 (10.5)	1 (0.4)	21 (10.8)	33 (14.9)	32 (10.0)	80 (18.5)	0 ( 0.0)	42 (10.0)	58 (13.5)	304 (10.8)
Brother	49 (13.9)	23 (8.1)	23 (11.9)	9 (4.1)	5 ( 1.6)	32 ( 7.4)	0 ( 0.0)	21 ( 5.0)	0 ( 0.0)	162 ( 5.8)
Sister	29 ( 8.2)	49 (17.3)	26 (13.4)	14 (6.3)	3 ( 0.9)	59 (13.6)	0 ( 0.0)	108 (25.7)	6 ( 1.4)	294 (10.5)
Mother	16 ( 4.5)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 0.5)	0 (0.0)	3 ( 0.9)	4 ( 0.9)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	55 (12.8)	79 ( 2.8)
Father-In-Law	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 (0.0)	45 (14.1)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 0.2)	46 ( 1.6)

Table 11 (Continued)

Role	Dallas	Eight is Enough	Happy Days	I'm a Big Girl Now	Little House on the Prarie	Waltons	One Life To Live	Young and the Restless	All My Children	Row Total
Brother-In-Law	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 3.4)	3 ( 0.7)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	14 ( 0.5)
Sister-In-Law	3 ( 0.8)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	3 ( 0.9)	36 ( 8.3)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	23 ( 5.3)	65 ( 2.3)
Grandmother	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	3 ( 1.5)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	8 ( 1.8)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	11 ( 0.4)
Stepmother	0 ( 0.0)	7 ( 2.5)	1 ( 0.5)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	8 ( 0.3)
Stepson	0 ( 0.0)	8 ( 2.8)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	8 ( 0.3)
Stepdaughter	0 ( 0.0)	3 ( 1.1)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	3 ( 0.1)
Son-In-Law	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 0.5)	0 ( 0.0)	44 (13.8)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	21 ( 4.9)	66 ( 2.3)
Daughter-In-Law	10 ( 2.8)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	2 ( 0.5)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	42 ( 9.8)	54 ( 1.9)
Stepbrother	1 ( 0.3)	119 (42.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	120 ( 4.3)
Stepsister	0 ( 0.0)	11 ( 3.9)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	11 ( 0.4)

Table 11 (Continued)

Role	Dallas	Eight is Enough	Happy Days	I'm a Big Girl Now	Little House on the Prarie	Waltons	One Life To Live	Young and the Restless	All My Children	Row Total
All Family	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	2 ( 0.5)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	2 ( 0.1)
Grandson	0 ( 0.00)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 0.5)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 0.0)
Granddaughter	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	11 ( 5.0)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 0.2)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	12 ( 0.4)
Grandfather	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 0.5)	11 ( 5.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	12 ( 0.4)
Uncle	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 0.2)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 0.0)
Aunt	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 0.2)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 0.0)
Column Totals	353 (12.5)	283 (10.1)	194 ( 6.9)	222 ( 7.9)	319 (11.3)	433 (15.4)	159 ( 5.7)	420 (14.9)	430 (15.3)	2813 (100.0)

To further analyze the differences in the appearances of the nuclear family roles, a chi-square goodness-of-fit test was performed on each of the eight nuclear family roles as they occurred across the nine subject programs. Significant differences were found ( $p < .05$ ) in the occurrences of six nuclear family roles (father, mother, husband, wife, son, brother), while no significant differences were detected in the roles of daughter and sister. This inconsistency of nuclear family roles across the eight subject programs reflected the differences in the story lines of the subject programs during the collection of the data. The consistency of daughter and sister across the subject programs may reflect the importance of the involvement of these roles on the subject programs.

The eight nuclear family roles were further analyzed by dividing them into male and female categories and administering a chi-square test. The test resulted in detecting significant differences across the subject programs ( $\chi^2 = 17.18$ ,  $df = 8$ ,  $p < .05$ ) with female roles occurring significantly more than male roles.

Looking across programs by Role, differences in frequency were quite large; for example, the husband role in I'm a Big Girl Now was zero, while in The Young and The Restless the frequency was 111. Part of this difference was due to the absence of the husband because of divorce in I'm a Big Girl Now and also a reflection of differences in the story lines of these programs in which the focus on specific family members shifts from week to week. This was reflected in the subject programs as analyzed in this study. Although family members were visible, the focus of the program would be upon a single member

of the family off "doing their own thing," and only meeting with the rest of the family for the inevitable crisis resolution at the end of the program.

It is interesting to note that although the Role and Recipient categories of mother-in-law and son-in-law were relatively peripheral, with mother-in-law appearing in five out of nine programs for a total of 2.8 percent of the total, and son-in-law appearing in three out of nine programs for a total of 2.3 percent of all role communications. In the Recipient category, mother-in-law received fewer (2.7 percent) communications than she gave (2.8%). Son-in-law also reflected a change from the number of communications sent (2.3 percent) to the number received (2.6 percent), but in the opposite direction of mother-in-law. A later analysis of the communications intentions of the Roles and their corresponding Recipients revealed that these two roles often fell into adversary positions with much of their communication in the Going Against category. Apparently, for the programs observed, these two roles made for zestful television viewing.

A series of chi-square tests within program formats consistently yielded differences significant at  $p < .05$ . This indicated that the family-role interactions could not be categorized into the three program formats. It appears that the classification problem (Cantor, 1980) has rendered useless the grouping by program format for analysis by role, recipient, and the intention of communication. Program formats were based upon production characteristics and not family characteristics, although there were similarities between the plots and those grouped by program formats.

The variety of family life was shown by the problem of classification of the programs into program formats. Since program format was no longer useful for classifying families, further analysis of family-role interaction proceeded by individual programs. The definitions for program formats took on a new meaning, and were applied to the structural and production characteristics of these programs. For example, Happy Days, Eight is Enough, and I'm a Big Girl Now were still classed as Situation Comedies, but no classification of family characteristics within that program format was implied.

#### Family-Role Recipients

The Recipients of all communications are shown in Table 12. The major Recipients reflected the same emphasis on the nuclear family roles as did the Roles of initiation. The eight roles constituting the nuclear family occurred as Recipients of communication 2270 times for 80.6 percent, whereas all other family communication recipients received only 544 communications for 19.3 percent of the total. The differences between the percentage of occurrences of nuclear family roles and nuclear family-role recipients totally deviated only 15 percent, and by individual nuclear family roles and recipients, the largest deviation was 2.3 percent, and the smallest was 0.0 percent.

#### Communication of Intent

The measure used to gather information on the internal structure of the family divided communication intentions into three components: major category, primary mode, and secondary mode. Two of these three

Table 12  
 Frequency and Percentage of Recipient as  
 Portrayed in Selected Programs

Recipient	Frequency	Percent
Husband	427	15.2
Wife	427	15.2
Son	172	6.1
Daughter	348	12.4
Father	212	7.5
Mother	239	8.5
Brother	163	5.8
Sister	282	10.0
Mother-In-Law	76	2.7
Father-In-Law	44	1.6
Brother-In-Law	12	0.4
Sister-In-Law	67	2.4
Grandmother	4	0.1
Stepmother	9	0.3
Stepson	5	0.2
Stepdaughter	4	0.1
Stepfather	2	0.1
Son-In-Law	74	2.6
Daughter-In-Law	52	1.8
Stepbrother	117	4.2
Stepsister	13	0.5
All Family	26	0.9
All Children	5	0.2
Grandson	5	0.2
Granddaughter	16	0.6
Grandfather	11	0.4
Nephew	1	0.0
Niece	1	0.0
Totals	2814	100.0

were utilized in the analysis. The major categories indicated the direction of the communication (Going Toward, Going Against, Going Away), and the secondary mode indicated the intention of each communication unit.

The major category, Going Toward, included one through fourteen of the secondary modes that focused on building or maintaining a family relationship. Going Toward accounted for 81.8 percent of all family-role interactions (see Table 13). Greenberg (1980), in a similar study, found that 84.8 percent of all family-role interactions fell into this category.

The analysis of secondary modes within the Going Toward category indicated that 12.9 percent of all family-role interactions were in the secondary mode, Offers Information. The secondary mode, Seeks Information, similarly occurred 10.9 percent, Seeks Support occurred 7.8 percent, and Showing Concern occurred 10.5 percent. The secondary mode, Seeks Gratification, defined as directly asking for something for oneself, surprisingly occurred in only 1.6 percent of all family-role interactions. The secondary mode, Manipulates Positively, which had the intention of trying to influence the other to behave in a desired way, occurred in 8.3 percent of all family-role interactions. The remaining secondary modes ranged in frequency of occurrence from 2.3 percent to 7.1 percent (see Table 13).

The second major category, Going Against, had four secondary modes and focused on the creation and maintenance of conflict within the family. This major category and its secondary modes, though occurring less, set the mood for the subject programs. The existence

Table 13  
 Family-Role Interaction: Frequency and  
 Percentage by Secondary Mode

Secondary Mode	Frequency	Percent
<b>Going Toward</b>		
Offers Information	363	12.9
Seeks Information	308	10.9
Humor	88	3.1
Miscellaneous	100	3.6
Affirmation	132	4.7
Showing Concern	296	10.5
Seeks Support	219	7.8
Seeks Attention	87	3.1
Seeks Gratification	44	1.6
Organizes	107	3.8
Positively Manipulates	233	8.3
Instructs	201	7.1
Accepts Supports	64	2.3
Accepts Opinion	60	2.1
<b>Going Against</b>		
Disregards	56	2.0
Opposes	149	5.3
Negatively Manipulates	88	3.1
Assaults	106	3.8
<b>Going Away</b>		
Evades	87	3.1
Withdraws	26	0.9
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2814</b>	<b>100.0</b>

of a television program without conflict is impossible. The entire plot focuses upon this idea, and builds in the ultimate and highly predictable family conflict. Action Drama developed more intricate approaches and solutions to conflict and made them less predictable, but conflict still existed in Situation Comedies and Soap Operas.

The most frequently occurring secondary mode, in the major category, Going Against, was Opposes, and had as its intention opposing another family member. This secondary mode occurred in 5.3 percent of all family-role interactions, and was manifested in verbal opposition through protesting, arguing, and disobeying. The secondary mode, Assaults, was coded when a family member became directly and openly, verbally hostile with another. The secondary mode, Assaults, occurred 3.8 percent of all family-role interactions, closely followed by Negatively Manipulates, with the intention of trying to confuse the recipient whether the communication was hostile or friendly. This secondary mode occurred in 3.1 percent of all family-role interactions (see Table 13).

The third major category, Going Away, had two secondary modes, and accounted for four percent of all family-role interactions. The two secondary modes were Evasion, occurring 3.1 percent of the time, and Withdraws, occurring .9 percent of the time. These secondary modes represented trying to avoid direct relationships and psychological and physical withdrawal (see Table 13).

### Nuclear Family-Role Interactions

An analysis of the nuclear family-role interactions that occurred by major category is the purpose of this section. Table 14 presents the nuclear family roles and their corresponding recipients, the frequency of occurrence, the percentage of the occurrences for each role and recipient within the total role interactions, and the percentage of each major category, which indicate the direction of the intention of each interaction.

