

# The Resilience, Adaptation and Well-Being Project



## Family Problem Solving Communication

FPSC

# **FPSC:**

## **Family Problem Solving Communication**

---

### **Overview**

The Family Problem Solving Communication (FPSC) Index was developed by Marilyn McCubbin, Hamilton McCubbin, and Anne Thompson (1988) to assess the two dominant patterns in family communication that appear to play an important part in family coping with hardships and life catastrophes. Recognizing that all families have both positive and negative patterns of communication, the need for a measure to assess both patterns as important factors in family problem solving and resiliency was apparent. The FPSC is available in English and Spanish.

### **Development of FPSC**

The Family Problem Solving Communication Index was developed specifically for family stress and resiliency research and to measure the problem solving and coping (PSC) component in the Resiliency Model of Family Stress, Adjustment and Adaptation (M.A. McCubbin & H.I. McCubbin, 1993) (see Chapter 1). In this model, adaptive coping strategies and problem solving communication patterns are more generalized ways of responding to family hardship and difficulties by creating a family environment or context of communication in which and through which family hardships and issues are addressed and resolved. It is assumed that the quality of family communication determines to a measurable degree how families manage tension and strain and acquire a satisfactory level of family functioning, adjustment and adaptation.

### **Conceptual Organization**

The FPSC is a 10-item instrument with a four-point Likert scale (0=False, 1=Mostly False, 2=Mostly True, and 3=True). Family members or respondents are asked to record the degree to which the statement about their family's pattern of communication is characteristic (True) or not characteristic (False) of how their family system typically behaves. The instrument consists of two five-item subscales, Incendiary Communication and Affirming Communication.

- I. Incendiary Communication. The pattern of family communication that is inflammatory in nature and tends to exacerbate a stressful situation. Incendiary communication is measured by five items such as: When we have conflicts, we yell and scream at each other.
- II. Affirming Communication. The pattern of family communication which conveys support and caring and exerts a calming influence. Affirming communication is measured by five items such as: When we have conflicts, we are respectful of each other's feelings.

### **Reliability**

The overall index of instrument and subscale internal consistency was determined. The alpha reliability for the FPSC instrument is .89. Incendiary Communication has an alpha reliability of .78 and Affirming Communication has an alpha reliability of .86.

### **Validity**

The Family Problem Solving Communication Index has been validated in several large scale studies of families under stress, some of which included samples of ethnic groups (H.I. McCubbin, A.I. Thompson, Pirner, & M.A. McCubbin, 1988; H.I. McCubbin, A.I. Thompson, E.A. Thompson, Elver, & M.A. McCubbin, 1994; E.A. Thompson, H.I. McCubbin, A.I. Thompson, & Elver, 1995). Two early studies included investigations involving investment executives and their families and rural non-farm families in

the banking industry (H.I. McCubbin & A.I. Thompson, 1988; 1989). Both groups faced major economic crises-the former confronted the stock market crisis known as "Black Monday" and the latter, the economic downturn in the farming economy. Construct validity was also confirmed through two independent factor analyses with identical factor structures emerging for Incendiary and Affirming Communication. Concurrent validity was confirmed through the correlations of the Family Problem Solving Communication Index with other established criterion measures of family functioning, namely family hardiness, family cohesion, family system distress, and self actualization (H.I. McCubbin & A.I. Thompson, 1989). In the sample of 297 investment executive families who had recently experienced the market crisis (H.I. McCubbin & A.I. Thompson, 1989), Incendiary Communication was found to be positively correlated with family system distress and negatively correlated with family hardiness, family coherence, and self-actualization. Affirming Communication was negatively correlated with family system distress and positively correlated with family hardiness, family coherence, and self actualization.

In a survey of 721 Wisconsin rural banking employees who had recently experienced the farm economy crisis (H.I. McCubbin & A.I. Thompson, 1988), Incendiary Communication was positively associated with both employee and spouse appraisal of family system distress and negatively associated with family hardiness. Affirming Communication was negatively associated with both employee and spouse appraisal of family system distress and positively associated with family hardiness.

