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Since I was born we have been going through many microtransitions: Oscillating from fighting to having fun together, and coordinating in looking for new balances...
Nella mia casa paterna, quand’ero ragazzina, a tavola, se io o i miei fratelli rovesciavamo il bicchiere sulla tovaglia, o lasciavamo cadere un coltello, la voce di mio padre tuonava: - Non fate malagrazie!
Se inzuppavamo il pane nella salsa gidava: - Non leccate i piatti! Non fate sbrodeghezzi! Non fate potacci!
Sbrodeghezzi e potacci erano, per mio padre, anche i quadri moderni, che non poteva soffrire.

Lessico famigliare
Natalia Ginzburg (1963)
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FAMILIES UNDER THE MICROSCOPE: CONCLUDING REMARKS
REFERENCES
Preface

This research project started as a challenge on different “fronts.”

First, I chose to work on the complicated, but intriguing subject of change. As stated by the Greek philosopher Heraclitus and later interpreted by Plato, "Everything changes and nothing remains still." Change has been a core issue in people’s lives. Change is continuous and affects everyday life. I left archetypal speculations to philosophers to focus my attention on the observation of how people change, and, more precisely, how their relationships change in intimate contexts such as families.

The possibility of “seeing” changes in interpersonal relationships required particular methods yet to be devised, which would allow us to grasp the transformative process of these changes. This was challenging as it required me to “start from scratch” and combine contributions from diverse disciplines other than psychology. Although the work originated in the context of social psychology as it is the framework of my three-year doctoral training, the results were combinations from linguistics, anthropology, sociology, and family therapy. I realized that interdisciplinarity is a necessity when studying the complexity of interpersonal relations.

These three years of work have meant mainly to “swim upstream” with all the difficulties that it implies. In the beginning, it was frustrating. To find the “right” academic contexts in which I could present my data (developmental or social psychology? anthropology?) was difficult. Gradually the difficulty became intellectually intriguing and suited my “counter-mainstream” passion.

Another challenge concerned language: I decided to write in English. This, again, required much effort. I am aware the syntax might be slightly (or perhaps, largely?) “Italianized”. However, I hope that I am clear in expressing my ideas.

What lies ahead in my academic career is still a challenge and a mystery. I cannot advance any predictions about that... I only know that I hope to explore and satisfy my many remaining curiosities.

Finally, the United States – the country, itself – was a challenging, albeit special place for me in the past three years. I began forming the basis of my dissertation in the icy chills of New Hampshire only to finish writing my dissertation in balmy California.

Let’s see where a new beginning will be!
The framework

Non si può osservare un’onda senza tenere conto degli aspetti complessi che concorrono a formarla e di quelli altrettanto complessi a cui essa dà luogo. Questi aspetti variano continuamente, per cui un’onda è sempre diversa da un’altra onda; ma è anche vero che ogni onda è uguale a un’altra onda, anche se non immediatamente contigua o successiva; insomma ci sono delle forme e delle sequenze che si ripetono, sia pur distribuite irregolarmente nello spazio e nel tempo.

Italo Calvino. Lettura di un’onda, Palomar (1983)

1. Introduction: An overview of the research project

Families change throughout their life course according to both internal changes and transformations that occur in relation to the broader context in which they are connected. In particular, changes of any one family member, dyad, or triad may trigger dis-equilibration and re-organization of the whole family system (Cowan, 1991).

Thus, how do such processes of change occur?

Starting from this broad question, I have devised a research project that placed great effort in attempting to address this issue.

*Family change* is at the core of my research interests. This notion has to be intended here in the specific declination of developmental transitions and, more precisely, as *micro-transitions* which occur in the everyday interactions among family members.

I decided to situate the study of microtransitions in a particular moment of family development: adolescence. This choice functioned to provide a better understanding of the processes of change because in this period, several microtransitions are clustered at a given time.

*Interdisciplinarity* is another fundamental characteristic of this research project, and all the disciplines considered share a *systemic-constructionist* orientation as a common
background. In line with this, the main effort of my work was to devise *methods* consistent with this epistemological background.

The structure of the entire research project, itself, is constructionist, in the sense that each of the three studies is built and emerges from the previous one as with “Chinese boxes.” More precisely, the results of one study serve as the starting point for new research questions, which are explored subsequently.

We begin with the “biggest box”: *Study 1*. This study provides the methodological framework of the entire research project. Innovative observational procedures are devised to collect and analyze data; furthermore, the two constructs of *oscillation* and *coordination* are operationalized. Six families with at least an adolescent child (13-16 years) participated in this study.

*Study 2* involved another six families, and it is focused on the observation of emerging *patterns of family interaction* from the interlocking of oscillation with coordination. Four specific patterns are presented, which account for the different ways in which continuity and change develop during microtransitions.

The last study, *Study 3*, is an attempt to focus the “lens” on the specific *forms of sequential interactions* family members displayed when talking about ongoing changes. The introduction of a new analytical procedure allowed for the study of the relational aspects of oscillation as the *stance-taking* process, which accounts for power dynamics displayed in the interaction among family members.

2. Lenses: Studying the processes of family *microtransitions*

The notion of family as a complex object of analysis has been claimed for a very long time as well as the necessity of devising methods to measure this complexity. The interests of researchers become even more complex at arriving at the core of the processes through which families change.

The type of “lens” to adopt to reach this complexity is a critical point.

One of the necessary steps I identified with my project is the importance of considering suggestions from multiple disciplines. Considering that the key words of my work are *families* and *transitions*, at least three traditions of study need to be considered:
developmental psychology, social psychology, and family therapy. These three lines of research will be briefly illustrated through graphic representations provided to define these models. More details will be presented in the introduction of the single studies.

Metaphorically, we can think of these theoretical approaches as binoculars chosen to observe the same object (the family), but with different lenses. If we were to watch from one side, we can see details, but the elements on the background will blur. Whereas if we turn it, we will see smaller objects but also the connections between them, as the background will be included in the frame. In order to observe a process in which both individual and relational aspects are included, methods consistent with this theoretical goal are needed.

At the end of the seventies, Lerner and Spanier (1978: 15) pointed out that “there is an emerging synthesis in social science of sociologists, psychologists, and physicians. The family is the central social institution in society and has been the focus of much research and scholarship among family sociologists in particular. Additionally, perhaps no topic in the social sciences has received as much attention, particularly from developmental psychologists, as has the behavioral development of the individual. Yet, these two closely related and obviously interdependent topics have not adequately been studied jointly.” Developmental psychologists place greater efforts in devising models of individual development in which the attention to relational contexts was fundamental. *Developmental contextualism* (Bronfenbrenner, 1995; Sameroff & Seifer, 1983) is an attempt to provide a complex and articulated model contaminated by systems theory in which it is claimed that individual developmental transitions are strictly affected by the ones that happen in the multiple contexts to which individuals participate (see Figure 1.1).
Figure 1.1. The developmental contextualism applied to human development (Ford & Lerner, 1992).

This complex model refers to organized configurations of person-context that reciprocally influence and lead to different evolutionary paths. These configurations are also affected by the nature of the variables and by the interactive dynamics among them (Ford & Lerner, 1992). Families, according to this approach, are one of the essential contexts of development, and they continuously influence and are influenced by the maturational processes of its members. As clearly noted in Fig. 1.1, however, families are intended as subunits; children and parents are “separate universes.”

Kreppner (1989) noticed that in such a model, families have been considered as an “ecological variable” or as a dyad of mother and children. Furthermore, most of the studies carried out in this theoretical perspective have mainly focused on the individual development while the more process-oriented ideas stemming from systems theory were left behind.
A second tradition of study originated from the study of family relations in social psychology: the family life-cycle model (Figure 1.2).

![Family Life-Cycle Model Diagram](image)

**Figure 1.2.** The family life-cycle model (Carter & McGoldrick, 2003).

This approach considers families as dynamic units, which change during the life cycle: from “the womb to the tomb”. Individual and relational levels emerge as “embracing” contexts, one from the other as clearly shown in the figure.

This model has encountered many critics, with integrations and revisions introducing several changes, sometimes confusing, from the original sociological formulation. However, its merit is that it stresses the relevance of considering the whole family as the unit of analysis.

Briefly, the family life-cycle model claims that transitions between different developmental stages are triggered by events of crisis (e.g., adolescence) in which all
family members must achieve some developmental task in order to move to the next stage. The notion of a critical event shows many limitations as maturational processes are conceived as discontinuous and abrupt events that break ongoing interactions.

On the contrary, some theories developed within a systemic approach have provided intriguing suggestions for the study of “normal family processes” (Walsh, 2003), the everyday interactions among family members in which new competences are acquired and incorporated in the repertoire of family interactions. Among them, Breunlin’s works (1988) carried out in the context of family therapy gave interesting suggestions for the study of family transitions (Figure 1.3).

![Fig 1.3. The process of transitions (Breunlin, 1988).](image)

In Breunlin’s oscillation theory, developmental changes occur through continuous oscillatory processes in which old competences are alternated with new ones until the latter prevails. Family interactions need to be regulated as new competences are incorporated. Moreover, the effective notion of micro-transition is introduced to stress that these oscillatory processes occur in everyday interactions.

The notion of micro-transition is a crucial starting point of my research project. How can these processes be studied?
3. Observation as a “political” choice

Kreppner (2002) highlighted that the application of systemic principles to methodological choices would open new perspectives for the understanding of families as adapting and developing contexts in which the children grow up. He states that the necessary premises for designing systems research are to

a) consider the centrality of relationships for understanding families;

b) conceptualize families as evolving over time, through developmental stages and transitional periods; and

c) focus on communication and interaction during different periods of the life course.

I view observational methods as the best choice.

Observation has a long methodological tradition in different scientific disciplines. However, few studies in the field of family research use direct observation as the main method for data collection. Scholars (Kerig & Lindhal, 2001) have noted that this method is useful for improving our understanding of family dynamics; and by watching how family members communicate with one another, researchers can draw conclusions about fundamental dimensions of family interactive processes (Margolin, et al. 1998).

Among the research tools used to conduct observations, the use of video recordings has only becoming widely accepted recently (Neale et al., 2007; Rose, 2000). In the field of anthropology, especially ethnography, there is a longstanding tradition of film and video (e.g., Bateson & Mead, 1942); however, the prevalent use of self-report methods in social sciences has kept this technique in a peripheral position (Grabb, 2008).

The potential of video recording was clearly outlined by Gesell at the beginning of the twentieth century (1928: 56):

The camera is, in a sense, mightier than the psychological eye. The living eye can see but it cannot record. Not even in the visual arcana of the most eidetic cortex can permanent immutable images be stored for retrospective reference. This is just what the camera can do for us. It can supply seriated optical records - records which do not fade with time nor warp with prejudice, but which perpetuate with impartial fidelity the configuration of the original event.

Interestingly, the advantages of studying interactions in intimate relational contexts using video material have recently been recognized (Goldman, et al. 2007; Ochs et al.,
2006). The persistence of the record allows the researcher to develop categorization after the detailed and careful analysis of the examples. The post-production and the delayed categorization allow for recognizing the complexity of interactions (Kreppner, 2009). Indeed, video recordings offer the possibility to speed up, slow down, or stop subtle aspects of interaction that occur and may go unnoticed by observation at the time. Both verbal and nonverbal aspects of interaction (tone, eye gaze, posture, and gesture) can be studied together or as separate streams. Furthermore, video records can be revisited over time to refine hypotheses or develop new research questions.

For these reasons, I found that the use of video is a choice particularly attuned to the study of the processes emerging in interpersonal relationships.

I also considered some relevant warnings by Goodwin (1996) who stressed that methodological choices are “political” in the sense that any camera position or any transcription can constitute a theory about what is relevant within a scene. This will have enormous consequences for what can be seen in it later and which forms of subsequent analyses are possible.

4. Methodological notations

Before going into the details of my work, some specifications about the methodological procedures adopted in the project are provided. This will allow one to avoid redundant definitions in the presentation of the single chapters.

First, this work was made possible only through a constant confrontation within a research team comprising my advisors and three graduate students besides me. The collaboration was fundamental in different parts of the project, but particularly for data collection and analysis. The calculation of inter-rater’s agreement was the main procedure adopted to guarantee reliability in each step of the analyses. During the presentation of the three studies, I would switch from the use of the first person (“I”) with the plural “we”, when appropriate, to emphasize the collaboration of the research team.

Second, researchers abided by the ethical principles defined by the National Psychological Association in collecting data. That this study involved 32 families with diverse compositions and children of different age videotaped in a laboratory setting or in
their homes necessitated extreme caution with respect to privacy norms. Parents and children were assured that they could stop the researchers in any moment during data collection, and that the data were to be used only for didactic and research purposes. Before data collection, all family members read a consent form about the procedures, and they were asked to sign only at the end of the video recording. This choice was consistent with the possibility that some families might not allow the treatment of data critical or sensitive in nature emerging from the interview. However, all families agreed to the use of the videotaped material.

All families that participated in the three studies have Italian origins and belong to middle and middle-upper class: both mother and father had a job at the time of the interview. Most of them worked either as employees in private companies or as teachers in schools; the others were managers and physicians. Specifications about age and family composition are provided in each study; moreover, pseudonyms for both the family name and the first names of participants are used.

Third, some notations are need for the interview extracts that I report in the result sections. As the research project was conducted with Italian families as participants, the original language of the interviews is Italian. Thus, for each study I translated the excerpts into English, trying to provide the closest meaning to some Italian colloquial expressions.

In the English version of the extracts, I did not translate the capital letters that refer to family members and interviewer, namely: father is “padre” in Italian, the P is kept, mother is “madre” in Italian, the M is retained, and interviewer is “intervistatrice” in Italian, the I is left as is. The other capital letters, observable in the extracts, stand for the first name of adolescents and siblings, and they will be specified in the header of each extracts.

As for the transcription of all interviews, I used conventions that partially follow the indications of Conversation Analysis. For the purposes of my work, I only considered ones that are summarized in the next page.
TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>((mother laughs))</td>
<td>Double parentheses enclose non verbal aspects of communication, in italics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.2)</td>
<td>Pauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Capitals indicate emphatic stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes [I think [but I</td>
<td>Square brackets enclose simultaneous talk (overlap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>A hyphen indicates a truncated word or interruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(home)</td>
<td>When words are in parentheses it indicates uncertainty on the transcriber’s part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Empty parentheses indicate that something is being said, but the transcriber could not hear it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>An equal sign indicates no break or delay between the words connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mom</td>
<td>Underlining indicates some form of stress or emphasis on the underlined item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the interviews’ excerpts additional signs were included:

- Colons in round parentheses indicate that part of the talk has been cut when too long
- Colons in squared parentheses indicate that some turns have been cut when too long
- Words in squared parentheses indicate that the researcher added some words especially in the English translation to make the sense of the utterances
Defining methods for the observation of families’ interactions

★ Study 1 ★

Deciding on the epistemology prior to selecting the theoretical perspective prior to choosing the methodology and then the specific methods puts methodology and methods firmly in their place.

(Chamberlain, 1999)

1. Introduction

When carrying out research on family relations in the field of social psychology and particularly when the research interests concern the study of developmental processes, methodological issues emerge as critical.

Scholars working in a socio-psychological framework have often faced the difficulty of maintaining coherence between the explicit theoretical premises and the most suitable methos (Lanz & Rosati, 2002). This difficulty becomes sharper when the attention is focused, beyond the consideration of a relational level, on the observation of the processes through which parents and children relate one to the others in the course of evolutionary changes.

There is a common agreement in the literature on the need to develop research in which families are investigated within a systemic theoretical approach, as it is the only one that can account for the complexity that characterizes these relational systems (Fruggeri, 1998a; Wagner & Reiss, 1995). As Kreppner (2005) has pointed out, over fifty
years of studies on families within the systemic perspective have led to the consolidation of crucial considerations that currently form a shared theoretical background.

The most relevant ones are considered: a) Families are characterized by a specific structure representing the framework within which the relations among the members are defined; b) The interactions among members of a family are regulated by a dynamic organization which is manifested in recurrent regulation patterns; c) Any change in a relationship affects all the relationships within the family system; d) Families tend to reach a state of balance called homeostasis; e) Regulation is activated by feedback or retroactions, which may limit deviations from the state of balance achieved (negative feedback) or amplify them by introducing new elements into the system (positive feedback).

In a systemic approach, therefore, the process of change is activated by a positive feedback that triggers a transition since the system is required to re-organize consolidated interactive patterns. Circularity, rather than linearity, becomes the focal point allowing the regulation of interactions among the members of a family (Kreppner, 1996).

In line with this orientation, stimulating assumptions derive also from the field of family therapy and, more precisely, from the work of Breunlin (1988). The author introduced the effective notion of micro-transition to highlight the constant negotiations required during maturational changes (biological, psychological, and social) undergone by members of a family in the course of its history. I consider this as an excellent starting point for promoting the theoretical and methodological reflections on how to study the processes of change in the families. In particular, an effort shall be made in order to identify standard methodological procedures, which are coherent with a similar theoretical background.

White and Kline (2008) have recently pointed out that empirical studies tend to re-utilize instruments that identify static dimensions rather than processes. Starting from the assumptions of these authors, I will discuss in depth these two particularly critical points: the level of analysis and the procedure for data collection in the field of family studies.
1.1 The controversy of the levels of analysis in the study of family relations

The level of analysis to be considered in the study of family relations is still a controversial topic debated by different scholars. Some consider families the result of the sum of individual points of view; others as interacting dyads; and a minority, as a unit of analysis.

In an overview by Lanz and Rosnati (2002), most of the research carried out with families appeared to lie within the field that Feetham (1991) rightly identified as family related studies. In other words, family relationships are investigated starting from the perception that the single individual has as regards interactive situations, using instruments, both quantitative (questionnaires or scales) (Cicognani, 2002) and qualitative (interviews) (Gilgun, Daly & Handel, 1992).

Yet, as Fischer (Fischer et al., 1985) and Olson (1990) have pointed out, these data should not be considered family data since they involve perceptions or actions related to a single individual without any reference to the family system in its general meaning. In order to solve this critical point, some authors\(^1\) have conducted research that used increasingly sophisticated psychometric models. In this case, however, the models were validated by using questionnaires as the main instruments for data collection and directed at identifying stable features, thus not easily applicable to the transformative processes families encounter during their development. Moreover, the level of analysis remains individual or, at the most, dyadic when considering the effects of bi-directionality introduced by the statistical model.

The consolidated tradition of studies conducted in the field of developmental psychology referring to ecological and contextual models also has ultimately defined the study of the family principally in terms of the sum of dyads. As Bertalanffy (1968: 98) claimed, “the meaning of that vaguely mystic expression ‘the whole is more than the sum of the parts’ is that the characteristics constituting a whole are not directly identified by the characteristics of its single parts.” It follows that the study of dyads cannot substitute the study of the family as a unit (P. Minuchin, 1985). Furthermore, it shall be considered that the interpersonal dynamics between mother and son, or father and son are often

---

\(^1\) See Kenny & La Voie (1984) for an overview and Cook (2005)’s recent additions.
modified when a third member intervenes, as shown by several studies on the development of intersubjectivity in the early months of life (Brody & Flor, 1996; Fivaz-Depeursinge & Corboz-Warnery, 1999).

In the introduction to their manual, Kerig & Lindhal (2001) draw attention to the fact that the literature appears to show limited agreement concerning the definition of the family as a unit and the methods that are suitable for measuring it. In this regard, McHale (2001) provides an effective definition of the notion of “family level”, indicating the processes that occur when the family interacts as a group, which are specific, can be operationalized, and are accessible to observation. Nevertheless, one shall note that in spite of the fact that “the functioning of the whole is qualitatively different from the sum of its parts, the properties of the family as a whole derive from the characteristics of the relationships between the individuals who are a part of it” (Rutter, 1990: 333).

Gjerde (1986) pointed out that when one speaks of interdependence of the parts, one should refer more correctly to the interdependence of the relationships because the quality of a relationship affects the other relationships and is affected by them. In the course of its history, each family is the outcome of processes occurring at different levels: individual, interpersonal, group and social (Fruggeri, 1998a). Adopting a level that is, for all intents and purposes, a family level thus means defining methodological procedures that permit the identification of their embrication.

The need to devise research tools that are coherent with the subject being investigated, in this case the family as a unit, is present in various approaches (Caprara et al., 2004; Lanz & Rosnati, 2002). Many scholars have acknowledged that, as families are “relational” research subjects by their own nature, qualitative methodologies should be privileged (Dely, 2007; Kidd, 2002; Madill & Gough, 2008). Although qualitative methods have not yet been widely used, when applied to the study of family relations, they reveal their potentialities as they favor in-depth investigations on the processual aspects of relations (Dely, 2007; Puing, Koro-Ljungberg & Echevarria-Doan, 2008). Furthermore, qualitative methodologies permit to keep coherence with a systemic framework, and its last contamination with constructionism, which poses more emphasis on the analysis of interactive processes (Schwandt, 2001). In this line, when family members interact with each other, they do not only exchange information and messages,
they negotiate the meanings to be attributed to events and behavior, construct individual and collective identities, define roles and relationships, and develop a specific manner of organizing reality (Pearce, 1994; Pearce & Cronen, 1980; Von Foerster, 1974).

Despite the last prolific consideration, much more work need to be done. As O’Brien (2005) noted, much research that is published in scientific journals still investigates the direct effects that individual or contextual characteristics have on certain variables as if they were static or unchanging. The author continued: “The reciprocity which lies at the heart of living systems has not yet been incorporated into our methods of analysis” (p. 888). According to P. Minuchin (2002), it is possible to report the persisting, constant absence in the literature of studies analyzing the processes of change that have included the entire family system as the focus of the analysis.

1.2 Procedures for data collection: self-report or observation?

As for the level of analysis, the selection of suitable instruments to collect data with families is controversial.

There is no doubt that self-reports are the most widely used instruments in the studies of families. Most of them are quantitative instruments, such as scales or questionnaires, which allow the identification of relevant characteristics for several aspects of family functioning (Kosco & Warren, 2000). Other scholars closer to the sociological tradition of family studies have pointed out that qualitative self-reports, such as family interviews or focus groups with family members, permit the identification of a cross-section of family processes and patterns (Dely, 1992; Houck & Kodadeck, 2001), as well as the promotion of an emerging self-awareness of the multiple voices found in a family, which may be autonomous or connected to one another (Hartrick & Lindsey, 1995). Empirical studies that use these methods are a minority, and some still lack coherence between the theoretical framework and the choice of the methods.

For example, one study (Harold, Colarossi & Mercier, 2007) involved 60 families with adolescents interviewed at home. Interviews were conducted individually and in association with eco-maps (Hartman, 1978) to explore the nature of the relationships each family member had with the other members as well as with the wider relational contexts.

---

2 See Lanz & Rosnati (2002) for an overview of scales that have been validated in Italy.
Despite interesting data collected by the authors on different aspects characterizing the period of transition between childhood and adolescence, analyses were conducted by considering families as a sum of individual points of view. Interestingly, the authors explicitly declared that they conducted this research in the framework of the family-life cycle model (Carter & McGoldrick, 1988) in which consideration of the entire family as a unit of analysis is one of the basic assumptions. However, the methodology selected, based on what is reported by the single members of the family concerning various contexts, appear to be incoherent with the theoretical framework.

Some suggestions to overcome these critical points derive from De Bruyn (2005) who claimed that researchers interested in the study of developmental processes should privilege observational methods for data collection. Observation appears to be consistent with a systemic approach as it favors access to the “rich, variegated and specific complex of interpersonal dynamics characterizing the interactions within a family group” (McHale, Kuersten & Lauretti, 1996: 5). Observation allows one to identify manifested behaviors, leaving out of consideration the self-awareness of the subjects, thereby providing unique information different from those by any family member (Kerig & Lindhal, 2001; Taylor & Barnett, 2005). In other words, it is possible to have indications on the processes because what lies at the center of our attention is the interaction between people, which is articulated on different levels: between the members of the family but also between the family and the researcher (Lanz & Rosati, 2002). Several research projects have proceeded in this direction and have adopted this approach since the late ‘90s. Much effort has been made to develop complex scales for the study of family interactions on the basis of observational codes (Fivaz-Depeursinge & Corboz-Warnery, 1999; Kerig & Lindhal, 2001; Mazzoni & Tafà, 2007).

Observation allows one to identify the different relational networks that have been established and to focus attention on behaviors from a perspective that lies “outside” the family. On the contrary, instruments such as self-reports allow one to identify an internal perspective, i.e., the perception individuals have of their family relationships (Olson, 1977).

These two approaches should not be seen as incompatible. Recent research projects involving families have made increasing use of multi-method procedures (Plano Clark et
Interesting examples can be found in longitudinal studies on communication patterns between parents and children, as shown by Kreppner and colleagues (Kreppner, 1996; Kreppner & Ullrich, 1998). The authors have observed families during discussions on a single topic in the family home and also have used questionnaires and daily diaries written by each member of the family. Such studies, however, are rare in the literature.

1.3 An observation-based approach stemming from the systemic approach

In considering the whole family as a unit of analysis and observation as a privileged method for the study for processes, a systemic-constructionist approach is the most suitable framework, permitting coherence between methodological choices and the theoretical framework. More precisely, we could develop an observation-based approach in which processes through which families change can be studied by observing the interactions between members.

Scholars (Mazzoni & Tafà, 2007; White, 2004) have acknowledged that, although originated and applied only in clinical contexts, Breunlin’s oscillation theory (1988) is a productive starting point for the study of the processes of family changes. Breul: used observational methods within a systemic theoretical framework to develop the oscillation theory to explain family development.

Oscillation is defined as a series of deviations with smaller or larger amplitudes from an established equilibrium in family functioning. According to the oscillation theory, transitions occur not as step functions in which discontinuous leaps are made from one level of functioning to another, but through an oscillation between levels of functioning. “Such oscillations are an inevitable feature of all transitions. In normal families, the oscillations dampen when the higher level of functioning predominates and replaces a previous level of functioning” (Breunlin, 1988: 140).

Although oscillation can be considered a permanent phenomenon in families, the family life-course is marked by alternating periods of stability and change (Minuchin, 2002). New needs and demands must be integrated into the family’s regular lifestyle and canon of interactions. The search for a sense of continuity and belonging through interactive practices has been defined by Reiss (1981; 1989) as coordination.
According to Reiss (1971), “coordination in families refers to a fundamental experience of sharing the same universe of experience. Each person perceives the structure of his environment the way his family does because each has a strong sense that the environment is the same for all” (p. 17). If coordinated, families establish patterns for relating and coping that are repeated and predictable, allowing them to maintain relationships and to regulate and perpetuate many aspects of family life. The construct of coordination can be considered as a dimension of the family continuity along the life cycle.

The constructs of oscillation and coordination have been elaborated and used in separate research contexts. To observe and describe the dialectic of family change and family continuity, both coordination and oscillation should be considered.

Thus, it is arguable that developmental changes become possible in a family system when oscillation, which activates a transformative process, is associated with coordination, which guarantees continuity and allows the family to recognize – identify itself also in its changes.

On the basis of these theoretical premises, which are the methodological implications of studying the processes of change? Can oscillation and coordination be useful indicators for the study of the processes of change in the families?

2. Aims

Study 1 is aimed at devising original, innovative methods allowing for the investigation of the processes of family change and respecting the whole family as unit of analysis. On the basis of the critical issues identified in the literature and because of the lack of studies providing suitable methodological indications, I intend to define a series of techniques for collecting and analyzing data that are coherent with the theoretical systemic approach formulated.

In particular, I will focus on
a. the setting and the technique for data collection;
b. the way to transcribe and prepare the material for the analysis; and
c. the definition and operationalization of the constructs of oscillation and coordination.

This study requires considerable effort because it is necessary to integrate methodological approaches from multiple disciplines (development and social psychology, family therapy, sociology, and linguistics).

3. Participants

This study involved a small group of families (N=6) with adolescent children (Table 2.1). As for parents, all of them were cohabiting and/or married. Of the adolescents, three were female and three males (mean age=13.8).

The number of participants was intentionally low because my aim was to provide an in-depth assessment of the possible application of a model for the analysis of family interactions.

To be eligible for the study, participating families must have at least one child in the age range of 13 to 16 and not be engaged in family therapy. Families were recruited from high schools of the city of Emilia Romagna in northern Italy. Adolescents were given a letter to be delivered to their parents that described the objectives and methods of the research project. Families that were interested to participate in the research project were asked to sign and fill out a form with their phone numbers and e-mail addresses. Those who decided to take part were then contacted by phone to set up a meeting for the interview. All family members were asked to participate with the exception of children under the age of six years. We determined that children of this young age would get easily bored during the interviews and might interrupt the conversation between the interviewer and the family members.
Table 2.1
Personal data: name, age and sex of family members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Mother's age</th>
<th>Father's age</th>
<th>Adolescent’s age and sex (M/F)</th>
<th>Siblings’ age and sex (M/F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albertini</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Chiara 15 (F)</td>
<td>Jacopo 13 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berti</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Veronica 13 (F)</td>
<td>Sofia 8 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marani</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Alessandro 13 (M)</td>
<td>Sara 18 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martelli</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Tommaso 14 (M)</td>
<td>Roberto 19 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sara 18 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Giulia 9 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergoni</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Damiano 13 (M)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponti</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Serena 15 (F)</td>
<td>Carolina 12 (F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Families were invited to the Laboratory of Observation in the Department of Psychology, University of Parma, to carry out and videotape an interview.