The nuclear family roles and recipients accounted for the majority (79.6 percent) of family-role interactions. The husband and wife interactions occurred 30.2 percent, and dominated all interactions within the nuclear family and in the extended family roles. Husband to wife (79.5 percent) and wife to husband (75.0 percent) interactions were predominantly in the Going Toward category. Slight differences appeared in these relationships indicating that the wife was more often coded as Going Against husband (20.0 percent) than husband was coded as Going Against wife (16.3 percent).

Although the interaction Brother to Brother only occurred 1.5 percent in the total of interactions, they were coded most frequently Going Against (31.7 percent). This interaction was the highest in the Going Against category.

An analysis of sibling relationships indicated 76.8 percent were Going Toward, 17.7 percent were Going Against, and 3.5 percent were Going Away. The parent and child interactions were as follows: Going Toward (87.9 percent), Going Against (9.3 percent), and Going Away (2.7 percent). In comparing these interactions with the

Table 14  
 Frequency and Percentage of Nuclear Family  
 Interactions Within Major Categories

Role	Recipient	Number of Acts	Percent of Total Acts	Major Category		
				Percent of Going Toward	Percent of Going Against	Percent of Going Away
Husband	Wife	424	15.1	79.5	16.3	4.2
Wife	Husband	427	15.2	75.0	20.0	5.0
Mother	Son	87	3.1	92.0	8.0	0.0
Son	Mother	61	2.2	90.2	9.8	0.0
Mother	Daughter	200	7.1	87.0	7.0	6.0
Daughter	Mother	168	5.9	91.7	7.7	0.6
Father	Son	81	2.9	86.4	13.6	0.0
Son	Father	74	2.6	89.2	8.1	2.7
Father	Daughter	148	5.3	80.4	10.1	9.5
Daughter	Father	127	4.5	86.7	10.2	3.1
Brother	Brother	41	1.5	68.3	31.7	0.0
Brother	Sister	109	3.9	78.0	12.8	9.2
Sister	Brother	118	4.2	81.4	16.1	2.5
Sister	Sister	171	6.1	79.6	18.1	2.3
		(n=2236)	79.6			
			(n=2814)			

sibling interactions, it appeared that sibling rivalry was an active part of the subject programs' portrayal of that relationship.

The analysis of secondary modes as they occurred in each of the programs provided for a more detailed description of the differences and similarities existing among program formats. Most striking were the differences existing between the programs in the program format Action Drama. The program Dallas sharply diverged from the other two programs in that program format. Dallas also diverged sharply from the family-role interactions seen in the Soap Opera program format. This indicated that Dallas may be in a category by itself, and yet in structure, fitting both Action Drama and Soap Opera program formats.

#### Communication Intentions Within Programs

The intentions or secondary modes of all family-role interactions are shown in Table 15 as they occurred in individual programs. The intention of family-role interactions can be followed within each program by moving down through Table 15.

In the programs, Eight is Enough, Happy Days, and I'm a Big Girl Now, Humor accounted for 5.7 percent, 5.2 percent, and 3.6 percent of the interactions, respectively. These programs were classed as Situation Comedies, and yet, they used Humor comparably to the two programs, Little House on the Prairie and The Waltons, in which Humor accounted for 6.9 percent and 3.5 percent of the interactions, respectively. These similarities may be due to the programs in Situation Comedies using Humor to convey meanings other than just

Table 15  
 Family-Role Interaction: Frequency and Percentage  
 of Secondary Mode by Programs

Interaction	Dallas	Eight is Enough	Happy Days	I'm a Big Girl Now	Little House on the Prairie	Waltons	One Life To Live	Young and the Restless	All My Children	Row Total
Offers Information	88 (24.9)	50 (17.7)	32 (16.5)	35 (15.8)	44 (13.8)	65 (15.0)	20 (12.6)	13 ( 3.1)	16 ( 3.7)	363 (12.9)
Seeks Information	46 (13.0)	33 (11.7)	37 (19.1)	23 (10.4)	34 (10.7)	49 (11.3)	19 (11.9)	37 ( 8.8)	30 ( 7.0)	308 (10.0)
Humor	1 ( 0.3)	16 ( 5.7)	10 ( 5.2)	8 ( 3.6)	22 ( 6.9)	15 ( 3.5)	6 ( 3.8)	7 ( 1.7)	3 ( 0.7)	88 ( 3.1)
Miscellaneous	24 ( 6.8)	7 ( 2.5)	10 ( 5.2)	13 ( 5.9)	23 ( 7.2)	9 ( 2.1)	4 ( 2.5)	6 ( 1.4)	4 ( 0.9)	100 ( 3.6)
Affirmation	9 ( 2.5)	5 ( 1.8)	11 ( 5.7)	7 ( 3.2)	35 (11.0)	25 ( 5.8)	2 ( 1.3)	23 ( 5.5)	15 ( 3.5)	132 ( 4.7)
Shows Concern	38 (10.8)	18 ( 6.4)	12 ( 6.2)	21 ( 9.5)	13 ( 4.1)	51 (11.8)	11 ( 6.9)	58 (13.8)	74 (17.2)	296 (10.5)
Seeks Support	9 ( 2.5)	26 ( 9.2)	11 ( 5.7)	26 (11.7)	18 ( 5.6)	27 ( 6.2)	14 ( 8.8)	51 (12.1)	37 ( 8.6)	219 ( 7.8)
Seeks Attention	1 ( 0.3)	17 ( 6.0)	4 ( 2.1)	10 ( 4.5)	15 ( 4.7)	13 ( 3.0)	6 ( 3.8)	8 ( 1.9)	13 ( 3.0)	87 ( 3.1)
Seeks Gratification	0 ( 0.0)	9 ( 3.2)	7 ( 3.6)	5 ( 2.3)	3 ( 0.9)	5 ( 1.2)	1 ( 0.6)	8 ( 1.9)	6 ( 1.4)	44 ( 1.6)

Table 15 (Continued)

Interaction	Dallas	Eight is Enough	Happy Days	I'm a Big Girl Now	Little House on the Prairie	Waltons	One Life To Live	Young and the Restless	All My Children	Row Total
Organizes	2 ( 0.6)	8 ( 2.8)	3 ( 1.5)	5 ( 2.3)	5 ( 1.6)	11 ( 2.5)	4 ( 2.5)	28 ( 6.7)	41 ( 9.5)	107 ( 3.8)
Positively Manipulates	17 ( 4.8)	18 ( 6.4)	9 ( 4.6)	20 ( 9.0)	19 ( 6.0)	41 ( 9.5)	33 (20.8)	54 (12.9)	22 ( 5.1)	233 ( 8.3)
Instructs	4 ( 1.1)	19 ( 6.7)	13 ( 6.7)	20 ( 9.0)	32 (10.0)	25 ( 5.8)	2 ( 1.3)	17 ( 4.0)	69 (16.0)	201 ( 7.1)
Accepts Support	7 ( 2.0)	9 ( 3.2)	2 ( 1.0)	9 ( 4.1)	6 ( 1.9)	8 ( 1.8)	2 ( 1.3)	13 ( 3.1)	7 ( 1.6)	63 ( 2.2)
Accepts Opinion	7 ( 2.0)	6 ( 2.1)	1 ( 0.5)	3 ( 1.4)	10 ( 3.1)	11 ( 2.5)	4 ( 2.5)	14 ( 3.3)	4 ( 0.9)	60 ( 2.1)
Disregards	9 ( 2.5)	14 ( 4.9)	2 ( 1.0)	2 ( 0.9)	3 ( 0.9)	10 ( 2.3)	0 ( 0.0)	3 ( 0.7)	13 ( 3.0)	56 ( 2.0)
Opposes	24 ( 6.8)	5 ( 1.8)	16 ( 8.2)	5 ( 2.3)	15 ( 4.7)	28 ( 6.5)	11 ( 6.9)	28 ( 6.7)	17 ( 4.0)	149 ( 5.3)
Negatively Manipulates	29 ( 8.2)	7 ( 2.5)	2 ( 1.0)	5 ( 2.3)	5 ( 1.6)	6 ( 1.4)	5 ( 3.1)	13 ( 3.1)	16 ( 3.7)	88 ( 3.1)
Assaults	35 ( 9.9)	6 ( 2.1)	5 ( 2.6)	1 ( 0.5)	6 ( 1.9)	9 ( 2.1)	0 ( 0.0)	15 ( 3.6)	29 ( 6.7)	106 ( 3.8)
Evades	2 ( 0.6)	7 ( 2.5)	5 ( 2.6)	2 ( 0.9)	8 ( 2.5)	19 ( 4.4)	10 ( 6.3)	22 ( 5.2)	12 ( 2.8)	87 ( 3.1)
Withdraws	1 ( 0.3)	3 ( 1.1)	2 ( 1.0)	2 ( 0.9)	3 ( 0.9)	6 ( 1.4)	5 ( 3.1)	2 ( 0.5)	2 ( 0.5)	26 ( 0.9)
Column Totals	353 (12.5)	283 (10.1)	194 ( 6.9)	222 ( 7.9)	319 (11.3)	433 (15.4)	159 ( 5.7)	420 (14.9)	430 (15.3)	2813 (100.0)

humor, and thus, being coded under other secondary modes. The category Humor for the two programs in the Action Drama program format was used solely as the secondary mode Humor intended.

Through the analysis of family-role interactions, the categorizing of programs or the names of those categories (program formats) was questioned. The analysis of family-role interactions has shown the disparate nature of programs classified by program format. Some other methods of classification may exist, but in this study the analysis of family-role interactions by the systematic measure used did not allow grouping these programs into program formats at the level of the interactions observed.

A comparison of the family-role interactions between the sexes was made to determine the existence of any patterns. In Table 16, males Offer Information (51.5 percent) more than females (48.5 percent). Females Seek Support (62.6 percent) more than males (37.4 percent), Show Concern for others (65.8 percent) more than males (34.2 percent), and gave Affirmation to others more (61.4 percent) than males (38.6 percent). Males and females had equal family interactions for Miscellaneous, Disregards, and Withdraws. The differences in family-role interactions between males and females in the nine subject programs indicated stereotypes of the two roles. The stereotyped behavior was closely related to the sex-role differentiation of Parsons and Bales (1955), in which role structure was divided into instrumental and expressive roles. These sex-linked roles postulated the male in the instrumental role and the female in the expressive role. The nine subject programs followed this stereotyping.

