

PART II
**Resilience and Well-Being in Home, School,
Community, and Sports Environments**

CHAPTER 13

Systemic Analysis of Family Resilience

ALEXANDER V. MAKHNACH and ANNA I. LAKTIONOVA

Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

ABSTRACT

This chapter presents analysis of family resilience by which we understand a systemic characteristic of a family capable of responding to stresses of various genesis using family resources inherent thereto, including the family's ability and willingness to cope, change, adjust and develop, from the point of A.A. Bogdanov's theory. The chapter gives a brief description of A.A. Bogdanov's organizational theory, consistently considering the notions of family resilience and its resources. It shows that the family is resilient when it is an organized system where the whole practically exceeds a mere total of its parts because its activity complexes match. In the event, the activities only partially sum up whereas partially represent mutual resistance, that is, subtract from the organizational point of view, the level of family resilience shall be determined by the correlation of risk factors and family resources. If the

family members' activities fully counteract and destroy each other or mutually disorganize, we believe the family to be nonresilient since it is a disorganized system.

13.1 INTRODUCTION

The term "resilience" was first used in Russian philosophy by A.A. Bogdanov, the founder of the General Systems Theory (Bogdanov, 1989). His main work "Tektologia (Universal Organizational Science)" published in the 1910–1920 is a generally scientific concept of an organizational approach to studying any system in nature and in human activity¹. It is believed that Ludwig von Bertalanffy first proposed a general theory describing the principles of the organization of living systems. However, even 20–30 years before he published the first works on his general theory of systems, Russian researcher, philosopher, and economist

¹ "The latter's fundamental and highly original work appeared in Russia under the title Tektologia, Vols. 1–3 (1912–1927), hence several years before von Bertalanffy's first system theoretic notions—at the time restricted to biology—were published (1928). Furthermore, a German version of the decisive first two volumes of Bogdanov's much more comprehensive presentation of systems organization was published in Bertalanffy's own mother tongue as early as 1926–1928, and was subsequently

reviewed in the pertinent German literature. We are certainly not accusing Bertalanffy of plagiarism, and do not dispute his many genuine contributions; the history of science has shown repeatedly that ideas frequently mature in the minds of two or more scholars simultaneously. Von Bertalanffy may well have conceived his system ideas without any influence from Bogdanov" (Mattessich, 1982, p. 387).

Alexander Bogdanov developed an equally sophisticated and comprehensive system theory, which, unfortunately, is almost unknown outside of Russia (Capra, 1997). Bogdanov's Tektology preempted N. Wiener and W. Ashby's cybernetics, the general systems theory by L. von Bertalanffy and I. Prigogine's synergetics. The freshness of A.A. Bogdanov's ideas was in bringing together all human, biological and physical sciences understood as systems of interrelation and searching organizational principles on the basis of all types of systems. According to the fundamental prerequisites of tektology, the functioning of two and more elements incorporated in a single process can exceed under certain organization or, on the contrary, be inferior in efficiency to the functioning of the same elements on their own (A.A. Bogdanov also pondered upon a "neutral" way of interaction) (Loktionov, 2016). Bogdanov (1989) explained the development processes of nature and society in terms of the equilibrium principle borrowed from natural science. All developing objects of nature and society are holistic formations or systems consisting of many elements, according to Bogdanov. The starting point for his concept is that organization laws are one for all objects in which very heterogeneous phenomena (elements) are brought together by structural bonds. Hence the approach to studying any phenomenon should be based both on the study of any system as an interrelation of all its parts and its relationship as the whole with the environment, that is, with all external systems. A.A. Bogdanov was among the first in the world to introduce the notion of systematicity, specifying that an organization as a whole, which is greater than the sum of its parts. The author believed that to take an organizational point of view meant to study any system from the point of interrelation of all

its parts as well as its relationship as the whole with the environment, that is, with all external materials. He developed the idea of a structural sustainability of a system and its conditions. He suggested two universal organizational principles (two types of pattern) for the system:

- The forming principle (patterns forming systems—and developments leading to the transition of the system into a different quality); and
- The regulating principle of "selection" (regulating, that is, functioning patterns that contribute to the stabilization of a given quality of the system).

The basis of the organizational mechanism forming any organizational system is in organizational actions—putting elements and complexes together and setting them apart. The process of formation of any organization is bringing elements together in one single body, the whole, but results attained with this can be different. The result depends on the properties of elements brought together, their congruity and correlation.

Any element has certain activity and resistance in relation to others or to the system. Resistance is also an activity but taken from a different point of view as if contraposed to another activity.

The consociation of complexes may go in three ways:

- Activities of the complexes coincide;
- Activities of one complex fully resist the other and paralyze it; and
- The most common case, activities of the components partially sum up and partially represent a mutual resistance to others, that is, organizationally subtract.