4. Methods as results

4.1 The definition of the methodological procedure

The main goal of this study was to devise methodological procedures that would aptly identify the processes of family change. In particular, three procedures were defined and will be presented in detail in the next paragraphs.

4.1.1. Setting

The families were invited to the Laboratory of Observation of the university, as this structure is equipped with a one-way mirror and video cameras (Figure 2.1 and Figure 2.2).
Figure 2.1. The Laboratory of Observation. View of the equipment used for the video recording behind the one-way mirror, where the members of the research team monitored the interview.

Figure 2.2. The Laboratory of Observation. View of the observation room, where the families were invited to carry out the interview.
This setting allowed the interviewer to conduct the interview in the same room as the family, while two researchers from the same team observed the interaction in another room from their positions behind the mirror. The role played by the researchers behind the mirror allowed the monitoring of the interview and the video-recording equipment to be used. This setting was adapted from family therapy (Minuchin, 1974) and was found to be particularly effective because it allowed the family to be placed in a comfortable setting and to become familiar with the interviewer, who informed the participants of the presence of the researchers in the other room.

As some scholars reported (Fivaz-Depeursinge & Corboz-Warnery, 1999; Reiss, 1981), the laboratory does not condition the data collection. It is the interactive context established between the researcher and the family that becomes an integral part of the research project. A total of 6 hours 30 minutes of video recording was completed.

4.1.2. Data collection

A specific instrument was identified to record the plurality of points of view and interactive patterns expressed by the family members, the family interview. This technique is borrowed in part from family psychotherapy with systemic orientation (Selvini Palazzoli et al., 1980; Tomm, 1985). Although most of the studies that use this technique have been limited to family psychotherapy (Beitin, 2008), I believe that this technique presents an interesting potential for non-clinical data collection of families.

As Eggenberg and Nelms (2007) stressed, research based on interviews to families is rare in the literature even though it presents certain advantages because it draws attention to the manner in which members interact with one another, and together, as a family, reveal problems, worries, and a shared history. Furthermore, it favors the emergence of an individual perspective while simultaneously allowing the emergence of a shared point of view, or rather, the essence of the family considered as a whole unit. Thus, recording the points of view by means of interviews with families allows one to identify the manner in which meanings are constructed and also favors their interpretation (Warren, 2002).

In summary, the family interview in my research allows for the a) focus on the whole family as the object of study; b) analysis of family interactions on content and relational
levels, as family members co-construct the meaning of their interactions in the current talk (Bercelli, Leonardi & Viaro, 1999); and c) evocation of a temporal dimension as all participants were asked during interviews to discuss changes with reference to the past, the present, and the future (Penn, 1985).

With these considerations, I proceeded to draw up a scheme for a family interview with a low structural level and divided into three different parts.

In the first part called descriptive, the interviewer looks at the adolescent and asks these first questions: “If you think of yourself in the last two years, do you feel you have changed, do you feel older? Can you tell us an episode that can help us to understand how you have changed?” With these questions, the temporal dimension and the topic of change are activated. This part continues with the interviewer asking several questions again directed to the adolescent in order to deepen the topic of his or her change. This part lasts about ten minutes and ends with the question: “Do you think that your parents have realized that you have changed?”

This question introduces the second part of the interview called generative.

The generative section investigates the possibility of exploring interactive aspects when other family members intervene on the opinions expressed by the adolescent in the previous part. The interviewer asks a question which allows the mother or father to be included in the conversation: “What made you realize that your child has changed?” Then all members are invited to express and respond to the others’ viewpoints. In this part of the interview, members are encouraged to interact as they normally do so at home, and the interviewer’s role is to facilitate the mutual exchange of opinions, thereby raising a circular conversation among members and allowing the observation of their interactions.

As reported by the authors who were the first to identify this technique in the field of systemic therapy (Bercelli et al., 1999; Selvini Palazzoli et al. 1980; Tomm, 1985), circularity should be seen as the ability to “trigger amongst the people involved a retroactive whirl which powerfully lights up the triadic relationships” (Selvini Palazzoli et al. 1980: 14). It follows that, in order to obtain information, the interviewer will “play” with the tension that has been created among the different points of view of the participants on the basis of the family’s retroactions concerning the information given, emphasizing the
differences, paraphrasing the contents, and finally activating a reciprocal mirroring of what has been said.

The next question aims at arousing reflections on the changes experienced at a family level, through episodes or narration, and that have represented a turning point in the history of the family being interviewed. Thus, the interviewer asks each family member the question: “Has there been an event which you noticed as a change for the whole family?” In this way the participants are encouraged to explore family changes in a temporal dimension, in a comparison between the past and the present situation of the family.

The generative part requires a longer duration than the previous descriptive section because each member is allowed to express his/her opinions in regard to the contents being discussed.

The third and final part of the interview called projective concerns projections about the future. The interviewer invites the family members to imagine themselves in a few years’ time and asks: “If you think of yourself three/four years from now, how do you see yourself?”

4.1.3. Preparation of the material: the frame analysis

All the interviews were video-recorded in order to allow a more precise transcription and to identify nonverbal elements implied in the interaction among participants and between participants and the interviewer.

The interviews were transcribed on the basis of some indicators used in Conversation Analysis (Fasulo & Pontecorvo 1999; Schegloff, 1995). In particular, verbal forms as well as nonverbal ones (positions, gaze, laughing, smiling, posture) were identified.

As for the procedures used in analyzing interviews, we believe that the methods traditionally used in analyzing textual materials in a psycho-social field (analysis of contents, conversation, narrative) are restrictive because we wished to identify the interwoven network of reports provided by the participants and the actions accompanying verbal communication.

---

3 More details about the transcription conventions see p. 10
4 Further specifications can be found in the manual by Mantovani (2008).
The possibility of accounting for the dimensions of the interactions occurring in the process and the regulation applied by anyone in dealing with the changes introduced by a family member are more effectively identified when the interview is subdivided into sequential frames.

The notion of frame was introduced for the first time by Bateson (1955) to indicate the manner in which individuals reach a common agreement concerning the meaning of an interactive pattern. This definition was further specified by Goffman (1974) who stated that frame indicates the “framework of meaning” characterized by communication exchanges between the participants of an interaction, allowing one to know at any given moment what is happening and what is the most suitable conduct to apply. As linguistic anthropologists have pointed out (Duranti, 1997), a conversation amongst family members can appear as a succession of frames, which alternate according to specific criteria.

Fogel and colleagues (2006) have suggested that certain indicators need to be taken into account whenever one plans to identify a frame that will characterize an interaction. First of all, a frame may be considered as segments of connected actions on a coherent topic, occurring in a fixed spatial-temporal context, which involves forms of co-orientation among the participants. The reference to “coherence to the topic being dealt with” is particularly important when analysing the interview data. Fogel further explains this as “sharing meanings or objectives, implicit or explicit, as regards the nature and course of the communication” (p. 49).

On the basis of these considerations, the interviews were divided into sequential frames, which allowed the materials to be analysed on two levels. The first level was called intra-frame, as each context of the answer (or reference frame) is the expression not only of what is being claimed but also of how each person reacts to the statements and actions of others. The second level is called inter-frame, and refers to the passing and moving from one frame to another, adopting a sort of “meta” point of view. This aspect allows observation of the interactive patterns that are typical in each family. Some examples are provided in order to clarify the analytical procedure.

A new frame can be initiated following an innovative contribution to what is being discussed at that moment: in this case, the indicator for change is the question formulated
by the interviewer or the intervention of a family member eliciting the expression of new contents and therefore new interactive exchanges (for example, after analyzing the event of change together with the adolescent, the interviewer turns to the sister and asks: “and have you noticed that your brother has changed?”).

In other cases, a new frame can start when the family interaction takes on different forms, e.g., after a dialogue between a mother and the interviewer, when the mother turns to her daughter and involves her in an interactive exchange; in this case, the indicator for change does not concern a content, but the analog aspects of the interaction.

To illustrate the above, the procedure for sequential analysis of the frames is reported below as it is applied to one of the six interviews. Each frame has been given a title and a short caption, summing up the main contents.

Eight frames were identified in the interview with the Martelli family.

I Introducing the three brothers
II Tommaso’s changes
III The point of view of the mother
IV Acknowledging the change in Tommaso
V The parenting
VI Bodily changes
VII The changes in the family
VIII The future of the family

Frame VII (Excerpt 2.1) is provided below, showing the transcription methods used. The interactional exchanges are numbered and identified according to who is speaking: the letter I refers to the interviewer’s question, the letter M refers to the mother’s statements, the letter P to the father’s, the letter G to the sister’s, and the letter T refers to Tommaso and R to his brother in other examples.
Excerpt 2.1 - Frame VII: The changes in the family (English translation is provided in the next page)

251. I e quando vi siete accorti che la vostra famiglia è cambiata da cosa? non so
partiamo da lei signora. (guardando la madre)

252. M ah è cambiata! dà quando (0.2) per uscire insieme ormai non è più fattibile!
per esempio noi spesso andiamo a cena fuori perché ci piace perché è un momento
per stare insieme poi insomma a pranzo sia io che lui ci siamo raramente poi
insomma sia a me che a lui piace molto l’idea della famiglia del fare le cose
insieme anche perché sulla base della mia esperienza ma anche della sua poi si
arriva ad un punto in cui le strade si dividono e dopo quello che è fatto è
fatto a me piace anche mettermi sul letto a parlare con loro (0.2) cioè io ad
esempio con Roberto ho fatto un sacco di sedute con lui sul letto a parlare
(0.2) perché lui ne aveva bisogno Tommaso invece è uno che ha più bisogno del
contatto fisico tipo passa e mi bacia passa e mi dà un’abbracciata però (0.2)
non è uno che viene li anche se poi se ci sono delle cose viene li e si rivolge
io poi sono una che chiedo mi informo

253. I quindi dice che si sono ridotti i momenti per stare insieme

254. M si perché alla fine la cena è un po’ il momento in cui si sta tutti insieme
però siamo tutti stanchi vogliamo sentire il telegiornale perché ci interessa-

255. G loro lo vogliono sentire

256. M si perché l’alternativa sono le loro trasmissioni quelle per i giovani invece
la Giulia chiede espressamente di spegnere la televisione perché a lei piace
stare insieme

257. I quindi diceva che ci sono pochi momenti per stare insieme e come si sente?

258. M ma mi sento un po’ persa io poi sono una che fin che può cerca di tenere tutto
quando sento che qualcosa si inizia ad allentare questo è il primo momento di
sbandamento poi mi so riorganizzare e quindi io insomma avrò un po’ più di
tempo per me e lei (verso Giulia) poi io ho avuto loro due stando qui a
Modena da sola perché non avevo nessuno pur continuando a mantenere il mio
lavoro per cui la fatica e l’investimento che ci ho messo è tanto credo d’altra
parte che è stata una mia scelta questa di non avere baby-sitter o altro ma il
minimo indispensabile perché insomma li ho voluti e me li sono cresciuti ecco e
mi rendo conto adesso che effettivamente ognuno-

259. I secondo lei rispetto a questa sensazione che ha nel vedere quello che accade
come si sentono i suoi figli?

260. M ma io credo che (0.2) poi io scherzo anche molto cioè io chiedo ma nello stesso
tempo do anche molto per esempio alle riunioni di scuola sono sempre andata io
per ragioni di tempo per cui quando tornavo dicevo a lui tu hai sicuramente
l’impressione di esserci stato perché racconto e dico quello ha detto questo
quest’altro

261. P confermo-

262. M e lui dice con loro che chiedono come è andata tutto bene e basta e io dico
racconto tutto nel dettaglio e (poi lui

263. P [dare dei messaggi semplici chiari! (a bassa voce e in tono scherzoso)]
(tutti ridono)

264. M comunque io credo che a loro così a caldo può dare fastidio la mia
intromissione o il mio essere apprensiva infatti loro mi dicono tu gufi perché
io dico sono sempre lì a dire guardate che può succedere che (0.2) però credo
che poi alla fine capiscano che è affetto non un volermi intromettere

265. I e secondo lei suo marito come vede questa situazione?

266. M nel senso questa situazione che sono più ridotti i momenti dello stare assieme?
(j [l’intervistatore annuisce]) ma lui li vive diversamente rispetto a me cioè io
metto al primo posto lo stare con loro anche per lui ma se non è possibile fa
lo stesso invece io se non è possibile sto male-

267. I e fa in modo che sia possibile

268. I invece il suo punto di vista su questo? sente che la sua famiglia sia cambiata
in che cosa?

269. P ma io no ho la capacità di vedere questi cambiamenti perché è stata una
continua evoluzione cioè quello che noi facciamo quando loro erano piccoli
rispetto a quello che noi facciamo adesso è una continua trasformazione e
adattamento loro e nostro proprio nel contesto che stava cambiando

270. I e che cosa facevate adesso che non facevate prima?

271. P ma (0.3) i momenti in cui si stava tutti insieme erano maggiorni adesso si fa
più fatti a stare tutti e cinque insieme questa eventualità si verifica sempre
alla sera ma con le cose che diceva lei prima il sabato e la domenica loro non
ci sono mai prima c’erano sempre per cui (0.2) è vero che io avevo un lavoro
diverso spesso facevo le notti il sabato e la domenica e non c’era questo
stacco io nella mia organizzazione lavorativa non erano previsti festivi e
prefestivi però quando capitava che il week-end era libero si faceva tutte le
 cose insieme si usciva si andava via ci si organizzava adesso che io il sabato
Excerpt 2.1 - Frame VII: The changes in the family

251. I and when did you realize that your family was changing? How did it happen?
Let’s start from you ((looking at the mother))

252. M ah it has changed indeed! We can no longer go out together (0.2). For example, we often go out for dinner together because we like going out for dinner and because it is a way to spend time together as we are seldom at home for lunch time we both love our family and love to do things together, this may come from my personal experience but also from my husband’s. Then one comes to the point where paths divide and what is done is done. I also like to sit on the bed and talk with them (0.2) with Roberto for example I had many sessions sitting on his bed and talking (0.2) because he needed it while Tommaso is more physical, he passes and kisses me or holds me but (0.2) he doesn’t come to talk. Even if when there is something he comes to me, then it’s me, I ask and want to be informed.

253. I so you are saying that there are less occasions to stay together

254. M yes because dinner is the moment in which we are all together but we are also all tired and want to listen to the news because we are interested in it.

255. G they want to listen [to the news]

256. M yes as an alternative there are their TV programs, for young people, but Giulia expressly asks to switch the television off because she likes being together

257. I so you were saying you have few moments to stay together, and how do you feel?

258. M I feel a little lost also because I try to keep everything, when I feel that something begins to loosen this is the first moment of yielding then I manage to reorganize and I know I will have more time for her ((towards Giulia)) I had them staying here in Modena alone because I had no one keeping my job with great effort and investment by my side anyway it was my choice not to have baby sitters or other facilities but the minimum. I wanted them and I grew them up, even if now I realise that each of us

259. I how do you think you children feel towards your way of seeing things?

260. M I think that (0.2) I also play a lot I mean I demand but I also give a lot for example I’ve always attended school meeting because I have more time but when I am back I always tell him you will think you were present because I tell you what this and that said

261. P I confirm

262. M and then if they ask how it was he says ok and that’s all while I explain everything in details [and then he

263. P [give clear and simple messages! ((speaking in a lower and funny tone)) ((everybody laughing))

264. M anyway I think at first they can be disturbed from my interference and anxiety that’s why they tell me I bring bad luck because I often say be careful because it may happen that (0.2) but I think in the end they understand it’s love and I’m not trying to interfere

265. I how do you think you husband sees this situation?

266. M you mean the fact that we have less time to stay together? ((the interviewer nods)) well he lives things in a different way I mean I put at first place being with them for him as well but if it is not possible he does not mind while if it is not possible I suffer-

267. P =so made it possible

268. I your point of view about that? Do you feel your family has changed? In which ways?

269. P well I am not able to be aware of all these changes because it has always been an evolution I mean what we did when they were younger respect to what we do now is our and their transformation and evolution towards an environment which is changing

270. I and what do you do now that you did not do before?
271. P  well (0.3) we had more occasions to stay together now it’s more difficult to be
all five together and this occasion always occurs in the evening but with the
things she was saying before on Saturdays and Sundays they are never at home
before they were always here (0.2) so it’s true that before I had another job
and I was always absent at night and on Saturdays and Sundays and there was this
distance but in my job there were no holidays but when it happened that I had a
free week end we always did things together we went out, we organized now that I
am always home on Saturdays and Sundays (0.2) then Tommaso and Roberto of course
do their things and Giulia sometimes has her friends coming to visit her so most
of times we are three and also on Saturday night and also during these summer
evenings except for Roberto who now has to study but usually they go out and
have their own thing. Let’s say that while before we were five in the family now
we are three

272. I  and how do you feel?
273. P  I am quite upset (0.3) but we have many occasions to talk we begin to talk
about what a friend or a friend’s friend or the radio said when we are all in we
can talk but a miss a lot the possibility to talk I am often away from home for
the reason I said before but when I am here we reorganize

The frame starts with the interviewer asking Tommaso’s mother a question about
changes observed in the family over the past few years. Her answer describes change
mainly in the fact that it is difficult for all of them “to be together”, especially at meal
times. This used to be a regular habit when the children were younger. A short time later,
the father confirms this habit.

In the subsequent passage, it is possible to observe the shift from one frame to the
other (Excerpt 2.2).

In frame V, after a long discussion between the father and the mother on their role as
parents, the father concludes the conversation by revisiting a topic that had been
previously been discussed (186). This intervention starts a new form of interaction which
will gradually involve the whole family on another topic, and producing a new frame
labeled, “bodily changes” (Frame VI).

The point in which the father moves to the next frame is highlighted in gray.
In the six interviews, each member of the team proceeds individually to subdivide the interviews into frames, using the criteria of analysis that have been described.

At the end of the analysis, the judges justify the frame sequences they identified and discuss for several minutes. Inter-raters reliability was calculated by assigning different scores according to the level of agreement they reached after the discussion. Four scores were assigned when all the judges agreed about the frame division, three scores when three of them agreed, two when only two agreed, and one when none agreed. In order to calculate the total level of agreement, we added up these rates and used a formula to obtain a value between 0 and 1. The inter-rater level of agreement for the sequential frame division was very high (0.90).

4.2 Operationalization of the constructs: coordination and oscillation

One of the main aims of this study was to define how coordination and oscillation could be observed in course of families’ interactions.
4.2.1. Coordination

The analysis of coordination is carried out by taking two levels into consideration: on one level, attention is focused on what a family members say concerning change (contents level); on another level, how the whole family reacts towards what s/he is saying, i.e., whether the other members of the family listens or interrupt the talk without being addressed or if a member remains on the outskirts despite being explicitly invited to express an opinion (analog level).

Families are coordinated when they show synchrony both at the content and analog level, and are not coordinated when different fractures interrupt this synchrony. Synchrony in coordination is observed when

a. none of the family members intervenes in the discourse and all the family members keep a peripheral position; or

b. one or more family members intervene following a request.

Fractures in coordination, on the contrary, are observed when

a. family members remain in a peripheral position disregarding a member’s explicit requests for intervention; or

b. one or more family members intervene without the explicit request to do that.

In order to give a clear description of synchrony and fractures in coordination among family members, I report some excerpts observed in the first part of the interview\(^5\), when the setting defined by the interviewer is a dialogue with the adolescent, having the other family members serve as an “audience”.

The interviewer addresses the adolescent by saying “I will start with you”, thus offering two kinds of information: 1) she informs the adolescent that s/he is asked to express thoughts about change, and 2) she informs the whole family that later in the interview everybody will be invited to speak. At a nonverbal level, the interviewer looks at the adolescent and, if distracted by other family members, she keeps her attention on the adolescent.

---

\(^5\) Synchrony and fractures are showed here with reference to the first part of the interview for reason of clarity, however they can be observed throughout the interview.
The families’ interactions varied greatly during this part of the interview. In several families, all participants respected the setting. When the adolescent was answering the various questions, parents and siblings listened, smiled, nodded and did not interrupt. Family members acknowledged that the adolescent is considered capable of responding and therefore “mature enough” to handle his or her changes. The same can be said if a member intervenes after an explicit request from the adolescent. This interaction was considered an indicator of *synchrony* in coordination.

In the Excerpt 2.3, for example, it is clearly observable that all family members remained in a peripheral position while the adolescent answered questions about her changes.

**Excerpt 2.3 – Albertini family. C (adolescent), I (interviewer)**

Frame I: Chiara’s changes

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. I</td>
<td>se tu pensi a questi ultimi due anni (...) ti senti in qualche modo diventata più grande?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. C</td>
<td>[sì certo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I</td>
<td>[cresciuta comunque]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. C</td>
<td>si perché comunque dalle medie al liceo questi cinque anni ti cambiano molto anche come mentalità non solo come aspetto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I</td>
<td>ecco mi puoi fare un po’ di esempi (...)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. C</td>
<td>beh comunque più indipendente (0.2) [anche]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I</td>
<td>[cosa significa più indipendente?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. C</td>
<td>nel senso che prima non mi azzardavo a fare cose che invece adesso faccio normalmente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I</td>
<td>del tipo? se si possono dire(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. C</td>
<td>ero più timorosa nell’uscire fuori da sola (...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I</td>
<td>a uscire in che senso (...) a fare un giro in centro?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. C</td>
<td>sì-sì va beh che comunque è cambiato anche molto (0.2) l’ambiente dell’amicizia perché comunque non mi trovavo molto bene alle medie e adesso invece mi sono perfettamente integrata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

21. I | if you think at the last two years (...) do you feel changed? |
22. C | [yes of course] |
23. I | [grown up though] |
24. C | yes because in the passage from the middle to the high school you change a lot not only in your look but also the way you think |
25. I | right can you give me some examples(?)? |
26. C | well more independent though (0.2) [also] |
27. I | [what do you mean by more independent?] |
28. C | I mean before I didn’t attempt to do things that I do not |
29. I | like? If you can tell that (0.2) |
30. C | I was more scared of going out alone (...) |
31. I | to go out in which sense (...) like to hang out in the city center? |
32. C | yes-yes I mean it has also changed a lot (0.2) the environment the friendship |
33. I | because at the middle school I was not doing very well but now I’m totally integrated |
The above is only a short excerpt of the dialogue between the adolescent Chiara and the interviewer, which lasts for a total of 51 verbal exchanges without interventions by other family members, and in which the adolescent deals with various issues without turning to the parents or inviting a contribution from them.

In other families, we observe instead fractures in coordination given by the fact that the parents “break” this setting, interrupting, overlapping or substituting their child in the answer. Below is a short extract from the Martelli family.

Excerpt 2.4 - Martelli family. M (mother), P (father), T (adolescent) I (Interviewer)

Frame II: Tommaso’s changes

24. I se pensi all’ultimo anno o due anni fa ti sei sentito cambiato (…)
25. T (0.2) si nella scuola dal non far niente al dovere iniziare a studiare!
26. P e poi sei molto cambiato! non solo perché sei passato dalla scuola media alle superiori ma anche-
27. I [ci sono dei momenti o degli episodi o dei momenti che ti hanno fatto pensare che eri cambiato? (la Tommaso)]
28. T mmm (0.2) un po’ di tempo fa ho incontrato una mia amica delle elementari che mi ha detto che ero molto cambiato
29. I in che cosa cos’era successo?
30. T dai capelli! ((ridono tutti)) e poi (0.3) non so
31. P secondo me ti ha fatto piacere

When the interviewer asks the adolescent about change (24), Tommaso formulates his initial reply (25), which is followed at once by an unsolicited comment by his father, who interrupts his son by asserting the importance of the change (26). This brief exchange draws attention to the initial manifestation of a fracture in coordination, which is particularly interesting because it is expressed in the discrepancy between the meaning of the utterance (the father acknowledges his son’s change) and the effect that occurred (the son was not allowed to describe the change). The interviewer immediately directs the exchange at Tommaso again (27) who identifies the awareness of his change with an
image a classmate transmitted to him (28), and once again the father appears to encourage him (31) while acting as if his son were not an autonomous interlocutor.

The Berti family also presents various fractures produced by the mother who intervenes by replacing Veronica in the interaction with the interviewer (5, 7, 11) as shown in the excerpt below (Excerpt 2.5).

Excerpt 2.5 – Berti Family. M (mother), P (father), V (adolescent), I (interviewer)
Frame I: Veronica’s changes

1. I well Veronica I start from you ((Veronica holds her father’s harm and he whisper her to keep the attention on the question)) I’d like to ask you do you feel you have changed in the last two years (…)?
2. V well a bit yes
3. I in what do you feel the changes?
4. V (0.3) uh? I go along better with her ((points at her sister)) I fight less here at home((she laughs and his father says something in a low voice)) then (0.2) and also with my classmates we go along better and-
5. M yes you feel more like a woman Veronica if compared to before
6. V uhm? I think so
7. M and your thoughts are different than the ones when you were at the middle school
8. V well I start understanding much more issues
9. M but more than that it is more from a romantic point of view (0.2) let’s say that boyfriends start to hang around ((Veronica gets closer to her father and she looks embarrassed)) these stuff
10. I look ((looking at Veronica)) I’d like to know if you can recall an episode (…)?
11. M come on Veronica you must be honest you must not be ashamed of the others

At the beginning, the mother interrupts the adolescent, preventing her from completely expressing of her point of view (4-5). At the end of the extract, the
interviewer addresses Veronica directly, but again the mother replies rather than encouraging her daughter to respond.

Another way of observing fractures is when family members do not accept the explicit request to participate in the talk. In the Pergoni family, the father at first and then the mother do not respond to the request for intervention that their son explicitly directs towards them (Excerpt 2.6).

Excerpt 2.6 – Pergoni family. M (mother), P (father), D (adolescent), I (interviewer)

Frame I: Damiano’s changes

[...]
3. I volevo sapere se negli ultimi tempi ci sono stati dei momenti in cui hai sentito che tu stavi cambiando (...)
4. D (0.5) ((guardando il padre e anche l’intervistatrice guarda il padre))
5. P non guardare mica me ((sorridendo))
6. I dopo ci arriviamo ma intanto ci interessa il tuo parere (...)
7. D (0.5) non lo so (0.5)
8. I più adulto? hai detto prima oh adesso faccio proprio cose diverse (...)
9. D (0.5) non lo so ((volgendo gli occhi al cielo))
10. I in qualsiasi ambito
11. D (0.5) non lo so ((volgendo gli occhi al cielo)) non saprei boh?

[...]
14. I e i tuoi genitori vedono il tuo cambiamento la tua crescita?
15. D boh? non lo so ((guardando alternativamente padre e madre))
16. I non lo sai allora vuoi che sento da loro poi sento cosa penai tu di quello che pensano loro
17. D si-si

[...]

In this excerpt, Damiano breaks the definition of the given situation (dialogue with the interviewer) by asking for help to his father nonverbally (4), but the father does not grant his request (5). Later, the adolescent makes a second attempt to involve his parents in the talk, but once again, they do not reply (15). The frame ends with the interviewer asking the son’s permission to ask his parents the same question, in an effort to repair his
parents’ failure to respond (16). The three family members maintain this form of interaction with each other throughout the first frame, which lasts for a total of 17 exchanges.

4.2.2 Oscillation

Oscillations are identified by focusing on what family members are saying in a specific frame (intra-frame level) or in different frames (inter-frame level). Two forms of oscillations were observed: individual and family.

*Individual oscillations* can be observed when a single member of the family acknowledges, in an internal dialogue that is then shared publicly, the alternation of new and old behavioral modalities in him/herself and in others. The expression of this alternation remains a personal reflection. When it occurs, the family member refers to innovative aspects which concern him/herself or the family members and at the same time, recalls the habits involved in old, consolidated behavioral modalities. Individual oscillations can be identified within the same frame and can be displayed by each member of the family.

Excerpt 2.7 shows a clear example of individual oscillations expressed by the mother of the Berti family. This extract refers to the fourth frame of the interview in which Veronica’s mother intervenes regarding change in her daughter. In the mother’s opinion, Veronica has changed in different ways. She has become more responsible in her school life, and she also requests more privacy.

Excerpt 2.7 – Berti family. M (mother), V (adolescent)

Frame IV: The mother’s point of view

70. M [allora se tu mi dici che cerchi di camminare veramente con la testa sulle spalle che cerchi di non fidarti di quello che ti dicono gli altri allora è il momento in cui effettivamente non entro nella tua privacy perché è giusto rispettare la sua privacy ma io a volte mi sento veramente...

70. M [then if you tell me that you try to be responsible and that you don’t trust what the others tell you then I actually don’t violate your privacy because it is right to respect her privacy but sometimes I feel something and I feel I have to intrude in...
In the passage at point 70, the mother, in a monologue, clearly depicts her contrasting feelings. On one hand, she acknowledges the need to respect Veronica’s wish for privacy. On the other, she checks on and intervenes in her daughter’s life.

Also in the Martelli family, the mother appears to oscillate between two polarities directed at anxiety/tranquillity (Excerpt 2.8).

Excerpt 2.8 – Martelli family. M (mother)
Frame IV: The parenting

150. M ma io dico di no subito poi (0.2) but at the beginning I say something but later (0.2) I consider the experiences I had when I was younger even if they think it was impossible (0.2) and I think of the dynamics with my parents and then I realize I can’t limit them because of my concerns and obviously I tend to keep these constraints even though it is right they have their own experiences (0.2) even though as a mother I feel very anxious because obviously as a mother I’m afraid that something bad might happen this is an unbearable idea for me even though I can’t be there and overall I can’t see this is something I can’t stand

[..]