Table 16  
 Family-Role Interaction: Frequency and Percentage  
 of Secondary Modes by Sex

Secondary Mode	Male	Female
Offers Information	187 (51.5)	176 (48.5)
Seeks Information	136 (44.2)	172 (55.8)
Humor	54 (61.4)	34 (38.6)
Miscellaneous	50 (50.0)	50 (50.0)
Affirmation	51 (38.6)	81 (61.4)
Shows Concern	101 (34.2)	194 (65.8)
Seeks Support	82 (37.4)	137 (62.6)
Seeks Attention	40 (46.0)	47 (54.0)
Seeks Gratification	14 (31.8)	30 (68.2)
Organizes	46 (43.0)	61 (57.0)
Positively Manipulates	87 (37.3)	146 (62.7)
Instructs	99 (49.3)	102 (50.7)
Accepts Supports	23 (35.9)	41 (64.1)

Table 16 (Continued)

Secondary Mode	Male	Female
Accepts Opinion	26 (44.1)	33 (55.9)
Disregards	28 (50.0)	28 (50.0)
Opposes	67 (45.0)	82 (55.0)
Negatively Manipulates	41 (46.6)	47 53.4)
Assaults	49 (46.2)	57 (53.8)
Evades	45 (51.7)	42 (48.3)
Withdraws	13 (50.0)	13 (50.0)
Column Totals	1239 (44.1)	1573 (55.9)

The Parsons and Bales (1955) approach has been refuted by Raush, Barry, Hertel, and Swain (1974). In their observation of communications between husbands and wives in conflict situations, no support was found for the Parsonian theory. The data so greatly conflicted with the differentiation of these roles into expressive and instrumental qualities that it was concluded that it was "time to put to rest once and for all the sex-role differentiation theory of Parsons and Bales" (Raush et al., 1974, p. 146).

Communication Intentions Between  
Role and Recipient

A final analysis of who said what to whom had as its purpose to analyze the previous differentiation of male and female family-role interactions in more depth. This analysis focused on the family role and recipient, and the intentions of the communication between family role and recipient.

The eight roles constituting the nuclear family were most prevalent, and the remaining 20 roles were seen only sporadically. Hence, the family-role interactions of these 20 family roles were spread thinly across all of the 20 secondary modes of the family-role interaction measure. Appendix F presents this analysis.

Husbands and wives were the primary interactors accounting for approximately one-third (30.3 percent) of all family-role interactions. The analysis of the interactions of husband to wife further indicated the stereotyping of this behavior previously discussed by male and female categories.

Even by looking at individual cases, few departures were indicated in this sex-stereotyped behavior. One small departure was husband Shows Concern toward wife in 10.9 percent of the interactions, whereas wife Shows Concern in 9.8 percent of the interactions with husband. In the 20 secondary modes coded, this was the only secondary mode that did not represent sex-stereotyping in the husband and wife relationship.

In the relationship of mother and father to son, mother Shows Concern to son 15.5 percent, while father Shows Concern to son 4.2

percent. The same sex-stereotyping situation existed as in the relationship between husband and wife. The portrayal of mother was as a peacekeeper, a placator, and more interested in the family than herself. The role of mother accounted for 10.8 percent of role interactions, while the role of father accounted for 8.5 percent of role interactions, but the mother role was portrayed as subservient to father.

The parent and sibling relationships further reflected the traditional male-favored position. Mothers tried to Organize daughters (3.4 percent) more than sons (.6 percent). Mothers tried to Positively Manipulate daughters 3.9 percent more than sons, Show Concern 8.3 percent less to daughters than to sons, and Give Affirmation 2.8 percent less to daughters than sons.

Father reflected the same situation in his relationship with daughter and son as did mother. Father gave Affirmation 2.2 percent less to daughter than to son, Positively Manipulates daughter 3.4 percent more than son, and Instructs daughter less (5.1 percent) than son. The analysis of these parent and child roles clearly indicated that mother favored son over daughter, father favored son over daughter, but the differences were not as large in the latter relationship as in the former relationship.

CHAPTER V  
SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Research studies have found that prosocial behaviors can be learned from viewing select television programs. In a time when the family has been thought of as disintegrating and has few role models for parenting, television could be of prime importance as a source for models of effective parenting and family life in general.

This study has been a preliminary examination of the potential for television to positively influence parents and future parents. With 65 million families viewing television each evening (Comstock et al., 1978), and its power as a source for socialization (Gerbner et al., 1976), although television might be a cause of the decline in family interaction, it could be a resource for the teaching and learning of prosocial behaviors and how to rear children. This study attempted to describe families as they are portrayed on television.

The Problem

The major objectives of this study were:

1. To describe families as they appear on television by determining the frequencies, directions, modes, and intentions of family-role interactions.

2. To analyze the levels of empathy as portrayed by parents toward children on television.
3. To determine the differences in family-role interactions and parental empathy between selected Situation Comedies, Action Dramas, and Soap Operas.
4. To collect demographic information on family structure of television families, such as size, pattern, approximate age of family members, and approximate socioeconomic status.

#### Limitations

1. This study was limited to only those television programs in which families were portrayed as the main characters.
2. The content analysis was limited to three programs in each of the three program formats for a total of 16 hours of programming.

#### Design of the Study

Data for this study were obtained from nine television programs, with three programs in each program format of Situation Comedy, Action Drama, and Soap Opera. Each program was videotape recorded for two consecutive episodes.

Two instruments were used as a means of systematically identifying the family behaviors under study. The first instrument, Empathy Measure (Stover, Guerney, & O'Connell, 1971), was used to collect

information on the levels of parental empathy by systematically analyzing verbal and nonverbal communications between parents and children.

The second instrument, Family-Role Interaction and Intentions Measure (Borke, 1967), was used to collect information on family-role interactions. Data were collected on the Initiator of the Communication, the Role of the person communicating, the role of the person receiving the communication (Recipient), the direction of the intention of the communication (Going Toward, Going Against, Going Away), and the intention of the communication from the standpoint of the person in the family role (secondary mode).

### Major Findings

Some major findings of this study in the attempt to describe families as they were portrayed on television were as follows.

#### Description of Families

1. Of the seventeen families in this study, 70 percent were nuclear families, 18 percent were families extended by one generation, and 12 percent were single-parent families. One mother and one father were in the role of single parent.
2. The average age of parents was in the age bracket 36 to 50 years, with the average age of children in the age bracket 13 to 19 years. Ages ranged from approximately one year to 60 years. All old people portrayed were youthful in appearance.

3. The majority of families portrayed were in the middle-socioeconomic status (76 percent). The next most frequent was the upper-socioeconomic status (18 percent), with lower-socioeconomic status appearing the least (6 percent).
4. Of the 17 families portrayed, there was an average of four children per family. Thirty-six were female, and 35 were male; they were nearly evenly distributed by sex across the 17 families.

#### Parental Empathy

1. The nine subject programs combined displayed average levels of parental empathy. From the scales of the measure, based on a one to five range, the average empathy score for all subject programs was 2.20.
2. Situation Comedies displayed significantly higher levels of parental empathy than Action Dramas and Soap Operas. Removing the program Dallas from the analysis caused the significant differences between Situation Comedy and Action Drama to disappear. With Dallas excluded, Situation Comedies and Action Dramas were significantly higher in their displays of parental empathy than Soap Operas.
3. The majority of parental empathy displayed toward children was verbal. Nonverbal displays of parental empathy were rare.
4. Parental empathy on The Waltons and Little House on the Prairie was straightforward and uncomplicated. Although

nonverbal displays of parental empathy were rare, these two programs displayed the majority of these situations.

5. To the casual observer, parental displays of empathy would be difficult to isolate. The rapid pace of television programs and the fleeting emotions made it difficult to see displays of parental empathy when systematically looking for it.
6. Parental empathy was not highly visible on the program Dallas. The parents and children in this program were adults with only one grandchild visible. The parental displays of empathy were low, in general, but were offset by the one good parent and child relationship in which high levels of empathy occurred frequently.

#### Family-Role Interactions

1. Significant differences were found in the frequencies of roles, secondary modes, and recipients of communications across program formats and within program formats. This indicated that families could not be categorized into the three program formats by family descriptions. The program formats were useful only in categorizing program types by production characteristics and styles of communication, but not by content analysis of role interactions.
2. Offering Information was the predominant secondary mode within all family role interactions. This secondary mode occurred in 12.9 percent of the interactions, followed by Seeks Information occurring 10.9 percent of the time.

3. The secondary modes, Shows Concern and Organizes, were predominantly parental roles. These secondary modes were most often used by parents with mother using them more than father. Father's use of these secondary modes was also directed at mother much the same as to children.
4. The secondary modes, Seeks Support, Seeks Attention, and Seeks Gratification, were predominantly portrayed by mother, wife, and children. The roles father and husband appeared only infrequently using these secondary modes.
5. Females initiated significantly more conversation than males. This may be interpreted as females controlling the family communications and being more powerful or merely fulfilling their expressive role.
6. Television families are highly sex-stereotyped. Most relationships displayed the traditional views of male and female roles with the male as instrumental and female as expressive.
7. Husband and wife roles occurred more frequently than any other roles. These roles were highly stereotyped, and depicted a husband in charge or control with the wife following orders and making home life suitable to the husband's expectations.
8. Male children held a favored position over female children on the subject programs analyzed. Although male children appeared less frequently, parents showed greater concern and care for males than for females.

9. Children under eight years of age appeared infrequently, leaving this role vague. Only in fleeting scenes were young children ever portrayed, leaving the impression that they were not important or did not even exist.
10. No black families were portrayed on any of the nine subject programs; out of 110 family members analyzed, none was an ethnic minority. In all, only one black person was portrayed and he had no apparent family.
11. The children portrayed were all precocious. All of the children acted much older than the age they portrayed. No children were observed who acted "appropriate" to their developmental stage.
12. For all family-role interactions, 83.2 percent were Going Toward, 13.5 percent were Going Against, and 3.3 percent were Going Away. Although approaching others in a constructive manner occurred more frequently, the plot of each program focused around the conflicts represented by Going Against.
13. Sibling rivalry was displayed highest between brothers. Brothers were Going Against each other in 31.7 percent of their interactions. Next after the brother relationship, the wife and husband dyad portrayed the second highest amount of Going Against (20.0 percent), followed by sister to sister Going Against (18.1 percent).

14. Mother-in-law and son-in-law relationships were portrayed as antagonistic, perpetuating the existing stereotype of this relationship. These roles occurred frequently in the Soap Operas, and were always portrayed as conflict situations.
15. Individualism was stressed over familism. Scenes were portrayed in which the independence of a child or other family member was emphasized. The struggle of autonomy and interdependence within the family were not obvious in this study.
16. Styles of family communication differed by program format. Situation Comedies used Humor as a method to communicate, Action Drama centered around violence and built up a complex network of communications, and Soap Operas' style of communication could be characterized as antagonistic.
17. Family problems were always resolved at the end of the program. At the conclusion of each program, the family had always weathered the crisis and was left smiling at one another or was left with the entire family bidding each other good night.
18. Soap Operas are not recommended as models for parenting and family life. They break every conceivable symbol of family trust and solidarity. Soap Opera families displayed the lowest levels of empathy ( $\bar{X} = 2.41$ ) and the largest amounts of Going Against behavior (15.0 percent). Goldsen

(1977) referred to these programs as portraying "fly apart marriages, throw away husbands, throw away wives, and-- recently throw away lovers" (p. 66).

### Implications

By and large, television continues to become more a part of our lives. The implications resulting from this study, beyond the description of television families, may provide a framework for using television families as case studies for teaching courses on the family, and for determining the effects of social learning of televised family life on existing families. Implications that were derived from this study are presented in two sections: (1) family-life education, and (2) directions for further research.