Three types of systems are possible to be formed in consequence of a continuous interaction:

- Organized (the whole practically exceeds a simple sum of its parts);
- Neutral (the whole is equal to the sum of its parts);
- Unorganized, disorganized (activities fully counteract and destroy each other, and get mutually disorganized).

The main peculiarity of tektological selection, according to Bogdanov, is its systemic nature: tektological selection affects the whole complex in its entirety, continuously transforming it in accordance with the environment. A tektological complex is capable of self-development and enhancement of self-discipline, characterized by such a level of instability that leads to a higher level of organization. A.A. Bogdanov believed the balanced state of a system to be not something given once and forever, but a “dynamic” or “transient” equilibrium. It acts as a continuous interaction of a progressively developing system with the environment, which gradually takes it out of equilibrium and subsequently leads to instability (crisis), another structural rearrangement which generates a new equilibrium and a new state of balance at a higher turn of its further development.

System instability is a source of its inner development and it takes the system to a higher level of organization, according to A.A. Bogdanov. His definition reads, “Any resilience is relative; it exists only in relation to this or that given environment; elements highly adjusted to one environment, highly sustainable under its influence, may turn (and this is very likely in the majority of cases) into poorly adjusted or unstable in a different environment or under substantially different impact” (Bogdanov, 1989, pp. 215–216).

Thus, we have very briefly described some aspects of A.A. Bogdanov’s organizational theory. To analyze family resilience from this point of

view we shall consistently consider the notion of family resilience and its resources.

13.2 FAMILY RESILIENCE

By family resilience, we understand a systemic characteristic of a family capable of responding to stresses of various genesis with the use of family resources (individual, belonging to the family as a system, and external environment resources) inherent only thereto, that envisages the family’s ability and willingness to cope, change, adjust, and develop (Makhnach, 2016). A new interest toward the notion of “a resilient family” coincides, according to M. Worden, “with the change of the paradigm in the field of family psychotherapy. A resilient family is a notion that underlines strong sides of a family under stress” (Worden, 2002, p. 167). The paradigm based on a family pathology is replaced with the paradigm that focuses on competency and the family’s strong aspects (Walsh, 2006). Family resilience is considered as a multifactor and dynamic factor. The family is a natural context of both growth and healing. One or another resilient family structure is necessary to fulfill the family’s main objectives—to support individuality along with the creation of the feeling of belonging to the whole, according to Minuchin and Fishman (1981). McCubbin and McCubbin (1996) conceptualize “family resilience” with the help of two different but still interconnected processes continuously taking place in the family: (1) adjustment when the family leans on defense factors which helps it to preserve its integrity, functionality, and continue tackling tasks under risk conditions; and (2) adaptation, that is, bringing itself to “norm” with the account of a crisis situation in the family. They believe it is the success or failure to adapt

after a trauma that helps to tell resilient families from nonresilient. Resilient families make their path through changes, can “cope with situational challenges, correct their life, adapt, and even thrive,” in spite of these challenges. In contrast, nonresilient families easily become “exhausted” (McCubbin & McCubbin, 2005). G. Patterson assumed that there were four key processes that describe resilient families and conceptualize this notion. She identified the processes that facilitate family functioning, acting as defense factors under unfavorable life circumstances: (1) family cohesion—the balance of connectedness of family members and individualization thereof; (2) family flexibility—balance between willingness to accept changes and adjust to them, and perseverance in the preservation of earlier existing components of the family identity; (3) family ties—affection and instrumental; (4) family values, that is, how the family internally determines problems, in which context the family lives, and who are they as a family (Patterson, 2002). F. Walsh who was one of the first to turn to the theme of family resilience, described the main family processes that work as defense factors in her theoretical review. They include three main groups: (1) the system of opinions and convictions; (2) organizational processes; (3) communication processes. She described these processes in her fundamental book “Strengthening Family Resilience,” having filled them with concrete content. She delves into the family as an organized unit with interdependent substructures; in its turn family resilience is determined by their interconnectedness (Walsh, 2006). The study of family resilience logically continued through the search of sources of family strength and resources in spite of all unfavorable factors of the external environment and internal family circumstances. From the position of its resilience, the family is

not a system with dysfunctions and responses to external adverse impacts, but rather a system exposed to a stress impact. From this point of view, “proponents of the family assessment approach from the position of its resilience strive to understand what makes the family survive and even thrive under stress” (Worden, 2002, p. 206). Consequently, there appeared papers with the study of family resources which we class as a family protecting factor. Resources play a special protective compensatory role, contribute to adaptive behavior, and are indicators of family resilience as a whole (Windlea et al., 2008). Family defense factors can enhance pro-social behavior and resilience to negative consequences of a crisis or stress, ensuring stable but flexible and favorable environment which facilitates the development of “harmony and family members’ growth” (McCubbin & McCubbin, 2005, p. 31). Studies of family resilience are carried out within the framework of various theoretical approaches. Our studies are undertaken from the point of family resources (Makhnach et al., 2015; Makhnach & Postylyakova, 2012; Laktionova, 2015, 2016; Makhnach, 2015, 2016), which allow us, first, to gain knowledge about family resources; and second, to assess family members’ ability to use them for their own wellbeing.