[..]

[..]

[..]

[..]

[..]
The mother, with two other children besides Tommaso, defines herself an “anxious mother” who does not accept the fact that her children go out at night with their friends because she worries that they might be involved in accidents even though she remembers her own needs for independence when she was an adolescent. Her worries lead her to adopt restrictive measures, even though she acknowledges that the children need to have different experiences (150). Soon she states that she feels reassured by her husband who, unlike her, is less worried. At the end of the exchange, however, she once again points out that her anxiety is hard to appease and that it does not help to have someone with her to calm her down.

In these two excerpts I illustrated (Excerpts 2.7 and 2.8) how parents oscillate about their own feelings and opinions, while in other cases, we observed oscillations expressed about other family members.

In the Pergoni family (Excerpt 2.9), the father voices his opinion on Damiano’s change.

Excerpt 2.9 – Pergoni family. P (father), I (interviewer)
Frame V: The changes in the adolescent’s relationship

110. P mah il desiderio di trascorrere tempo con gli altri con gli
110. P but the desire to spend time with friends is important

38
amici è forte

ciò è ci sono dei bambini che sono sempre stati socievoli

mah lui fin da piccolo è sempre stato molto socievole non ha mai avuto problemi a stare fuori ora aumenta il desiderio di stare con i suoi amici ma è un percorso naturale non vedo degli strappi (...)

si e anche il punto secondo me fondamentale è quello che fa fatica ad essere indipendente da noi anche nella gestione delle piccole che però lo aiutano a stare fuori anche con gli amici

mi può fare un esempio su questo?

mah non so fra due giorni deve andare in gita si dimentica i soldi si dimentica le chiavi per entrare in casa e ha bisogno di noi si dimentica la merenda nello zaino la mangia dopo due giorni non si porta le scarpe adatte

In the excerpt above, the father refers to his son’s requests to go out more often with his friends. Damiano has given proof of his sociable nature since he was a child (112). In this sense, it would appear that the father wishes to encourage his son’s autonomy with regard to his relationship with others. Shortly afterwards (113-115), he refers an episode in which his son is described as extremely dependent on his parents and barely able to manage autonomously even when out with friends.

In the Marani family, it is the mother who expresses an oscillation concerning her eldest daughter’s changes on an organizational level and as far as her responsibility is concerned (Excerpt 2.10).

Excerpt 2.10 – Marani family. M (mother), P (father), A (adolescent), S (sister), I (interviewer)
Frame X: The parents’ concerns

307. P sono preoccupato quando lei avrà la patente non perché io sono apprensivo ma perché conosco lei!

308. M no perché lei è veramente-

307. P I’m concerned for when she will have the driving license not because I’m worried but because I know her!

308. M no because she is really-
309. A maldestra!
310. M ha tante qualità però
311. I come può essere maldestra se suona il violino! (ridendo)
312. S si si siamo a posto! (…)
313. M lei probabilmente avendole rotto molto le scatole sul fumo lei che è una ragazza bravina in questo cerca di smaltire la tensione dello studio con Brahms ma non c’è verso che lei riesca e mettere il bricco nel cabaret lo mette sulla tavola dove ci sono residui zuccherosi sparsi e cose che si spalmano sul cellulare sulle fotocopie macchie viola
314. I bisogna pur avere qualche trasgressione comunque! (ridendo)
315. M no ma infatti questo va benissimo l’unica cosa che mi fa un po’ tremare il traffico che conosciamo un po’ (0.2) (…) se deve prendere l’aereo quando deve tornare non ci sono problemi (0.2) (…) la mia preoccupazione in questi anni era sull’influenza profonda che magari persone potevano avere su di lei

[…] […]

In this excerpt in the wake of the father’s statement (307), the mother refers to the daughter, Sara, and underlines her maturity which can be measured by the absence of transgressions (314). Shortly afterwards, she claims that Sara is very clumsy, almost childish, both in the management of their home and when driving the car.

The research team and I observed also oscillations that went beyond the expression of individual points of view as they involved more than one family member. We called this form of oscillation, family oscillations.

*Family oscillations* display through the *alternation* of different opinions and evaluations in the same frame or among them. Let us consider some examples in of this alternation (highlighted in gray).

In the Martelli family, family oscillations display between two frames: one relating to Tommaso’s changes and the other focusing the mother’s point of view.
In the excerpt below (Excerpt 2.11), it is possible to note how mother and father alternate in the expression of different points of view, thereby generating a family oscillation. The children participate and intervene but without re-launching the topics.

Excerpt 2.11 – Martelli family. M (mother), P (father), T (adolescent), G (sister), I (interviewer) Frame II: Tommaso’s changes - Frame III: The mother’s point of view

Frame II

[..] [..]
41. P posso dire una cosa? Tommaso secondo me ha fatto un grande cambiamento positivo perché alle scuole superiori all’inizio le ha prese un po’ sotto gamba [così]
42. T [e (0.2) va be’ ero abituato
43. P [ci insomma ha preso un po’ sotto gamba l’attività scolastica all’inizio dell’anno poi secondo me è stato capace di rimboccarsi le maniche (0.2) di mettersi con maggiore impegno (…)
44. M però non c’è stato solo quello
[..] [..]

Frame III

[..] [..]
60. M io (0.2) devo dire la verità il cambiamento che ho notato in Tommaso è che è un pochino più tranquillo nel senso che rispetto a quello che diceva lui (guardando il marito) rispetto all’inizio della scuola non credo che Tommaso l’avesse preso sotto gamba (…)
[..] [..]
83. P però scusami ((guardando la moglie)) si sa molto bene organizzarsi cioè Tommaso è uno che ha le idee chiare quando vuole qualche cosa sa mettere bene le idee in fila per poterle realizzare
84. M sai fin troppo! (…)
[..] [..]
88. I il papà non mi sembra molto d’accordo
89. M lui non c’è mai in casa per ((laughing))
90. P ma (0.2) adesso!
91. M no ma Tommaso per esempio è bravissimo per esempio è uno che prende la porta di casa (0.2) cioè
From the beginning of the interview, the father expresses his view concerning Tommaso’s change. He thinks that Tommaso has changed a lot (41) but he had some difficulties with school activities at the beginning of the year. The mother disagrees (44) with him and, in the next frame, explicitly contradicts her husband as she thinks that Tommaso did not have any problem in managing school issues (60).

Later, both mother and father switch their points of view. The father stresses the competences of the adolescent by emphasizing his ability to get organized and to plan different activities (83, 94), and the mother agrees with him now, as she acknowledges Tommaso’s abilities (91).

Other family oscillations can be noted in the Berti family. It is possible to observe various family oscillations in this family, which characterize the entire interview between the parents and the sisters in particular. Interestingly, family oscillations are triggered by the initial individual oscillation of the mother. Later, a significant alternation in the expression of different opinions involving the mother, the adolescent Veronica, and the younger sister, Sofia (8 years old) are noticeable in the passage from frame VII to frame VIII (Excerpt 2.12).

Excerpt 2.12 – Berti family. M (mother), V (adolescent), S (sister), I (interviewer)
Frame VII: Veronica’s autonomy - Frame VIII: The changes of the family
43

Frame VIII

146. M (...) io sono una persona molto ansiosa quindi questa ansia aumenta con il fatto che lei [Veronica] cresce però devo anche dire che devo ammettere forse è un grosso errore e Veronica invece non lo vuole dire forse sono una mamma magari un po’ troppo oppressiva che non giustamente non le lascio vivere il suo però non lo faccio

147. V la privacy

148. I cioè tu dici che lei ((guardando la madre)) non rispetta tanto la tua privacy?

149. V beh no non è che non la rispetti però ad esempio mi arriva un messaggio e lei vuole sapere chi è se c’è il dimmelo-dimmello e io non glielo voglio dire

150. M sí perché temo sempre che siano certe persone con le quali secondo il mio punto di vista che lei ben conosce non vale neanche la pena rispondere [è solo questo]

151. V [oh mamma mia che sarà per una volta!]

152. M beh nessun genitore è perfetto

[...]

163. M ecco questo è un’altra cosa che ad esempio e anche la responsabilità e lei la vede che è più grande appunto magari al sabato viene in centro e io le do un po’ di soldi mi dice guarda mamma a me servirebbe questo e quindi lei si gestisce giustamente con i soldi

164. S ho capito ma lei usa solamente i soldi degli altri

165. V e va beh mieli risparmio! ((sorridente))

[...]

179. I la vedi ansiosa la tua mamma verso di te ansiosa? vuol dire essere preoccupata

180. M che ti sto sempre addosso

181. V beh certe volte ai specialmente quando cominciavo ad uscire mi chiamava sul cellulare ogni dieci minuti

182. M però anche tu Veronica hai sempre avuto questa bellissima abitudine che comunque dove vai mi chiamavi e mi dici [mi metti al corrente se ritardi o meno

183. V [ai ho capito mamma ma una volta che dico ti chiamo io poi non mi puoi chiamare ogni cinque minuti

184. M it is true but now I haven’t done that any more
In the frame VII, family members discuss about the increased independence of Veronica. Near the last exchanges presented in the excerpt above, the mother expresses the difficulty to keep a balance between control and autonomy. The adolescent promptly intervenes to specify that she is bothered by her mother’s excessive intrusion because the mother wants to control her even when she received text messages on her mobile (148). The mother replicates by underlining that this is her duty as a parent (149), and later she re-asserts her role then referring to Veronica as a child (151).

However, in the in the subsequent frame (VIII), the mother changes her opinion: she describes her adolescent daughter as very responsible and competent also in the management of money (163). The younger sister intervenes to minimize the importance of Veronica’s change (164), and now the adolescent, instead of reaffirming her responsibility, agrees with her sister (165). A lively exchange between the mother and daughter is displayed later and both of them switch their earlier points of view once again. Veronica challenges her mother’s need to control her (181) and the mother, instead of confirming Veronica’s responsibility, now stresses the need for continuity and the “nice habits” of the past (182).

5. Discussion and new research questions

The main concern of this study was to devise methodological procedures consistent with the theoretical framework in which the entire research is placed. More precisely, the research team put particular efforts in devising procedures that allowed for the observation of family interactions, considering the whole family as the unit of analysis. In line with this, the first step consisted of choosing a suitable setting where the data could
be collected. A laboratory of observation equipped with a one-way mirror and video cameras was the setting where all family members were invited to conduct a family interview.

The family interview is an innovative instrument to collect data. I used a specific technique, partially borrowed from family therapy, in carrying out the interview. At first, questions were addressed to one of the family members (the adolescent, in this case) in order to observe the “audience” reactions. Immediately after the other family members were involved, while the interviewer stimulated the emergence of the different points of view. Also the procedure for the data analyses had never been used before in other studies to my knowledge. We worked on the sequential frames of interaction when describing the two dimensions at the core of family change: coordination and oscillation.

In particular, we noticed that when families are called to discuss different aspects related to the ongoing changes, they can express great coordination when synchronized. Some families, in fact, tend to share the same views and to converge on a common “plot” along the whole interview. In such cases, all family members take reciprocal turns, they agree or elaborate their own opinions on the basis of those expressed by others, thereby participating in the talk as if in a harmonious dance. This way of being mutually coordinated shows of continuity with previously consolidated modalities of interaction that is, synchrony. conveys a sense of stability.

On the contrary, in other families coordination is broken by different fractures: family members do not look for consent but instead diverge on what it is said. Moreover, they reciprocally interrupt and overlap, or reply when the question is not addressed to them, substituting for others. We assume that this kind of interaction indicates that the continuity with usual kinds of interaction is challenged.

While family members coordinate during the talk, they express different evaluations and opinions about ongoing changes by displaying diverse forms of oscillations. More precisely, we noticed that a single member referred to changes about him/herself or about the others by alternating between contrasting opinions. This is a form of individual oscillation as it is observable in what we called an “internal dialogue” that is shared in the discourse, but does not have any effect on the course of interaction. The other form of
oscillation we outlined involves at least two family members, and we described it as *family oscillations instead*.

Family oscillations are extremely relevant for the purposes of the entire research project as they can be considered as indicators of ongoing changes. This form of oscillation was more difficult to observe than the individual one, as the analysis required us to outline the “moves” of all family members. Thus, a constant confrontation within the research team was fundamental.

To reiterate on family oscillations, let us consider the previous paragraph where I illustrated how, given a particular topic, some family members alternate different opinions about it. To be clearer: consider the issue about the increased competences of the adolescent. Family oscillations are observable in the moment in which the mother stresses the maturity of her child and the father minimizes it, disagreeing with her. After some exchanges, they switch their opinions, and now it is the father who refers to the adolescent as very mature and the mother instead provides some examples in which the adolescent is depicted as immature. Family members then, expressing these alternations are contemporary referring to the adolescent by saying that s/he is changing and that s/he is not.

We assume that it is in this sort of fluctuating movement like “waves” which go up and down and then down and up again, that an oscillatory process is observable. Consequently, the process of family change becomes noticeable as the tension between these alternations, as Breunlin (1988) had outlined, conveys the contemporary presence of old and new modalities by which family members are defining themselves.

These results can lead to the formulation of new questions, which are the starting point for a subsequent study. In particular, I argue that it is necessary to identify the possible *connections* between oscillation and coordination, and that it may be considered as the expression of *microtransition processes*, implying change and continuity.

The new research questions therefore are:

- What are the connections between coordination and oscillation?
- Can the interlocking of these constructs give rise to different patterns of interactions that can account for the moment of change families are experiencing?

Study 2 will address these questions starting with the involvement of a larger number of participants.
I found peculiarly revealing a classification of families by the pattern of personal relationships between husbands and wives and parents and children. The study of patterns of personal relationships in family life led directly to the conception of the family as a unity of interacting persons. By a unity of interacting personalities is meant a living, changing, growing thing. I was about to call it a superpersonality.

(Burgess, 1926: 5)

1. Introduction

Burgess’ quotation touches on some of the key points I will argue in the following paragraphs. Surprisingly, these considerations were advanced more than eighty years ago. However, as the literature examination will show, they are still critical issues that have been discussed only partially.

In particular, Burgess’ assumptions about both the “conception of family as interacting unit” and the relevance of studying the “patterns of personal relationship in family life” allowed me to bridge a connection between the results of the previous study and the main goals of the present one. Starting from the methodological foundation of the entire research project, this second study is intended to observe and then describe the patterns of family interaction that emerge from the interlocking of oscillation and coordination.
Before going into the details of this study, I will examine the different traditions of research developed by social and developmental psychology, and family therapy as well, which have focused on the study of developmental processes in family contexts.

I will then focus on some specific issues regarding microtransitions in families with adolescent children. I argue that adolescence can be considered as a “window” that allows for the observation of how family members adjust to each other in their everyday interactions.

1.1 The theoretical debate about the processes of family change

In the context of family studies, different theoretical perspectives have depicted the paths of family development in the life course. The debate about theories on family development is still vigorous, as shown in the recently published handbooks in which revised versions of family development theories are discussed (Chibucos & Leite, 2005; Mazzoni & Tafà, 2007; White & Klein, 2002, 2008).

The family life-cycle model was the first to pave its way into the study of family changes, considering the whole family as a dynamic unit (Cigoli, 1985; Cusinato, 1990; Malagoli Togliatti & Lufrano Lavadera, 2002; McGoldrick & Carter, 1982, 2003; Scabini, 1995). In this approach, family development was displayed in fixed developmental stages, ranging from five to eight\(^6\). The transition from one phase to another is triggered by specific events defined as critical (Rapaport, 1963), and more recently, as stressors (McGoldrick & Carter, 2003). These events, either normative (expected) or non-normative (unexpected), have the characteristic to perturb family systems with the consequence of activating the family system re-organization at different relational levels. Each stage is defined by specific family-related developmental tasks, which members must accomplish to move to the next step. In this orientation, transitions during the family life-cycle coincide with “irreversible” and mainly socially determined steps such as wedding, first child’s birth, adolescence, midlife, retirement, and old age.

\(^{6}\) Scholars diverge on the number of developmental stages of family life-cycle (Duvall, 1957; McGoldrick, Carter 2003; Scabini, 1995). In general, they identify couple formation, children’s birth, adolescence, empty nest, and old age. However, some propose the inclusion of a separation/divorce stage because of its increasing incidence, particularly in the United States.
Adolescence, for instance, is considered one of the *normative critical events* that families go through in their life cycle.

Despite the different criticisms of this model, one of the most relevant contributions is the consideration of changes affecting the *whole family system*; however, development is conceived as *discontinuous* in that it is defined by a sequence of critical events that characterize different stages. In fact, the notion of critical events and the one of universal developmental stages are the most questioned issues of this approach (Aldous, 1990; Bengston & Allen, 1993; White, 2004).

In particular, if the notion of developmental task represents the effort to focus on the processes of change, the perturbation of the family system by a sudden and abrupt event—as critical events are defined—is not in line with the continuity of developmental processes (White & Klein, 2008). As theoretical approaches on individual development have illustrated, maturational processes characterize the entire life span (Baltes, 1987; Baltes, Lindenberger & Staudinger, 1998). Thus, children’s birth, adolescence, and retirement can be considered events that family members expect and consequently are prepared to deal with. It is also true that despite being “normative,” a critical event can be as dramatic as an unexpected event such as bereavement.

Some developmental psychology orientations have abandoned the notion of developmental stages in favor of one of *continuity* of developmental processes. Among the different approaches, the most relevant ones are oriented in a contextual sense: the life-span (Baltes, 1987; Baltes, Lindenberger & Staudinger, 1998); life-course (Elder, 1977, 1994, 1998); and ecological approaches (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998). These models stress the inter-connection between ontogenetic development, and structural and functional changes in different relational contexts: family, peers, school, and community, which are then connected to political, historical, and cultural contexts.

Some scholars also specified the notion of *developmental transition*. According to Seidman and French (2004), life-course transitions are periods of potential transformations of the self and of interpersonal relations, which may have a long-term effect on psychological well-being. Transitions are unique opportunities for growth,
maturity, and development, either positive and constructive or negative and destructive. In this sense, adolescence is one of the most emblematic transitions of the life course.

1.2 Microtransitions in families with adolescent children

Researchers in the field of family therapy (Breunlin, 1988; P. Minuchin, 1985), which share a common systemic background, have provided some interesting suggestions in depicting the connection between the processes of individual and family development. At the beginning of the 1970s, Speer (1970) introduced the notions of morphogenesis and morphostasis to describe the process of change displayed in family contexts. Morphogenesis is a process that regulates the transformations occurring inside and outside the family, while morphostasis guarantees continuity and stability in facing the constant variations of the surrounding environment. These two processes reciprocally influence and allow individuals to develop their own personal autonomy through paths of differentiation, but still maintaining a sense of belonging and continuity with the family context (Fruggeri, 1998a).

The notion of microtransitions elaborated by Breunlin (1988) goes to the core of these interactional processes. The interesting formulations by the author lie in the fact that changes occur through everyday and continuous interactions, and discussions among family members rather than in particular stages of family development. It is during constant negotiations among members that competences that regulate old patterns of interaction are challenged and new ones are incorporated in the family repertoire of interactions. From this perspective, family development is continuous, although there are periods when many microtransitions are clustered at a given time. One of these is adolescence.

Most of the research on adolescence that considers the relevance of family context has focused on very static dimensions of change. For instance, in the life-cycle model adolescence is considered a sudden and abrupt event (Malagoli Togliatti & Lubrano Lavadera, 2002; Scabini & Cigoli, 2000), while a few contributors place greater efforts in focusing on the “micro-analytical” processes that occur in the everyday life. Some exceptions can be considered in Burgess’ research (1926) that pioneered the field of family communication. He indicated how patterns of family communication change
accordingly to the members’ growth through processes of reciprocal adjustment. Kreppner and Ullrich (1998) noticed that parents adapt to the topics discussed in the family by changing the *modality of discussion*, i.e., the parents acknowledge the maturational changes of their children as becoming more competent. In other cases, it is the *intensity of discussions*, particularly about appropriate conduct, that increases.

Conflicts and negative emotions are usually present in the interactions between parents and children during adolescence. However, some scholars stress that these aspects should not be considered as negative in and of itself, but rather they represent the “substantial impulse to changes, adjustment and development” (Shantz & Hartup, 1992: 35). A moderate level of conflict is “normal” in families. According to Collins (1995) and Smetana (1995), conflicts may indicate that the adolescent’s needs and expectations have changed and, consequently, the relationship between parents and children needs to be recalibrated. Cooper and colleagues found that some types of disagreement between family members are associated to a more advanced exploration of adolescent’s identity. Moreover, several studies (Collins, 1990; Collins & Laursen, 1992; Steinberg, 2002) have shown that less than 10% of families with adolescents must deal with relational problems. In many cases, conflicting families have problems that are continuations of dysfunctional dynamics that preceded the transition to adolescence.

An increased level of conflict in this period also indicates that the parents’ control over many aspects of the adolescent’s life is challenged (Broderick & Smith, 1979; Hill, 1981, 1983; Hill & Holmbeck, 1987) and, similarly, the family *power hierarchy* is pushed towards change. The relationship between parents and children moves from asymmetry to mutuality: children challenge the unilateral exercise of authority with the effect of pushing parents towards greater symmetry (Grotevant & Cooper, 1985; Hofer, 2004; Silverstein *et al.*, 2006; Steinberg, 1981). This also implies the need to reciprocally *regulate distances* (Wynne, 1988), and in this process of regulation, parents must adjust their parenting practices, decrease care and increase monitoring, but favor autonomy at the same time (Hartup & Laursen, 1991; Kantor & Lehr, 1975; Scabini, 1995; Silverberg & Steinberg, 1987; Steinberg, 1981; Wynne, 1988).

It is clear from the examination of these studies that adolescence is a period of dramatic and complex changes and that it involves not only the children but also the
entire family system (Lerner & Steinberg, 2004). Moreover, the two main issues of autonomy and dependence emerge from these studies. Particularly in Western society, children are helped to reach a degree of personal autonomy in a context of dependence from their parents. After adolescence, young adults seek to maintain bonds with their parents in a context of autonomy.

In the mid-1990s, Laursen and Collins (1994) stressed that despite the vast literature on the topic, the complex interaction among context, maturation, and characteristics of relationships was not yet clearly understood. Moreover, Holmbeck (1996) claimed that studies about the transformative processes that characterize the relationship between parents and children in adolescence were still lacking. These works, in fact, rarely considered the analysis by which these changes also involve other family members and how they negotiate, revalue, reconstruct, and interpret transformations through their everyday interactions. According to Granic and colleagues (2003), this is due to the methodological limitations: most methods in psychology, particularly self-reports, are not well-suited for studying processes of change in family interactions over time. The vast majority of the studies on adolescence have focused on the content of these changes and how such content develops over time (Lewis, 2000).

The examination of literature on family development reveals the lack of empirical studies within a theoretical framework that allows for the understanding of the complexity of relationships. In this study I intend to fill this void, starting from the consideration of a systemic theoretical framework in which the connection between continuity and change can be observed in the families with adolescents.

2. Aims

The main aim of this study is to explore the process of microtransitions in families with adolescent children. More precisely, starting from the individuation of the forms of oscillations as they arise in families’ interactions, and the synchrony or fractures family members display in coordination, I will focus on how the various combinations of forms of oscillations and synchrony or fractures allow for the observation of different patterns of family interaction.
As the definition of the forms of oscillations and the types of coordination have been presented elsewhere\(^7\), I will report on detailed descriptions of the patterns of family interaction in this study.

3. **Method**

In Study 1, the research team and I invested great efforts in devising methodological procedures consistent with the theoretical principles of the entire research project. The methodology is the same as that presented in the previous study. No changes have been made in setting, data collection, or analytical procedures.

3.1 **Participants**

In order to recruit a larger number of participants, families were contacted not only through high schools but also through youth associations without any religious or political affiliations.

Six families with at least one adolescent child agreed to participate in this study (Table 3.1). The personal data of the new group of participants are presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Mother’s age</th>
<th>Father’s age</th>
<th>Adolescent’s age and sex (M/F)</th>
<th>Siblings’ age and sex (M/F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contini</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Silvia 15 (F)</td>
<td>Enrico 18 (M) (n.p.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanti</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Daniele 14 (M)</td>
<td>Andrea 18 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melloni</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Gaia 16 (F)</td>
<td>Sonia 15 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simone 12 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perelli</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Calotta 15 (F)</td>
<td>Giovanni 7 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicola 2 (M) (n.p.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riccardi</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Laura 14 (F)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinci</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Camilla 15 (F)</td>
<td>Antonio 5 (n.p.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{7}\) For more details, check results of Study 1.
As for parents, three were cohabiting and/or married, one was a stepparent, and two were divorced (in these cases, only the mother participated with the children). As for adolescents, five were females and one male (mean age=14.8).

### 3.2 Setting and procedure for the data collection and analysis

The setting was the same as in the previous study. Family interviews were conducted at the Laboratory of Observation, equipped with video cameras and a one-way mirror, located at the Department of Psychology.

For the data analysis, we considered both the family of the Study 1 and of this study (N=12). This corpus of data consisted of 11 hours and 39 minutes of videotaped material. All interviews were transcribed in detail using transcript conventions\(^8\). In each step of the analysis, the research team and I first worked independently, then came together to discuss matters until an agreement was reached. For the division of the family interviews in sequential frames, we obtained a high level of agreement (0.90)\(^9\).

Afterwards, the analysis of the collected material was conducted at two different levels (intra-frame and inter-frame), and indicators of oscillation and coordination were considered. Short descriptions of indicators are presented here.

1. **Oscillations**
   
   a. **Individual oscillations.** We considered individual oscillations when *a single member* expresses an alternation between contrasting points of view or opinions on topics related to change. The others listen and do not comment or act against or in favour of what this member says.

   b. **Family oscillations.** They emerge when *two or more family members* state different opinions, expressing alternation between them (e.g., one member expresses something “up,” the other says or acts “down” and minutes later, they switch). Family oscillations are often

---

\(^8\) Transcript conventions are presented on p. 10.
\(^9\) Procedures for the calculation of inter-rater reliability are presented in detail in the Study 1.
detectable at an inter-frame level of analysis, but in the same frame, they may also be “launched” by individual oscillations. As alternation of points of view of two or more members on the same topic, family oscillations are considered as indicators of tension to change. Similarly, the absence of family oscillations indicates a closure to change and evolution of the system. As specified in the previous study, we could identify oscillation only at a content level of analysis.

2. **Coordination.**
   a. *Synchrony in coordination.* At the content level, we considered synchrony in coordination when two or more members interact, being able to converge and share the meanings attributed to the ongoing interaction. At the analog level, we observed 1) all parts of the frame in which given the specific interaction between two or more members, the others respect the setting and do not intervene as they are not called to participate, and 2) all parts in which one member intervenes after an explicit request from the other. Smiling, nodding, and lack of interruptions are also indicators of synchrony.
   b. *Fractures in coordination.* At a content level, we examined all the parts of interview in which family members diverge on the definition of the ongoing interaction. At the analog level, we considered 1) all parts of the frame in which family members intervene in the unfolding interaction when not directly requested and 2) all parts in which a member directly requests the other to participate but s/he does not do so.

The definition of indicators for oscillation and coordination are summarized in the table below (Table 3.2).
Table 3.2
Definition of the indicators for oscillations and coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Oscillation</th>
<th>Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analog</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>A single member alternates opinions, evaluations, points of view. The others listen</td>
<td>Two or more members alternate opinions, evaluations, points of view</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data analysis consisted of observing how synchrony or fractures in coordination and individual or family oscillations combined in various ways for the twelve families. For each family, we then considered the pattern of interactions that emerged from the different combinations of oscillations and coordination, and families were qualified according to the prevalent pattern.

The patterns of family interactions are now presented, with reference to some excerpts taken from the twelve interviews.

4. Results

Four patterns of family interaction were obtained from the analysis of the interviews: we defined them as quiet, drifting, stormy and critical (Figure 3.1).
Figure 3.1. Graphic representation of the four patterns of family interaction.

The figure represents the possible ways in which oscillation and coordination can be combined. To simplify these features, I used the following symbols.

a) For synchrony in coordination (indicator of continuity), same type of curves (smooth). Synchrony in coordination is represented in the upper part of the square.

b) For fractures in coordination (no continuity), different types of curves (smooth and sharp). Fractures in coordination are represented in the bottom part of the square.

c) For family oscillations (indicator of change) intersection of curves. Family oscillations are represented in the right part of the model.
d) For individual oscillations (no change), absence of intersection of curves. It is represented in the left part of the model.

The label we chose for each pattern (quiet, drifting, stormy, and critical) metaphorically recalls the “shape” of the interactional moves among family members.

4.1 The quiet pattern

This pattern was observed in two families: Albertini and Marani. These families displayed *synchrony* in coordination both at the content and analog level, and *individual oscillations* that did not eventually trigger family oscillations.

Let us consider an example taken from the interview with the Albertini Family. As I illustrated in Study 1 in the first part of the interview with the family (Excerpt 2.3), the adolescent, Chiara, speaks with the interviewer while other members listen. They approve and do not interrupt her, thus showing a degree of coordination and recognition of Chiara as able to describe her changes. The girl makes reference to several competences that she has acquired: her body has changed and to a greater degree, her mentality. She is more independent and does not play as much with her younger brother anymore. Later Chiara seems to minimize her change (individual oscillation), describing her peers as far advanced of her, too oriented toward adult behaviors, while she still likes to play and act like a “foolish” girl.