#### Family-Life Education

1. Whether television programs portray positive or negative models of families, they could be used as a readily available source for the study of the family. Although television families present the status quo from years gone by, within these family interactions were provided examples of effective and ineffective family communications.
2. Television, as a representation of the real world, distorts and presents a simplistic view of family life. Certain programs could hold an unrealistically high expectation for families to model, while others so distort behavior that it becomes difficult to distinguish right from wrong.

3. Through the identification process and the diversity of family life on television, it is possible for people to find common behaviors between themselves and television characters. With the difficulty in distinguishing levels of empathy and effective communication due to the encroachment of antisocial acts, it is possible that this learning incorporates behaviors of less than desirable nature as well as desirable behaviors.

#### Further Research

1. Additional research is needed to determine how social learning of television family roles occurs.
2. Instrumentation should be refined to incorporate coding of multiple meanings for single messages, the duration of the message, and its intensity.
3. Similar studies should be conducted in a natural setting with existing families to determine how representative television families are of the general population.
4. The use of commercial television in courses on family life should be explored for its utility as accessible case studies within the classroom.
5. Further research should investigate specifically if families are cognizant of the conflict and reinforcement potential of television's portrayal of family roles.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aldous, J., & Dahl, N. International bibliography of research in marriage and the family (Vol. II, 1965-1972). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1974.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. Introduction to research in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1972.
- Aspy, D. Counseling and education. In R. R. Carkhuff (Ed.), The counselor's contribution to facilitative process. Urbana, IL: Parkinson, 1967.
- Atkin, C. K., & Miller, M. M. Experimental effects of television advertising on children. Paper presented at the convention of the International Communication Association, Chicago, 1975.
- Atkin, C. K., Murray, J. P., & Nayman, O. The Surgeon General's research program on television and social behavior: A review of empirical findings. Journal of Broadcasting, 1971, 16, 21-39.
- Baggaley, J., & Duck, S. Dynamics of television. Westmead, England: Saxon House, 1978.
- Bales, R. F. Interaction process analysis. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1951.
- Bales, R. F., & Strodtbeck, F. L. Phases in group problem solving. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1951, 46, 485-495.
- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. Social learning and personality development. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1963.
- Bateson, G. Steps to an ecology of mind. New York: Chandler, 1972.
- Bateson, G., Jackson, D., Haley, J., & Weakland, J. Toward a theory of schizophrenia. Behavioral Science, 1956, 1, 251-264.
- Berkowitz, L. Violence in the mass media. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Aggression: A social psychological analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Berlo, D. K. The process of communication: An introduction to theory and practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1960.

- Bienvenu, M. S. J. Talking it over at home: Problems in family communication. Public Affairs Pamphlet (No. 410). New York: Public Affairs Committee, 1967.
- Bochner, A. P. Conceptual frontiers in the study of communication in families: An introduction to the literature. Human Communication Research, 1976, 2, 381-397.
- Borke, H. The communication of intent: A systematic approach to the observation of family interaction. Human Relations, 1967, 20, 13-28.
- Borke, H. Interpersonal perception of young children: Egocentrism or empathy? Developmental Psychology, 1971, 5, 263-269.
- Bower, R. T. Television and the public. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1973.
- Brim, D. G., & Wheeler, S. Socialization after childhood: Two essays. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Buchanan, H. E. Communication and marital interaction: An exploratory study (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1961). Dissertation Abstracts, 1961, 22, 243. (University Microfilms No. 61-02360)
- Burgess, E. W. The family as a unity of interacting personalities. The Family, 1926, 7, 3-9.
- Burke, P. J. Role differentiation and the legitimization of task activity. Sociometry, 1968, 31, 404-411.
- Burr, W. R. Theory construction and the society of the family. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1971.
- Burr, W. R., Hill, R., Nye, F. I., & Reiss, I. L. (Eds.). Contemporary theories about the family: General theories/theoretical orientations (Vol. II). New York: Free Press, 1979.
- Cantor, M. G. Prime-time television: Content and control. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1980.
- Caputo, D. V. The parents of the schizophrenic. Family Process, 1963, 2, 339-356.
- Carkhuff, R. R. The counselor's contribution to facilitative processes. Urbana, IL: Parkinson, 1967.
- Carkhuff, R. R., & Berenson, B. G. Beyond counseling and therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1967.

- Carkhuff, R. R., & Truax, C. B. Toward explaining success and failure in interpersonal learning experiences. Personnel Guidance Journal, 1966, 46, 723-278.
- Chandler, M. J. Egocentrism and antisocial behavior: The assessment and training of social perspective-taking skills. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 9(3), 326-332.
- Coffin, T. Television's effects on leisure time activities. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1948, 32, 550-558.
- Comstock, G. A., Chaffee, S., Katzman, N., McCombs, M., & Roberts, D. Television and human behavior. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.
- Comstock, G. A., & Lindsey, G. Television and human behavior: The research horizon, future and present. Santa Monica: The Rand Corp., 1975.
- Daniel, W. W. Applied non-parametric statistics. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.
- DeFleur, M. L. Occupational roles as portrayed on television. Popular Opinion Quarterly, 1964, 28(1), 57-74.
- Drechsler, R. J., & Shapiro, M. I. A procedure of direct observation of family interaction in a child guidance clinic. Psychiatry, 1961, 24, 163-170.
- Drechsler, R. J., & Shapiro, M. I. Two methods of analysis of family diagnostic data. Family Process, 1963, 2, 367-370.
- Dunn, O. J. Multiple comparisons using rank sums. Technometrics, 1964, 6, 241-252.
- Dymond, R. F. Personality and empathy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1950, 14, 343-350.
- Farina, A. Patterns of role dominance and conflict in parents of schizophrenic patients. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 30-38.
- Fenichel, O. The psychoanalytic theory of neurosis. New York: Norton, 1945.
- Ferreira, A. J., & Winter, W. D. Family interaction and decision-making. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1965, 13, 214-233.

- Feshbach, N. D. Empathy: An interpersonal process. In W. Hartup (Chair), Social understanding in children and adults: Perspectives on social cognition. Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, August 1973.
- Feshbach, N. D. Empathy in children: Some theoretical and empirical considerations. Counseling Psychologist, 1975, 5(2), 25-30.
- Feshbach, N. D. Studies of empathic behavior in children. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), Progress in experimental personality research, Vol. 8. New York: Academic Free Press, 1978.
- Feshbach, N. D., & Kuchenbecker, S. A three component model of empathy. In R. Iannotti (Chair), The concept of empathy: Bond between cognition and social behavior. Symposium presented at the 82nd Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, September 1974.
- Feshbach, S., & Feshbach, N. D. Cognitive processes in the self-regulation of children's aggression: Fantasy and empathy. Paper presented at the Conference on Developmental Aspects of Self-Regulation, LaJolla, February 1972.
- Foley, V. D. An introduction to family therapy. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1974.
- Foot, N., & Cottrell, L. B. Identity and interpersonal competence. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Foster, J. E. Father images: Television and ideal. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1964, 26, 353-355.
- Framo, J. L. Systematic research on family dynamics. In I. Boszormenyi-Nagy & J. L. Framo (Eds.), Intensive family therapy: Theoretical and practical aspects. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Framo, J. L. (Ed.). Family interaction: A dialogue between family researchers and family therapists. New York: Springer, 1972.
- Geer, J. H., & Jarnecky, L. The effect of being responsible for reducing another's pain on subject's response and arousal. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26, 232-237.
- Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. Living with television: The violence profile. Journal of Communication, 1976, 26(2), 173-199.
- Glasser, W. Reality therapy: A new approach to psychiatry. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

- Goffman, E. The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor, 1959.
- Goldsen, R. K. The show and tell machine: How television works and works you over. New York: Dial Press, 1977.
- Goldstein, M. J., Gould, E., Alkire, A., Rodnick, E. H., & Judd, L. L. Interpersonal themes in the Thematic Apperception Test stories of families of disturbed adolescents. Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases, 1970, 150, 354-365.
- Goldstein, M. J., Judd, L. L., Rodnick, E. H., Alkire, A., & Gould, E. A method for studying social influence and coping patterns within families of disturbed adolescents. Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases, 1968, 147, 233-254.
- Gordon, I. J. Significant social-cultural factors in effective parenting. In M. D. Fantini & R. Cardenas (Eds.), Parenting in a multicultural society. New York: Longman, 1980.
- Greenberg, B. S. Life on television: Content analysis of U.S. tv drama. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing, 1980.
- Guerney, B. G., Jr., Stover, L., & DeMeritt, S. A measure of empathy in parent-child interaction. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1968, 112, 49-55.
- Gumpert, G., & Cathcar, R. (Eds.). Inter/Media: Interpersonal communication in a media world. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Haley, J. Observation of the family of the schizophrenic. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1960, 30, 460-467.
- Haley, J. The strategies of psychotherapy. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1963.
- Haley, J. (Ed.). Changing families. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1971.
- Hatch, R. S. An evaluation of a forced-choice differential accuracy approach to the measurement of supervisory empathy (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1961). Dissertation Abstracts, 1962, 23, 323. (University Microfilms No. 62-03110)
- Henry, J. Pathways to madness. New York: Random House, 1971.
- Hill, R. Methodological issues in family development research. Family Process, 1964, 3(1), 186-206.
- Hill, R. Decision-making and the family life cycle. In E. Shanas & C. F. Streib (Eds.), Social structures and the family generational relations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

- Hill, R., & Aldous, J. Socialization for marriage and parenthood. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1969.
- Hill, R., & Hansen, D. A. The identification of conceptual frameworks utilized in family study. Marriage and Family Living, 1960, 22, 299-311.
- Horney, K. Our inner conflicts. New York: Norton, 1945.
- Howells, J. G. Principles of family psychiatry. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1975.
- Huckabay, L. M. A developmental study of the relationship of negative moral-social behaviors to empathy, to positive social behaviors and to cognitive moral judgment (Doctoral dissertation, University of California-Los Angeles, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 1337A. (University Microfilms No. 71-23010)
- Iannotti, R. J., & Meacham, J. A. The nature, measurement and development of empathy. Paper presented at meeting of Eastern Psychological Association, Philadelphia, 1974.
- Jackson, D. D. The question of family homeostasis. Psychiatric Quarterly Supplement, 1957, 31, 79-90.
- Jackson, D. D. The eternal triangle. In J. Haley & L. Hoffman (Eds.), Techniques of family therapy. New York: Basic Books, 1967.
- Jackson, D. D., & Satir, V. A review of psychiatric developments in family diagnosis and family therapy. In N. Ackerman, F. Beatman, & S. Sherman (Eds.), Exploring the base for family therapy. New York: Family Association of America, 1961.
- Jacob, T. Family interaction in disturbed and normal families: A methodological and substantive review. Psychological Bulletin, 1975, 82, 33-65.
- Kafka, F. Letter to his father. (E. Kaiser & E. Wilkins, Trans.) London: Schocken Books, 1966.
- Kantor, D., & Lehr, W. Inside the family. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.
- Katz, R. L. Empathy: Its nature and uses. New York: Free Press, 1963.