13.3 FAMILY RESOURCES AS A SOURCE OF FAMILY RESILIENCE

The family as an integral unit has a number of strong features—resources—that are held in the family system itself (Balswick & Balswick, 1999; Hobfoll & Spilberger, 1992; Olson, 1991). As Walsh (2003) noted, some families that find themselves in adverse and critical life situations fall apart, whereas many demonstrate

all symptoms of strength and potential in such instances. Family resources are valuable social, economic, psychological, emotional, and physical characteristics and qualities that family members can use to cope with stress. Such resources include flexibility of family boundaries, role flexibility, possibility to review family rules, clear communication, moderate family cohesion, and openness in world perception (Makhnach & Postylyakova, 2013). Since family resources as a whole develop from individual psychological resources of each family member and the resources that belong to the family as a system, the notion of individual resources is introduced by which we understand physiological, cognitive, personal, social and psychological qualities, and properties of a subject (which they are mainly aware of), that can be accumulated/disposed, developed or modified, to which the subject turns at times of stress and difficult life situations with the goal to cope therewith (Postylyakova, 2016). Along with individual resources, availability of formed family resources and the ability to use them facilitates both the family's adaptation to external conditions and coping with possible challenges, and further family development. Family resources are created, recognized and tested for reliability by various life situations. For clear reasons the family needs time—several years—to have resources generated in it. Family resources play a very important role in maintaining homeostasis in the family when responding to intrafamily and external requirements, challenges, and when coping with family stress. Resources can enhance pro-social behavior and resilience to negative consequences of crisis or stress, ensuring a stable but flexible and a favorable environment that facilitates the development of “stability, harmony, and growth of family members” (McCubbin & McCubbin,

2005, p. 31). For this reason, we should not only consider the family as a resource for an individual (for instance, as a source of social support), but rather as a resource potential of the family in its entirety, where individual resources of its members complement the family resources thus increasing their resilience (Walsh, 2003).

There are three main constituent components that exert considerable impact on family resilience: the system of family values, organizational patterns, and communication processes. We have correlated family systemic resources with these components, as well as with a number of stability factors of a family system (Varga, 2001; Voronina et al., 2011; Kovaleva, 2012; Kryukova et al., 2005; Kuftyak, 2010; Makhnach & Postylyakova, 2013; Tkachenko, 2014). Thus, we believe that communication processes are represented by family communication and family support; organizational patterns—by cohesion, resource management, problem resolution skills in the family, family boundaries, family roles and rules, financial freedom of the family; family values—by physical health of family members, trust in the family, religion, interests, views, responsibility, children, and love. Under stress, the family will modify cohesion, adaptivity and flexibility, and adjust to the circumstances. In the sphere of family beliefs, resilient families are aware of the meaning of a crisis or problem, and they consider a crisis to be a problem common for the whole family. Such families find it very important to have a relationship and confidence shared by all its members that together they can enhance their ability to cope with a problem. By expanding their view of themselves as part of something larger than they are, the families keep a broader view of the crisis they are experiencing. The sphere of family organization and resources imply that resilient families have a more flexible structure which they will be able to change and

adjust to their needs, rather than hold onto a rigid understanding of family roles and rules, which allows resilient families to get adjusted to changes that happen during the crisis. Such families are capable of reorganization in challenging times. Connectedness is an important characteristic of a resilient family. It reflects the family's conviction that family members can rely on each other in the times of crisis. Along with that resilient families become stronger, when all the members respect individual peculiarities and individual boundaries of each other. Such families know how to maintain a balance between the singularity of each member and general connectedness, which helps them to give a successful response to challenging situations (Makhnach et al., 2015). Noncontradicting clear messages play an important role in family communication. Direct, consistent, noncontradicting, honest communication in resilient families helps all the family members recognize and accept the crisis that the family has faced, and support each other, sharing feelings, and opinion of each family member. This type of communication facilitates a joint process of decision taking as to how the family will handle the problem. Open demonstration of emotions implies that a resilient family creates an atmosphere of trust and support to its members, sharing their feelings, expressing empathy, showing the sense of humor, etc. Such families have the tradition of a joint resolution of problems and looking for ways to handle it (Makhnach et al., 2015).