More recent studies include the survey of Caucasian, Asian, Hawaiian, and mixed race families, as well as a longitudinal study of balancing work and family issues for employees of a large insurance company (H.I. McCubbin, A.I. Thompson, Kretzschmar, et al, 1992), and the study of families with chronically ill children (M.A. McCubbin, 1988). In these investigations Incendiary Communication was inversely related to family well-being for Caucasian, Hawaiian and mixed race families. In contrast, Affirming Communication was positively related to family well-being for Caucasian, Asian, Hawaiian, and mixed race families (H.I. McCubbin & A.I. Thompson, 1992).

### **Test-Retest Reliability**

The test-retest reliability for the subscales and overall FPSC is .86.

### **Additional Validity Checks**

No additional validity information is available at this time.

### **Scoring Procedures**

The FPSC may be scored in two ways. To measure Incendiary and Affirming Communication separately, the values (i.e., 0 = False, 1 = Mostly False, 2 = Mostly True, and 3 = True) of the items in each should be summed after reversing items 3 and 9 of the Incendiary Communication scale (i.e., 0 = True, 1 = Mostly True, 2 = Mostly False, and 3 = False) in order to ensure that all items are scored in the same direction for analysis and interpretation. This will make the Incendiary subscale a negative form of communication. In contrast, Affirming Communication will then be a positive attribute. The following list will help you determine which items belong to each subscale. Items which require reversal before summing are marked with an asterisk in the right hand column.

Subscale 1: Affirming Communication 2, 4, 6, 8, 10

Subscale 2: Incendiary Communication 1, 3\*, 5, 7, 9\*

The FPSC may also be scored to create a total score where the values (i.e., 0 = False, 1 = Mostly False, 2 = Mostly True, and 3 = True) of all ten items are summed after reversing certain items (1, 5, and 7) to ensure that all items are scored in a positive (all affirming and non-incendiary) direction for analysis and interpretation. When creating a total score (positive score) do NOT reverse items 3 and 9.

### **Norms and/or Comparative Data**

The comparative data for FPSC are available separately for several different samples including investment executives and their families, rural non-farm families in the banking industry, Native Hawaiian families, employees of a large Midwestern insurance company, and families of children with chronic illness. Percentiles with standardized scores, means and standard deviations are in Tables 21.1 through 21.32.

### **Instrument Utilization for Research**

The FPSC instrument is in its early stages of use and is currently being tested within the Family Stress, Coping and Health Project and by other investigators. To facilitate the review of research involving the use of FPSC, a limited summary table of related publications is provided (Table 21.33). This table includes the authors, subjects, reliabilities, and notations on findings.

---

### **Notes**

1. The availability of additional psychometrics and bibliographies of other users is limited at the date of publication due to the recent development of the instrument. Upon publication of this material, wider usage is expected, and as subsequent publications become available they will be added to our database. If you would like to inquire about more recent studies, please write to us at the Center for Excellence in Family Studies, Family Stress, Coping and Health Project, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1300 Linden Drive, Madison, WI 53706 or send email to [manual@macc.wisc.edu](mailto:manual@macc.wisc.edu). There will be a charge for these additional materials.
2. When referencing this instrument, the proper citation is: McCubbin, M.A., McCubbin, H.I., and Thompson, A.I., (1988). Family Problem Solving Communication (FPSC). In H.I. McCubbin, A.I. Thompson & M.A McCubbin (1996). *Family assessment: Resiliency, coping and adaptation-Inventories for research and practice*. (pp. 639-686). Madison: University of Wisconsin System.