- Kenkel, W. F. Influence differentiation in family decision making. Sociology and Social Research, 1957, 42, 18-25.
- Kerr, W. A., & Speroff, B. J. The empathy test: Supplement to the manual. Chicago: Psychometric Affiliates, 1951.
- Klemer, R. H., & Smith, R. M. Teaching about family relationships. Minneapolis: Burgess, 1975.
- Kohlberg, L. Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior: Theory, research and social issues. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1976.
- Laswell, H. D. The structure and function of communications in society. In L. Bryson (Ed.), The communication of ideas. New York: Harper & Row, 1948.
- Lazarus, R. S. Psychological stress and the coping process. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- LeMasters, E. E. Parents in modern America (3rd ed.). Homewood, IL: Dorsey, 1977.
- Lennard, H. L., & Bernstein, A. Patterns in human interaction. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.
- Liebert, R. M., Neale, J. M., & Davidson, E. S. The early window: Effects on children and youth. New York: Pergamon Press, 1973.
- Liebert, R. M., & Poulas, R. W. Television as amoral teacher. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Man and morality: Theory, research and social issues. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1976.
- McDougall, W. An introduction to social psychology (15th Ed.). London: Methuen, 1920.
- Mahoney, S. C. The literature empathy tests: Development of a procedure for differentiating between "good empathizers" and "bad empathizers" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1960). Dissertation Abstracts, 1960, 21, 674. (University Microfilms No. 00-17869)
- Mead, D. E. Six approaches to child rearing: Models from psychological theory. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 1976.
- Mead, G. H. Mind, self and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Mead, M. And keep your powder dry. New York: William Morrow, 1943.

- Miller, M. M., & Reeves, B. Dramatic TV content and children's sex-role stereotype. Journal of Broadcasting, 1976, 20(1), 35-50.
- Mishler, E. G., & Waxler, N. E. Interaction in families: An experimental study of family processes and schizophrenia. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1968.
- Mishler, E. G., & Waxler, N. E. Functions of hesitations in the speech of normal families and the families of schizophrenic patients. Language and Speech, 1970, 13, 102-117.
- Murphy, G. Personality. New York: Harper, 1947.
- Murrell, S. A., & Stachowiak, J. G. The family group: Development, structure, and therapy. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1965, 27, 13-19.
- Murrell, S. A., & Stachowiak, J. G. Consistency, rigidity, and power in the interaction patterns of clinic and non-clinic families. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1967, 72, 265-272.
- Nielsen, A. C., Co. Personal communication with Assistant Director, National Television Index, March 18, 1981.
- Novak, M. Television shapes the soul. In G. Gumpert & R. Cathcar (Eds.), Inter/Media: Interpersonal communication in a media world. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Olson, D. H. The measurement of power using self-report and behavioral methods. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1969, 31, 545-550.
- O'Rourke, J. F. Field and lab: The decision-making behavior of family groups in two experimental conditions. Sociometry, 1963, 26, 422-435.
- Paul, N. L. Parental empathy. In E. Anthony & T. Benedek (Eds.), Parenthood: Its psychology and psychopathology. London: Little Brown, 1970.
- Parsons, T., & Bales, R. Family, socialization and interaction. New York: Free Press, 1955.
- Pear, T. H. What television might do. Listener, November 18, 1936, p. 17.
- Piaget, J. The moral judgment of the child. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1932.

- Postman, N. TV's "disastrous" impact on children. U.S. News and World Report, January 19, 1981, pp. 43-45.
- Powers, W. G., & Hutchinson, K. The measurement of communication apprehension in the marriage relationship. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1979, 41, 89-95.
- Raush, H. L., Barry, W. A., Hertel, R. K., & Swain, M. A. Communication, conflict and marriage. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- Reusch, J., & Bateson, G. Communication: The social matrix of psychiatry. New York: Norton, 1951.
- Ribot, T. The psychology of the emotions. London: W. Scott, Ltd., 1897.
- Riskin, J., & Faunce, E. E. Family interaction scales, I: Theoretical framework and method. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1970, 22, 504-512.
- Riskin, J., & Faunce, E. E. An evaluative review of family interaction research. Family Process, 1972, 11(4), 365-455.
- Robinson, J. P. Television and leisure time: A new scenario. Journal of Communication, 1981, 31(1), 120-130.
- Rogers, C. R. Client-centered therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.
- Rogers, C. R. The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 95-103.
- Rogers, C. R., Gendlin, E. T., Kiessler, D., & Truax, C. B. The therapeutic relationship and its impact: A study of psychotherapy with schizophrenics. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.
- Rubenstein, E. A., Liebert, R. M., Neale, J. M., & Poulas, R. W. Assessing television's influence of children's prosocial behavior. Stony Brook, NY: Brooksdale Int. Inst., 1974.
- Rue, V. M. Television and the family: A question of control. The Family Coordinator, 1974, 23, 73-81.
- Ruesch, J., & Kees, W. Nonverbal communication: Notes on the visual perception of human relations. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956.

- Safilios-Rothschild, C. The study of family power structure: A review 1960-1969. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 539-552.
- Sarbin, T. R. Role theory. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology: Vol. I Theory and Method. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
- Satir, V. Conjoint family therapy (2nd rev. ed.). Palo Alto: Science & Behavior Books, 1967.
- Satir, V. Peoplemaking. Palo Alto: Science & Behavior Books, 1972.
- Scheler, M. [The Nature of Sympathy] (P. Heath, Trans.). New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954. (Originally published, 1923.)
- Schuham, A. I. The double bind hypothesis a decade later. Psychological Bulletin, 1967, 68, 409-416.
- Shannon, C., & Weaver, W. The mathematical theory of communication. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949.
- Singer, J. L. The power and limitations of television: A cognitive-affective analysis. In P. H. Tannenbaum (Ed.), The entertainment function of television. Hillsdale, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Association, 1980.
- Slater, P. E. Role differentiation in small groups. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 300-310.
- Smith, H. C. Sensitivity to people. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Sorrels, J. M., & Ford, F. F. Toward an integrated theory of families and family therapy. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 1969, 6(3), 150-160.
- Staub, E. The use of role playing and induction in children's learning of helping and sharing behavior. Child Development, 1971, 42, 805-816.
- Stotland, E., Mathews, K. E., Jr., Sherman, S. E., Hansson, R. O., & Richardson, B. Z. Empathy, fantasy and helping. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1978.
- Stotland, E., Sherman, S. E., & Shaver, K. G. Empathy and birth order: Some experimental explorations. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971.

- Stotland, E., & Walsh, J. Birth order, in an experimental study of empathy. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 61, 619-614.
- Stover, L., & Guerney, B. G., Jr. The efficacy of training procedures for mothers' filial therapy. Psychotherapy Theory Research and Practice, 1967, 4(3), 110-115.
- Stover, L., Guerney, B. G., & O'Connell, M. Measurements of acceptance, allowing self-direction, involvement and empathy in adult-child interaction. Journal of Psychology, 1971, 77, 261-269.
- Strachey, J. (Eds.). The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Freud. (Vol. 14). London: Heath Press, 1957.
- Straus, M. A. Laboratory experimental studies of family roles. Indian Journal of Social Research, 1966, 1, 25-36.
- Straus, M. A. Communication, creativity and problem solving ability of middle- and working-class families in three societies. American Journal of Sociology, 1968, 73, 429.
- Strodtbeck, L. Husband-wife interaction over revealed differences. American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, 468-473.
- Sullivan, H. S. The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: Norton, 1953.
- Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior. Television and growing up: The impact of televised violence. Report to the Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1972.
- TV Guide, March 22, 1981.
- Taguiri, R. Person perception. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology (Vol. 3). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- Tannenbaum, P. H. (Ed.). The entertainment function of television. Hillsdale, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Assoc., 1980.
- Thayer, L. (Ed.). Communication and communication systems. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, 1968.
- Truax, C. B. A scale for the measurement of accurate empathy. Psychiatric Institute Bulletin, 1961, 1(12).

- Truax, C. B., & Carkhuff, R. R. Significant developments in psychotherapy research. In L. E. Abt, & B. F. Reiss (Eds.), Progress in clinical psychology. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1964.
- Truax, C. B., & Carkhuff, R. R. An introduction to counseling psychotherapy: Training and practice. Chicago: Aldine, 1966.
- Turk, J. L. Power as the achievement of ends: A problematic approach in family and small group research. Family Process, 1974, 13(1), 39-52.
- Turk, J. L., & Bell, N. W. Measuring power in families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34, 215-223.
- Turner, R. H. Family interaction. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970.
- Waxler, N. E., & Mishler, E. G. Experimental studies of families. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 6). New York: Academic Press, 1971.
- Weinraub, M. Fatherhood: The myth of the second-class parent. In J. H. Stevans, & M. Mathews (Eds.), Mother/child father/child relationships. Washington, DC: NAEYC, 1978.
- Weiner, N. The human use of human beings. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1954.
- Winter, W. C., & Ferreira, A. J. Interaction process analysis of family decision making. Family Process, 1967, 6(2), 155-172.
- Zahn-Waxler, C., Radke-Yarrow, M., & King, R. A. Child rearing and children's prosocial initiations towards victims of distress. Child Development, 1979, 50, 319-330.
- Zimmer, J. M., & Anderson, S. Dimensions of positive regard and empathy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 417-426.

APPENDIX A

FAMILY-ROLE INTERACTIONS AND INTENTIONS MEASURE

PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

- 120-121
- 123
- 
- 
- 
- 

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106 (313) 761-4700

APPENDIX B  
EMPATHY MEASURE

APPENDIX C  
EMPATHY MEASURE CODING SHEET

PROGRAM \_\_\_\_\_

TAPE NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

Communication  
of Acceptance

/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Footage Beginning

Allowing Self-  
Direction

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Footage Ending

Involvement

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Communication  
of Acceptance

/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Footage Beginning

Allowing Self-  
Direction

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Footage Ending

Involvement

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Communication  
of Acceptance

/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Footage Beginning

Allowing Self-  
Direction

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Footage Ending

Involvement

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX D  
FAMILY-ROLE INTERACTIONS CODING SHEET



APPENDIX E

FAMILY DEMOGRAPHIC CODING SHEET



APPENDIX F

COMMUNICATION INTENTIONS BETWEEN ROLE AND RECIPIENT

Table 17  
 Frequency and Percentage of Wife's Use of  
 Secondary Modes With Husband as  
 Recipient in Family-Role  
 Interactions

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Information	Humor	Miscellaneous	Affirmation	Shows Concern	Seeks Support	Seeks Attention	Seeks Grat- ification	Organizes
Wife	Frequency	32	46	1	11	19	42	37	14	11	21
	Row PCT	7.5	10.8	0.2	2.6	4.4	9.8	8.7	3.3	2.6	4.9
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Tot PCT	7.5	10.8	0.2	2.6	4.6	9.8	8.7	3.3	2.6	4.9
	Column Totals	32 7.5	46 10.8	1 0.2	11 2.6	19 4.4	42 9.8	37 8.7	14 3.3	11 2.6	21 4.9