Individual psychological resources of people with a high level of resilience complement the skills of family resources management thus increasing the family's resilience (Postylyakova, 2016). Communication skills will help the family change if necessary its levels of intimacy and flexibility. A broad network of social support is of great importance to the family. Social support

includes external and internal components: family members, friends, neighbors, colleagues, church, and public groups to whose help families may have recourse to if necessary (Balswick & Balswick, 1999; Boss, 1987; Helgeson & Lopez, 2010). Physical health is an important family resource. Chronically ill or disabled family members may cause dysfunction of a family system since the family finds itself in the situation of chronic stress. Meaningful efforts of family members to support and strengthen physical health enhance the family's resilience during stress (Boss, 1987). Researchers note that the family can successfully resolve one set of problems and experience difficulties while resolving another that it faces at different stages of its functioning. The studies of a family coping with stress on the basis of family resources also show the importance of not only the availability of resources but a developed skill to use them. For instance, it was noted that some families having many resources at hand use them so unskillfully that they tend to depreciate in the course of crisis, while the ability to handle resources is invaluable during stress (Balswick & Balswick, 1999). However, the problem is not only in the availability of resources in the family that ensure the progress of various intra-family processes and the ability to use them. Differences in family characteristics and tasks that the family faces at different stages of its life cycle also have their influence on the combination of family and individual resources that facilitates the support of normal family functioning and resolution of family problems. Thus, it is important to understand the peculiarities of resource combinations depending on: (a) structural characteristics of the family and stages of its life cycle; (b) peculiarities and differences that exist in individual and family resources of candidates to substituting parents.

All this will allow us to get a clearer picture which strong features characterize a particular family and which combination of individual and family resources can be considered as optimal. Rational and, what is particularly important, coordinated use of available resources by family members can ensure normal functioning of the family, regulate its behavior and facilitate problem resolution. Family resilience is not a mere result of an aggregated behavior of resilient family members, but rather it is a characteristic which the family develops after several years of existence when one or several components of individual resiliency of each family member join together with resiliency components of the other family members, and eventually the family becomes resilient (Postylyakova, 2015).

Thus, family resilience is a systemic characteristic of a family capable of responding to stresses of various geneses with the employment of family resources inherent to this particular family. Besides, the availability of resources in the family is important, as well as the ability to use these resources and peculiarities in combining these resources depending on structural characteristics of the family and stages of its life cycle. Which combination of resources promotes the enhancement of family resilience will subsequently be analyzed from the point of the organizational theory by A.A. Bogdanov.

13.4 ANALYSIS OF FAMILY RESILIENCE FROM THE POINT OF A.A. BOGDANOV'S THEORY

While coping with stress, the family interacts with such challenging situations whose resolution may be impossible through individual activity of each of its members acting separately; however, this is possible through joint

activity since a number of resources exist only in a family activity (Kuftyak, 2010). Joint activity can be described as a process of mutual tuning and adjustment, including compensatory, of regulatory resources of partners who interact in the currently important life situation. The coordination of regulatory resources may have the nature of both direct positive accommodation and compensation. By compensation we understand redistribution of a resource when the implementation of a necessary behavior is carried out through the use of the partner's possibilities in the situation (Kovaleva, 2009).

Having undertaken the attempt to analyze family resilience from the organizational approach by A.A. Bogdanov, which as we said above, is applicable to the study of any system in nature and human activity, we consider the family both as a system and as a correlation of all its members (family members). The essence of considering the family as a system is that all processes unfolding in its different fields are interrelated and targeted at supporting the family integrity. The family's objectives are thus not only subordinated to the law of homeostasis under which the family maintains its own status, but also to the law of development, that is, the need to transit to the next stage of the life cycle with its specific objectives and functions. The transition is implemented as a result of experiencing a normal crisis by the family, the period when the old ways of achieving the goal become inefficient and the family has to develop new ones. This happens, for example, when children are born, when they grow up or start their independent life, when a family member retires or there is a need to contact new social institutions. Quite often, the family faces challenges of maintaining its own integrity under new circumstances. Then family goals begin to get implemented not by means

of generating new ways of functioning but due to the so-called dysfunctional processes, that is, special interactions that allow the family to preserve its own integrity in a new situation using the old strategies. Dysfunctional processes include, for example, the change of internal and external psychological boundaries, the onset of psychosomatic symptoms, and transfer to the previous stage of the family's life cycle (regression) (Systemic Family Psychotherapy, 2002; Varga, 2001).