The following excerpt (Excerpt 3.1) illustrates the mother’s and adolescent’s individual oscillations, following the same trend (Chiara is growing/not too fast) and therefore expressing synchrony in coordination.
Chiara reports an attraction to a group of girls who behave differently from what her parents recommend, but in the end, she prefers to stay in line with the family’s expectations. Synchrony is clear also on the analog level, as all members do not interrupt and look at each other while talking. Oscillation is expressed only at the individual level, as family oscillations do not occur.

4.2 The stormy pattern

The stormy pattern has reversed features from the quiet one, as families that showed this pattern are characterized by multiple fractures in coordination and repeated family oscillations.

A stormy pattern was observed in five families: Berti, Contini, Martelli, Perelli, and Vinci. Excerpt 3.2 pertains to the Contini family, in which Silvia is the adolescent and her older brother is not present in the interview.
In the frame preceding this excerpt, Silvia has described her change in maturation especially in school, work, and in her evolving interest in reading and writing stories. The frame ends with the adolescent stating that, in her opinion, her parents have not yet realized that she has changed.

Excerpt 3.2 – Contini family. M (mother), P (father), S (adolescent), I (interviewer)
Frame II: Silvia’s point of view – Frame III: Silvia’s new interests
più autonoma prende sue iniziative e le porta anche avanti diciamo (...) 75. I can you give an example?
76. P for example when she started to use the computer she had difficulties with some programs but she didn’t ask and tried over and over again and-
le portà anche avanti diciamo (...) 77. M she created a lot of troubles tanto ma ha incominciato e-
78. P yes but I see that when she per esempio quando lei ha incominciato a provare sul computer come utilizzare certi programmi eccetera fa fatica e non ha chiesto tanto ma ha incominciato e-
79. M she creates a lot of troubles 

I can you give an example? 75. I can you give an example?
76. P for example when she started to use the computer she had difficulties with some programs but she didn’t ask and tried over and over again and-

This excerpt is a fine illustration of oscillation involving all family members. At point 56, the mother expresses a first alternation between aspects of her daughter’s maturity and immaturity (individual oscillation). Later (62), the mother answers when Silvia is explicitly asked to respond (fracture in coordination) and reports a specific episode again, stressing the oscillation between competence and incompetence. Silvia disagrees and states her reasons, and the mother emphasizes her daughter’s unpredictable behavior. The father (point 72) first supports his wife’s opinion, but then claims that Silvia has changed considerably and describes his daughter as now more able and mature as compared to previous years. At point 77, the mother interrupts her husband and diminishes the transforming value of her daughter’s actions. The frame ends with the father referring to Silvia’s growing interest in literature (the starting point, as Silvia mentioned in frame I, in the event of change), and the mother agrees by completing her husband’s phrase.

Many family oscillations are observed also in the Perelli family with reference to several aspects of change. The first frame starts with the adolescent Carlotta defining herself as more mature at school and in the competitive sport she practices. She also has a larger group of girlfriends with whom she likes to hang out, especially on Saturday nights. The mother and father acknowledge these changes at the beginning of the interview, and they also stresses that Carlotta became more competent in negotiating different issues with them.

When the adolescent later mentions the issue of going to the disco, complaining that her parents are too strict about the possibility of going there more often, family
oscillations take place between mother and daughter. The excerpt below (Excerpt 3.3) is an interesting example of family oscillations displayed in different frames (inter-frame) throughout the family interview.

Excerpt 3.3 – Perelli family. M (mother), P (father), A (adolescent), I (interviewer)
Frame IV: The point of view of the mother – Frame VI: The parenting – Frame VIII: The New Year party

80. I allaora secondo te cos’è cambiato nel rapporto con la mamma ((guardando Carlotta))?
81. C e va beh (...) non so (0.2) come si diceva dire da tutte le due parti si cerca di trovare un’un accordo si un-
82. M si beh aspetta dipende spesso e volentieri dai luoghi e (0.2)[dal tipo di richieste
83. C [beh si in discoteca non te lo chiede neanche ((guardando la madre))
84. M esatto!
85. [...]
88. I però a te piacerebbe per esempio andare [in discoteca]?
89. C certo! eh si come tutti = come tutti i quindicenni! ((fissando la madre))
90. [...]
92. C si magari ecco per le feste della scuola mi mandano invece magari con il gruppo di amiche non è che non penso non si fidino di me magari non si fidano degli altri e lo non so non lo chiede neanche
93. M [non ce lo chiede neanche C [ciò è lo ho chiesto due volte ma assolutamente no
94. [...]
285. I e sulle richieste che fa Carlotta perché’ ha aperto dicendo insomma io ad esempio adesso chiedo di stare fuori fino a più tardi (...) 286. M io credo nel senso che lei ((guardando Carlotta)) dovrà sempre chiedere e stare al tiro e noi cercare di (fermarla) credo che la morale sia un po’ quella lì (...) 289. I but would you like to go? [to the disco]
290. [...]
291. P [io penso poi che sia molto ragionevole anche nelle richieste 292. M [si-si sono abbastanza ragionevoli
This extract starts with the mother’s individual oscillation and with fractures in coordination; in prior frames, she had agreed with both her husband and Carlotta that they can reach agreements easily. Here, she interrupts the adolescent and contradicts her to stress that to reach an agreement on some requests is still a critical issue.

Carlotta anticipates her mother mentioning her request “to go to the disco” (82-83). The adolescent reveals that she made the request, even if she could anticipate that her mother would not allow her to go. At point 89 and taking advantage of the interviewer line of questioning, she stares at her mother and stresses that everybody of her age likes such places. After some exchanges, Carlotta and the mother swap their points of view.

The adolescent takes back the fact that she has resigned to their parents’ decisions, while the mother now mitigates the issue of the limitations (286). First, she mentions the daughter’s preoccupation with places such as discos, the father intervenes to redefine Carlotta as “reasonable” in her requests (291), and then the mother agrees.

At the end of the frame, family members mention the recent New Year’s party in a disco club that the adolescent was not permitted to attend. As showed in the last exchanges of the excerpt, Carlotta was not compliant with her parents and protested on that occasion. While talking about her feelings, she expresses anger by repeating and emphasizing the words “New Year.”

In other parts of the abstract, interruptions and overlaps showing fractures in coordination are observable.
4.3 The drifting pattern

This pattern is observable in three families: Fanti, Melloni, and Riccardi and it is characterized by both family oscillations and synchrony in coordination.

The members of the Fanti family, composed of a divorced mother and her two sons, show throughout the interview a good degree of synchrony, express individual oscillations, but also several family oscillations involving mainly the mother and adolescent, as in the following extract (Excerpt 3.4).

Excerpt 3.4 – Fanti family. M (mother), D (adolescent), I (interviewer)
Frame VIII: Changes of the family – Frame IX: The future

215. I ((alla madre)) lei da questo punto di vista si vede cambiata per esempio con i figli che adesso appunto uno è al termine della adolescenza e uno che è all’inizio
216. M io mi sento sicuramente sono cambiata-sono cambiata da qualche anno già a questa parte e sono più serena vedendoli crescere in serenità (...) io ecco l’unica cosa che posso dire è questo saper che il fatto di non essere una madre autoritaria non sia stato negativo perché a volte può essere negativo a volte hanno bisogno di sicurezze (…) I’ve never been an authoritative mother and I hope this is not negative I know that in some cases it can be negative because they need security
217. I cosa ne pensi? ((guardando Daniele))
218. D beh dipende essere autoritari può essere utile a volte e non utile altre

[...

221. I fammi capire tipo un esempio sulle uscite del sabato sera
226. D ma no io dico vado fuori con i miei amici e lei mi dice dove andate io dico boh al cinema così e poi dopo dico quando quando ho finito ti chiamo così te lo dico e finisce li

[...

231. M io sono tranquillissima anche perchè questo significa che se lui quella sera è fuori anche io con tranquillità posso uscire a mangiare fuori quando era piu’ piccolo era un patema insomma mi chiamava mi faceva “quando torni?” (…)

[...]
The family oscillations emerging in this dialogue between mother and son concern the issue of parental control. The mother and Daniele alternate their opinions on the mother’s role while also depicting an atmosphere of good coordination. A family oscillation emerges as to who controls whom. The mother first states that she is not inclined to authoritative behavior and questions whether this is beneficial for her sons (216). She later states that her younger child used to control her when she went out with friends (231). Daniele alternates considerations about the same issue and replies to his mother, who seems surprised about his mature behavior (he, unlike his brother, never comes home late) (256).

Interestingly, the same pattern is observed also in the Riccardi family, which again is composed of a divorced mother and her adolescent daughter, Laura. The synchrony between mother and adolescent is clearly observable in the sequence of mutual gazes and smiles while talking to each other, as shown in the extract below (Excerpt 3.5).

Furthermore, family oscillations are observable when discussing the increasing distance between mother and daughter.

Excerpt 3.5 – Riccardi family. M (mother), L (adolescent), I (interviewer)
Frame V: The changes in the relationship between the parent and adolescent – Frame VI: The parenting

139. I and in the relationship with your mom did you notice any changes (looking at Laura)?
139. I e nel rapporto con la mamma hai notato dei cambiamenti (guardando Laura)?
141. L certo perde un po’ di un po’ di ruolo ((guardando la madre))
142. M [no cambia-cambia anche il mio ruolo cioè non è più]
143. L [non è più quello di imboccarmi ((guardando la madre))]
144. M si esatto ((guardando la figlia))

147. I e ti confidi di più con le tue amiche da sempre da quando eri bambina per esempio oppure magari ultimamente lo fai di più?
148. L eh magari adesso lo faccio più con le mie amiche prima magari ero più piccola allora forse boh (0.2) mi confidavo con te prima? ((guardando la madre e la madre annuisce)) (0.2)
149. M eh prima parlavi di più tipo alle elementari e medie

168. L e non lo so io per esempio mi trovo molto meglio appunto ciò a confidarmi con le mie amiche oppure con compagni di classe che vedo ogni giorno di cui mi fido molto certo è ovvio

178. I lei diceva ((guardando la madre)) no si in effetti prima alle medie me ne parlavi di più per esempio dei ragazzi
179. M si no va beh ma penso che sia giusto un minimo di non lo so di riservatezza cioè è bene che le cose se le dica ((guardando la figlia)) tra le sue amiche piuttosto che con la mamma (...) ogni tanto capita però se lei c’ha voglia parla insomma (...) è la mia curiosità più che la avrei voglia vorrei-vorrei di essere soddisfatta di sapere ma non ottengo niente quando chiedo-chiedo (...)
At the beginning of the extract, the mother and Laura agree that the parenting role has changed, as the mother no longer needs to care for her daughter like a little child (143). In this sense, mother and daughter are synchronized in recognizing that their relationship is changing. Later (148, 168), the adolescent says that she likes to talk with her girlfriends about intimate issues, in contrast to when she was a child and preferred to talk intimately with her mother. A family oscillation is activated when the mother first complains that Laura is becoming more concerned about privacy (149), but later acknowledges that this is typical of adolescence (179).

At the end of the frame, the mother expresses again her curiosity in knowing more about her daughter’s private life. The adolescent, in different parts of the frame, acknowledges preferring friends rather than parents as confidants, but at the end, changes her point of view and reveals that she still discusses personal issues with her mother.

4.4. The critical pattern

Two families, Pergoni and Ponti, show a critical pattern, characterized by fractures in coordination and by the absence of family oscillations.

The Ponti family is composed of the mother, father, and two daughters, adolescent Serena and her sister, Carolina (12 years old). Disagreements between the adolescent and her parents or sister were observed in almost all frames of the interview. Several fractures in coordination were observed in the adolescent, mother, and sister interactions. Only very few individual oscillations were observed, mainly expressed by the mother.

The central issue in this family is that Serena is not changing. In the first frame, the adolescent cautiously expresses some elements of change, especially her openness to new friends, and she asks for her mother’s opinion about such a change. The mother belittles these aspects, clarifying that her daughter meets only friends of the family and limits herself in the exploration of new places. Serena ends the first frame by stating that she has not changed. From the second frame, all members begin a “family game” that sets Serena against the others. The mother, father, and sister describe as facts that Serena disagrees with. They often interrupt each other and seem to support the idea that “she is not mature enough and she often takes arbitrary positions”.

It is interesting to consider in particular the last frame of the interview (Excerpt 3.6).
As asked to imagine her future, Serena expresses the desire, ideally, to live in a city where some relatives of her father reside (447). Shortly afterwards, a disagreement
typical of this family ensues, which drastically opposes their point of views (451-453). Again at point 469, Serena’s sister expresses her clear distance. When at point 476, the mother seems to support Serena’s idea to live away from the family; Serena herself repeats her previous opinion, again without expressing alternations of any sort. The father seems to support Serena’s view only because she would be in a protected environment (485), reinforcing the message that she is not mature enough. Finally, the mother ends the interview wishing for a better future for her family who needs to find the path to development and maturity, thus expressing an image of her family as static and the wish that the family will change and grow in time.

5. Discussion and new research questions

Study 2 has highlighted the interlocking of oscillation and coordination as a way to outline different patterns of family interaction. We observed four patterns and argue that they account for different ways in which families go through microtransitions.

Oscillation and coordination are the constructs that correspond to the two basic processes of family functioning, continuity and change. The possibility to outline how different interactive scenarios emerge from the connection of these two dimensions, have permitted to advance considerations about how families deal with changes.

Two families were observed in the quiet pattern, seemingly to converge on a sort of “affection” to old and consolidated patterns of interaction.

The adolescent of the Albertini family describes in details changes that have occurred in the last years and expresses a high level of competence, acknowledged also by other family members. In fact, they do not interrupt or overlap with the adolescent; rather, they orient their points of view in the same direction. When the adolescent starts to oscillate, however, none of the other family members participate in the oscillations, remaining at an individual level. Similarly, this occurs for parents who express individual oscillations. The mother of the Marani family alternates between her concerns of her daughter’s friends and the importance of hanging out with peers in different parts of the interview. Again, the other family members agree, but this does not trigger a family oscillation. These families seemingly share the expression of what Minuchin (2002) calls a “period
of stability”, demonstrated by well-established and coordinated patterns of family relationships. Any instance of deviation from a state of equilibrium is rapidly reduced, and the amplitude of change is minimized on behalf of well-known family patterns.

An opposite scenario was observed in families that showed a stormy pattern – the majority (five) of the recruited families presented this pattern. Compared to the “quiet” families, these seem to be in the “midst” of change. Through the repetition of fractures and continuous oscillations displayed by all family members, these families appear to be searching for a new balance. When the adolescent Silvia of the Contini family and her parents alternate opposite points of view about Silvia’s acquired competences in different aspects of her life, they demonstrate that the way they had related to each other no longer works. The continuity and the stability of the family interactive patterns are challenged, and the emergence of new issues in family life is acknowledged in part and denied in others. As in a “storm”, these families might be overwhelmed by the contemporary drive for change and the need to re-establish a new solidarity.

The drifting pattern, instead, shows a balance between continuity and change. In three families, members appear to relate to each other through “fluently motions”, as they retain usual interactive patterns, but quickly incorporated new changes in the family interactions. Of interesting note is that this pattern has been observed in two families with divorced parents. The small number of families with this structure obviously does not allow further generalization, but they show features of interactions in line with the vast literature on the functioning of single-parent families (Fruggeri, 2005; Hetherington & Arasteh, 1988).

In the critical pattern, neither continuity nor changes are present as fractures and the lack of family oscillations were observed. In these families, a tendency to deny changes seems to emerge in the course of interactions between family members, as if they were “frozen” to the possibility of acknowledging ongoing changes. In the Ponti family, the adolescent’s attempts to affirm her maturity are clearly observable in the course of the interview. However, the parents and the sister continue to express their own opinions without regard to each other’s points of view. In this pattern, family oscillations cannot begin. Moreover, the lack of coordination expressed in frequent disagreements and interruptions reveals that continuity has been lost. It may be that these families are not yet
open to changes and that they may be “stuck” in a pattern of non-change, which is intrinsically dissonant with the main assumptions of psychological literature on adolescence.

In sum, this study depicts different scenarios in which families deal with aspects of continuity and change during adolescence. Some interesting considerations could be advanced about family functioning during this period; however, further research will provide a more complex picture of the process of change in families’ systems.

The notion of family oscillation, in particular, can be improved. Oscillations among family members are the core of my work as they indicate ongoing changes in the family system. However, differently from coordination, oscillation has been observed only at a content level, that is, in terms of alternation between opposite points of view on changes reported by family members. I argue instead that family oscillations shall also be observed at a relational level. This is to say that the different “positions” more than the “points of view” should be examined while family members are talking.

In order to do that, the individuation of specific analog indicators of oscillation is needed. Furthermore, I posit that the consideration of the relational side of oscillation will allow for a more complex and articulated description of the four patterns of family interaction during microtransitions.

Thus, new research questions concluding this study are:

- Is it possible to describe the relational side of oscillation?
- Is it useful to re-define oscillation in relational terms for a better comprehension of the four patterns of family interaction?

To address these questions, I will consider them the main goals of a new study, which will include a larger number of participants and will be presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER
IV

At the core of oscillation: Stancetaking process in families’ interactions

★ Study 3 ★

All verbal behavior is governed by social norms specifying participant roles, rights, and duties vis-à-vis each other, permissible topics, appropriate ways of speaking and ways of introducing information.

(Gumperz, 1982: 165)

We are lived by Powers we pretend to understand.
(W.H. Auden, 1907-1973)

1. Introduction

The present study is intended to overcome the limitations I have outlined in the research questions at the end of the Study 2; in this vein, some theoretical and methodological considerations are required.

Study 1 allowed for the construction of the methodological foundation of the entire work, the second outlined the interactional patterns emerging from the interlocking of coordination and oscillations; the third delves deeply into the interactional processes that can account for the dynamics of ongoing changes in families.

In this sense, the issue at the core of this study is to reach a more complex description and understanding of the four patterns of family interaction through focusing on the relational aspects of oscillation.
In the previous study, the display of oscillation was observed in the alternation of opposite points of view among family members (in terms of what they say with respect to the adolescent’s changes). For example, the father may say that his adolescent son is very mature, whereas the mother may intervene to say that he actually is very immature in many aspects of his life. After a while, they swap their opinions and the father then describes the adolescent as immature whereas the mother does the opposite.

However, in this study, more attention is given to how family members say what they say by observing the display of the different “positions” they take in the interaction. Taking the same situation described above, I would consider how all family members position themselves: which stances they assume after the father’s statement. How does the adolescent react to his father’s definition? Does he accept it, by agreeing with his father, or oppose it? And what is the position of the other family members: Does the mother agree with her husband and then position herself in line with him, or does she align with the adolescent? How do siblings, if present, participate to these interactional exchanges?

In this sense, the Gordian knot of this study is a closer understanding of the display of those interactive sequences that can account for the presence or absence of oscillations when family members talk about ongoing changes.

1.1 Observing the relational side of oscillations

In order to observe the relational side of oscillation, I will refer to three theoretical frameworks. First, I will introduce new terms such as stance, positioning, and alignment, taking some suggestions from those disciplines that give particular attention to the study of interactions through the analysis of conversations and discourses. Second, I will consider the studies that have focused on the issue of power in the context of family interactions especially during adolescence. Third, I will focus on how the specific position of the adolescent is co-constructed through the process of stance-taking, involved in the negotiation of power issues.
1.1.1 The stancetaking process

As my research interest pertains the relational aspects that define oscillation, the consideration of research fields that focus on the study of interaction is fundamental.

Considering that data are based on discursive material, consisting in streams of talks among family members, interactions can be examined through the integration of theoretical contributions from the disciplines that share the slogan that “every social interaction entails a verbal interaction”. I argue that bringing together suggestions from different research fields that study interaction through the analysis of language allows for the construction of a framework in which it is possible the re-description of oscillation based on analog indicators.

This implies, at first, terminological clarifications, which will be presented through the review of different theoretical approaches.

In the last decade in the field of social psychology, a “discursive turn” has occurred (Potter, 1998; Potter & Edwards, 2001), and recent theoretical advances have specified the notion of positioning (Harrè et al., 2009). According to this approach, “positioning is something which happens in the course of an interaction: as such it is a discursive process” (Harrè et al., 2009: 10). More precisely, it is defined as the interactional process through which individuals produce a “diversity of selves.” In each encounter, participants take, resist, and assign positions by locating themselves and others in relation to values or characteristics, social categories, and discourses: ways of speaking and behaviors occurring at different interactional levels such as ‘disciplinary, political, cultural and small group’ or around a specific topic (Davis & Harrè, 1990). In this context, the notion of topic or content of positions “is local, it may be even momentary and ephemeral” (Harrè et al., 2009: 10) and, as such, any positioning act may be challenged. Changes are observable through the modification in the positioning of participants, which in turn modifies the context of interaction among them, and eventually the meanings of their actions. The illocutionary force of their speech acts has the consequence of changing the unfolding course of the discursive process.

The notion of positioning is relevant for my purposes, as it underlines that people define themselves by taking or resisting different positions in their discourses. However
this approach lacks the operational definition about the process by which positioning is devised.

In this sense, disciplines, such as linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics, have consolidated stronger constructs and methodology that can give greater suggestions. Among these, Conversation Analysis (CA) (Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff, 2007) has emphasized the study of the sequential organization of the talk-in-interaction stream during naturally occurring conversations.

In contrast to the positioning theory presented above, conversation analysts provide a strong methodology for documenting how people position themselves with respect to each other in their moment-to-moment conversation. They devised a micro-analytical coding that allows the identification of all the details of interactions: whether they be pauses and repairs, the selection of particular words, or the placement of interruptions and overlaps should not be assumed a priori to be irrelevant to interaction (Sacks, 1992). In addition to these interesting methodological contributions, CA gives relevant clues to the specification of positioning, as it stresses the issue of temporality of interaction with the notion of sequentiality, since “sequences are the vehicle to get some activity accomplished” (Schegloff, 2007: 2).

In sum, the notion of positioning sheds light on how people define themselves with respect to others, and the one of sequentiality stresses how they maintain or change such positions. I do not intend to go into further details about this approach, as the definitions of positioning and sequentiality are the necessary steps to introduce a third construct that will bring together the previous considerations.

In particular, I refer to the intriguing notion of stance, a concept devised and widely used in the field of linguistic and related disciplines, but to my knowledge still relatively unknown in psychology. Recent considerations on stance are noteworthy and productively in line with my arguments.

According to Englebretson (2007), definitions and conceptions of stance are as broad and varied as the individual backgrounds and interests of researchers themselves. This has entailed some critical aspects: researchers tend to operationalize stance within the frame of their own work, thus reaching as many definitions as the number of researchers
that use it. The opposite is also true, as researchers may use different terminologies to cover what appears to be the same type of phenomena.

The use of this notion is intended to stress the functions of language for which it is used and based on the contexts within which it occurs. More precisely, research on stance, however the term is defined, represents an ongoing trend toward understanding the full social and pragmatic nature of language, as it is used by actual speakers to act and interact.

Englebretson (2007) compiled the contributions of many scholars working with this construct to clarify the process of stancetaking in discourse. He suggested five key conceptual principles of stance for consideration:

1) Stancetaking occurs on three (often overlapping) levels – stance is physical action, personal attitude/belief/evaluation and social morality;

2) Stance is public, and is perceivable, interpretable and available for inspection by others;

3) Stance is interactional in nature, it is collaboratively constructed among participants, and with respect to other stances;

4) Stance is indexical, evoking aspects of broader sociocultural framework or physical context in which it occurs;

5) Stance is consequential – taking a stance leads to real consequences for the persons or institutions involved.

The first three principles are particularly attuned to the definition of the relational side of oscillation as they refer to the positioning of the participants in the interaction, and to the co-constructive process among them that recalls the notion of sequentiality outlined before.

Among other contributors, the contribution of Du Bois (2007) allows for further specifications, which are in line with my research interests.

Du Bois proposes the notion of stance triangle to shed light on the various elements and processes that are involved in a stance. More precisely, he states that “in taking a stance, the stancetaker (1) evaluates an object, (2) positions a subject (usually the self), and (3) align with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field” (p. 163) (see Figure 4.1). According to the author, stances include
three components or stance acts that are present at the same time in the *stancetaking* process in the discourse.

![Stance Triangle Diagram](image)

*Figure 4.1. The stance triangle. Adaptation from Du Bois (2007: 163).*

The *stance triangle* regards these components\(^{10}\) (evaluations, positions and alignment) as “subsidiary acts of a single overarching, unified stance act” and, more precisely, “each subsidiary act is distinguishable from the others by virtue of its own distinctive consequences, yet the three are yoked together through their integration in the dialogic stance act” (Du Bois, 2007: 163). By taking a stance, an interlocutor simultaneously displays an understanding of a prior stance (evaluates and positions him/herself), orients to, engages with each other’s stances and then engages in an intersubjective *stancetaking* (aligns).

---

\(^{10}\) Some scholars consider these three components as different kinds of stance: for example, some focus on assessment (Goodwin, 2006; Goodwin and Goodwin, 1992; Pomerantz 1984); others on positioning intended as affective and epistemic stance (Clift, 2006; Haviland, 1991; Ochs 1996) and others again on alignment (Heritage, 2002).
Consequently, the understanding of the stancetaking in discourse can be enhanced by considering the interrelations of the three components. In other words, the three components of stance are mutually constitutive: concomitant to evaluating a shared object of stance, stancetakers position themselves; and concomitant to positioning themselves, stancetakers define alignment with each other. Transferring these considerations to the context of family relations, family members in their discourses express evaluations about objects or topics, position themselves to some salient dimensions of their lives, and consequently align with each other. More precisely, in the unfolding talks the expression of evaluations about individual changes of the adolescent, for instance, can be considered as co-emerging with positions and alignments of the other family members. This also entails the “embrication” of individual and relational levels: when a family member positions him/herself at the same time s/he aligns with the other members and, vice versa, s/he aligns with the others by positioning her/himself.

In this sense, the stancetaking process is an effective mean to describe and understand the relational side of oscillation as it implies alternation of opposite stances (evaluations, positions and alignment) in the families’ talks.

A further consideration can now be advanced. The analysis of the alternation of opposite stances in the specific context of family interactions during adolescence can be useful to study a peculiar dimension of family functioning – the issue of power.

The link between the observation of the relational side of oscillations through a stancetaking process and the issue of power negotiation will be presented in the next paragraph.

1.1.2 Power negotiation in families’ interactions

The most challenging aspect of family changes during adolescence is that many contemporary dimensions are called into questions. As I presented in the theoretical frame of the Study 2, many research have revealed that in the transition from childhood to adolescence, new competences are incorporated in the family system through the regulations of distances and the negotiation of the power structure.
According to Patricia Minuchin (1985), *power*, together with cohesion, is a fundamental dimension that should be taken in consideration for the study of family development. Power pertains the ability to control and influence behaviors, while cohesion is related to issues of distance and closeness between family members. Feldman and Gehring (1988) studied the changes in cohesion and power in families with children during the transition between childhood and adolescence. They noticed that cohesion changed from high dependency between parents and children to more independence, while power required more negotiations among family members. In a further study (Wentzel & Feldman, 1996), it was demonstrated that power – related to aspects of parent-child relationships has a significant impact on adolescent functioning.

Olson *et al.* (1982) stress the relevance of power in the study of the adaptability of families to changes, defining adaptability as “the ability of a family system to change its power structure, role relationships, and relationship rules in response to situational and developmental stress” (p.84). Namely, the re-negotiation of the power structure is the clue of the ongoing developmental changes.

Jory (1997) amplifies this consideration when he states that power is an underlying dimension of every family relationship and of virtually every family activity. Its importance lies in the fact that having a sense of control over someone's life is necessary for the health and happiness of humans, including children, adults, and the elderly.

Not surprisingly, a recent growing body of research has specified different aspects of the dimension of power in the field of adolescent development: some in terms of transition from *asymmetry* to *mutuality* and cooperation (Silvesterin *et al.*, 2006); others as changes in the *family rules* (Kreppner, 1996); or again as *control* and *authority* in the parenting issues (Smetana, 2005).

However, I argue that some problems are still in place in the study of power. As Broderick (1993) lamented, “literally hundreds of studies have been done on family power, who wields it and at whose expense. The matter has turned out to be complicated and elusive. As a result the scholarly literature on family power is voluminous, complex and often contradictory” (p.164).

The main limitation that I have identified, especially in the context of developmental studies, is the lack of consideration of the *interactional aspects* involved in the construct
of power. As power calls into question notions such as role and status through which people define themselves with respect to the others, the study of the display of power in interaction is crucial to understand how people adapt to changes in the family context. Interestingly, Sprey (1972) introduced the concept of powering to refer to the “ongoing confrontation” of power inputs among family members (p. 236). However, the notion of “power inputs” was not adequately defined.

To overcome these limitations, researches carried out in domains related to psychology, which focus the study of interaction through the analysis of language, offer interesting contributions. For example, sociolinguists (Watts, 1991) and feminists (Osmond & Thorne, 1993) point out that the distribution of power in close-knit social networks (i.e. families) tends to be more covert than overt. This is why it is always critical to study it. Family members don’t overtly talk about power issues, but rather they practice them in the ongoing interactions.

Research on power through the analysis of family discourses (Ervin-Tripp et al., 1984; Ochs & Taylor, 1992, 1995; Tannen, 1994, 2001, 2007; Watts, 1991), clearly demonstrate how peculiar linguistic strategies contribute to the construction and deconstruction of the underlying dynamics of power in family contexts. Accordingly, it is questionable whether the display of power can be observed through the analysis of families’ talks and discussions.