Role		Positively Manipulates	Instructs	Accepts Supports	Accepts Opinion	Dis- regards	Opposes	Negatively Manipulates	Attacks	Evades	Withdraws	Row Totals
Wife	Frequency	47	20	10	7	11	23	24	28	17	6	427
	Row PCT	11.0	4.7	2.3	1.6	2.6	5.4	5.6	6.6	4.0	1.4	100.0
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	11.0	4.7	2.3	1.6	2.6	5.4	5.6	6.6	4.0	1.4	
	Column Totals	47 11.0	20 4.7	10 2.3	7 1.6	11 2.6	23 5.4	24 5.6	28 6.6	17 4.0	6 1.4	427 100.0

Table 18  
 Frequency and Percentage of Husband's Use of  
 Secondary Modes With Wife as Recipient in  
 Family-Role Interactions

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Information	Humor	Miscellaneous	Affirmation	Shows Concern	Seeks Support	Seeks Attention	Seeks Grat- ification	Organizes
Husband	Frequency	58	45	12	11	9	46	28	12	5	28
	Row PCT	13.7	10.6	2.8	2.6	2.1	10.8	6.6	2.8	1.2	6.6
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Tot PCT	13.7	10.6	2.8	2.6	2.1	10.9	6.6	2.8	1.2	6.6
	Column Totals	58 13.7	45 10.6	12 2.8	11 2.6	9 2.1	46 10.8	28 6.6	12 2.8	5 1.2	28 6.6

  

Role		Positively Manipulates	Instructs	Accepts Supports	Accepts Opinion	Dis- regards	Opposes	Negatively Manipulates	Attacks	Evades	Withdraws	Row Totals
Husband	Frequency	25	47	5	6	7	26	16	20	15	3	424
	Row PCT	5.9	11.1	1.2	1.4	1.7	6.1	3.8	4.7	3.5	0.7	100.0
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Tot PCT	5.9	11.1	1.2	1.4	1.7	6.1	3.8	4.7	3.5	0.7	
	Column Totals	25 5.9	47 11.1	5 1.2	6 1.4	7 1.6	26 6.1	16 3.8	20 4.7	15 3.5	3 0.7	424 100.0

Table 19  
 Frequency and Percentage of Son's and Daughter's  
 Use of Secondary Modes With Father as  
 Recipient in Family-Role  
 Interactions

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Information	Humor	Miscellaneous	Affirmation	Shows Concern	Seeks Support	Seeks Attention	Seeks Gratification	Organizes
Son	Frequency	18	12	6	7	5	1	5	2	0	1
	Row PCT	24.3	16.2	8.1	9.5	6.8	1.4	6.8	2.7	0.0	1.4
	Col PCT	52.4	50.0	85.7	46.7	55.6	7.7	26.3	18.2	0.0	50.0
	Tot PCT	9.0	6.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	0.5	2.5	1.0	0.0	0.5
Daughter	Frequency	16	12	1	8	4	12	14	9	8	1
	Row PCT	12.6	9.4	0.8	6.3	3.1	9.4	11.0	7.1	6.3	0.8
	Col PCT	47.1	50.0	14.3	53.3	44.4	92.3	73.7	81.8	100.0	50.0
	Tot PCT	8.0	6.0	0.5	4.0	2.0	6.0	7.0	4.5	4.0	0.5
	Column	34	24	7	15	9	13	19	11	8	2
	Totals	16.9	11.9	3.5	7.5	4.5	6.5	9.5	5.5	4.0	1.0

Role		Positively Manipulates	Instructs	Accepts Supports	Accepts Opinion	Disregards	Opposes	Negatively Manipulates	Attacks	Evades	Withdraws	Row Totals
Son	Frequency	3	0	5	1	3	2	1	0	0	2	74
	Row PCT	4.1	0.0	6.8	1.4	4.1	2.7	1.4	0.0	0.0	2.7	36.8
	Col PCT	18.8	0.0	100.0	25.0	100.0	16.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	1.5	0.0	2.5	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.0	
Daughter	Frequency	13	9	0	3	0	10	2	1	4	0	127
	Row PCT	10.2	7.1	0.0	2.4	0.0	7.9	1.6	0.8	3.1	0.0	63.2
	Col PCT	81.2	100.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	83.3	66.7	100.0	100.0	0.0	
	Tot PCT	6.5	4.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	5.0	1.0	0.5	2.0	0.0	
	Column	16	9	5	4	3	12	3	1	4	2	201
	Totals	8.0	4.5	2.5	2.09	1.5	6.0	1.5	0.5	2.0	1.0	100.0

Table 20  
 Frequency and Percentage of Son's and Daughter's  
 Use of Secondary Modes With Mother as  
 Recipient in Family-Role  
 Interactions

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Information	Humor	Miscellaneous	Affirmation	Shows Concern	Seeks Support	Seeks Attention	Seeks Grat- ification	Organizes
Son	Frequency	8	5	2	0	5	15	5	3	0	1
	Row PCT	13.1	8.2	3.3	0.0	8.2	24.6	8.2	4.9	0.0	1.6
	Col PCT	28.6	25.0	25.0	0.0	41.7	37.5	15.2	20.0	0.0	50.0
	Tot PCT	3.5	2.2	.9	0.0	2.2	6.6	2.2	1.3	0.0	0.4
Daughter	Frequency	20	15	6	12	7	25	28	12	1	1
	Row PCT	11.9	8.9	3.6	7.1	4.2	14.9	6.7	7.1	0.6	0.6
	Col PCT	71.4	75.0	75.0	100.0	58.3	62.5	84.8	80.0	100.0	50.0
	Tot PCT	8.7	6.6	2.6	5.2	3.1	10.9	12.2	5.2	0.4	0.4
	Column	28	20	8	12	12	40	33	15	1	2
	Totals	12.2	8.7	3.5	5.2	5.2	17.5	14.4	6.6	0.4	0.9

Role		Positively Manipulates	Instructs	Accepts Supports	Accepts Opinion	Dis- regards	Opposes	Negatively Manipulates	Attacks	Evades	Row Totals
Son	Frequency	4	4	2	1	1	1	0	4	0	61
	Row PCT	6.6	6.6	3.3	1.6	1.6	1.6	0.0	6.6	0.0	26.6
	Col PCT	26.7	30.8	25.0	50.0	20.0	12.5	0.0	100.0	0.0	
	Tot PCT	1.7	1.7	.9	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.0	1.7	0.0	
Daughter	Frequency	11	9	6	1	4	7	2	0	1	168
	Row PCT	6.5	5.4	3.6	0.6	2.4	4.2	1.2	0.0	0.6	73.4
	Col PCT	73.3	69.2	75.0	50.0	80.0	87.5	100.0	0.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	4.8	3.9	2.6	0.4	1.7	3.1	.9	0.0	0.4	
	Column	15	13	8	2	5	8	2	4	1	229
	Totals	6.6	5.7	3.5	.9	2.2	3.5	.9	1.7	0.4	100.0

Table 21  
 Frequency and Percentage of Father's and Mother's Use  
 of Secondary Modes With Son as Recipient in  
 Family-Role Interactions

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Information	Humor	Miscellaneous	Affirmation	Shows Concern	Seeks Support	Seeks Attention	Seeks Grat- ification	Organizes
Father	Frequency	13	12	3	7	7	7	1	0	0	4
	Row PCT	16.0	14.8	3.7	8.6	8.6	8.6	1.2	0.0	0.0	4.9
	Col PCT	65.0	60.0	42.9	77.8	41.2	21.2	50.0	0.0	0.0	80.0
	Tot PCT	7.7	7.1	1.8	4.2	4.2	4.2	0.6	0.0	0.0	2.4
Mother	Frequency	7	8	4	2	10	26	1	2	1	1
	Row PCT	8.0	9.2	4.6	2.3	11.5	29.9	1.1	2.3	1.1	1.1
	Col PCT	35.0	40.0	57.1	22.2	58.8	78.8	50.0	100.0	100.0	20.0
	Tot PCT	4.2	4.8	2.4	1.2	6.0	15.5	0.6	1.2	0.6	0.6
	Column	20	20	7	9	17	33	2	2	1	5
	Totals	11.9	11.9	4.2	5.4	10.1	19.6	1.2	1.2	0.6	3.0

Role		Positively Manipulates	Instructs	Accepts Supports	Accepts Opinion	Disregards	Opposes	Negatively Manipulates	Attacks	Row Totals
Father	Frequency	3	13	0	0	1	6	0	4	81
	Row PCT	3.7	16.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	7.4	0.0	4.9	48.2
	Col PCT	42.9	59.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	5.5	0.0	80.0	
	Tot PCT	1.8	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.6	3.6	0.0	2.4	
Mother	Frequency	4	9	3	2	0	5	1	1	87
	Row PCT	4.6	10.3	3.4	2.3	0.0	5.7	1.1	1.1	51.8
	Col PCT	57.1	40.9	100.0	100.0	0.0	45.0	100.0	20.0	
	Tot PCT	2.4	5.4	1.8	1.2	0.0	3.0	0.6	0.6	
	Column	7	22	3	2	1	11	1	5	168
	Totals	4.2	13.1	1.8	1.2	0.6	6.5	0.6	3.0	100.0

Table 22

Frequency and Percentage of Father's and Mother's  
Use of Secondary Modes With Daughter as  
Recipient in Family-Role Interactions

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Information	Humor	Miscellaneous	Affirmation	Shows Concern	Seeks Support	Seeks Attention	Seeks Grat- ification	Organizes
Father	Frequency	26	15	4	7	7	13	9	2	1	2
	Row PCT	17.6	10.1	2.7	4.7	4.7	8.8	6.1	1.4	0.7	1.4
	Col PCT	54.2	50.0	40.0	38.9	38.9	34.2	30.0	66.7	20.0	14.3
	Tot PCT	7.5	4.3	1.1	2.0	2.0	3.7	2.6	0.6	0.3	0.6
Mother	Frequency	22	15	6	11	11	25	21	1	4	12
	Row PCT	11.0	7.5	3.0	5.5	5.5	12.5	10.5	0.5	2.0	6.0
	Col PCT	45.8	50.0	60.0	61.1	61.1	65.8	70.0	33.3	80.0	85.7
	Tot PCT	6.3	4.3	1.7	3.2	3.2	7.2	6.0	0.3	1.1	3.4
Column	48	30	10	18	18	38	30	3	5	14	
Totals	13.8	8.6	2.9	5.2	5.2	10.9	8.6	0.9	1.4	4.0	

Role		Positively Manipulates	Instructs	Accepts Supports	Accepts Opinion	Dis- regards	Opposes	Negatively Manipulates	Attacks	Evades	Withdraws	Row Totals
Father	Frequency	18	9	4	2	0	11	3	1	8	6	148
	Row PCT	12.2	6.1	2.7	1.4	0.0	7.4	2.0	0.7	5.4	4.1	42.5
	Col PCT	45.0	33.3	57.1	40.0	0.0	61.1	100.0	100.0	42.1	85.7	
	Tot PCT	5.2	2.6	1.1	0.6	0.0	3.2	0.9	0.3	2.3	1.7	
Mother	Frequency	22	18	3	3	7	7	0	0	11	0	200
	Row PCT	11.0	9.0	1.5	1.5	3.5	3.5	0.0	0.0	5.5	0.5	57.5
	Col PCT	55.0	66.7	42.9	60.0	100.0	38.9	0.0	0.0	57.9	14.3	
	Tot PCT	6.3	5.2	0.9	0.9	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.3	
Column	40	27	7	5	7	18	3	1	19	7	348	
Totals	11.5	7.8	2.0	1.4	2.0	5.2	0.9	0.3	5.5	2.0	100.0	