We can assume, leaning on A.A. Bogdanov's propositions, that the family as an organized system is resilient if the whole practically exceeds a mere sum of its parts through the match of activity complexes. This happens both on the basis of operating the already available resources by the family and, primarily, by generating new resources, formation of new patterns of family functioning which ensures necessary changes in the family, processes of coping, adaptation and development, that is, successful responses to new requirements that indicate the family's resilience. How well the family can mobilize its outer and inner resources determines its resilience at a certain period of time: when responding to a risk factor the available family resources get restructured each time. This happens so that the feedback response in the form of coping and adaptation allows the family to achieve its ultimate goal—problem resolution (Makhnach, 2016). Our study shows the importance of such family resources as availability of family support, physical health of family members, established skills of problem resolution, clear family roles and rules, warm emotional ties in the family, financial freedom (as an ability to manage financial resources), and family communication. Specifically it was identified that openness of family members to communication and their ability to discuss any

issues are the family's key resources (Makhnach et al., 2014, 2015). Apparently, these resources help to achieve a joint coordinated activity of the family members that leads to higher family resilience. Our findings are that the total number of links between family resources in functional families is less than in dysfunctional. But although they are few in functional families, there are more links identified between individual and family resources. This fact means that functional family members are more involved in the life of their family, their mindset contributes to more openness and interest in other people and the world, ability to love, cooperate and be reliable, while their meaningful, rational and “energy-saving” use of resources speaks about established instrumental skills of dealing with them. These skills characterize the family efficiency and potential (Postylyakova, 2015).

The most common case is when activities partially sum up and partially represent mutual resistance, that is, subtract from the organizational point of view (Bogdanov, 1989). In this case, the level of family resilience is determined by the correlation of risk factors and family resources. Lately, there have been more and more studies dedicated to risk factors and defense factors in the context of family resilience (Boyden & Mann, 2005; Cowan et al., 1996; Flouri et al., 2010; Halford et al., 2001; Luthar & Suchman, 2000; Osofsky & Thompson, 2000; Steptoe & Marmot, 2003). However, the focal point of the studies on family resilience is quite often on the identification of strong sides of the family as challenges to ill-being, stress, etc. with the emphasis on family dysfunction and pathology (Walsh, 2006), whereas little attention is paid to the identification of family vulnerability as a result of its exposure to risks. The following factors may act as predictors of behavioral or functional disturbances in the

family: abuse, incest (Daniel, 2006; Gaudin et al., 1993; Wright et al., 2013), early leaving of the family or loss of close relatives at a young age (Mannarino & Cohen, 2011), or problems in the mother's family history (Barnes et al., 2014; Collishaw et al., 2016). As a whole, it is considered that the main risk factors for the family are loss of employment, poverty, divorce, death, chronic diseases, infertility, and disposition of a family member to addictive behavior. Family vulnerability along with an individual's vulnerability has lately been viewed as a separate risk factor. Risk factors for a family can be found both in the external environment (economic, social, political, cultural, etc.) and in the family itself (illness of a family member, normative family crises, rigidity of the family system, poor communication, pursuit of goals and achievements contradicting the family system, etc.). Exerting impact on the family system, risk factors set requirements to the family's ability to respond to stresses of various origins using defense factors characteristic of this particular family which imply ability and willingness to change, cope, and adjust. For this the family employs its resources (individual and family), as well as the resources from the external environment. These resources in their turn ensure the processes of coping, adaptation, and recovery. We mentioned above that there are three main components that exert substantial influence on family resilience, that is, the system of family values, organizational patterns, and communication processes. Diverging activities intermediated by differences in the understanding of family values, communicative needs, and organizational patterns lead to mutual resistances and a lower level of family resources (potential). If we analyze, for instance, peculiarities of a young family, then its resilience is tested by such socially important processes as mutual adaptation

of the spouses' personal qualities, internalization of most challenging parental roles, division of family responsibilities, and assertion of statuses in the family (Dzagkoev, 2000). If the response to a stress factor balances the risk and defense factors, or the latter exceed risk factors, such a family can be considered resilient.

If the activities completely counteract or destroy each other, or mutually disorganize, then we believe the family to be a disorganized system and consider it as a nonresilient one. Counter-organizational activity is a particular case of organizational activity. "If society, classes, or groups clash in a destructive manner, disorganizing each other, they do this exactly because each collective body strives to organize the world and the human race around itself in its own way. This is the result of singularity and detachment of organizing forces, because their unity or common harmonious organization has not been achieved yet. This is a fight of organizational forms" (Bogdanov, 1989, p. 210). The impossibility to coordinate own resources lays a regulatory foundation for the behavior that makes it impossible to tackle relevant tasks. The same results may happen because the excessively close troubled relationship, the absence of personal space, or merger does not allow the spouses to develop new joint strategies of behavior and its regulation in the current situation. We can only assume that the main condition for development—differentiation—does not work in this case, and no integration is possible without this as well as the generation of new forms of behavior (Aleksandrov, 2006; Chuprikova, 2009; Sergienko, 2009). The absence of a clear individual position of the partners on a situation does not allow them to lean on each other and correlate resources. When we look at the family from the child-centered perspective, we see that an excessively strong perception

of family cohesion reduces the feeling of own social competence in adolescents. The similarity of values also has a different influence on them depending on whether they share the father's or the mother's values. For instance, the difference in opinion with the mother undermines their social competence. On the other hand, difference in opinion with the father that offers a possibility to challenge the family ties, virtually strengthen social competence of young people. The loss of maternal support may be an extremely powerful threat, whereas the father's behavior triggers independence (Craig & Baucum, 2001, p. 610). Werner (1993) showed that the development of a boy's resilience is under a positive influence of a clear role structure and rules in the family, open exchange of feelings, and a positive model of masculine behavior for identification. As for girls, it is very important to encourage independence in the family and a positive feminine model for identification.