As suggested by Goodwin (2002), power should be located in the actual conversations, rather than in the static notion of social role. In the context of family relations, the consideration of asymmetry between the generations is the main issue of defining the roles of each family member. The analysis of everyday conversations in families with young children (Ervin-Tripp et al. 1984) showed that the hierarchical structure is frequently challenged through acts of control and directive toward the parents, rather than being steady.

Consequently, do parents and adolescents control, influence and bid for attention from each other? What does the adolescent do when parents are directive? Is s/he directive as well or is s/he compliant? And what kind of positions do the other family members take?
Some of these questions are the starting point for the analysis of how power issues are displayed in family talks with specific attention to the stances that each family member assumes.

1.1.3 The focus on the adolescent’s stance from a systemic perspective

Throughout my research, I have underlined how the systemic approach is the theoretical background of my work. Here, I reiterate that I consider families as an organized system and the individual as a contributing member, part of the process that creates and maintains the patterns that regulate behaviors (P. Minuchin, 1985). I have stressed how, during developmental transitions, any change that affects adolescent children also influences other family members, as part of the same relational context.

Since then, my research has focused greater efforts in devising a strong methodology strictly attuned to and coherent with the theoretical framework. I consider as unit of analysis the family as a whole. However, after the theoretical considerations I argued in the previous paragraphs, some methodological aspects can be specified as well. Among them, the issue of level of analysis is at the core of the study of interactive processes.11

This is why also in this study I will point out how the individual contribution of the adolescent child to the process of change of the entire family is connected to its specific relational pattern (quiet, drifting, stormy, and critical).

The possibility of outlining individual’s behavior starting from the textures of relational contexts recalls the idea of schismogenesis, widely examined by Bateson (1958; 1972) with reference to different relational contexts. He claimed that schismogenesis refers to “a process of differentiation in the norms of individual behavior resulting from cumulative interactions between individuals” (1958: 175).

The process of differentiation takes place through different positions assumed by the individual (the adolescent) within an interactive system (the family). In particular, s/he can take a symmetrical position by defining her/himself at the same level as the others or an asymmetrical position by defining her/himself at a complementary level with respect to the others.

11 For more details see Study 1 on page 13.
The reference to asymmetrical and symmetrical schismogenesis calls into question the issues of power that, as highlighted above, become relevant in the transition of family members through adolescence. In this work, I also claim that the display of power is observable through the analysis of family discourses. The analysis of the power relations should allow for the understanding of the individual differentiation of the adolescent and the interactive pattern within which the adolescent differentiates.

Some methodological questions may be raised after these considerations. How is it possible to draw the boundaries of the individual’s position, which emerges in the sequences of interaction? More precisely, what are the indicators that allow for the “tracking” of the adolescent’s stances in the family talks?

2. Aims

The main aim of the present study is to deepen the understanding of the four patterns of family interaction described in the previous chapter (quiet, drifting, stormy, and critical), considering both coordination and oscillations. While I will use the construct of coordination as I did in the previous studies, the construct of oscillation will be re-defined paying particular attention to the relational aspects of oscillation. I intend to shed light on the forms of sequential interactions that family members co-construct through a) the analysis of synchronies and fractures in coordination, b) the analysis of the oscillations displayed through the stancetaking process about the ongoing family changes.

Given that taking stances on a specific object implies that a person evaluates someone or something, positioning him/herself through different alignments, I expect that:

1. family oscillations are observable when an alternation of symmetrical and asymmetrical positions takes place in the alignment of each family member with one another, and
2. no family oscillations are observable when each family member aligns with the other, keeping the same position either at a symmetrical level or at an asymmetrical one. The process of stancetaking should allow for the observation of the ongoing power negotiation. Consequently, each pattern of
family interaction described before (quiet, drifting, stormy and critical) should be defined by a specific form of sequential interactions, which accounts for the display of the power dynamics.

Moreover, considering that the focus of my work is on adolescence as a privileged window through which the processes of change are observable, and power negotiation is of peculiar interest for child adjustment and identity development, I intend to focus on how adolescent children contribute to the construction of the peculiar forms of sequential interactions.

To pursue these goals, twenty families were involved and the methodological procedure was further developed.

3. Method

3.1 Participants

Twenty families with at least an adolescent child participated on a volunteer basis. As for parents, 18 were cohabiting and/or married couples and two were separated (only mothers participated with their children); as for adolescents, 16 were males (mean age=14.69) and four females (mean age=14.50). Three families had an only child; ten families had two children; three families had three children; and four families had more than three children. In three families, one or more siblings refused to participate (see Table 4.1, where n.p. stands for not present). In the same family, if more than a child was in the adolescence age range (13-16), we chose the youngest as the target of our analysis.
Table 4.1
Personal data: names, age and sex of family members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Mother’s age</th>
<th>Father’s age</th>
<th>Adolescent’s age and sex (M/F)</th>
<th>Siblings’ age and sex (M/F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpi</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Giovanni 15 (M)</td>
<td>Christian 20 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armani</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Emanuele 14 (M)</td>
<td>Zeno 12 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beati</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Lorenzo 14 (M)</td>
<td>Paolo 30 (n.p.) (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alberta 26 (n.p.) (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedetti</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Teresa 14 (F)</td>
<td>Elisa 13 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mara 11 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Giulio 6 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carini</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lucio 14 (M)</td>
<td>Guglielmo 12 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carta</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Gianluca 16 (M)</td>
<td>Antonio 30 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simone 28 (n.p.) (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donati</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Stefano 15 (M)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follini</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Roberto 14 (M)</td>
<td>Chiara 8 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giuliani</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Daniele 14 (M)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandi</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Carlo 15 (M)</td>
<td>Jacopo 11 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberi</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Gianmario 14 (M)</td>
<td>Lorenzo 25 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Filippo 22 (n.p.) (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elena 12 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manini</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Erica 15 (F)</td>
<td>Stefania 18 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pani</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Ombretta 14 (F)</td>
<td>Giorgia 17 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luca 15 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matteo 11 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poggiali</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Edoardo 16 (M)</td>
<td>Vittoria 20 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Augusto 9 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Righi</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Alberto 15 (M)</td>
<td>Bartolomeo 13 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ramona 12 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrea 6 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossetti</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Dario 15 (M)</td>
<td>Martina 17 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sassi</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Rosa 14 (F)</td>
<td>Sara 15 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toscani</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Nicolas 14 (M)</td>
<td>Rebecca 17 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanotti</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Andrea 15 (M)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zurlini</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Marcello 15 (M)</td>
<td>Lorenza 17 (F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the interviews were collected in a period of six months from December 2007 to May 2008. The procedure for the recruitment was the same as for the previous studies while important changes were introduced in the setting for the data collection.

3.2 A new setting for the data collection

The new setting chosen for conducting and video recording the family interviews of this study was the families’ home (Figure 4.2).
Two reasons were at the core of this choice: one practical and one methodological. As for the practical one, I favored the participation of a larger group of families, recruiting them from more cities of the region. Because of the distance from Parma, for some family members was a problem to reach the laboratory of observation, located in the Department of Psychology.

The second reason concerned the ecological validity of the laboratory setting. Families feel more comfortable in a familiar environment, especially young children. Children can walk around, play, and when tired, leave the room where data collection is conducted. Differently from anthropologists and ethnographers whose main interest is the study of houses and artifacts (David & Kramer, 2001; Ochs et al., 2006; Pontecorvo & Arcidiacono, 2007), we did not require the video recording to be conducted in a specific room. My main concern was that family members could participate in a quiet and comfortable place.

Furthermore, since the technique of the family interview had been well established and tested in the previous studies, laboratory equipment for supervision, such as the one-way mirror, was no longer needed.

After families’ consent to participate was obtained, an appointment was arranged by a phone call, and some details about the video recording procedure and the data consent were given. Families were also informed that a research assistant and I would reach their homes in a day and time most convenient for all family members.
Once in their homes, family members chose a comfortable place for video recording. We mentioned that the room was to contain no noise and that music players and televisions were to be switched off. Most of the families chose the living room, as people favor conversations among couches and small tables.

As family members sat on couches, the research assistant set the camera on the tripod and chose the right angle to include the entire family. I sat on a separate chair, not in front of them, but on a semi-circle position to include all the members in my line of sight. The research assistant sat in the back, close to the camera, and monitored the videotaping for the entire interview. The recording started when I begun explaining the procedure for the data consent and continued until the end of the interview.

3.3 Preparation of the material for the analysis

This new corpus of data consists of 21 hours and 10 minutes of videotaped material. All twenty interviews were at first transcribed and divided in sequential frames, following the conventions I presented in the Study 1. After this, three steps were followed to prepare the material for the analysis:

1. Individuation and selection of all the utterances that trigger a sequence of free and spontaneous interactional exchanges among family members independently from the questions and the intervention of the interviewer. Suggestions from discourse and conversational analytic methods were considered;

2. Focus on the quality of the utterances through which family members aligned in the interactional exchanges. Each interactional exchange was considered finished when family members stopped reacting to the topic debated in the sequential interaction;

3. Application of the coding system (described in details in the following paragraph) to each of the selected interactional sequence.

The analysis was conducted on parts of family interviews that largely differed in length. Reliability was assessed throughout the material preparation and the analysis: two judges and I worked independently and an agreement higher than 80% was reached.
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3.4 Data analysis

Scholars (Goodwin, 1990; Schegloff, 2007) have stated that to study the impact of different utterances in interaction, the analyst must examine not only the utterance itself, but also the *sequential organization* of utterances in the interactional exchange. As Goodwin specifies “utterances in conversation occupy a uniquely interstitial position in that they are simultaneously *context shaped* (that is they are built in response to the frameworks of intelligibility and action created by the immediately prior utterance) and *context renewing* in that each utterance provides the contextual point of departure for the action(s) that will follow it” (2006: 443). In other words, the action that a speaker might be doing with an utterance, may have implications for what actions should or might be done in the next utterance as a response to it, thus *sequentiality* is the criteria followed in the analysis of the stances family members took in interaction.

In line with this consideration, the research team devised a coding system for the analysis of the *utterances* that shaped participant stances. After accumulating a collection of interactions, the judges coded different types of utterances considering sequentiality and, correspondingly, assigned specific labels.

3.4.1 Utterance coding scheme

We called “provocative” all those utterances that triggered different kinds of alignments expressed through *five different* types of utterances (directive, challenge, opposition, compliance, justification) (Figure 4.3).
Both verbal and nonverbal indexes were considered for the analysis of the utterances, and specific definitions are provided below with reference to some examples (each type of utterance is highlighted in gray).

**Provocative utterance.** These utterances are defined provocative as they, in fact “provoke” a sequence of free and spontaneous interactional exchanges among family members. An unspecific connotation was given purposely to these utterances, as no prototypical forms were found. The fact that they are provocative is observed in what follows them. Namely, they trigger a sequence of different kinds of utterances. In the
examples below, the subject (S) expresses an evaluation about Luca’s (S2, the adolescent) behavior that leads to a cascade of interactions among family members (S3, the mother) (Example 1). S2 opposes to S, while S3 challenges S, and S2 concludes the exchange opposing to S again.

Example 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Luca e’ sempre stato molto critico</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Luca has always been very critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>no non e’ vero</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>no it’s not true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>beh insomma spesso dai!</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>well it often happened come on!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>infatti scusa anche a scuola con i</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>yes indeed also at school you used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prof.</td>
<td>alzavi spesso la voce e-</td>
<td></td>
<td>to raise your voice when you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((guardando Luca))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>were talking to the teachers and-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>adesso non esageriamo!</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>well don’t exaggerate!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Directive.** All utterances that refer to acts of control, orders (Example 2a), or direct requests were considered as directives (Example 2b). As for verbal indexes, these utterances are defined by the imperative tense, commonly used in Italian language to express orders and direct questions. As for nonverbal indexes, the eye gaze is considered an indicator of a directive utterance: a subject can a) stare at someone else by saying something, b) gazing at him/her without saying anything, or c) direct the gaze toward the interlocutor and widening his/her eyes.

Example 2a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Ieri sera sono rientrato piu’ tardi</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Last night I came back later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Dille che cosa hai fatto la scorsa notte!</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Tell her what you did last night!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 2b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Ieri sera sono rientrato piu’ tardi</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Last night I came back later.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Che cosa hai fatto la scorsa notte?</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>What did you do last night?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>((fissando la figlia adolescente))</td>
<td></td>
<td>((staring at his adolescent daughter))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Challenge.** Challenges are observed when a subject “takes action against” the interlocutor, such as re-launching a competition based on new positions. The indexes taken in consideration for challenges in the interactions are: *exclamations, increased tone of the voice* and *hand gestures* (Example 3).

**Example 3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Martina si lamenta sempre per qualcosa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>No non e’ vero sei tu che mi dai sempre fastidio quando studio perche’ non hai niente da fare!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Martina is always complaining about something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>No it’s not true it’s you who are always bothering me when I’m studying because you don’t have anything to do!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opposition.** Oppositions are utterances that refer to a “resistance to” the definition given by the interlocutor. Different from directives and challenges, the subject expresses disagreement *only* by refusing the definition of the interlocutor, rather than controlling or acting against him/her (Example 4). On a verbal level, opposition is observable by the use of grammatical forms and verbs that refer to disagreements (“no”, “but”, “instead”, “I disagree”, etc.) and on a nonverbal one, through *head movements* such as shaking the head.

**Example 4.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Ultimamente tieni la tua camera piu’ in disordine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>No non e’ vero ((scuote la testa mentre guarda S))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Lately you have been keeping your room messy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>No it’s not true ((shakes his head while looking at S))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Compliance.** These types of utterance are defined as “being in line with”, and this is a way to express agreements, then *accepting* the definition given by the interlocutor
(Example 5). It is observable both at the verbal level (by linguistic forms, e.g., “yes,” “it’s true,” or “I agree”) and at the analog one, by *nodding*.

**Example 5.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Nelle ultime settimane esco anche al sabato sera</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>In the last weeks I go out also on Saturday night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Si e’ vero ((annuendo)) hai ragione in effetti esci di piu’</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Yes it’s true ((nodding)) actually you go out more often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification.** With these utterances a subject accept the definition given by the other, however different from compliances, “defends” him/herself, accepts the responsibility for the fact in question, but denies the pejorative quality associated with it. Thus, justification is coded as referred to the self not to the interlocutor (Example 6). As for verbal indicators, similar grammatical forms as for compliance are observable (e.g., “it’s true,” “I agree,” etc.). However, these are followed by expressions such as “but” or “however,” which introduce an explanation of the speaker’s position, sometimes followed by specific verbs or forms such as “I think”, “in my opinion”. Analog indicators can be identified, for instance, in the gaze moving down.

**Example 6.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Adesso comunque sei diventato più riservato</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Actually now you are becoming more closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>E’ vero ma non sempre ho voglia di raccontare tutto e poi spesso torno a casa che sono stanco</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Yes it is true but I don’t always want to tell you everything and then I’m often tired when I’m back home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The definitions of the utterances are summarized in the Table 4.2.
Table 4.2
Definitions of the utterances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of utterances</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provocative</td>
<td>Unspecific utterances that trigger interactional exchanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Acts of controls and/or direct questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Taking action against interlocutor’s definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition</td>
<td>Resisting to the interlocutor’s definition (disagreement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Accepting the interlocutor’s definition (agreement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Defending from the interlocutor’s definition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each family, every selected interactional exchange was coded considering the different types of utterances described above. Afterwards, coders conducted a further analysis in identifying oscillations (in the new relational definition) and coordination in the sequence of interaction.

In particular, two other aspects were considered:

1. The *alternation* between up and down positions as indicator of *family oscillations*; in contrast to *stable* positions of family members (either up or down) as indicator of absence of family oscillations.

2. The *synchrony* or *fracture* of *coordination*. For coordination, we used the same coding scheme described in the previous chapters, with particular attention to the indicators that account for power aspects. In accordance with some research (Watts, 1991; Tannen, 2001; 2007), three codes were observed in the unfolding interaction: a) overlaps, b) interruptions, and c) substitutions. More precisely, if in the previous studies we only considered the presence or lack of these indicators of coordination, in the present analysis we considered the specific meaning they assume in the interaction.

   a) *Overlaps*. Two kinds of overlap are considered: one indicates that symmetrical alignments are taking place as in a competition in which a member re-affirms his/her own position above the interlocutor. The other
is a “cooperative” kind of overlap (Tannen, 2001) that is accompanied by indicators of synchrony such as smiling and no interruptions.

b) *Interruptions*. Indicate symmetrical alignments in which a subject prevents the interlocutor from completing the expression of his/her position.

c) *Substitutions*. Allow a subject to prevent the interlocutor from expressing his/her position by anticipating him/her and then affirming his/her own position.

An exploration of the “arena” where the interactions took place was also conducted. Given that the *stancetaking process* implies an *object* that family members evaluate and to which position themselves, coders identified all the *topics* discussed by family members in the interviews that allowed for the display of the interactional sequences.

In the next paragraphs, results will be presented focusing first on the *topics* of the interactive sequences following a *provocative utterance* and then on the details of the *forms of sequential interactions*.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 *What family members say: the sensitive topics triggering families’ interactions*

Before discussing in detail the *forms* of interaction that characterize the four *patterns* of family interaction (quiet, drifting, stormy, and critical), I will focus on the *topics* debated in the family interviews.

Differently from conversations and discourses naturally occurring in family contexts (Pontecorvo & Arcidiacono, 2007; Tannen, Kendall & Gordon, 2007), interviews have peculiarities that, not surprisingly, can direct the conversation towards specific topics. The structure of this technique itself requires the interviewer to conduct data collection by selecting specific areas or thematic contents consistent with his/her research goal. Thus, the researcher has more control than the interviewees over the course of the interaction. Nevertheless, *family interview*¹² is intended to stimulate *circularity* among

---

¹² For more details about the technique of the family interview see Study 1.
family members as a way to limit the asymmetry between interviewer and interviewees and to favor the conversation.

Furthermore, as we stated elsewhere (Everri et al. 2009), family members can hardly “hide” the patterns they have consolidated through everyday interactions in the course of their lives. Likewise, some topics should become more salient than others especially in peculiar periods of family life. Thus, topics discussed during a family interview should be considered not simply as content, but rather as the “arena” of meaningful topics that permits one to observe the display of interactional dynamics.

In line with these considerations, the analysis of this new corpus of interviews points out that the introduction of a specific topic or the narration of particular episodes activated interactive sequences, as if family members were discussing or confronting as they normally do. These topics were defined sensitive.

The connotation of sensitivity here is not intended to stress that some topics cannot directly and explicitly be discussed as they hurt people’s morality (Linell & Bredmar, 1996), rather they are topics that solicited the “spontaneous” participation of family members in the ongoing talk, and for this reason, they are sensitive.

Some of the topics mentioned in the interview were very intimate, such as the reference to transgressive issues (going out without the parents’ permission): in some families they did not trigger any reaction, while in others they launched a long interactive exchange. On the contrary, topics apparently ordinary, such as going out with new friends or the request to have a cell phone, were particularly sensitive to some families, as evident when all family members were passionately involved in the discussion; in other families, the same topics were almost ignored. This is to say that it is not the quality of the content itself that is relevant for the analysis of family interactions instead it is that some topics more than others and, for that specific family, trigger a stancetaking process.

The sensitive topics were indentified by analyzing, frame by frame, all parts of the interviews in which at least two family members were involved in sequential exchanges. For each of these interactional exchanges, the research team (two independent judges and I) considered the specific thematic issues that family members were discussing. Afterward, a label that summarized the thematic area of the sensitive topic was assigned.
(see Table 4.3). Inter-judges reliability was calculated, and a level of agreement higher than 80% was reached.

Table 4.3
*Sensitive topics discussed in each frame for each family*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families</th>
<th>N. frame</th>
<th>Sensitive topics</th>
<th>N. interactive exchanges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alpi</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Discussions between brothers</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Adolescent’s organization</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Increased adolescent’s competences</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Family’s organization</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Curfew</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Mother’s role</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Discussions for transportation</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Armani</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Relationship between brothers</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Parents’ separation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Cell phone</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Relationship between adolescent and mother</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Relationship between brothers</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beati</strong></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Father’s role</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Democracy in making decisions (Ep.)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Relationship between mother and adolescent</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Relationship between father and adolescent (Ep.)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benedetti</strong></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Conflicts between parents and adolescent</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Adolescent’s request to go out with friends</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Adolescent’s increased privacy</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carini</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Physical changes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>To go out without permission (Ep.)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>New and old friends</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Father’s role</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Conflicts between mother and adolescent</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Presence of the father</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>To leave children alone at home</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carta</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Parenting role</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Relationship between brothers</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Adolescent’s requests to go out at night</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Adolescent’s summer holidays</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Disco</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donati</strong></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Scooter (Ep.)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Scooter (Ep.)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Physical distance (Ep.)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Future of the adolescent</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follini</strong></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Increased control over the adolescent’s life</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Adolescent’s increased privacy</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Discussions between mother and adolescent</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Giuliani</strong></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Scooter and disco</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Frame (Frame number)</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandi</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Relationship between mother and adolescent</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Adolescent’s travels alone</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberi</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Adolescent’s request to go out at night</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Relationship between brothers</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Relationship among siblings</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Adolescent’s requests to go out</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Differences between brother and sister</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Cell phone</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Future of the adolescent</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manini</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Sister’s boyfriend</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Relationship between sisters</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Discussions between sisters</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Disco and value of money</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pani</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Scooter</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Dependence on the father for the transportation</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Discussions between father and children</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poggioli</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Conflicts between parents and adolescent</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Curfew</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Relationship between mother and sister</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Conflicts among siblings</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Physical distance (Ep.)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Righi</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Increased privacy of the adolescent’s brother</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Scooter</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Adolescent’s girlfriend (Ep.)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Discussions between mother and adolescent</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Request to increase the weekly tip</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossetti</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Relationship between mother and daughter</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Differences between the siblings</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sassi</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Punishments and rules</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Future of sisters</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toscani</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Relationship between siblings</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Sister’s boyfriend</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Relationship between parents and children</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Relationship between mother and sister</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Future of the sister</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanotti</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Adolescents’ requests to go abroad</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Scooter</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Relationship between mother and son</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Conflicts between father and adolescent</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Conflicts between mother and adolescent</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Separation between parents and adolescent (Ep.)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zurlini</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Parties with friends</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table above, for each family we reported a) the frames in which the sensitive topics were observed, b) the labels that summarize the sensitive topics and, in the last column, c) the number of the interactional exchanges family members used to confront on sensitive topics. The abbreviation “Ep.” enclosed in parentheses stands for
“episode” and it specifies that sensitive topics were discussed with reference to the specific episodes where the adolescent was the protagonist.

Let us first consider the number of frames (second column of the table) and the number of interactive exchanges (fourth column of the table).

We suggest that the number of frames, where sensitive topics were observed, should be considered in the confrontation with the number of interactive exchanges that characterize each frame. In the same frame, family members, indeed, alternated interactive sequences on sensitive topics to detailed descriptions of their points of view and feelings in a discursive form close to monologues. Namely, the interviewee’s point of view did not trigger any reaction from the other family members who, in these cases, participated as an “audience.” However, considering that the aim of this work is to focus on the parts of interview in which the interactive exchanges were observable, we focused only on the parts of interactive exchanges for each frame, rather than on the ones of monologues.

The number of frames in which family members discussed sensitive topics was variable: from a minimum of one in the Zurlini family to a maximum of seven in the Alpi and Carini families. In some families, like the Benedettis, sensitive topics were observed in only three frames, whereas in the frames VI and VIII, family members confronted each other for more than fifty interactive exchanges (55 and 53, respectively). On the contrary, in the Alpi and Carini families, the number of exchanges was very short and rapid (as for the Alpi’s, the range went from 5 to 25 and for the Carini’s from 4 to 12) while the number of frames was higher in the other families.

These evidences show that some families take up few sensitive topics (low number of frames) that are examined through long interactional sequences (high number of interactive exchanges), while others tend to focus their discussions on different kinds of sensitive topics (high number of frames) however through shorter exchanges (low number of interactive exchanges).

Between these two extremes, there are families (Liberi, Manini and Donati) that talked about sensitive topics in four/five frames and alternated between long and short interactive exchanges. More precisely, in the Manini family, sensitive topics were debated in four frames and through interactive exchanges that varied from 9 to 63.
Likewise, in the Liberi family, the sensitive topic of the cell phone (frame VIII) involved family members in interactive exchanges much longer in sequence (59 exchanges) than those about the differences between siblings (8 exchanges) or the requests of the adolescent to go out more often (11 exchanges). Again, in the Donati family, the episode about the physical distance (43 exchanges) was discussed in a much longer sequence than the scooter episodes (Frames I and IV) that lasted 16 and 12 exchanges, respectively.

In these cases, a hierarchy of sensitive topics is a possible explanation: in a family, some topics may be considered more sensitive than others when they involve family members for longer sequences of interaction.

As for the types of the sensitive topics (see third column of table 4.3), a closer look showed that most of them referred to a broader thematic area that we defined by the expression of distance regulation. Distance regulation is intended here to stress that most of the sensitive topics referred to a semantic polarity about both closeness or togetherness and distance or separateness at different levels (emotional, physical and symbolic).

In almost all families, members discussed the emotional aspects of distance regulation, such as the changes in the relationship between parents and children or between siblings. In only four families (Benedetti, Carini, Poggiali and Zanotti) the reference to conflicts was explicit as in the others, family members specified that the amount of confrontations increased in the last years, however, using a less intense term as “discussion,” as we reported in the labels of the sensitive topics.

Other sensitive topics concerned issues of physical and symbolic distance. As for physical distance, we considered the increased privacy of the adolescent and the request to meet people and attend places (new friends, boy/girlfriends, discos and pubs) that take the adolescent far from the family context. As for symbolic distance, we intended this as a reference to specific requests such as buying a scooter, a sensitive topic mentioned in five families (Donati, Giuliani, Pani, Righi and Zanotti), or a cell phone, discussed in two families (Armani and Liberi). These objects can be considered, in fact, as “symbols of belonging,” as they allow adolescents to build a connection with relational contexts other than the family and, contemporary, to define themselves and be identified as members of the peer groups.
Interestingly, six families out of twenty (Beati, Carini, Donati, Poggiali, Righi and Zanotti) discussed sensitive topics on distance regulation through the narration of specific episodes. We noticed that family members brought past moments of their family history in which the adolescent served as the protagonist into the course of the current talk. Thus, it is the narration of past experiences that becomes the arena for the display of the interactive sequences.

Episodes that took place in the past can be evoked for many purposes, such as to launch or justify present time practices (Ochs & Capps, 2001). In line with this, in the Poggiali family, for example, the sensitive topic, which family members debated in the frame XII, concerned physical distance. The father said that he cannot understand why the adolescent child refuses to accept a car ride from him to school. The mother agrees with him and recalls an episode to justify her position: she recalled that when the adolescent was a child in the kindergarten, he had refused to be taken there by the parents even at that time.

In other cases (Beati, Righi and Zanotti), the narration of particular episodes instead had the function to provoke the interactive exchanges. In frame VIII, the mother of Zanotti family recalled when her husband and she had to manage their first separation from their child for a long period of time. This was the starting point for a confrontation on how, nowadays, they deal with the issue of physical distance, considering the increased requests of the adolescent to spend more time in other contexts.

Furthermore, we noticed that past episodes had both the functions of triggering interactive exchanges and to justify the specific positions that family members took in the unfolding talk (Carini and Donati). In the Donati family, for example, in three frames out of four, the parents recalled past episodes about scooter and physical distance, where the adolescent was the protagonist. The narration of these episodes not only activated confrontation among family members, but it also allowed them to add details as a way to justify and sustain their specific positions in the talk.

In sum, I have drawn attention to the sensitive topics that family members discuss through the display of interactive sequences. This “snapshot” on what triggers different sequences of interaction was the necessary step to move to the focus on the specific forms of sequential interactions.
4.2 How family members say what they say: The forms of sequential interactions

The results that I present in this section are focused on the description of the forms that the sequences of interaction take when family members are talking about family changes, previously defined as sensitive topics.

This calls into question the notions of oscillation and coordination, the constructs that are at the core of the study of microtransitions observable in the four patterns of family interaction I had depicted in the Study 2. Thus, before presenting in the details this new section of results, I will reiterate the aspects that specify the four patterns of family interaction.

These patterns emerged from the combination of fractures and synchrony in coordination on one side, and individual and family oscillations on the other. Family oscillations were particularly notable, as they accounted for the way family members were defining and acknowledging the ongoing changes.

Oscillation was observed in the alternation of different opinions or points of view expressed by each family member during the interviews. For instance, the father may describe the adolescent as childish, while the adolescent claims that he is very mature; later in the interview is the father who mentions episodes in which the adolescent is depicted as mature, while the adolescent recognizes his immaturity on some issues.

Coordination was observed when family interactions were synchronic as opposed to when they displayed fractures.

The four patterns of family interaction emerged from the combination of these dimensions and they were defined as:

a) Critical: no family oscillations and fractures in coordination.

b) Quiet: no family oscillations and synchrony in coordination.

c) Drifting: family oscillations and synchrony in coordination.

d) Stormy: family oscillations and fractures in coordination.

In this study (Study 3), I move a step further in the description of these four patterns of family interaction, focusing on the relational side of oscillation.

The theoretical considerations and the methodological advances I presented in the previous paragraphs allowed for the introduction of the notion of stance, which permits a new definition of oscillation based on analog indicators. Oscillation is then studied as a
stancetaking process observable in the ongoing talks where family members express evaluations, positions, and alignments on specific sensitive topics.