Table 23

Frequency and Percentage of Brother's and Sister's  
Use of Secondary Modes With Brother as Recipient  
in Family-Role Interactions

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Information	Humor	Miscellaneous	Affirmation	Shows Concern	Seeks Support	Seeks Attention	Seeks Grat- ification	Organizes
Brother	Frequency	10	4	4	6	0	1	1	0	0	0
	Row PCT	24.4	9.8	9.8	14.6	0.0	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Col PCT	40.0	14.3	50.0	85.7	0.0	14.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Tot PCT	6.3	2.5	2.5	3.8	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sister	Frequency	15	24	4	1	2	6	5	1	2	2
	Row PCT	12.7	20.3	3.4	0.8	1.7	5.1	4.2	0.8	1.7	1.7
	Col PCT	60.0	85.7	50.0	14.3	100.0	85.7	83.3	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Tot PCT	9.4	15.1	2.5	0.6	1.3	3.8	3.1	0.6	1.3	1.3
	Column	25	28	8	7	2	7	6	1	2	2
	Totals	15.7	17.6	5.0	4.4	1.3	4.4	3.8	0.6	1.3	1.3

  

Role		Positively Manipulates	Instructs	Accepts Supports	Accepts Opinion	Dis- regards	Opposes	Negatively Manipulates	Attacks	Evades	Withdraws	Row Totals
Brother	Frequency	1	0	0	1	1	0	10	2	0	0	41
	Row PCT	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.4	2.4	0.0	24.4	4.9	0.0	0.0	25.8
	Col PCT	4.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	0.0	76.9	28.6	0.0	0.0	
	Tot PCT	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.0	6.3	1.3	0.0	0.0	
Sister	Frequency	22	8	1	3	1	10	3	5	2	1	118
	Row PCT	18.6	6.8	0.8	2.5	0.8	8.5	2.5	4.2	1.7	0.8	74.2
	Col PCT	95.7	100.0	100.0	75.0	50.0	100.0	23.1	71.4	100.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	13.8	5.0	0.6	1.9	0.6	6.3	1.9	3.1	1.3	0.6	
	Column	23	8	1	4	2	10	13	7	2	1	159
	Totals	14.4	5.0	0.6	2.5	1.3	6.3	8.2	4.4	1.3	0.6	100.0

Table 24  
 Frequency and Percentage of Brother's and Sister's  
 Use of Secondary Modes With Sister as Recipient  
 in Family-Role Interactions

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Information	Humor	Miscellaneous	Affirmation	Shows Concern	Seeks Support	Seeks Attention	Seeks Grat- ification	Organizes
Brother	Frequency	23	18	3	3	0	5	9	4	0	0
	Row PCT	21.1	16.5	2.8	2.8	0.0	4.6	8.3	3.7	0.0	0.0
	Col PCT	53.5	45.0	37.5	75.0	0.0	20.0	56.3	57.1	0.0	0.0
	Tot PCT	8.2	6.4	1.1	1.1	0.0	1.8	3.2	1.4	0.0	0.0
Sister	Frequency	20	22	5	1	16	20	7	3	2	5
	Row PCT	11.7	12.9	2.9	0.6	9.4	11.7	4.1	1.8	1.2	2.9
	Col PCT	46.5	55.0	62.5	25.0	100.0	80.0	43.8	42.9	100.0	100.0
	Tot PCT	7.1	7.9	1.8	0.4	5.7	7.1	2.5	1.1	0.7	1.8
	Column	43	40	8	4	16	25	16	7	2	5
	Totals	15.4	14.3	2.9	1.4	5.7	8.9	5.7	2.5	0.7	1.8

  

Role		Positively Manipulates	Instructs	Accepts Supports	Accepts Opinion	Dis- regards	Opposes	Negatively Manipulates	Attacks	Evades	Withdraws	Row Totals
Brother	Frequency	12	3	1	4	4	6	3	1	10	0	109
	Row PCT	11.0	2.8	0.9	3.7	3.7	5.5	2.8	0.9	9.2	0.0	38.9
	Col PCT	50.0	27.3	11.1	36.4	57.1	33.3	30.0	10.0	83.3	0.0	
	Tot PCT	4.3	1.1	0.4	1.4	1.4	2.1	1.1	0.4	3.5	0.0	
Sister	Frequency	12	8	8	7	3	12	7	9	2	2	171
	Row PCT	7.0	4.7	4.7	4.1	1.8	7.0	4.1	5.3	1.2	1.2	61.1
	Col PCT	50.0	72.7	88.9	63.6	42.9	66.7	70.0	90.0	16.7	100.0	
	Tot PCT	4.3	2.9	2.9	2.5	1.1	4.3	2.5	3.2	0.7	0.7	
	Column	24	11	9	11	7	18	10	10	12	2	280
	Totals	8.6	3.9	3.2	3.9	2.5	6.4	3.6	3.6	4.3	0.7	100.0

Table 25  
 Frequency and Percentage of Son-in-Law's and  
 Daughter-in-Law's Use of Secondary Modes  
 With Mother-in-Law as Recipient  
 Family-Role Interactions

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Information	Miscellaneous	Affirmation	Shows Concern	Seeks Support	Seeks Attention	Organizes	Positively Manipulates	Instructs
Son-in-Law	Frequency	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	0	0
	Row PCT	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	13.0	0.0	0.0
	Col PCT	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
	Tot PCT	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0
Daughter-in-Law	Frequency	7	4	0	1	7	13	1	6	3	7
	Row PCT	13.2	7.5	0.0	1.9	13.2	24.5	1.9	11.3	5.7	13.2
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	87.5	100.0	100.0	66.7	100.0	100.0
	Tot PCT	9.2	5.3	0.0	1.3	9.2	17.1	1.3	7.9	3.9	9.2

  

Role		Accepts Supports	Accepts Opinion	Negatively Manipulates	Attacks	Evades	Row Totals
Son-in-Law	Frequency	1	0	1	8	8	23
	Row PCT	4.3	0.0	4.3	34.8	34.8	30.3
	Col PCT	50.0	0.0	1.3	10.5	10.5	
	Tot PCT	1.3	0.0	1.3	10.5	10.5	
Daughter-in-Law	Frequency	1	3	0	0	0	53
	Row PCT	1.9	5.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	69.7
	Col PCT	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Tot PCT	1.3	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Column	2	3	1	8	8	76
	Totals	2.6	3.9	1.3	10.5	10.5	100.0

Table 26  
 Frequency and Percentage of Son-in-Law's and  
 Daughter-in-Law's Use of Secondary Modes  
 With Father-in-Law as Recipient in  
 Family-Role Interactions

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Information	Humor	Miscellaneous	Affirmation	Seeks Support	Attention	Organizes	Positively Manipulates	Instructs
Son-in-Law	Frequency	5	3	4	1	9	2	1	2	1	1
	Row PCT	11.9	7.1	9.5	2.4	21.4	4.8	2.4	4.8	2.4	2.4
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Tot PCT	11.6	7.0	9.3	2.3	20.9	4.7	2.3	4.7	2.3	2.3
Daughter-in-Law	Frequency	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Row PCT	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Col PCT	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Tot PCT	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Column	5	3	4	2	9	2	1	2	1	1	
Totals	11.6	7.0	9.3	4.7	20.9	4.7	2.3	4.7	2.3	2.3	

Role		Accepts Supports	Accepts Opinion	Opposes	Attacks	Row Totals
Son-in-Law	Frequency	2	4	6	1	42
	Row PCT	4.8	9.5	14.3	2.4	97.7
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	4.5	9.1	13.6	2.3	
Daughter-in-Law	Frequency	0	0	0	0	1
	Row PCT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
	Col PCT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Tot PCT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Column	2	4	6	1	43	
Totals	4.7	9.3	14.0	2.3	100.0	

Table 27  
 Frequency and Percentage of Mother-in-Law's Use of  
 Secondary Modes With Daughter-in-Law as  
 in Family-Role Interaction

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Information	Humor	Miscellaneous	Affirmation	Shows Concern	Seeks Support	Organizes	Positively Manipulates	Instructs
Mother-in-Law	Frequency	15	7	1	0	4	12	1	2	1	3
	Row PCT	29.4	13.7	2.0	0.0	7.8	23.5	2.0	3.9	2.0	5.9
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Tot PCT	29.4	13.7	2.0	0.0	7.8	23.5	2.0	3.9	2.0	5.9
	Column Totals	15 29.4	7 13.7	1 2.0	0 0.0	4 7.8	12 23.5	1 2.0	2 3.9	1 2.0	3 5.9

  

Role		Accepts Opinions	Disregards	Negatively Manipulates	Evades	Withdraws	Row Totals
Mother-in-Law	Frequency	1	1	1	1	1	51
	Row PCT	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	
	Column Totals	1 2.0	1 2.0	1 2.0	1 2.0	1 2.0	51 100.0

Table 28  
 Frequency and Percentage of Mother-in-Law's and  
 Father-in-Law's Use of Secondary Modes  
 With Son-in-Law as Recipient in  
 Family-Role Interactions

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Information	Humor	Miscellaneous	Affirmation	Shows Concern	Seeks Support	Seeks Attention	Seeks Grat- ification	Organizes
Mother-in-Law	Frequency	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Row PCT	0.0	3.6	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0
	Col PCT	0.0	20.0	12.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	Tot PCT	0.0	1.4	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0
Father-in-Law	Frequency	3	4	7	0	5	1	3	2	0	1
	Row PCT	6.5	8.7	15.2	0.0	10.9	2.2	6.5	4.3	0.0	2.2
	Col PCT	100.0	80.0	87.5	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
	Tot PCT	4.1	5.4	9.5	0.0	6.8	1.4	4.1	2.7	0.0	1.4
	Column Totals	3 4.1	5 6.8	8 10.8	1 1.4	5 6.8	1 1.4	3 4.1	2 2.7	1 1.4	1 1.4

  

Role		Positively Manipulates	Instructs	Accepts Opinions	Opposes	Negatively Manipulates	Attacks	Row Totals
Mother-in-Law	Frequency	1	3	0	3	6	11	28
	Row PCT	3.6	10.7	0.0	10.7	21.4	39.3	37.8
	Col PCT	14.3	30.0	0.0	60.0	100.0	84.6	
	Tot PCT	1.4	4.1	0.0	4.1	8.1	14.9	
Father-in-Law	Frequency	6	7	3	2	0	2	46
	Row PCT	13.0	15.2	6.5	4.3	0.0	4.3	62.2
	Col PCT	85.7	70.0	100.0	40.0	0.0	15.4	
	Tot PCT	8.1	9.5	4.1	2.7	0.0	2.7	
	Column Totals	7 9.5	10 13.5	3 4.1	5 6.8	6 8.1	13 17.6	74 100.0