13.5 CONCLUSIONS

The Organizational Theory by Alexander Bogdanov is a general academic concept of an organizational approach to the study of any system in nature and human activity. According to the fundamental assumptions of tektology, the functioning of two and more elements included in a single process may exceed under a certain organization (organizational structure) or, on the contrary, be inferior in efficiency to the functioning of the same elements taken separately. In that theory, any element is characterized by a certain activity and resistance in relation to others or the system. Resistance is, actually, the same activity but taken from a different perspective as set against the other activity. According to A.A. Bogdanov, three

options are possible when complexes unite: the activities of complexes coincide; the activities of one complex fully turn into resistances to the other and paralyze it; most often the activities of components partially sum up and partially represent mutual resistance to others, that is, subtract from the organizational point of view.

Also three types of systems can be possibly formed as a result of a continuous interaction: as it can be organized (the whole practically exceeds a simple sum of its parts), neutral (the whole is equal to the sum of its parts), or unorganized, disorganized (activities fully counteract and destroy each other, and get mutually disorganized).

The Organizational Theory by A.A. Bogdanov as a general academic concept of an organizational approach to the study of any system makes it possible to analyze family resilience as its systemic characteristics, and with this we consider the family both as a system and correlation of all its parts (family members). Family resilience is a systemic characteristic of a family capable of responding to stresses of various origins with the employment of family resources inherent to this particular family, implying the family's ability and willingness to cope, change, adjust, and develop.

According to F. Walsh, the system of family values, organizational patterns, and communication processes are identified as three main constituent components that exert considerable impact on family resilience. Consideration of those components as the main family resources and availability of those to all family members, as well ability to use them at all stages of its life cycle play an important role in family resilience. The family as an organized system where the whole practically exceeds a mere sum of its parts through the match of activity complexes is resilient. This happens when the family both operates the already available resources and

generates primarily new resources, forming new patterns of family functioning.

In the event the activities partially sum up and partially represent mutual resistance, that is, subtract from the organizational point of view, the level of family resilience shall be determined by the correlation of risk factors and family resources. If the response to a stress factor balances the risk and defense factors, or the latter exceed the risk factors, such a family can be considered as a resilient one. Diverging activities intermediated by differences in the understanding of family values, communicative needs, and organizational patterns lead to mutual resistances and a lower level of family resources (potential). If the activities completely counteract or destroy each other, or get mutually disorganized, we believe the family to be a disorganized system and consider it a nonresilient one. The failure to coordinate own resources lays a regulatory foundation for the behavior that makes it impossible to tackle relevant tasks and counteract stresses.

KEYWORDS

- **family resilience**
- **systemic approach**
- **Bogdanov's general system theory**
- **family resources**
- **systemic analysis of the family**

REFERENCES

- Aleksandrov, I. O. (2006). Formation of the structure of individual knowledge. Moscow: Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences Publ. (in Russian).
- Balswick, J. O., Balswick, J. K. (1999). The family: A Christian perspective of the contemporary home. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- Barnes, J., Gardiner, J., Sutcliffe, A., Melhuish, E. (2014). The parenting of preschool children by older mothers in the United Kingdom. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 11*, 397–419.
- Bogdanov, A. A. (1989). Tekhtology: General organizational science. Vol. 1. Moscow: Ekonomika (in Russian).
- Boss, P. (1987). Family stress. In: M. Sussman & S. Steinmetz (Eds.). *Handbook of marriage and the family* (pp. 695–723). New York: Plenum.
- Boyden, J., Mann, G. (2005). Children's risk, resilience, and coping in extreme situations. In: M. Ungar (Ed.). *Handbook for working with children and youth: Pathways to resilience across cultures and contexts* (pp. 3–26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Capra, F. (1997). *The web of life: A new scientific understanding of living systems*. Doubleday: Anchor.
- Chuprikova, N. I. (2009). The universal differentiation-integration law of development as the basis of an interdisciplinary paradigm theory of development. *Psychological Studies, 1*(3), 1–15. Available at: <http://www.psystudy.ru> (Accessed 28 May 2018). (in Russian)
- Collishaw, S., Hammerton, G., Mahedy, L., Sellers, R., Owen, M. J., Craddock, N., Thapar, A. K., Harold, G. T., Rice, F., Thapar, A. (2016). Mental health resilience in the adolescent offspring of parents with depression: A prospective longitudinal study. *The Lancet Psychiatry, 3*(1), 49–57.
- Craig, G. J., Baucum, D. (2001). *Human development*. (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Cowan, P., Cowan, C., Schulz, M. (1996). Thinking about risk and resilience in families. In: E. M. Hetherington & E. A. Blechman (Eds.). *Stress, coping, and resiliency in children and families* (pp. 1–38). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Daniel, B. (2006). Operationalizing the concept of resilience in child neglect: Case study research. *Child: Care, Health and Development, 32*(3), 303–309.
- Dzagkoev, A. K. (2000). Young family in modern conditions. Author's abstract of PhD dissertation. Moscow: Moscow State University Publ. (in Russian)
- Flouri, E., Tzavidis, N., Kallis, C. (2010). Adverse life events, area socioeconomic disadvantage, and psychopathology and resilience in young children: The importance of risk factors' accumulation and protective factors' specificity. *European Child Adolescent Psychiatry, 19*, 535–546.
- Gaudin, J. M., Polansky, N. A., Kilpatrick, A. C., Shilton, P. (1993). Loneliness, depression, stress, and social