This stancetaking process is an expression of power negotiation. As I argued before, when family members take stances in the course of interaction, align with the others by positioning themselves up or down with respect to their interlocutors, thereby reflecting the confrontation or the confirmation of family hierarchy.

These positions can be stable in that each family member never changes the way in which s/he aligns with the others, or alternated when, on the contrary, positions are switched between up and down. This process is triggered by specific utterances I defined as provocative.

In the description of the patterns, I will focus on the specific forms of sequential interactions defining them. More precisely, I will consider:

a. Provocative utterances. Utterances that trigger the interactive sequences.

b. Oscillation. Family oscillations are defined by the alternation of relational positions among family members. No family oscillations are evident when family members maintain their relational positions.

c. Coordination. As in the previous study, synchrony and fractures are the indicators for the presence or absence of coordination.

Excerpts from the twenty family interviews will be presented to highlight the forms of sequential interactions displayed in each family. For each excerpt, I will report the specific utterances that express the different positions starting from the provocative utterance of a family member. Abbreviations for both the utterances and the participants in the interaction are used for practical reasons (Table 4.4).
Table 4.4
Abbreviations used in the presentation of results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labels</th>
<th>Abbreviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utterances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provocative</td>
<td>p.u.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>dir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition</td>
<td>opp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>com.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>just.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>B (B2, B3, …)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>S (S2, S3, …)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * B2, B3 or S2, S3 are used in case of more than one brother and sister.
The progressive number stands for the birth order.

On the left side of each extracts, I indicate the participants’ abbreviations, the kind of utterance used, and the interlocutor to whom the utterance is addressed. For example, if the adolescent challenges the father, I will indicate it as: A ch. F.

Let us go now into the details of every pattern, starting from the ones showing fractures in coordination as the description of the forms of the sequential interactions requires more attention.

4.2.1. Re-defining the four patterns of family interaction

4.2.1.1. The critical pattern: stable-symmetrical forms of sequential interactions

In the critical pattern, two different forms of sequential interactions were observable:

a) the adolescent and one parent align by positioning themselves at a symmetrical level (opposing and challenging each other), while the other parent justifies or complies some times with the adolescent, and some other times with his/her partner. Siblings, when present, either take the adolescent’s side or the parents’ one.
This form of sequential interaction was present in four families: Armani, Beati, Liberi and Pani.

b) the parents (and siblings), differently from the previous form, are together in keeping a symmetrical alignment, and the adolescent positions himself at the same level of parents by oppositions and challenges for some interactive exchanges. However, afterwards s/he switches to a down position. Two families, Carta and Donati, showed this form of interaction.

Both the forms of interaction were stable throughout the interview as each family member kept always the same position (either up or down) in the alignment with the others throughout the interaction. Thus no family oscillations started, while fractures in coordination were frequently observed.

Let us now consider the first form of interaction (a) that can be summarized as following:

*Adolescent and one parent develop a symmetrical interaction while the other parent (and siblings) shifts in supporting either one or the other.*

This form is stable throughout the sequential exchanges.

The first excerpt refers to the interview with the Beati family: Lorenzo is the adolescent and he has two older siblings not present in the interview, a brother (30 years old) and a sister (26 years old).

Excerpt 4.1 – Beati family. P (father), M (mother), L (adolescent), I (interviewer)
Frame VI. Sensitive topic: Democracy in making decisions (Ep.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.p.a.</th>
<th>230. P e (0.3) no a nove a nove anni il brighello mi ricordo ancora e era vicino a quella poltrona ((indica la poltrona della sala)) non so quale discussione stavamo facendo e lo stavamo sgridando un po’ e lui ma insomma in questa casa non c’è democrazia!</th>
<th>230. P and (0.3) uhm when he was nine he was an urchin I still remember he was close to that armchair ((points at the armchair in the living-room)) I don’t remember what we were arguing about but we were scolding him a bit and him [said] well we have no democracy in this home!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ch. F</td>
<td>231. L e lo ribadisco tuttora!</td>
<td>231. L and I say it again right now!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ch. A</td>
<td>232. P e lo ribadisce tuttora! (0.2)</td>
<td>232. P and he says it again (0.2) but</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
però a nove anni da un brighellino alto così noi siamo rimasti così perché ti senti dire la democrazia
(0.2)
he was nine a little urchin like that we were struck 'cause we heard democracy(0.2)

M com. F 233. M eh si e’ vero ((guardando il marito)) 233. M eh yes it’s true ((looking at her husband))

F ch. A 234. P eh però la democrazia c’è 234. P but we have democracy

A opp. F 235. L non è vero ((padre dice qualcosa e non ben articolato))- 235. L it’s not true ((the father said something in a low voice))-;

F opp. A 236. P eh pero’ lo sono il capo ((sorridendo)) 236. P but I am the boss((smiling))

237. I ma nel senso che tu che cosa rivendicheresti Filippo (0.2) non so di comportamenti che sono più democratici?
237. I but in the sense that you Filippo what do you claim (0.2) like more democratic behaviors?

A ch. F 238. L e (0.2) tipo lasciarmi scegliere di più qualcosa come tutte quelle che abbiamo detto finora come la televisione e i libri e anche il gameboy e poi vorrei il computer e senza [democrazia nisba!]
238. L well (0.2) like I’d like to be free to choose like all the things I said before like the TV and the books and the gameboy and then I’d like a computer but without democracy [nothing!]

F ch. A 239. P [e vivere senza regole quindi (0.3) fare quello che si vuole eh? Ah!
239. P [so live without any rules (0.3) do whatever you want right? Ah!

A opp. F 240. L no ma almeno la democrazia (0.3) così c’è mamma che è un po’ variabile ((la madre annuisce e sorride))
240. L no but at least the democracy (0.3) mom is a bit variable though ((the mother nods and smiles))

F dir. A 241. P però ci sono delle regole ci sono delle leggi in democrazia che bisogna rispettare
241. P but there are rules there are laws in democracy and you must obey to them

This sequential exchange is provoked by the introduction of a past episode narrated by the father. He recalls that when Lorenzo was a child and the parents reproached him, he protested by stating that there was no democracy in the family. This triggers the prompt reply of Lorenzo who challenges his father; the father relaunches another challenge (232), while the mother takes the father’s side expressing compliance both verbally and nonverbally (233). Later on, Lorenzo calls his mother into question (240), who nods and smiles as to agree with him, while the father increases the symmetry with his son using a directive utterance (241).
In this sequence fractures are observable in the expression of oppositions with interruptions (235-236), and of challenges with overlaps (238-239) underlined also by exclamations. The repetition of some verbal forms can be considered indicators of fractures in coordination. For example, the repetition of “e” and “e però” at the beginning of a sentence in Italian stresses and increases the pace of the talk, with the consequence of conveying a symmetrical escalation.

In Excerpt 4.2, the same form of sequential interaction is shown, but the role of the parents is reversed.

In the Liberi family, Gianmaria, the adolescent, keeps a symmetrical interaction with both parents. However, in this family, it is the mother who is directive, challenging, and opposing towards the adolescent. The father, instead, alternates an asymmetrical position toward both the mother and the adolescent throughout the exchanges. This sequence of interactions is more complex than the previous one, as it is a family with numerous children: Luciano, 25; Filippo, 22; and Elena 13. Filippo did not participate in the interview.

Consider the extract in the next page.
Excerpt 4.2 – Liberi family. P (father), M (mother), G (adolescent), L (brother), E (sister), I (interviewer)

Frame VIII. Sensitive topic: Cell phone

F p.u. 294. P sono privi di cellulare ancora loro due (((indica Gianmaria e Elena)) 294. P they don’t have the cell phone yet ((points at Gianmaria and Elena))

295. I ah ecco questo e bello ciò non in tutte le famiglie funziona così 295. I ah right this is nice as I mean not in all families is like that

M ch. A, S 296. M si è bello! per loro mica tanto (((sorridendo)) 296. M yes it is! but it is not so nice for them ( ((smiling))

297. I non ne potete più siete gli unici? (((verso Gianmaria ed Elena)) 297. I you can’t stand it any more? Are you the only ones? ((toward Gianmaria and Elena))

F com. M 298. P ma si dai e’ bello distinguersi! ( ((con tono ironico e guardando Gianmaria)) 298. P but yes it nice to be different! ( (with irony and looking at Gianmaria))

A ch. F, M 299. G no mica tanto ( (confusione generale)) no anche questo è un aspetto critico perché aspetta cosa dicono? ah che non siamo abbastanza grandi per usare il cellulare perché non lo usiamo in modo adeguato allora non ho capito chi dice quale sia il modo adeguato 299. G no not so much ( (general confusion)) no this is also a critical aspect because wait what do they say? Ah yes we are not old enough to use the cell phone as we do not use it in a right way so I don’t understand who says which is the right way

M dir. A 300. M io lo dico- 300. M I say that-

A opp. M 301. G e no! 301. G and no!

B dir. A 302. L insomma io l’ho avuto a 15 anni quindi è giusto che tu lo abbia a quindici anni 302. L in short I got it when I was 15 then it is right you get it when you are 15

A dir. M 303. G e tu me l’hai proibito secondo te perché? ((la madre dice qualcosa a bassa voce)) (Cosa? ((guardando la madre)) 303. G and you forbid it to me and why did you do that? ((the mother says something in a low voice)) (What? ((looking at his mother))

M dir. A 304. M (perché non hai ancora l’età) 304. M (because you are still too young

F com. M 305. P non è indispensabile 305. P it is not fundamental

A ch. M 306. G perché non hai ancora l’età! 306. G because you are still too young!

S ch. A 307. E non ce l’hanno tutti (0.3) ci sono alcuni della scuola che non ce l’hanno 307. E it not that everybody owns it (0.3) in our school any guys don’t have it

M ch. A 308. M ecco dai così siete originali! 308. M come on so you are different!

309. I questa e’ una regola che avete messo voi genitori? ((guardando i genitori)) 309. I is this a rule that you parents decided? ( (looking at the parents))

A ch. M, F 310. G e’ una stupida regola che hanno messo e non sis a perché’ ((il padre tocca la spalla del figlio come per consolarlo)) 310. G it is a stupid rule they decided but no one knows why (0.2) ((the father touches his son’s shoulder as to comfort him))
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In this sequence, the father’s statement about the cell phone activates an interactional exchange among all family members, including the siblings. The mother launches a challenge towards both the adolescent son and the daughter (296); the father is compliant with the mother; while the adolescent replies addressing a challenge toward both parents. Gianmaria upholds up positions mainly through challenges (299, 306, 310), and even directives (303) addressed specifically toward the mother, who reciprocates him by positioning herself at the same level. The father, as the mother of the Beati family, sustains both the mother’s positions and the adolescents’ one by agreeing (nonverbally with the adolescent, 310). Interesting to note in this sequence is the siblings’ positions: both the older brother (302) and the sister position themselves up with respect to their adolescent brother. For instance, the sister instead of taking up the challenge of the mother at the beginning of the exchange challenges Gianmaria (307).

Indicators of fractures in coordination are evident in the whole sequence (interruptions at points 300-301; overlaps at points 303-304), in particular substitutions are noteworthy, as they convey the attempt of the adolescent, in this case, to anticipate the others and then reaffirm his/her own poision (309-310).

In the next excerpt (Excerpt 4.3), for instance, the rapid succession of overlaps and interruptions arrives to the point in which participants cannot complete their utterances. Pani is another numerous family, as Ombretta, the adolescent has a one year older brother, Luca, and two more siblings: Giorgia (17 years old) and Matteo (11 years old).

Excerpt 4.3 – Pani family. P (father), M (mother), O (adolescent), L (brother), G (sister), I (interviewer)

Frame VII. Sensititive topic: Discussions between father and children
257. I [e lei ((guardando la madre)) si sente cambiata nel rapporto con i suoi figli?  
F dir. B  
258. P [eh? ((guardando Luca))  
B ch. F  
259. L si cioè dici che se uno ha un parere è meglio non parlarne? ((il padre annuisce)) infatti secondo me e' così che-  
F ch. B  
260. P no non è vero quello (0.2) alle volte si fa fatica a tenere una posizione o un'opinione è vero che magari tu insisti in un certo senso e io sono convinto di un'altra cosa e quindi se ne parlassimo da stasera a domattina secondo me io non cambierei idea  
B ch. F  
261. L [e si!  
A ch. F  
262. O [e va be' allora mi spiace ma il confronto di opinioni ci vuole  
B com. A  
263. L [e ma è questo  
F com. A  
264. P [si ci vuole  
B ch. F  
265. L [e ma allora è la tua opinione che va bene  
F dir. A  
266. P [e ma anche tu allora la tua opinione è quella che deve avere ragione?  
B opp. F  
267. L è lo stesso discorso  
A com. B  
268. O solo che se non c'è il confronto  
F ch. A  
269. P e no il confronto c'è (0.2) solo che si certe cose non si cambia idea anche se uno si confronta non si cambia idea ((la madre annuisce))  
A ch. F  
270. O non è vero perché magari non ha mai sentito l'opinione di un altro allora o quello che pensa lui-  
F opp. A  
271. P si può approfondire si può cercare di imparare qualcosaltro ma non-
A opp. F 272. O e appunto tu hai detto- 272. O and you just have said that-

F opp. A 273. P no non solo- 273. P no not only-

A dir. F 274. O e tu hai detto che è meglio sentire solo un parere 274. O and you said that it is better to listen to only one opinion

F opp. A 275. P no non solo (0.2) non ho mai detto quello (0.3) 275. P no (0.2) I never said that (0.3)

S ch. F 276. G abbiamo la registrazione (guardando Ombretta) 276. G we have the recording (looking at Ombretta)

[..] [ ..]

F p.u. 281. P be' poi ci sono dei (0.3) ogni argomento c'ha le sue motivazioni per svilupparle in un modo o in un altro (0.2) 281. P well then you have (0.3) you can develop a topic toward one or another direction (0.2)

282. O ( ) (a bassa voce)) 282. O ( ) (in a low voice)

283. P non mi sembra di rimandare sempre le decisioni come dicevi ((la madre sorride)) 283. P I don’t think I always postpone decisions ((the mother smiles))

A ch. F 284. O mmm sempre-spesso (0.3) 284. O uhm always-often (0.3)

F opp. A 285. P no questo non è vero 285. P no this is not true

A ch. F 286. O e cioè ti chiediamo qualcosa e se stiamo parlando tu cambi argomento 286. O and I mean we ask you something and you change the topic

F dir. A 287. P e ad esempio? 287. P and for example?

A dir. F 288. O alla sera per esempio anche quando siamo a tavola anche con la mamma ma non solo con me (0.2) spesso ((la madre sorride con imbarazzo)) 288. O in the evening for example when we are having dinner also with mom not only with me (0.2) often ((the mother smiles as embarrassed))

[..] [ ..]

292. I volevo sapere la mamma in queste discussioni dove sta? che cosa fa? (0.2) si butta nella mischia? (0.3) 292. I I’d like to know where is mom in these discussions? What does she do? (0.2) Do you get out? (0.3)

M p.u. 293. M e non so (0.2) dipende dalle volte (0.3) dall’atteggiamento 293. M I don’t know (0.2) it depends on the time (0.3) the attitude

F dir. M 294. P no tu stai di solito stai indietro stai zitta ((la madre ride)) 294. P no usually you stay on the side you are silent ((the mother laughs))

295. I manda avanti lei ((guardando il padre)) nelle questioni difficili? 295. I does she let you go further (looking at the father) for the difficult issues?

M com. F 296. M no non però può darsi che io anzi senz’altro io medio di più (0.2) ho un 296. M but it can be that actually for sure I mediate more (0.2) I’ve a character more
In this excerpt, the father’s evaluation about the dynamic of the family discussions is the starting point of a long sequence in which the father and Luca align using directives and challenges (258-266) for nine exchanges. The adolescent, Ombretta, participates in this first sequence, complying with her brother (268), but later, she leads the symmetrical interaction with the father until the end of the extract. The mother does not align verbally in the interaction rather she expresses compliance with the father by analog indicators in different parts of the sequence (269, 283, 288, 294). Only at the end of the sequence, when the interviewer inquires her directly, she expresses the agreement with her husband verbally.

These three excerpts are a fine illustration of the absence of family oscillations as each family member constantly aligns with the others maintaining the same positions.

Noticeably a “fight” for the control of the interaction is observable between one parent and the adolescent. Everyone positions him/herself above the other in a symmetrical escalation expressed both verbally and nonverbally. The stances taken by other family members are similarly relevant as they contribute to this interactional process: one parent sustains alternatively the other parent or the adolescent by positioning him/herself down. When siblings are also present this form of interaction becomes more complex: they can either participate in the symmetrical interaction by positioning themselves above the adolescent as one parent did (Liberi family), or by being compliant with him/her, thereby taking a down position (Pani family).

(b) The following results concern the form of sequential interactions that characterize the variation of the critical pattern. Different from the previous one, this form of interaction can be summarized as:

Both parents keep an up position toward the adolescent who maintains a symmetrical interaction with them in the first part of interaction, but at the end the adolescent switches
by positioning him/herself down. The main difference with previous form (a) is that the two parents stay together justifying or complying with each other.

Two families showed this form of sequential interactions: Carta and Donati.

In the two following excerpts observed in the Donati family this form of sequential interactions is effectively shown.

Consider the two extracts of the Donati family’s interview (Extract 4.4 and Extract 4.5) in which the adolescent Stefano is the only child.

Excerpt 4.4 – Donati family. P (father), M (mother), S (adolescent), I (interviewer)
Frame IV. Sensitive topic: Scooter (Ep.)

---

F p.u.  101. P  e io però sapendolo così responsabile e tutto dico il motorino è pericoloso lo accompagnavo a scuola una mattina vedo un ragazzino che scende dalla micro-car e va a scuola e io dico [al figlio] ti piacerebbe la macchinina? e lui dice (0.2) si va bene poi apprendo in questo momento (0.2) grazie di essere venuta qui da noi [all’intervistatrice] apprendo questa sera (0.3) che gli piacerebbe di più il motorino della micro-car [si gira verso il figlio e la madre lo segue con lo sguardo)]

---

102. I  ah quindi non era una cosa dibattuta?

103. P  lo apprendo questa sera!

---

A opp. F  104. S  no io l’ho chiesto più di una volta [non è stato solo una volta

F opp. A  105. P  [Stefano

M com. F  106. M  diciamo che non hai insistito più di tanto

F ch. A  107. P  ma fa niente! cioè io adesso posso dire una cosa in diretta? prendiamo in esame questo discorso del motorino io non ho mica nessun genere di problema ([alza le mani in segno di arresa])

---

101. P  and then I know he is very responsible for everything I still think the scooter is dangerous one morning I took him to school and I saw a guy who got off a micro-car and then he went to school and I asked him [his son] would you like that small car? And he said (0.2) ok then I realize right now (0.2) thank you [to the interviewer] for being here with us tonight (0.3) that he would rather prefer the scooter than the micro-car ([he looks at his son and the mother follows him with her gaze])

102. I  ah then wasn’t that stuff you’ve already debated?

103. P  I’ve realized it this evening!

104. S  no I asked that more than one time [it wasn’t only one time

105. P  [Stefano

106. M  let’s say that you didn’t insist too much

107. P  but nevermind! I mean now can I say something live? Let’s examine this issue about the scooter I don’t have any problems ([he raises his hands as to yield])
A com. F 108. S ( ) ((Stefano sussera qualcosa tenendo lo sguardo in basso)) 108. S ( ) ((Stefano whispers something keeping his gaze down))


A com. F 110. S niente-niente ((tiene lo sguardo in basso)) 110. S nothing-nothing ((he keeps his gaze down))

Excerpt 4.5 – Family Donati. P (father), M (mother), S (adolescent), I (interviewer)
Frame VIII. Sensitive topic: Physical distance (Ep.)

M p.u. 197. M c’è stata una sera in cui [il marito] era via e ho detto beh non vieni a letto con me [al figlio]? a letto con te? (0.3) e da quella sera lì è andato a letto nel suo letto cioè quella è stata una pugnalata
197. M one night he [her husband] was abroad and I told him [her son] well don’t you come into the bed with me? In the bed with you? (0.3) And from that night he went into his own bed and that was a big stab wound

198. I ma questo quando è successo? Stefano tu te e lo ricordi?
198. I but when did it happen that? Stefano did you remember that?

199. S cos’era la seconda elementare? ((guardando il padre))
199. S when was this? Second year of the elementary school? ((looking at his father))

F opp. A 200. P eh no
200. P well no

M com. F 201. M no è stato dopo
201. M no it was later

F com. M 202. P quinta o prima media
202. P fifth year of the elementary school or first year of the middle school

A opp. F 203. S oh no-no!
203. S oh no-no!

F opp. A 204. P si-si
204. P yes=yes

A opp. F 205. S no-no-no cosa dici!
205. S no-no-no what are you saying!

M dir. A 206. M quarta quinta come minimo
206. M fourth fifth at least

M com. F 207. S no-no
207. S no-no

F dir. A 208. P Stefano fermati! ((tocca il figlio)) siamo venuti ad abitare in questa casa nel 2005
208. P Stefano stop! ((the father touches his son)) we came to live here in this house in 2005

M com. F 209. M esatto
209. M exactly

A opp. M 210. S non ci venivo più ((fa segno di no col dito))
210. S I didn’t go there anymore ((the shakes his finger as to say no))
In the shorter sequence (Excerpt 4.4), the interactional exchange develops starting from the recall of an episode about purchasing a scooter for Stefano, the adolescent.

It is interesting to note how the adolescent’s moves from an up position to a down one in the alignment with his parents by nonverbal indicators. Indeed after an initial resistance to his father’s position (104) Stefano aligns with him at an asymmetrical level by both moving his gaze down on the table and lowering the tone of his voice (108). The father, on his side, firmly upholds a symmetrical position in the alignments with his son by overlapping (fracture) and using Stefano’ first name (105) as a way to get his attention.
The mother aligns with the father by completing his utterances as to reinforce his position (106) and, likewise she supports the directive of her husband toward Stefano with a questioning gaze (109).

Later (Excerpt 4.5), the mother mentions another sensitive topic concerning the sudden physical distance. This episode provokes a cascade of oppositions by the adolescent that are clearly detectable in the sequence of “no” he repeats throughout the talk. However, as in the previous excerpt, after a while he switches his positions and complies with his parents (223). Mother and father align by sustaining each other’s positions, and once more by expressing reciprocal agreement (201, 202, 209, 222); whereas they both maintain an up position in the alignment with Stefano.

In sum, also in this form of sequential interactions no family oscillations were observable as members interacted maintaining the same positions, which were also displayed by many fractures in coordination. However, differently from the previous form (a), the symmetrical exchanges involved both parents “allied against” the adolescent in this sort of competition between equals; the adolescent, in this case, held out the symmetrical interaction, but at the end he surrendered by agreeing with his parents.

4.2.1.2. The stormy pattern: alternating between up and down positions

As in the critical pattern, families that show a stormy pattern are characterized by fractures in coordination; however, family oscillations are observable as each family member alternates between taking up and down positions in the alignment with the other. Similar to the critical, in the stormy pattern two variations are indentified: form (a) and form (b). The form (a) of sequential interactions can be defined as:

All family members constantly change their reciprocal positions toward one another from up to down and from down to up positions.

This form of sequential interactions is observable in two families: Manini and Alpi.
Let us consider some extracts from the interview with the Manini family in which the alternating positions are evident in the alignments during the unfolding talk. In this family two children are present: Erica, the adolescent, and Stefania, her sister who is 17.

In the excerpt below (Excerpt 4.6), the father and Erica start their interaction by aligning at a symmetrical level as they reciprocally position up to the other, whereas the mother takes a down one nonverbally.

Excerpt 4.6 – Manini family. P (father), E (adolescent), I (interviewer)

Frame VII. Sensitive topic: Relationship between sisters

| F.p.a. | 111. P | (...) ripeto quello che facevano cinque anni fa lo fanno anche adesso non (0.3) ecco adesso non vedo questo grosso cambiamento ((la madre annuisce)) |
| F.p.a. | 111. P | (...) I repeat it what they are doing now is what they used to do also five years ago (0.3) I mean currently I don’t see big changes ((the mother nods)) |
| A dir. F | 112. E | a ballare ci andavo cinque anni fa?((guardando il padre)) |
| A dir. F | 112. E | did I use to go to dance five years ago? ((looking at her father)) |
| F ch. A | 113. P | e va be' quando ci vai? due volte su- |
| F ch. A | 113. P | ok but how many times do you go there? Two times out of- |
| A opp. F | 114. E | e va be' comunque ( ) |
| A opp. F | 114. E | but in any case ( ) |

In this short sequence an interesting snapshot of family interactions is observable: the father minimizes the changes of his daughters and the mother nods, expressing compliance with him. Erica promptly intervenes with a directive addressed to him as, in a rhetorical way, to deny the way her parents positioned her (112). The father once more does not acknowledge this change and he challenges the adolescent, but Erica resists to this definition. At a first look, this form of interaction does not differ from the ones of the critical pattern, but if we pay attention to the display of the stancetaking process in the next extracts, family oscillations will clearly emerge.

For instance, in the next excerpt (Excerpt 4.7, taken from the subsequent frame of Excerpt 4.6) the positions of the father and the adolescent are reversed. Differently from above, both of them comply, in particular, at the end of the sequence. In this case a family oscillation is observable in that the parent and the adolescent have changed their positions from one frame to the other (inter-frame oscillations). In the extract below it is also displayed a family oscillation between the sisters (intra-frame oscillations).
In the initial part of the excerpt, Erica and her sister agree that discussions with their grandparents are complicated. Gradually the tone of the talk increases as highlighted by the sequence of overlaps that indicates fractures in coordination. Afterwards, the sisters switch their positions: they now align through directives and oppositions (286-289) for a while. At the end of the extract, the father intervenes in agreement with the adolescent who reciprocates (290-292).

Excerpt 4.7 – Manini family. P (father), M (mother), E (adolescent), S (sister), I (interviewer)
Frame VIII. Sensitive topic: Discussions between sisters

In the initial part of the excerpt, Erica and her sister agree that discussions with their grandparents are complicated. Gradually the tone of the talk increases as highlighted by the sequence of overlaps that indicates fractures in coordination. Afterwards, the sisters switch their positions: they now align through directives and oppositions (286-289) for a while. At the end of the extract, the father intervenes in agreement with the adolescent who reciprocates (290-292).
In the next excerpt (Excerpt 4.8) the alternation of all family members’ positions is observable. Here the mother provokes a sequence of exchanges about decision-making in the family.

Excerpt 4.8 – Manini family. P (father), M (mother), E (adolescent), S (sister), I (interviewer)
Frame IX. Sensitive topic: Disco and value of money

M.p.a. 350. M no ma lei non conosce Mario [suo marito] per cui lui è una persona che non farebbe mai nulla e per questo le ragazze dicono che poi decide sempre la mamma (…) io che sono probabilmente ho un carattere un po’ più forte sotto questi punti di vista (0.2) spesso e volentieri l’ho dovuto mettere davanti al fatto compiuto (…)

[–] [–]

F ch. M 355. P però io sarò troppo da una parte e tu sei troppo dall’altra (((la madre fa un ghigno abbassa lo sguardo e scuote la testa)))

A ch. F 356. E nella stessa famiglia e completamente diversi! (0.3)

F just 357. P io di solito non d’accordo perché al sabato sera prima vanno a bere l’aperitivo poi a mangiare la pizza e poi al cinema

358. I ma questo per un discorso di suo principio?

359. P si di principio e anche economico eh perché noi non navighiamo nell’oro

S opp. F 360. S e ma non e’ solo economico perché’ il discorso che mi hai fatto adesso sulle vacanze

360. S but it is not only an economical issue because the reasons you gave me for the holidays

F dir. S 361. P e ma ti ho mai detto di no una volta?

361. P but have I ever said no to you one time?

S com. F 362. S tu in principio mi dici no poi è chiaro che se poi ci tengo ((il padre annuisce))

362. S at the beginning you say no then it is clear that if I care ((the father nods))

[–] [–]

F p.u. 397. P (…) penso che si meritino la mia fiducia per tutte le altre problematiche che ci potrebbero essere

397. P (…) I think they deserve trust for any other possible issues
The father refuses the way that his wife has positioned him as he replicates by launching a challenge addressed to her. She does not reply verbally rather she expresses her dissent through the gaze and the posture (355). Interestingly, after this exchange between the parents, the adolescent expresses a comment that conveys a challenge addressed to the father (356). Here, the father switches his positions as to justify himself in response to Erica (357). Similarly, the sister, at first, opposes to her father, but then changes her position by agreeing with him (360). The mother as well, at the end of the interactional sequence, modifies her position as she now agrees with the father by nodding (400).

This last excerpt is an effective example of the how an oscillatory sequence displays in the stancetaking process among family members. Each member changes his/her positions, sometimes positioning up to the others, and some other times down. Afterwards, either in the same or among frames, they swap the way they have aligned with each other.