Table 29  
 Frequency and Percentage of Brother-in-Law's and  
 Sister-in-Law's Use of Secondary Modes With  
 Brother-in-Law as Recipient in  
 Family-Role Interactions

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Information	Humor	Miscellaneous	Affirmation	Organizes	Accepts Supports	Negatively Manipulates	Withdraws	Row Totals
Brother-in-Law	Frequency	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	7
	Row PCT	14.3	14.3	14.3	14.3	14.3	0.0	14.3	14.3	0.0	58.3
	Col PCT	50.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	100.0	0.0	
	Tot PCT	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	0.0	8.3	8.3	0.0	
Sister-in-Law	Frequency	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	5
	Row PCT	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	41.7
	Col PCT	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	100.0	50.0	0.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	8.3	8.3	0.0	8.3	
	Column Totals	2 16.7	1 8.3	1 8.3	1 8.3	2 16.7	1 8.3	2 16.7	1 8.3	1 8.3	12 100.0

Table 30  
 Frequency and Percentage of Brother-in-Law's and  
 Sister-in-Law's Use of Secondary Modes With  
 Sister-in-Law as Recipient in  
 Family-Role Interactions

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Information	Humor	Affirmation	Shows Concern	Seeks Attention	Organizes	Positively Manipulates	Instructs	Accepts Supports
Brother-in- Law	Frequency	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
	Row PCT	14.3	14.3	14.3	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0
	Col PCT	12.5	10.0	100.0	20.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0
	Tot PCT	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0
Sister-in- Law	Frequency	7	9	0	4	13	1	3	8	2	3
	Row PCT	12.7	16.4	0.0	7.3	23.6	1.8	5.5	14.5	3.6	5.5
	Col PCT	87.5	90.0	0.0	80.0	92.9	100.0	100.0	88.9	100.0	100.0
	Tot PCT	11.3	14.5	0.0	6.5	21.0	1.6	4.8	12.9	3.2	4.8
	Column	8	10	1	5	14	1	3	9	2	3
	Totals	12.9	16.1	1.6	8.1	22.6	1.6	4.8	14.5	3.2	4.8

Role		Accepts Opinions	Disregards	Opposes	Negatively Manipulates	Evades	Row Totals
Brother-in- Law	Frequency	0	0	0	0	1	7
	Row PCT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	11.3
	Col PCT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	
Sister-in- Law	Frequency	1	1	3	0	0	55
	Row PCT	1.8	1.8	5.5	0.0	0.0	88.7
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
	Tot PCT	1.6	1.6	4.8	0.0	0.0	
	Column	1	1	3	0	1	67
	Totals	1.6	1.6	4.8	0.0	1.6	100

Table 31  
 Frequency and Percentage of Grandson's and  
 Granddaughter's Use of Secondary  
 Modes with Grandmother as  
 Recipient in Family-  
 Role Interaction

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Attention	Row Totals
Grandson	Frequency	1	0	1
	Row PCT	100.0	0.0	50.0
	Col PCT	100.0	0.0	
	Tot PCT	50.0	0.0	
Granddaughter	Frequency	0	1	1
	Row PCT	0.0	100.0	50.0
	Col PCT	0.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	0.0	50.0	
	Column Totals	1 50.0	1 50.0	2 100.0

Table 32

Frequency and Percentage of Granddaughter's Use of  
 Secondary Modes With Grandfather as Recipient  
 in Family-Role Interactions

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Support	Seeks Attention	Positively Manipulates	Accepts Supports	Row Totals
Grand- daughter	Frequency	3	4	1	1	2	11
	Row PCT	27.3	36.4	9.1	9.1	18.2	100.0
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	27.3	36.4	9.1	9.1	18.2	
	Column Totals	3 27.3	4 36.4	1 9.1	1 9.1	2 18.2	11 100.0

Table 33  
 Frequency and Percentage of Grandmother's and  
 Grandfather's Use of Secondary Modes  
 With Granddaughter as Recipient  
 in Family-Role Interaction

Role		Offers Information	Humor	Miscellaneous	Affirmation	Shows Concern	Organizes	Positively Manipulates	Accepts Opinions	Row Totals
Grand- mother	Frequency	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	4
	Row PCT	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
	Col PCT	100.0	50.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
	Tot PCT	6.3	6.3	0.0	6.3	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	
Grand- father	Frequency	0	1	1	0	6	0	3	1	12
	Row PCT	0.0	8.3	8.3	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	8.3	75.0
	Col PCT	0.0	50.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	0.0	6.3	6.3	0.0	37.5	0.0	18.8	6.3	
	Column Totals	1 6.3	2 12.5	1 6.3	1 6.3	6 37.5	1 6.3	3 18.8	1 6.3	16 100.0

Table 34

Frequency and Percentage of Grandmother's Use of  
 Secondary Modes With Grandson as Recipient  
 in Family-Role Interactions

Role		Seeks Information	Shows Concern	Organizes	Instructs	Row Totals
Grandmother	Frequency	1	1	1	2	5
	Row PCT	20.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	100.0
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	20.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	
	Column Totals	1 20.0	1 20.0	1 20.0	2 40.0	5 100.0

Table 35

Frequency and Percentage of Uncle's Use of Secondary  
Modes With Nephew as Recipient in  
Family-Role Interaction

Role		Organizes	Row Total
Uncle	Frequency	1	1
	Row PCT	100.0	100.0
	Col PCT	100.0	
	Tot PCT	100.0	
	Column Totals	1 100.0	1 100.0

Table 36

Frequency and Percentage of Aunt's Use of Secondary  
Mode With Niece as Recipient in Family-Role  
Interaction

Role		Shows Concern	Row Total
Aunt	Frequency	1	1
	Row PCT	100.0	100.0
	Col PCT	100.0	
	Tot PCT	100.0	
	Column Totals	1 100.0	1 100.0

Table 37

Frequency and Percentage of Father's and Mother's Use  
of Secondary Modes with All Children as  
Recipients in Family-Role Interaction

Role		Organizes	Instructs	Opposes	Row Totals
Father	Frequency	0	1	1	2
	Row PCT	0.0	50.0	50.0	40.0
	Col PCT	0.0	33.3	100.0	
	Tot PCT	0.0	20.0	20.0	
Mother	Frequency	1	2	0	3
	Row PCT	33.3	66.7	0.0	60.0
	Col PCT	100.0	66.7	0.0	
	Tot PCT	20.0	40.0	0.0	
	Column Totals	1 20.0	3 60.0	1 20.0	5 100.0

Table 38  
 Frequency and Percentage of Stepbrother's Use of  
 Secondary Modes With Stepsister as Recipient  
 in Family-Role Interactions

Role		Seeks Information	Seeks Support	Seeks Attention	Seeks Grafitication	Organizes	Instructs	Disregards	Row Totals
Stepbrother	Frequency	2	2	3	1	1	1	3	13
	Row PCT	15.4	15.4	23.1	7.7	7.7	7.7	23.1	100.0
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	15.4	15.4	23.1	7.7	7.7	7.7	23.1	
	Column Totals	2 15.4	2 15.4	3 23.1	1 7.7	1 7.7	1 7.7	3 23.1	13 100.0

Table 39  
 Frequency and Percentage of Stepmother's Use of  
 Secondary Modes with Stepdaughter as  
 Recipient in Family-Role  
 Interaction

Role		Humor	Shows Concern	Row Totals
Stepmother	Frequency	2	2	4
	Row PCT	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	50.0	50.0	
	Column Totals	2 50.0	2 50.0	4 100.0

Table 40  
 Frequency and Percentage of Stepson's Use of  
 Secondary Modes with Stepfather as  
 Recipient in Family-Role  
 Interaction

Role		Offers Information	Miscellaneous	Row Totals
Stepson	Frequency	1	1	2
	Row PCT	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	50.0	50.0	
	Column Totals	1 50.0	1 50.0	2 100.0

Table 41  
 Frequency and Percentage of Stepmother's and  
 Stepfather's Use of Secondary Modes With  
 Stepson as Recipient in Family-Role  
 Interaction

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Information	Shows Concern	Organizes	Row Totals
Stepmother	Frequency	0	1	1	1	3
	Row PCT	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	60.0
	Col PCT	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	0.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	
Stepfather	Frequency	2	0	0	0	2
	Row PCT	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0
	Col PCT	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Tot PCT	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	Column Totals	2 40.0	1 20.0	1 20.0	1 20.0	5 100.0

Table 42  
 Frequency and Percentage of Stepbrother's and  
 Stepsister's Use of Secondary Modes With  
 Stepmother as Recipient in Family-  
 Role Interaction

Role		Offers Information	Seeks Information	Humor	Affirmation	Shows Concern	Seeks Support	Seeks Attention	Seeks Gratification	Organizes	Positively Manipulates
Stepbrother	Frequency	10	6	4	1	4	15	7	7	1	7
	Row PCT	9.5	5.7	3.8	1.0	3.8	14.3	6.7	6.7	1.0	6.7
	Col PCT	76.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	80.0	88.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Tot PCT	8.6	5.2	3.4	0.9	3.4	12.9	6.0	6.0	0.9	6.0
Stepsister	Frequency	3	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0
	Row PCT	27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Col PCT	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Tot PCT	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Column Totals	13 11.2	6 5.2	4 3.4	1 0.9	5 4.3	17 14.7	7 6.0	7 6.0	1 0.9	7 6.0	

  

Role		Instructs	Accepts Supports	Accepts Opinion	Disregards	Opposes	Negatively Manipulates	Attacks	Evades	Withdraws	Row Totals
Stepbrother	Frequency	10	2	3	8	4	5	6	3	2	105
	Row PCT	9.5	1.9	2.9	7.6	3.8	4.8	5.7	2.9	1.9	90.5
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	75.0	100.0	80.0	83.3	100.0	75.0	66.7	
	Tot PCT	8.6	1.7	2.6	6.9	3.4	4.3	5.2	2.6	1.7	
Stepsister	Frequency	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	11
	Row PCT	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	9.1	9.1	0.0	9.1	9.1	9.5
	Col PCT	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	20.0	16.7	0.0	25.0	33.3	
	Tot PCT	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.9	
Column Totals	10 8.6	2 1.7	4 3.4	8 6.9	5 4.3	6 5.2	6 5.2	4 3.4	3 2.6	116 100.0	

Table 43

Frequency and Percentage of Stepson's and  
 Stepdaughter's Use of Secondary Modes  
 With Stepmother as Recipient in  
 Family-Role Interaction

Role		Offers Information	Humor	Seeks Support	Seeks Attention	Positively Manipulates	Accepts Supports	Row Totals
Stepson	Frequency	1	1	1	1	1	0	5
	Row PCT	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	62.5
	Col PCT	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	
	Tot PCT	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	0.0	
Step- daughter	Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
	Row PCT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	37.5
	Col PCT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
	Tot PCT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	
	Column Totals	1 12.5	1 12.5	1 12.5	1 12.5	1 12.5	3 37.5	8 100.0