- supports in neglectful families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 63(4), 597–605.
- Halford, W. K., Sanders, M. R., Behrens, B. C. (2001). Can skills training prevent relationship problems in at-risk couples? Four-year effects of a behavioral relationship education program. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15, 750–768.
- Helgeson, V. S., Lopez, L. (2010). Social support and growth following adversity. In: J. W. Reich, A. J. Zautra & J. S. Hall (Eds.). *Handbook of adult resilience* (pp. 309–330). New York: The Guilford.
- Hobfoll, S. E., Spielberger, C. D. (1992). Family stress integrating theory and measurement. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 6(2), 99–112.
- Kovaleva, Yu. V. (2012). Joint regulation of spouses' behavior at different stages of the family life cycle. *Psikhologicheskij Zhurnal*, 33(5), 50–70 (in Russian).
- Kovaleva Yu. V. (2009). Study of subject regulation of behavior from the standpoint of the psychology of a collective subject. In: A. L. Zhuravlev, V. V. Znakov, Z. I. Ryabikina & E. A. Sergienko (Eds.). *Subjective approach in psychology* (pp. 466–482). Moscow: Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences Publ. (in Russian).
- Kryukova, T. L., Saporovskaya, M. V., Kuftyak, E. V. (2005). Family psychology: Life difficulties and coping. Sankt Petersburg: Rech Publ. (in Russian).
- Kuftyak, E. V. (2010). *Psychology of family coping*. Kostroma: Kostroma State University Publ. (in Russian).
- Laktionova, A. I. (2015). Features of an effective foster family raising an orphan adolescent. In: A. V. Makhnach & K. B. Zuev (Eds.). *Family, marriage and parenthood in modern Russia*. Issue 2. (pp. 225–242). Moscow: Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences Publ. (in Russian).
- Laktionova, A. I. (2016). Resilience development of the foster family in the process of its support. *Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Organizational Psychology and Psychology of Labor*, 1(1), 254–271 (in Russian).
- Loktionov, M. V. (2016). Alexander Bogdanov as a founder of the General Systems theory. *Philosophy of Science and Technology*, 21(2), 80–96 (in Russian)
- Luthar, S. S., Suchman, N. E. (2000). Relational psychotherapy mothers' group: A developmentally informed intervention for at-risk mothers. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12, 235–253.
- Makhnach, A. V. (2015). Psychopathological symptoms and family resources of candidates for replacement parents. In: A. V. Makhnach & K. B. Zuev. (Eds.). *Family, marriage and parenthood in modern Russia*. Issue 2. (pp. 249–264). Moscow: Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences Publ. (in Russian).
- Makhnach, A. V. (2016). Family resilience: a new object and conceptual background to the study. In: A. L. Zhuravlev, E. A. Sergienko, N. V. Tarabrina & N. E. Kharlamenkova (Eds.). *Psychology of everyday and traumatic stress: Threats, consequences, and coping* (pp. 350–375). Moscow: Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences Publ. (in Russian).
- Makhnach, A. V., Laktionova, A. I., Postylyakova, Yu. V. (2014). The program of psychological diagnostics of personal and family resources in the practice of selection, training and maintenance of foster parents. In: L. G. Dikaya, A. L. Zhuravlev & M. A. Kholodnaya (Eds.). *Methods of psychological support of professional activity and technology for the development of mental resources* (pp. 166–193). Moscow: Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences Publ. (in Russian).
- Makhnach, A. V., Laktionova, A. I., Postylyakova, Yu. V. (2015). The role of the family resources in the assessment of foster parents' applicants. *Psikhologicheskij Zhurnal*, 36(1), 108–122 (in Russian).
- Makhnach, A. V., Postylyakova, Yu. V. (2012). Family resilience: Psychological resources as a protective factor of the family. In: A. L. Zhuravlev & E. A. Sergienko (Eds.). *Psychological problems of modern Russian society* (pp. 529–550). Moscow: Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences Publ. (in Russian).
- Makhnach, A. V., Postylyakova, Yu. V. (2013). Model of family resilience. In: A. L. Zhuravlev & E. A. Sergienko (Eds.). *Psychological studies of the problems of modern Russian society* (pp. 438–460). Moscow: Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences Publ.
- Mannarino A. P., Cohen J. A. (2011). Traumatic loss in children and adolescents. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Trauma*, 4(1), 22–33.
- Mattessich, R. (1982). The systems approach: Its variety of aspects. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 33(6), 383–394.
- McCubbin, H. I., McCubbin, M. A. (1996). Resiliency in families: A conceptual model of family adjustment and adaptation in response to stress and crisis In: H. I. McCubbin, A. I. Thompson & M. A. McCubbin (Eds.). *Family assessment: Resiliency, coping and adaptation: Inventories for research and practice* (pp. 1–64). Madison: University of Wisconsin.