Consider also the following parts of the interview with the Alpi family, which like the Maninis, has two children present: the adolescent Giovanni and his older brother, Cristiano (20 years old). In the following excerpts (Excerpt 4.9 and Excerpt 4.10) family oscillations emerge in the interactional sequence among the father, adolescent, and brother.
Excerpt 4.9 – Alpi family. P (father), G (adolescent), C (brother)
Frame II. Sensitive topic: Discussion between brothers

B p.u. 40. C recentemente ((guardando il fratello)) è successo qualcosa che non accadeva più o meno da quando ci lanciavamo i castelli del lego da quando ci siamo detti un po’ qualcosa però’ boh neanche tanto lo e lui andiamo molto d’accordo

F opp. B 41. P [avete litigato ((guardando Cristiano))] 41. P [you had a fight ((looking at Cristiano))]

A opp. F 42. G abbiamo discusso 42. G [we discussed]

B com. A 43. C abbiamo discusso in maniera accesa ((guardando il padre)) però sì no rispetto ad altri andiamo molto d’accordo

A com. B 44. G non mi ricordo di avere mai litigato davvero con lui 44. G I don’t remember to have ever had a real fight with him

Excerpt 4.10 – Alpi family. P (father), G (adolescent), C (brother), I (interviewer)
Frame II. Sensitive topic: Adolescent’s organization

F p.u. 66. P diciamo che lo riteniamo abbastanza grande ((guardando Giovanni)) da potersi organizzare determinate cose che soprattutto quelle che riguardano che riguardano lui (...) in questo c’è sempre un po’ ma lo fa la mamma ((guardando la moglie)) ma lo faccio io ma l’ha fatto non l’ha fatto e si arriva all’ultimo minuto finchè poi si arriva allo scontro

I 67. è così Giovanni? Non ti sai organizzare?

A ch. M, F 68. G ma secondo me si solo che secondo loro faccio troppo tardi oppure quando devo andare cioè andare a scuola parto sempre all’ultimo minuto ((guardando la madre)) tutti strippano credendo che io arriverò in ritardo invece-

B dir. A 69. C effettivamente arrivi in ritardo arrivi dopo ((guardando il fratello)) 69. C actually you are late you arrive late ((looking at his brother))

A ch. B 70. G l’importante è quello! ((ridendo)) 70. G that’s important! ((laughing))
In the first extract (Excerpt 4.9), the father and the adolescent are involved in a symmetrical interaction segmented by fractures: they oppose and overlap to each other (41-42). The brother complies with Giovanni, who reciprocates by agreeing with him; however, later on in the same frame (Excerpt 4.10), the brothers swap their positions as they now address directives and challenges to each other (69-70).

In the next sequences, the alternations of mother and father’s positions are also observable. In the extract below (Excerpt 4.11), for instance, the father’s evaluation about Giovanni’s increased maturity provokes a series of exchanges in which the parents constantly alternate oppositions to compliances, thereby showing oscillations.
Excerpt 4.11 – Alpi family. P (father), M (mother), G (adolescent), I (interviewer)

Frame II. Sensitive topic: Adolescent’s organization

F p.u. 86. P diciamo che come dico spesso Giovanni è uno che parla piano ma va in giro armato nel senso che normalmente tranquillo silenzioso calmo rilassato fa le sue cose poi però quando deve imporre il suo desiderio non dico che alza la voce ma lo fa (guardando Giovanni) e questo è chiaramente negli ultimi tempi di più con più coerenza in fondo motivando anche i suoi perché per quel che riguarda nei miei confronti sì ((guardando la moglie))

86. P let’s say that as I always say Giovanni is a guy who is mainly silent but he is well equipped in the sense that he is usually quiet relaxed and he does his stuff but when he desires something and he wants it he takes it (looking at Giovanni) and this is clearer recently as he does that with more coherence and he provides arguments for that he does so towards me yes (looking at his wife))

M opp. F 87. M è sempre stato ((la madre scuote la testa))

87. M he’s always been like that ((the mother shakes her head))

F com. M 88. P è sempre stato si d’accordo

88. P yes right he’s always been like that

M com. F 89. M è sempre stato molto tranquillo ma quando non voleva una cosa si non lo fa e non c’è nessuna possibilità di fargli cambiare idea uno potrebbe picchiarlo a sangue ma non cambia idea

89. M he’s always been very quiet but when he didn’t want to do something he didn’t do that and you cannot make him to change his mind even if you beat him

F opp. M 90. P ok però quello che voglio dire-

90. P ok but what I wanted to say-

M opp. F 91. M l’ha sempre fatto

91. M he always did that

F opp. M 92. P quando era piccolo lo faceva a livello istintivo cioè c’era un sì o un no e una contrapposizione adesso argomenta di più il perché della contrapposizione questo è quello che voglio dire (guardando la moglie in maniera continua)

92. P when he was a child he did that in a more instinctive way I mean he only used to say yes or no like a contrast but now he argues more the oppositions I meant this (staring continuously at his wife)

A com. F 93. G e poi i maggiori conflitti sono appunto quello chiamo questo chiamo quell’altro muoviti così e io comunque chiamo solo che non cambia niente se chiamo alle 2:30 o se chiamo alle 3:00 (guardando i genitori)

93. G and then most of the conflicts are about giving a phone call to one or about hurrying up and so on then if I call but at the end it doesn’t change anything if I call at 2:30 instead of 3:00 (looking at his parents)

M ch. A 94. M dopo ti dimentichi e io devo sempre dire ti sei ricordato? (guardando Giovanni) lo ho migliaia di biglietti nella mia agenda che uso per lavoro ritira Giovanni ha telefonato ha fatto quindi se tu lo facessi subito avremmo già risolto tutto li

94. M then you forget and I’ve always to tell you did you remember to do that? (looking at Giovanni) I’ve thousands of notes in my agenda and I use them when I work or to remember to go and pick up Giovanni and so on then if you do that immediately everything will
The adolescent intervenes in this interactional sequence between the parents by sustaining his father’s position (93). Interestingly, the mother replies launching a challenge to Giovanni (94) who does not respond, but instead it is the father who takes advantage to oppose to the mother once more (95).

Afterwards in the interview (Excerpt 4.12), all family members switch their positions another time.
Excerpt 4.12 – Alpi family. P (father), M (mother), G (adolescent), C (brother), I (interviewer)
Frame XI. Sensitive topics: Discussions for transportation

M p.u. 312. M dopo un po’ ho capito che per lui era un problema del tipo se tu non mi dai l’abbonamento dell’autobus tu credi troppo piccolo e non sono idoneo quando ho capito questo ho preso l’abbonamento dell’autobus ma lui andava a calcio da solo tornava da solo a calcio e aveva bisogno dell’abbonamento ma non è mai andato a scuola da solo in autobus e anche per le cose sportive non insomma in teoria non aveva bisogno però quando ho capito che era un problema-
((guardando Giovanni))

A opp. M 313. G non è vero che non ne avevo bisogno perché spesso lo uso e dato che-
((guardando la madre))

M opp. A 314. M allora non lo usavi era inutile però

A opp. M 315. G qualche volta

M just 316. M qualche volta potevi prendere quello del fratello sì da quando ho capito che era un problema che tu lo vivevi come lo credo tu sei piccolo te l’ho preso
((guardando Giovanni))

[..]

A p.u. 339. G a volte è più comodo l’autobus della bici quando devo andar lontano o quando piove o quando c’è brutto tempo o quando

B dir. A 340. C si però obiettivamente quando l’hai preso?

M com. B 341. M si possono contare su una mano

B com. M 342. C all’inizio adesso lo usi sicuramente di più ma quando l’hai preso ci sei andato due volte

M com. B 343. M sì

A just. 344. G o quando vado (0.2) va beh

M com. A 345. M sì-sì va bene

A just 346. G quando piove non vado in bici ’perche’ sai

312. M after a while I understood that it was a problem for him not to have the bus pass because you are considered as a child and when I realized this I bought him the bus pass as he needed it to go back and forth from the soccer coaching but he never went to school alone nor to school by bus before so he didn’t need it but when I understood it was a problem-
((looking at Giovanni))

313. G it’s not true I didn’t need it because I often use it considering-
((looking at his mother))

314. M at that time you didn’t use it it was useless though

315. G some times

316. M some times you should have taken your brother’s pass but when I understood that for you it was a problem as you were considered as a child I bought it to you
((looking at Giovanni))

[..]

339. G some times the bus is more comfortable than the bike when I’ve o go far or when it is raining or when the weather is bad

340. C but frankly when did you take it?

341. M you can count it on your fingers

342. C you use it more frequently for sure but at the beginning you brought it only two times

343. M yes

344. G or when I go (0.2) nevermind

345. M yes= yes it’s ok

346. G when it is raining I don’t take the bike ’cause you know
In this last sequence further family oscillations are observable. The mother and adolescent align through a series of oppositions, but after a while they switch their positions: the mother gives a justification of her behavior (316) the adolescent does the same (344, 346) and, at the end, it seems they have reached an agreement, sustained by the father as well (347).

It is clear, once more, how the oscillatory process is observable through the constant alternation of up and down positions. In the stormy pattern, family members align by continuously accepting and resisting to the reciprocal definitions and evaluations, thereby allowing each other to exchange his/her own positions. Furthermore, indicators of fractures are evident in different parts of the excerpts, particularly interruptions and overlaps.

The second form (b) of sequential interactions of the stormy pattern was observed in three families (Rossetti, Toscani, and Zurlini). The description of this form of interactions is not presented here, as the peculiarities we observed did not allow a confrontation with the other forms. In these families, the adolescent maintains a peripheral position throughout the talk, as the attention of family members is focused on the firstborn child. Interestingly, in all these families the firstborn is a daughter who is 17, and the adolescent is her brother who is 14. The whole interview was then “displaced” on the firstborn rather than on the adolescent, with the family members showing oscillations on sensitive topics in which the firstborn served as protagonist. In addition, they alternated synchrony and fractures in coordination during the talk.

For these reasons, the research team and I decided to define this form of sequential interactions as a variation of the stormy pattern. However, considering these aspects and the fact that the adolescent’s stance was not clearly detachable because of the displacement on the firstborn child, we decided not to consider this pattern in the analysis. Rather, we suggest that this should be an interesting path for further analysis.
Family oscillations could also be identified in family patterns of interaction in which family members coordinate with a great level of synchrony. This is the case of the drifting pattern described in the following paragraph.

4.2.1.3. The drifting pattern: negotiating by taking different positions

The form of sequential interactions that defines this pattern is intriguing.

Differently from the stormy pattern, sequences of compliances and Justifications were observed in different parts of the excerpts, and they were alternated mainly with oppositions. Thus, family oscillations were displayed as family members changed their positions during the talk. Nevertheless, no fractures were present and family members did not interrupt each other and even when overlapping they were intended to complete the previous speaker’s utterance. Furthermore, nonverbal indicators stress the display of synchrony throughout the interactions.

This form of sequential interaction can then be summed up as:

Adolescent and parents (and siblings when present) align by negotiating the reciprocal positions. Family members switch between accepting most of the times the definitions given by the others that can be legitimated (justifications), and resisting sometimes to them (oppositions).

The Carini, Giuliani, and Zanotti families showed this form of sequential interactions.

In the Zanotti family, the display of synchrony is clearly observable in the gaze contact, the smiles, and the laughs when family members align with each other (Excerpt 4.13). The adolescent’s name is Andrea and he is an only child.

Excerpt 4.13 – Zanotti family. P (father), M (mother), A (adolescent), I (interviewer)
Frame V: Sensitive topic: Relationship between mother and son.

M p.u. 203. M e’ sempre stato un rapporto tra me e lui [l’adolescente] perch’è comunque lui forse e’ arrivato piu’ tardi perch’è arrivato che (0.2) noi eravamo belli

F com. M 204. P non lo volevamo–non lo

204. P we didn’t want him–we
volevamo più’ (\{guardando Andrea\})
didn’t want him any more
\{\{laughing and looking at Andrea\}\}

M com. F 205. M eh (\{guardando Andrea\}) pensavamo di non averlo
well (\{laughing and looking at Andrea\}) we thought we were not able to have him

F com. M 206. P ci eravamo messi (\{guardando la moglie\})
we were like (\{looking at his wife\})

M com. F 207. M l’anima in pace e poi e’ arrivato (0.2) per cui il nostro rapporto era e’ sempre stato basato sulla fiducia per cui quando è lui arrivato non è che ha sconvolto il nostro modo di rapportarci il rapporto che avevamo con lui era uguale a quello che (\{si gira verso il marito che annuisce\}) era un po’ alla pari ecco non so se è un bene o un male
we were about to give up and then he came (0.2) thus our relationship has always been based on trust I mean when he arrived it didn’t change the way we used to related to each other the relationship we had with him was the same ((she turns towards her husband who nods)) it was as among equals I don’t know if it was good or bad

F opp. M 208. P ma per me è stato un po’ un male perché forse ci riconosce poco come genitori e forse più come amici (\{guardando la moglie\})
but for me it was a bit bad because maybe he doesn’t see us as parents but rather as friends ((laughing and looking at his wife))

209. I ah si? avete questa sensazione? Cosa dici tu Andrea è così?
I really? do you have this feeling? What do you think Andrea is it like that?

A opp. F 210. A ma insomma (no) no dai ((\{a bassa voce\}\})
well maybe no come on ((in a low voice))

M opp. A 211. M si ogni tanto ti dimentichi che [sono tua mamma]
yes sometimes you forget I’m your mother [I’m your mother

A opp. M 212. A [\{dipende\}]
[it depends]

M opp. A 213. M [\{ma da quello che dici (0.2) guarda che io sono la tua mamma\}]
[\{but considering what you say (0.2) look I’m your mom

A opp. M 214. A ma dipende dalla situazione è dai (\{guardando la madre\})
but it depends on the situation come on ((laughing and looking at his mother))

M opp. A 215. M e non si può dire proprio così alla mamma sono la mamma (\{ridendo\})
and you shouldn’t tell any stuff to your mom (\{laughing\})

A opp. M 216. A ma no dai (\{ridendo\})
but no come on (\{laughing\})

A just 217. A [\{\}] and I tell him well you forget you are talking to your mom and he says yes it’s ok (\{laughing\})
A opp. M 218. A e io dico ma ti stai dimenticando che stai parlando con la mamma e lui si faine (\{ridendo\})

A just 219. A e ma per quello che dico per raccontargli non e’ che ( }
but for what I tell her is not so ( )
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In the first exchanges, the mother and father comply with a great deal of synchrony. Even later, when the father switches his position and opposes to her (208), he smiles to lighten the tone of opposition. Likewise, in the symmetrical exchanges between the mother and the adolescent (212-218) disagreement is expressed by smiling, laughing, and decreasing the tone of the voice. Furthermore, verbal forms that downgrade dissent in the Italian language, such as “ma insomma”, “dipende,” and “no dai,” were also used.

Family oscillations are observable in the sequence of alignments, as the adolescent after resisting through a series of oppositions to her mother’s positions at the end of the extract (219) justifies. In this sense, he accepts the definition given by his mother but he also legitimates it, in fact, instead of being compliant he “defends” his position by giving the reasons for his behavior.

In the excerpt below (Excerpt 4.14), the mother and father also reverse their positions.

Excerpt 4.14 – Zanotti family. P (father), M (mother), A (adolescent), I (interviewer)
Frame V: Sensitive topic: Relationship between mother and son.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F p.u.</th>
<th>234. P</th>
<th>ma noi non controlliamo mai niente ((ridendo e muovendosi sulla sedia))</th>
<th>234. P</th>
<th>but we never control anything ((laughing and moving on his chair))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M opp. F</td>
<td>235. M</td>
<td>insomma ((ridendo))</td>
<td>235. M</td>
<td>so-so ((laughing))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A com. M</td>
<td>236. A</td>
<td>si va be’ ((si sovrappongono tutti e tre) (0.2) non dico che non ci sia niente di controllato</td>
<td>236. A</td>
<td>well I mean ((the there of them overlapping)) (0.2) I don’t think they never control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F just</td>
<td>237. P</td>
<td>magari le altre famiglie ( ) [sono più]</td>
<td>237. P</td>
<td>maybe other families ( ) [are more]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A just</td>
<td>238. A</td>
<td>[diciamo che si interessano di quello che faccio e così però non è che mi controllano</td>
<td>238. A</td>
<td>[let’s say that they care for what I do but they don’t control me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[…]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[…]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M opp. A</td>
<td>246. M</td>
<td>no be’ (0.2) un minimo si controllo magari lo facciamo ((padre con l’indice indica no)) però</td>
<td>246. M</td>
<td>no actually (0.2) we control a bit ((the father shakes his finger as to says no)) but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>247. I</td>
<td>perché magari aumentano [le anse]</td>
<td>247. I</td>
<td>because maybe worries [increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>248. M</td>
<td>[perché dobbiamo essereonesti</td>
<td>248. M</td>
<td>[because we have to be honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F com. M</td>
<td>249. P</td>
<td>no perché può essere che succeda (_) be’ certo bisogna essere onesti perché può sempre essere che succeda</td>
<td>249. P</td>
<td>no because it can happen (_) well of course we have to be honest because it can always happen something as violence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
qualcosa e oramai la violenza c'è dappertutto per cui i casi succedono anche qui a L. anche se e' una cittadina che e' un po' cosi' abbastanza tranquilla

M com. F 250. M pero' per esempio quando e' capitato [che

F com. M 251. P [si noi consigliamo di stare con il gruppo che si conosce

M com. F 252. M si con il gruppo

In this sequence, parents start the interaction by opposing to each other, while toward the end they converge by expressing mutual compliance. It is interesting to note how overlapping interactions, as evident in the previous excerpt, can be intended as an expression of synchrony and, more precisely, as a way to specify the interlocutor’s position by completing his/her utterances.

In the next excerpt (Excerpt 4.15), for instance, the development of a sequence of overlaps between the father and the adolescent is clearly observable, as they oscillate by alternating compliances to oppositions while they align.

The following extract concerns the interview with the Giuliani family in which the adolescent Daniele is the only child.

Excerpt 4.15 – Giuliani family. P (father), M (mother), D (adolescent), I (interviewer)
Frame V. Sensitive topic: Scooter and disco

F p.u. 182. P (...) capisco il discorso su discoteca motorino eccetera però anche su queste non è che ci siano dei casi per cui c’è il caso motorino o il caso discoteca cioè è chiaro che c’è quando lui ci ha detto i miei amici questo sabato vanno in discoteca e ci vorrei andare anche io

183. I a chi l’ha chiesto a tutti e due oppure prima la mamma e poi il papa? (0.2) di solito a chi le fai queste richieste?

184. D ma di solito a tutt’e due (guardando il padre)

F opp. A 185. P [a tutt’e due però

186. I usually who do you ask to? To both of them or first to mom and then to dad? (0.2)

187. D well usually to both of them (looking at his father)

188. P [to both of us though
A com. F
186. D [se no altrimenti alla mamma
186. D [otherwise only to mom

187. P no ma diciamo (0.2) [che è
187. P no but let’s say
(0.2) [that ((looking at
his wife))

A ch. F
188. D [sì di solito la mamma è più
188. D [yes usually mom is nicer
buona perché lui ((ridendo))

F opp. A
189. P ma no di [solito
189. P no but [usually

190. I [o fa un po’ il rompiscatole
190. I [or is he a bit a pain as
come dice lui? ((guardando il
padre))

A ch. F
191. D no perché se lo becco nella
giornata no ((ridendo e
guardando il padre))

192. I la mamma è sempre la via
192. I mom is always the best
preferenziale

193. D si anche quand’è la giornata
193. D yes also when she has an
no (0.2)

194. I può andare
194. I it’s ok

M com. A
195. M sì può andare bene (0.2)
195. M yes it can be ok (0.2)

F just.
196. P no però stavo dicendo che cioè
196. P no but I was about to say
non è che ci sia un caso
discoteca un caso motorino che
diciamo così abbia come dire
l’attenzione per

197. I sì abbia causato cose che
197. I yes they didn’t cause any

198. P ma no lui mi ha fatto un
198. P no but he told me a very
ragionamento semplice visto
che c’era da venire poi a casa
molto tardi poi essendo
anche molto più giovane
rispetto ai suoi gli si è
spiegato che per questa volta
lui era meglio che stesse a
casa

199. I ma più giovane per una ragione
199. I but you mean younger
anagrafica?

200. P sì-sì perché lui è di dicembre
200. P yes=yes because he is born
per cui è come se lui avesse
avesse un anno in meno

M com. F
201. M [si
201. M [yes

F com. M
202. P [poi i suoi amici ci sono
202. P [then his friends went
andati quelli che si vengono
anche qui da noi per cui gli
hanno raccontato eccetera cosa
che per noi comunque non è che
voglio dire però che sia un
tabù [la discoteca] certamente
cioè lui ci andrà (…)

[-]

204. I insomma non c’è stata (0.2)
204. I finally you didn’t have to
(0.2)
In this sequence, a family oscillation displays by overlaps between the father and the adolescent and in a relaxed emotional climate (smiles and laugh). The short utterances that shape their positions can then be considered a chain of specifications on the sensitive topic they are discussing, rather than as sudden interruptions as observed in the stormy pattern. Interestingly, as in the Zanotti family, few challenges (188-191) are expressed through nonverbal forms that mitigate the effect of this position.

Furthermore, father’s justification (196, 198) is noticeable after that the adolescent positioned above him by addressing a challenge. In these short exchanges (191-198), it is clear how the father legitimates the way his son defined him by providing specific arguments.

Negotiation is then the aspect that characterizes the form of sequential interactions of the drifring pattern. This term is intended here to underline a way in which family oscillations are displayed in a context of synchrony in coordination. As I showed in the extracts above, family members exchanged their positions by accepting (compliances) or resisting (oppositions) to the definitions given by the others. However, they overall acknowledged and further elaborated those definitions as a way to reach agreements through the expression of different positions.

4.2.1.4. The quiet pattern: keeping homeostatic positions

The last form of sequential interactions, observed in the data, defines the quiet pattern and it is the one identified in majority of the families: Benedetti, Follini, Grandi, Poggiali, Righi, and Sassi.

In this form of sequential interactions, family members do not show family oscillations, and they are synchronized in coordination. The lack of family oscillations is observable in that each family member upholds stable positions during all the talk;
moreover, the alignments are displayed only through compliances and justifications. Thus, this form of interaction is defined as *homeostatic* and in this sense, it can be summarized as it follows:

*All family members align one with the other by always accepting the reciprocal definitions, thereby expressing their positions by being compliant and giving justifications.*

Interestingly, two families (Righi and Benedetti) in which the adolescent child is the firstborn showed this pattern. In the excerpt below (Excerpt 4.16), about the Righi family, the father’s statement about the adolescent’s weekly tip triggers a long sequence of alignments in which all family members participate by converging on the same positions.

In the Righi family four children are present: Alberto, the adolescent, Bartolomeo (13), Ramona (12) and Andrea (6).

Excerpt 4.16 – Righi family. P (father), M (mother), A (adolescent), R (sister), B (brother), I (interviewer)

Frame VIII. Sensitive topic: Request to increase the weekly tip

F.p.u. 286. P ma anche per il discorso della paghetta no che dicevamo prima poi nell'ultimo anno è lui [l’adolescente] quello che ha più richiesto ma anche giustamente (...) abbiamo detto questo è il budget settimanale che ti consente di fare le tue cose se spendi di più non ne hai se spendi meno li spendi dopo

286. P but also for the issue of the weekly tip as we mentioned before in the last year he [the adolescent] advanced more requests but it is also right (...) we decided to give him weekly budget which allows him to do his stuff and if he spends more than that he can’t have more money if he saves it he can spend the money also later

M com. F 287. M si ti gestisci

287. M yes you have to manage it

F com. M 288. P magari è più una cosa di gestione che magari all’inizio non gli piaceva neanche tanto (guardando Alberto e sorridendo)

288. P it is more the issue to manage the money and maybe at the beginning he didn’t like it (looking at Alberto and laughing)

289. I perché? com’era? (guardando Alberto)

289. I why? How was that issue? (looking at Alberto)

A com. F 290. A cioè che era più scomoda cioè prima avevo tipo la paghetta era cinque euro adesso tipo è aumentata a venticinque però mentre

290. A well at the beginning it was a bit uncomfortable I mean before I used to have five Euros as tip and now it is increased to twenty-five but
prima non li usavo neanche
cioè certi mesi non li usavo mai adesso invece certe volte faccio fatica

291. I cioè aumentano le esigenze
291. I do you mean you have more needs?

292. A sì
292. A yes

S com. A 293. R e anche per il motorino si spende molto ((guardando Alberto))
293. R and also for the scooter he spends a lot ((looking at Alberto))

294. I certo
294. I right

A com. S 295. A se una volta devo fare benzina e poi devo andare a R. li uso già tutti
295. A if I've to get gas and then I've to go to R. I finish all of it

296. I e certo (0.2) però sai che la cifra è quella e non è modificabile? diciamo per ora poi (0.2)
296. I right (0.2) but you know that the amount is that and you can't change it for now right? (0.2)

297. A non è modificabile ((guardando la madre e sorridendo))
297. A no it can't be changed ((looking at his mother and laughing))

F just 298. P non è modificabile no adesso c'è l'inflazione ((la madre ride)) cioè se una sera devi andare a mangiare una pizza e non hai i soldi non ci vai e come no? ((ridendo))
298. P it can't be changed as now we have inflation ((the mother laughs)) I mean if one night you wanna go out for a pizza and you don't have the money you don't go there right? ((laughing))

299. I e questa cosa come l'avete decisa no stabilire una cifra che è anche poi una regola no? Non so l'avete deciso?
299. I and how did you decide this amount? is it a rule right? Did you both decide it?

M com F 300. M sì-sì
300. M yes=yes

F com M 301. P si l'abbiamo decisa insieme e l'abbiamo maturata anche vedendo come si muoveva l'entità delle sue spese ma da questa estate in avanti perché prima in realtà non c'era ((i due fratelli maggiori parlano sottovoce))
301. P we decided that together and we came up with this considering also his expenses but we decided this this summer as before he actually didn't need it ((the two older brothers speak in a low voice))

302. I non c'era l'esigenza
302. I he didn't need it

303. P si un po' com'è adesso per Bartolomeo non è che la paghetta adesso gli serva più di tanto
303. P yes as for Bartolomeo now he doesn't need so much money

M com. F 304. M sì-sì
304. M yes=yes

B com. M 305. B si per uscire a prenderci un gelato
305. B yes to go out and buy an ice cream

M com. B 306. M o andare al cinema
306. M or to go to the movie theatre

F just 307. P si è più un fattore simbolico che altro anche li per non dire mamma dammi i
In the whole sequence, it is clear how the family members, including the siblings (293, 305), constantly justify and comply with one another, thus maintaining the same positions. The repetition of “si” at the beginning of the utterances, and the completion of the interlocutor’s position by adding details (287-288; 304-307) are other indicators of agreement and synchrony in coordination. As for the drifting pattern, nonverbal aspects of synchrony, such as smiling and looking for the gaze contact, are also observable.

In this sequence, and as in other parts of the interview not reported here, it is interesting and contrary to expectations that families with four children can align, maintaining positions of agreements and acceptance of the mutual definitions in a context of synchrony for long sequences. In line with this, consider also the next extract (Excerpt 4.17) of the Benedetti family that has a composition closer to the Righis.

Teresa is the adolescent and she has three siblings: Elisa (13), Mara (11) and Giulio (6). The youngest child’s statement provokes a long sequence of alignments.

Excerpt 4.17 – Benedetti family. P (father), M (mother), T (adolescent), E (sister), G (brother), Ma (sister), I (interviewer)

Frame VI. Sensitive topic: Conflicts between parents and adolescent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B p.u.</th>
<th>127. G</th>
<th>d’estate loro due ((indica le due sorelle maggiori))</th>
<th>127. G</th>
<th>during the Summer they fight ((points at his older sisters)) for the clothes ((points at his mother))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S com. B</td>
<td>128. I</td>
<td>i vestiti</td>
<td>128. I</td>
<td>the clothes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129. E</td>
<td>perché magari lei lascia ((guardando Teresa))</td>
<td>129. E</td>
<td>because she does ((looking at Teresa))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130. I</td>
<td>in disordine</td>
<td>130. I</td>
<td>a mess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131. E</td>
<td>in disordine</td>
<td>131. E</td>
<td>a mess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132. T</td>
<td>( ) ((sorriso e annuisce))</td>
<td>132. T</td>
<td>( ) ((laughs and nods))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133. I</td>
<td>( ) questo è un classico</td>
<td>133. I</td>
<td>( ) this is very common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134. E</td>
<td>lei ((guardando Teresa))</td>
<td>134. E</td>
<td>she ((looking at Teresa)) leaves her closet in a mess and when mom opens it she gets a bit angry ((Mara looks at her sister Elisa nodding))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lascia l’armadio disordinato e quando la mamma lo apre si arrabbia un po’ ((Mara guarda la sorella Elisa annuendo))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
135. M un po’ si ((sorridendo))

136. E e lei dice che non ha il tempo di metterlo a posto però dopo

137. I queste cose qua? ((guardando Teresa))

138. T si questo sempre

139. I cioè è sempre stato un po’ il tuo modo di essere?

140. T ultimamente sto peggiorando ((sorridendo e guardando la madre che annuisce))

141. M e anche sulla disorganizzazione se posso

142. I si-si dica pure

143. M lei assolutamente è disorganizzata cioè insomma su alcune cose ovviamente è organizzata però è sempre un po’ in attesa dell’ultimo secondo (...) ((Teresa sorride e abbassa lo sguardo))

144. I è un po’ l’argomento delle discussioni

145. M si

146. P l’uso del tempo non esattamente adeguato alle situazioni

147. I ma tipo non so nella scuola?

148. M beh un po’ in tutto

149. P ma in generale il fatto di aspettare l’ultimo momento facciamo (...) però avendo il tempo a disposizione magari se uno si organizzasse un attimo ((guardando Teresa))

150. M poi mettersi avanti mettersi a posto lo studio perché comunque nello studio se c’è ordine magari studia meglio e io non sono una precisa però insomma

151. P confermo ((la madre sorride))

152. [-]

153. P si uno deve pagare di tasca propria le proprie inadeguatezze

154. I ma questo un po’ sempre sei stato così cioè sei d’accordo intanto

155. P sì uno deve pagare di tasca propria le proprie inadeguatezze

156. I ma questo un po’ sempre sei stato così cioè sei d’accordo intanto

157. P I confirm it ((the mother laughs))

158. [-]

159. P yes you have to pay on your own your inadequacies

160. I but have you always been like that? I mean do you agree with that?
In the first part of the excerpt, the two younger sisters agree with their brother’s statement: Elisa specifies her position verbally, while Mara complies by nodding at her (134). The mother is also involved in this alignment, at the beginning, by simply complying with Elisa (135). However, later the mother “amplifies” her position by adding more elements (141-143) that trigger a new cascade of alignments on the same sensitive topic in which also the father takes part. As for the adolescent, Teresa, she accepts the definition given by other family members mainly through justifications (140, 169) by which she provides more details about her position.

The use of justifications is also evident in the last excerpt (Excerpt 4.18). Here, not only Carlo, the adolescent, aligns with the other family members through justifications, but also the parents give specific explanations by which they “defend” their own positions. In the Grandi family also a younger child is present, Jacopo who is 11.
M 199. M perché io ritengo che non sia ancora in età e neanche che ci siano delle cose che in questo momento possano interessargli visto che si beve si fuma queste cose qua e non è motivato ((guardando il marito))

F 200. P anche perché comunque non potrebbero entrare al di là di tutto fino a 16 anni

M 204. M si ne abbiamo parlato lui ((guardando il marito)) sarebbe stato anche propenso a dire si va bene anche se va a fare un giro lo dico non mi pare che sia necessario ancora adesso più avanti avrà delle conquiste che pian pianino farà più avanti quindi

A 206. C no va bah comunque avevo degli amici della compagnia che si fermavano lì mi è un po’ dispiaciuto comunque però

C 208. C ho provato a chiedere qualche volta in più però poi però alla fine ( )

I 209. I quindi c’è il tentativo di richiesta ma poi hai ceduto ecco ((sorridendo))

C 210. C no comunque c’è sempre questa cosa qua che sono fortunato perché c’è una compagnia di venticinque persone cioè noi abbiamo una compagnia di venticinque persone poi c’è chi si aggiunge ( )

F 211. P ma poi io l’ho già detto secondo me lui è fortunato avere tutti questi vincoli tutti questi stop se nella vita tu hai tutto così facilmente poi alla fine ti rompi le scatole (...) ((Carlo annuisce))
In this sequence, the mother gives specific reasons for refusing the adolescent’s request (199-204); the adolescent justifies as well (206, 208, 209) and at the end, he sustains his father’s position by nodding at him (211). From these exchanges, the construction of reciprocal agreements through a series of compliances and justification emerge clearly. Challenges and oppositions have never been expressed either verbally or nonverbally.

From the two excerpts I reported above the *homeostasis* that characterizes this form of interaction has clearly emerged. All family members never switched their positions as they consensually align on the sensitive topics debated, thereby insuring that family oscillations could not emerge. Furthermore, as for the drifting pattern, each family member is extremely coordinated with the other, as shown both verbally and nonverbally.

In the table below (Table 4.5), the patterns of family interaction and the specific forms of sequential interactions are summarized. The adolescents’ stances are indicated and will be presented in detail in the next paragraph.
Table 4.5  
*Patterns of family interaction, forms of sequential interactions and adolescent’s stances*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analog Oscillation</th>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Quiet (Homeostatic)</th>
<th>Drifting (Negotiation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synchrony</td>
<td>No oscillations</td>
<td>Family oscillations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Down-down</em></td>
<td><em>Down-down-up-up</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benedetti</td>
<td>Carini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Follini</td>
<td>Giuliani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandi</td>
<td>Zanotti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poggiali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Righi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sassi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fractures</td>
<td><em>Critical (a)</em></td>
<td><em>Critical (b)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Stable-symmetrical)</td>
<td>(Stable-symmetrical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Up-up</em></td>
<td><em>Up-up-down</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Armani</td>
<td>Carta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beati</td>
<td>Donati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liberi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Stormy (b)</em></td>
<td><em>Stormy (a)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Alternated)</td>
<td>(Alternated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Firstborn child, Up-down,)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rossetti</td>
<td>Alpi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Toscani</td>
<td>Manini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zurlini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 The adolescent’s stance in the different patterns of family interaction

As a third step in data analysis we considered how the position of the adolescent emerged from the texture of the different forms of sequential interactions. For each pattern, I present the most salient parts in which it is clear how in the stancetaking process, the adolescent assumes specific positions – down or up and stable or alternated – the result of a process of co-construction displayed in the family talks.

The different positions taken by the adolescent from time to time in the course of the sequence of exchanges should be regarded as the result of a situated interactional process. For example, if we take two different scenarios in which the adolescents position themselves at a symmetrical level in alignment with the father, the possibility of the adolescents maintaining that position or changing it by positioning themselves down is linked to the positions taken by the father and by other family members.

Consequently, the adolescent might uphold a stable symmetrical position in one scenario in alignment with the father by reciprocal oppositions and challenges, but in another scenario, the adolescent switches his/her position and becomes compliant with his/her father after an initial alignment at the symmetrical level.

What allows for alignments to take one direction rather than another?

In the example above, I described the course of the interaction focusing on the exchanges between two participants, but what were the other family members doing in the two scenarios? To consider the whole family as a unit of analysis is to acknowledge that interactions are at least triadic. In a symmetrical escalation between two persons, the possibility of maintaining it would rely on the “moves” of a third person who may not even be directly involved in the symmetrical exchange.

In the presentation of this new section of results, I will show how even individual positions (either up or down) are the result of alignments that involve all family members.

Let us now consider two patterns that present opposite forms of sequential interactions: the quiet and the stormy patterns.

In the quiet pattern, all family members align with each other by keeping a homeostatic form of sequential interaction (everybody complies and justifies), and they are synchronized; whereas in the stormy pattern, each family member alternates between up and down positions through fractures in coordination.
Which stance do adolescents take as they evaluate, align, and position themselves in sequential interactions with other family members?

As for the stormy pattern, in the Table 4.5 above\(^\text{13}\), the positions taken by the adolescent are summarized as *Up-down-up-down* to stress that s/he often switches her/his position as part of the oscillatory process. On the contrary, in the quiet pattern, the adolescent’s positions are defined as *Down-down*. If we focus the alignments of adolescents in the forms of sequential interactions in both these patterns, it is possible to “track” their moves. Starting from the same down position, it is possible to observe the course that different alignments take.

Consider the table below (Table 4.6) in which I reported the extracts of the alignment sequences of each family member in relation to the others. The adolescents’ alignments are indicated by their utterances, highlighted in gray.

\(^{13}\) See p. 139
Table 4.6
Adolescent’s stance in two families with different patterns: Quiet (Benedetti family) and Stormy (Manini family)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frames</th>
<th>Benedetti family</th>
<th>Manini family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Conflicts between parents and adolescent</td>
<td>Relationship between sisters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sensitive Topic*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members' alignments</th>
<th>Benedetti family</th>
<th>Manini family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S p.u.</td>
<td></td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A com. S</td>
<td></td>
<td>M p.u.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F com. M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B p.u.</td>
<td></td>
<td>S opp. F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S com. B</td>
<td></td>
<td>M just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S ch. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A just.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B p.u.</td>
<td></td>
<td>M dir. S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S com. B</td>
<td></td>
<td>S ch. M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A com. S</td>
<td></td>
<td>M com. S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A p.u.</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F com. M</td>
<td></td>
<td>S dir. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M com. F</td>
<td></td>
<td>A ch. S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F p.u.</td>
<td></td>
<td>S dir. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M com. F</td>
<td></td>
<td>M just.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F com. M</td>
<td></td>
<td>A ch. S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M p.u.</td>
<td></td>
<td>F p.u.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F com. M</td>
<td></td>
<td>S opp. F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M com. F</td>
<td></td>
<td>F opp. S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A just.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A com. F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M p.u.</td>
<td></td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A just.</td>
<td></td>
<td>S chall. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A opp. S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two frames I have selected effectively show the *stancetaking* process of two adolescents who have positioned themselves at a down level in alignment with their interlocutors.

In the Benedetti family, Teresa expresses compliance, while in the Manini family, Erica justifies. The course of their alignments along the interaction, however, is different.
as it is clear that Teresa constantly keeps down, while Erica often switches between up and down. We can understand the differences by considering the positions of other family members.

In the Benedettis, none changes his or her initial position in the course of the alignments (all comply). By contrast, all members of the Manini family move their positions at least once by alternating between up and down. In the Manini family, therefore, the adolescent has the possibility to be positioned and then position herself at different levels. In other words, Erica can alternate justifications and compliances to challenges and oppositions, as the other family members can continuously swap their positions. Thus, the adolescent sometimes complies with the father, but other times, she can oppose to him. The mother may agree with Erica, thus allowing her to maintain an up position in the alignment with the father.

In the Benedetti family, all members agree in the manner in which sensitive topics are discussed. Teresa never relents to the ways that others define her nor does she repositions them by re-launching a challenge or opposing them. The fact that no one changes in course of the interaction makes it even more complicated for Teresa to differentiate her position from the others’ ones.

In the next two extracts, both adolescents initially show an up position in the alignment with other family members. The two variations of the critical pattern are considered. The critical pattern presents two forms of sequential interactions that also correspond to two different adolescent’s stances: form (a) is defined as Up-up, while form (b) is defined as Up-up-down.

In the table below (Table 4.7), excerpts of the sequences are illustrated for the Beati family [form (a)] and for the Donati family [form (b)].
Table 4.7
Adolescent’s stance in two families with different patterns: Critical (a) (Beati family) and Critical (b) (Donati family)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frames</th>
<th>Beati family</th>
<th>Donati family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sensitive Topic**
- Demography in making decisions (Ep.)
- Physical distance (Ep.)

**Members’ alignments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beati family</th>
<th>Donati family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[…]</td>
<td>M p.u.</td>
<td>F opp. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A p.u.</td>
<td>F com. M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M com. A</td>
<td>F opp. A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F opp. A</td>
<td>A opp. M, F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F p.u.</td>
<td>F dir. A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ch. F</td>
<td>M com. F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F opp. A</td>
<td>A opp. M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M com. F</td>
<td>F ch. A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ch. A</td>
<td>A opp. F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A opp. F</td>
<td>M com. F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F opp. A</td>
<td>F opp. M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ch. F</td>
<td>M com. F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ch. A</td>
<td>F dir. A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A opp. F</td>
<td>A opp. F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F dir. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ch. M</td>
<td>[…]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M just.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two sequences reported in the table may initial appear similar, considering the prevalence of *up* positions such as oppositions and challenges. However, a more detailed analysis reveals that in the Beati family the adolescent, Lorenzo, maintains a constant symmetrical alignment with his parents. In the Donati family, the adolescent, Stefano, upholds the symmetry for a while, but in the end, yields and moves to a *down* level, becoming compliant.

What contributes to these differences? If we focus on the form of sequential interactions of the Beati family, we will notice some differences in the parents’
alignments. The father creates a symmetrical alignment with the adolescent, as he keeps opposing and challenging him, while the mother complies sometimes with the father and sometimes with the adolescent. This role played by the mother allows Lorenzo to have an “ally” or a supporter in the alignment with the father.

Let us consider now the dynamics displayed in the Donati family. In this case, Stefano is involved in the same symmetrical alignment with his father. However, he cannot rely on any particular partner, as both mother and father are strictly “allied”. The parents work as a team: when the father positions himself above the adolescent, the mother complies with him, and vice versa, the mother is directive or opposes to the adolescent, and the father complies with her. In the course of the interactions, the adolescent attempts to resist his parents’ definitions, as shown in the sequence of opposition he displays in the interaction; however, given the compact alignment of their parents, he surrenders by agreeing with them.

The last pattern shown is the drifting, where the adolescent’s stance is defined as Down-down-up-up. In the sequential interactions that define this pattern, the adolescent is positioning her/himself in line with the parents. However, in some parts of the interactional sequences, s/he may switch to “up” positions, as a way to resist the definitions provided by other family members. Consider the following excerpt about the sequential alignments of the frame V (Table 4.8).
Table 4.8
Adolescent’s stance in the drifting pattern (Zanotti family)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frames</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive Topics</td>
<td>Relationship between mother and son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members’ alignments</td>
<td>M p.u.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F opp. M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A opp. F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M ch. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A opp. M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M dir. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A just.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M dir. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A just.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M p.u.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A com. M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M dir. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A just.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F p.u.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M opp. F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A com. M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F opp. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A com. F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M opp. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F com. M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this sequence, Andrea, the adolescent child of the Zanotti family alternates compliances and justifications to oppositions. In families that showed this pattern, the use of justifications was observed, and interestingly, adolescents frequently used this kind of utterance.

A noteworthy aspect of this dynamic is that the adolescent rarely challenges, given the prevalent use of justifications. This outlines the difference between the adolescent’s stance emerging from this pattern and one observable in the stormy pattern. Furthermore, oppositions are expressed through some verbal and nonverbal indicators that mitigate their effect. Andrea aligns by taking a down position with his mother when she is directive towards him. This implies that he responds to an act of control by conforming to
it; however, by choosing justification instead of compliance, he accepts the interlocutor’s definition, but he “defends” his own position as taking responsibility for it.

The adolescent also has the possibility of resisting by opposing to his interlocutors. He can switch to an “up” position and then align at a symmetrical level with them, as if the adolescent is mainly compliant with his parents like adolescents of the quiet pattern. In the drifting pattern, the adolescent can change his/her positions by “moving up” in the hierarchy, as other family members sometimes alternate between symmetrical and asymmetrical alignments.

The adolescent participates in the oscillation process as he switches positions along with other family members, even though he seems to converge more often towards consent with his parents except in specific instances in which he expresses his dissent.

5. Discussion and new research questions

Some attempts were made to overcome limitations encountered in the Study 2.

Thanks to both the theoretical integrations of psychology-related fields and the introduction of methodological advances, it was possible to use the notion of stance and then to re-define the four family patterns at a more specific interactional level for the study of microtransitions. This allowed for the identification of specific forms of sequential interactions, which were analyzed in the stancetaking process that occurred as family members were interviewed about the ongoing changes.

Results were presented in three separate paragraphs for clarity. However, they should be considered as different focalizations rather than isolated from one another.

First, I would like to call attention to the micro-analytical “turn” we introduced for analysis of specific forms of sequential interactions, which allowed for the identification of more nuances in the four patterns of family interactions. It has been possible to identify specific variations of both the critical and the stormy patterns.

Second, not only could I provide a description of the relational side of oscillation through specific analog indicators, but I could also specify the display of the power dynamics as family talks unfolded. Consequently, each pattern of family interaction is defined by a specific interactional form, which informed us as to how family members
were dealing with the ongoing changes in their relations. By taking different stances in the discourses elicited in the interview, family members have shown how they are “moving” along the family’s hierarchy. I could identify how individual positions (focusing on the adolescent) co-emerged in the course of interactions, thereby highlighting that they are *situated* rather than the result of personality traits. This aspect is particularly relevant, as no research, to my knowledge, has provided similar evidences since now.

Furthermore, the topics of the family talks were reviewed, not in a way to qualify or quantify them, but rather as a means of exploring the display of interactional dynamics. It is interesting to note that the “sensitivity” of topics discussed in the families is not connected to “general principles” or expectations stereotypically associated to adolescence, such as sexuality or transgressive behaviors. Rather, family members can be activated and highly involved in debating ordinary topics or episodes of everyday family life.

What have these results added to the understanding of family developmental processes during adolescence?

Advances provided by results of this study allow for a better understanding of the patterns of family interactions in the context of a more complex framework. The context of family relations is an asymmetrical relational context by definition. However, in narrowing the lenses on each pattern of family interaction, it was possible to identify how family members are continuously and reciprocally changing, adapting or resisting to their interlocutor’s definitions by oscillating and being or not being coordinated.

In the *critical* pattern, the father and child define their relation as equal, as shown by the maintainance of the *stable-symmetrical alignments*. In this case, power is not negotiated, but rather it is observable in a symmetrical escalation in which the adolescent is firmly challenging his father’s role with the siblings and/or the mother as “allies”.

In the case of the *stormy* pattern, family members, instead, seem to be in the course of defining the nature of their relationship. They continuously *alternate* sequences in which they define themselves as uneven to sequences more symmetrical and therefore more equal. This also allows the adolescent to take different roles in the interaction and to experiment with different relationship with others.
In the *drifting* pattern, family members are *negotiating* power as they change their positions between opposite hierarchical polarities but with reciprocal legitimations. As part of this process, the adolescent mainly differentiates from others as s/he keeps a down level in interactions with parents, (for example, giving justifications when the interlocutor is directive), but in some parts, defining her/himself at the same level of her/his interlocutors.

In the *quiet* pattern, power is not negotiated. As each family member converges on the same interactional “plot,” it can be argued that in these families there is no need to challenge the definition of the relationship (*homeostatic*). The adolescent seems to be in line with the positions of others and accepts the definition given by other family members, as if to say that the process of differentiation has not yet taken place or, on the contrary, it has just finished.

This last consideration outlines a fundamental issue I intend to develop in future studies. Until now I have placed greater efforts in specifying patterns of family interaction, but this remains a static snapshot of different kinds of interactional dynamics. Thus, the next step in my scientific pursuit would be to depict the “movement” of these different family patterns.

New research questions emerging from these results include:

- Do these patterns of family interaction change?
- Can we consider these patterns as characteristic of family styles of interaction or as different phases of the same developmental process?

Assuming that these patterns change:

- Do these four patterns evolve one from the other?
- Which is the “direction”? Do families that show a critical pattern move towards a stormy pattern or vice versa?
- Would these patterns evolve towards new ones that I have not observed in my studies?
To answer these questions, a longitudinal study is needed to illuminate our understandings of everyday family life - the interconnection of time and texture in relational dynamics. Only *longitudinal data* can offer “a movie rather than a snapshot” (Berthoud, 2000: 15).
FAMILIES UNDER THE MICROSCOPE:
CONCLUDING REMARKS

I introduced the entire project with a challenge: Is it possible to observe the process of change? At the beginning, this question was posed philosophically rather than as a specific research goal. In the course of three years of intensive work, I believe that I may have “approached” an answer.

The microscope that I metaphorically used to refer to the theoretical and methodological choices allowed me to provide a better understanding of the amazing and still partially understood processes by which human beings incorporate changes.

I have described specific results at the end of each study. In my concluding remarks, I would rather reflect on the implications, methodology, and experience of my work.

It has been difficult to choose the right “lenses.” Sometimes the lenses are too wide at the risk of losing the particulars, and others are so narrow as to blur the background. Our research team has toiled many hours looking for the “right balance” of different lenses. Thus, I hope that the “picture” emerging from the composition of the different family scenarios illustrated in the three studies will become clearer and clearer as I elaborate.

I am aware that this work, despite the considerable effort required, represents merely a snapshot of how family members co-regulate during micro-transitions, given by everyday and continual “relational unbalances” characterizing their lives.

However, I believe that the results can provide some indications on how families face life challenges because the manner in which families undergo periods of change can predict their adjustment (Reiss, 1981; Walsh, 2006). In this sense, my work can illustrate possible processes of development in families facing changes.

The family patterns and their implications. It is difficult to elaborate on the meaning and implications of the observed patterns of family interactions, particularly with regard to the topic of normative or problematic processes of family adjustment. However, a couple of words can be dedicated to the two patterns characterized by the absence of family oscillations: quiet and critical. The fact that no oscillations were observed in these families raises the issue of non-change, which, in and of itself, may eventually place family members at greater risk compared to those sharing other interactive patterns. The
absence of tension during change, observed in the quiet pattern, relies on stability (coordination), as if family members were “manufacturing consent” instead of change and differentiation. On the contrary, the absence of change in the critical pattern is connected to a lack of stability and cohesion among members. In the critical pattern, the two different forms of sequential interactions clearly show patterns of “resistance” to change, as demonstrated by the symmetrical escalation between parents and adolescent.

How do families arrive at this state, and how can they move towards new paths oriented to change? At this point, it is not possible to advance any predictions on the evolution of these patterns. However, the results can be useful “tools” for practitioners to counsel families with difficulties or obstacles during their children’s “normal” adolescence.

Well-developed knowledge gathered in the field of family therapy also may be useful for the observation of non-clinical families who encounter problems without necessarily being pathological. Nowadays, the challenge for psychologists and educators is to reach a deeper understanding of transitional processes in “normal” families, in order to design prevention programs and to intervene between parents and adolescents. The idea of “strengthening family resilience” (Walsh, 2006) has become central both in research and in work with families. The very idea of family resilience generates more knowledge about the different ways families can cope with their transitional phases. I am aware that the research project has depicted only possible paths that families can undertake in dealing with adolescents. However, I hope that this work also contributes to specific programs of intervention aimed at supporting families in the coping processes.

The innovative methodology devised in this work can orient family therapists in the elaborating clinical hypotheses and then lead to the emergence of “empirically informed therapeutic work” (Steinglass, 1995).

The long-standing tradition of family therapy has shown that working with families can be a creative and enriching process and at other times, be boring and frustrating. Conducting research with families parallels certain aspects of family therapy, but with different goals and results.

Research as a “political” activity. The three years of research experience has led me to realize that conducting research, particularly on matters of social relevance, must be
intended as a political activity in that the researcher’s decisions entail a personal engagement at each step of the research, starting from the definition of the epistemological framework. Thus, conducting research “with” instead of “on” families is a political choice that affects the subsequent course of the entire research project. The preposition “with” emphasizes my choice to situate my work within an orientation of studies in which both participants and researcher actively participate in the process of “data construction” (Clark & Moss, 2001; Fruggeri, 1998b; McNamee, 1994). Similarly, research with (and also within) families cannot be considered a merely aseptic way of collecting information “out there” and jealously guarded by family members, but rather a choice to engage in a relational process involving not only the participants, but also the researcher. This also implies that the researcher develops a competence defined as reflexivity (Dely, 2007; Mantovani, 2008; Moustakis, 1990). I gradually realized the responsibility undertaken by a researcher in continually and reflexively monitoring each step of a research process that includes myself.

My research with the families entailed much more than interviewing. It was a life changing experience.

The experience of the research. In these three years, I have learned much from “my” families. I have shared moments of their everyday life, empathizing with them, just as I believed they emphasized with me.

On the way home from interviews, I have often wondered what the family members were discussing after I had left. And the families probably experienced the same desire to continue the conversation, as several have sent me a text message thanking me for the opportunity to talk about themselves and their relationships, and relaying to me that they have been discussing in length what transpired during the interview.

Other times we kept on talking once I switched off the camera. On a few occasions, parents and children began asking me questions about myself as if the roles were switched. It was fun, but also illuminating in considerations on reflexivity mentioned above. Many times I was invited for dinner and offered cookies, cakes, wines, and homemade liquor. It has been very easy to gain weight, conducting research within these families (especially among Italian families)!
More seriously, it has been a real journey working with families: starting with phone calls with a family member (in almost all cases with the mothers) to touching and critical moments I experienced during the three years. These experiences have changed me on a professional and personal level.

**Critical moments in the research process.** Working with families is not without its complications. First, recruitment was very difficult. I contacted families at first through schools, youth associations, and “words of mouth.” Considering the huge amount of letters I printed and distributed, I must admit that the percentage of positive answers is less than minimal. It should be noted, however, that the families participating in the three studies (32) did not receive any compensation. Participation was completely voluntary. Recruitment represents a limitation of this study, as families were self-selected. Indeed, all families motivated to participate belonged mainly to the upper or middle class and all were of Italian origins.

Another critical aspect of the study was the requirement that all family members participate. Many were flexible in their schedule and adapted to the schedule of other family members with consideration of the needs of all family members. In Study 1 and Study 2, family members were invited to the Laboratory of Observation at the University of Parma. This setting generated some tension in family members at the beginning, but soon the interview proceeded and they became more comfortable and relaxed, ignoring the one-way mirror and ceiling cameras. I was therefore not surprised, as it has occurred during my short clinical experience as a family therapist, that some families asked to meet the research team behind the mirror. They were curious about the research procedure and equipment that we had devised.

In Study 3, the setting changed, and I, with an assistant, journeyed to the families’ homes. A notation for the implications of the change of the setting is needed, as it is related to the issue of ecological validity that I have mentioned partly in Study 3. The main reason for entering the family homes is practicality. I could reach them any time (laboratory was closed during the evenings and on weekends when most families are free) and in different cities of the region (laboratory is located in Parma). However, we were conscious that this change might have an effect on how family members behaved and interacted. It is very interesting to note instead that families displayed the same
patterns of interaction both in the laboratory setting and in the natural environment. As Fivaz-Depeursinge and Corboz-Warnery (1999) discovered, behaviors may change, but family interactive patterns are cross-sectional to contexts.

**Further steps: regrets and new curiosities.** I have had the opportunity to record many hours of family interactions in the three years. This had led undoubtedly to a rich corpus of data that would provide opportunities for future analyses. However, this implies that I have had to be selective about the portions of my work to present. I regret that I could not include all the material collected in this dissertation. In particular, I did not feature two corpus of data, one relating to a problem-solving task that families completed after the interview, and the second comprising a longitudinal data collection with a smaller sample of eight families.

The main regret actually concerns the longitudinal study. This study was designed to answer theoretical and methodological issues raised by previous studies. One of the crucial questions generated by results of Study 3 was whether the four identified patterns are to be considered as stable or as developing forms of family interactions. According to Cowan (1991), transitions amplify processes that are already in motion before the transition even begins because the way in which families handle current change is a direct reflection of how they have handled past transitions and crises. Following this and other suggestions (Breunlin, 1988; Reiss, 1981), I argue that the interactive patterns most likely expressed specific ways in which family members interact in particular moments of their lives, that is, each time they are dealing with change. To explore this aspect, a longitudinal study was planned and actually realized.

I met eight families in their homes four times in the last year. However, data collection ended only a month ago, and so far I have not had the possibility to deeply analyze them. This is why these data were not included as a final study in my dissertation. I would like to mention that a preliminary assessment of these data allows me to state that some of these families have “moved” from one pattern of interaction to another. For example, I observed movement from a stormy pattern towards forms of interaction characteristic of a drifting pattern.
Additional “months” (at least) of analysis would be required to address the crucial question of whether the patterns of interaction are idiosyncratic styles of family interaction or different moments of a family during microtransitions.

Other data not included were those of a problem-solving task. After the interview, families were invited to build a puzzle entitled the “Pyramid of the Pharaoh” to observe their interactions when making decisions in critical situations. Interesting aspects emerged, but again these results were not coherent with the three studies presented. Fortunately, some of the problem-solving data will soon be published (Everri & Molinari, in press).

What are other considerations? Just as many lenses can be applied to a microscope, various lines of research have stemmed from this project. For example, I noticed that family members mentioning aspects of moral values or confronting their families of origin with parenting styles. Although not explored in the current analysis, I consider these aspects particularly “attractive” for formulating new research questions generated from these data.

Similarly, other variables such as gender were not considered. The focus on gender roles in the context of families with adolescents might provide further details about the different stances that family members take in the course of their interactions. Gilligan (1990: 56) has stated that “initiation into the demands of patriarchy, that is code and scripts of manhood and womanhood, tends to occur at adolescence”.

The attention to the birth order of siblings is also of great interest. In Study 3, a subgroup of families was not included in the analysis because of their attention to the firstborn child rather than the adolescent. Interestingly, the first child was a daughter two years older than the adolescent son. One mother emphasized about her adolescent son, “He is not ready yet! I’ve more troubles with her [daughter] recently”. Adolescents became more “peripheral” during these interviews. Certainly, further studies are needed. An interesting “working hypothesis” may be that in these families, members are still oscillating towards the firstborn, leaving the second child in the background.

Furthermore, it should be noted that families might undergo multiple transitions at a given time of their life. Multiple transitions could consist of divorce/separation during the child’s adolescence or job loss after the birth of a child. Transitions can also be
cumulative and of different intensity, with some transitions becoming more salient than others. These comprise other possible “lenses.”

I am aware that much work needs to be done, and many limitations still characterize this project. However, borrowing an image from the process of sculpture of the famous Michelangelo, let me just say that I have only begun to “liberate the figure imprisoned in the marble” by outlining the paths of family development to a “fairly finished state” while other rough-hewn parts struggle to be freed.

Further concluding remarks are left to the words of Gregory Bateson:

…

D: What did you mean by conversation having an outline? Has this conversation had an outline?
F: Oh, surely yes. But we cannot see it yet because the conversation isn’t finished. You cannot even see it while you’re in the middle of it. Because if you could see it, you would be predictable – like the machine. And I would be predictable – and the two of us together would be predictable –
D: But I don’t understand. You say it is it important to be clear about things and you get angry about people who blur outlines. And yet we think it is better to be unpredictable and not to be like a machine and you say we cannot see the outlines of our conversation till it’s over. Then it doesn’t matter if we are clear or not. Because we cannot do anything about it then.
F: Yes, I know and I don’t understand it myself… but anyway, who wants to do anything about it?

*Metalogue: Why do thing have outline*
(Steps to an Ecology of Mind, 1972: 32)
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