- McCubbin, L. D., McCubbin, H. I. (2005). Culture and ethnic identity in family resilience: Dynamic processes in trauma and transformation of Indigenous people. In: M. Ungar (Ed.). *Handbook for working with children and youth: pathways to resilience across cultures and contexts* (pp. 27–44). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Minuchin, S., Fishman, H. C. (1981). *Family therapy techniques*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Olson, D. H. (1991). Three-dimensional (3D) circumplex model and revised scoring of FACES III. *Family Process*, 30(1), 74–79.
- Osofsky, J. D., Thompson, D. (2000). Adaptive and maladaptive parenting: Perspectives on risk and protective factors. In: J. P. Shonkoff & S. J. Meisels (Eds.). *Handbook of early childhood intervention* (pp. 54–75). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Patterson, J. M. (2002). Integrating family resilience and family stress theory. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64(2), 349–360.
- Postylyakova, Yu. V. (2015). Individual and family resources of foster parents' applicants. In: A. V. Makhnach, A. M. Prikhozhan & N. N. Tolstykh (Eds.). *The problem of orphanhood in modern Russia: The psychological aspect* (pp. 459–477). Moscow: Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences Publ. (in Russian)
- Postylyakova, Yu. V. (2016). Family resources and individual viability of candidates for alternative parents. In: A. V. Makhnach & L. G. Dikaya (Eds.). *Human resilience: individual, professional and social aspects* (pp. 288–298). Moscow: Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences Publ. (in Russian)
- Sergienko, E. A. (2009). Principles of differentiation—integration and continuity—discreteness of mental development. *Psychological Studies*, 1(3). Available at: <http://www.psystudy.ru> (Accessed 10 August 2018) (in Russian)
- Steptoe, A., Marmot, M. (2003). Burden of psychosocial adversity and vulnerability in middle age: Associations with biobehavioral risk factors and quality of life. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 65(6), 1029–1037.
- Systemic Family Psychotherapy (2002). In: E. G. Eidemiller (Ed.). Sankt Petersburg: Piter Publ. (in Russian)
- Tkachenko, I. V. (2014). Personal developmental resources of the family: Ethnic determination. *Family and Personality: Problems of Interaction*, 1, 173–178.
- Varga, A. Y. (2001). Systemic family therapy. Sankt Petersburg: Rech Publ. (in Russian).
- Voronina, T. D., Puchkina, Yu. A., Averina, E. A. (2011). Informal and institutional resources of the modern family in the context of the formation of the familial environment in the region: the possibility of using qualitative research methods. *Tomsk State University Bulletin*, 1(13), 32–43 (in Russian).
- Walsh, F. (2003). Family resilience: a framework for clinical practice. *Family Process*, 42(1), 1–18.
- Walsh, F. (2006). *Strengthening family resilience*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Werner, E. E. (1993). Risk, resilience, and recovery: Perspectives from the Kauai longitudinal study. *Development and Psychopathology*, 5, 503–515.
- Windlea, G., Markland, D. A., Woods, R. T. (2008). Examination of a theoretical model of psychological resilience in older age. *Aging & Mental Health*, 12(3), 285–292.
- Worden, M. (2002). *Family psychotherapy basics* (3rd edition). Cengage Learning.
- Wright, E. M., Fagan, A. A., Pinchevsky, G. M. (2013). The effects of exposure to violence and victimization across life domains on adolescent substance use. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 37(11), 899–909.