**Table 21.1**  
**Employees of a National Insurance Company Personal Problem Solving, and Communication**  
**Affirming Communication Scale (N=1404)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0	-4.7	.1
1	-4.3	.2
2	-3.9	.4
3	-3.5	.6
4	-3.1	.8
5	-2.7	1.3
6	-2.3	2.8
7	-1.9	4.8
8	-1.5	9.0
9	-1.1	14.8
10	-0.7	33.8
11	-0.3	47.6
12	+0.1	60.8
13	+0.5	72.7
14	+0.9	83.7
15	+1.4	100.0

**Mean = 11.667**

**SD = 2.457**

**Range =15**

**Kurtosis = .799**

**Skewness = -.634**

**Mode = 10.0**

**Table 21.2**  
**Employees of a National Insurance Company Personal Problem Solving and Communication**  
**Incendiary Communication Scale (N=1409)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0	-1.6	8.7
1	-1.2	16.6
2	-0.8	29.4
3	-0.4	43.1
4	0.0	59.5
5	+0.4	78.6
6	+0.8	85.8
7	+1.2	91.3
8	+1.6	94.7
9	+2.0	97.4
10	+2.4	98.7
11	+2.8	99.1
12	+3.2	99.5
13	+3.6	99.8
14-15	+4.0	100.0

**Mean = 3.978**

**SD = 2.510**

**Range = 14**

**Kurtosis = .677**

**Skewness = .617**

**Mode = 5.0**

**Table 21.3**  
**Employees of a National Insurance Company Personal Problem Solving and Communication Total**  
**Scale (N=1399)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0-1	-4.7	.1
2-3	-4.2	.1
4	-4.0	.4
5	-3.8	.4
6	-3.6	.5
7	-3.4	.6
8	-3.2	.9
9	-2.9	1.2
10	-2.7	1.5
11	-2.5	1.9
12	-2.3	2.6
13	-2.1	3.6
14	-1.9	4.9
15	-1.7	6.9
16	-1.4	9.0
17	-1.2	11.3
18	-1.0	14.8
19	-0.8	20.4
20	-0.6	30.9
21	-0.4	39.0
22	-0.1	47.7
23	+0.1	56.1
24	+0.3	63.0
25	+0.5	69.9
26	+0.7	76.3
27	+0.9	83.3
28	+1.1	89.4
29	+1.4	93.8
30	+1.6	100.0

**Mean = 22.697**

**SD = 4.659**

**Range = 29**

**Kurtosis = .960**

**Skewness = -.684**

**Mode = 20.0**

**Table 21.4**  
**Mothers of Children with Cardiac Illness Time 1 Personal Problem Solving and Communication**  
**Affirming Communication Scale (N=107)**

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-6	-2.5	1.9
7	-2.1	5.6
8	-1.6	8.4
9	-1.2	13.1
10	-0.8	29.0
11	-0.4	46.7
12	+0.1	57.0
13	+0.5	67.3
14	+0.9	83.2
15	+1.3	100.0

**Mean = 11.879**  
**SD = 2.362**  
**Range = 9**  
**Kurtosis = -.531**  
**Skewness = -.412**  
**Mode = 11.0**

**Table 21.5**  
**Mothers of Children with Cardiac Illness Time 1 Personal Problem Solving and Communication**  
**Incendiary Communication Scale (N=107)**

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0	-1.8	5.6
1	-1.4	10.3
2	-1.1	15.9
3	-0.7	31.8
4	-0.3	46.7
5	0.0	63.6
6	+0.4	73.8
7	+0.7	80.4
8	+1.1	87.9
9	+1.5	92.5
10	+1.8	97.2
11	+2.2	98.1
12-15	+2.5	100.0

**Mean = 4.963**  
**SD = 2.778**  
**Range = 12**  
**Kurtosis = -.203**  
**Skewness = .376**  
**Mode = 5.0**



**Table 21.6**  
**Mothers of Children with Cardiac Illness Time 1 Personal Problem Solving' and Communication**  
**Total Scale (N=107)**

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-10	-2.5	.9
11	-2.3	2.8
12	-2.1	4.7
13	-1.8	5.6
14	-1.6	9.3
15	-1.4	11.2
16	-1.2	15.0
17	-1.0	16.8
18	-0.8	24.3
19	-0.6	27.1
20	-0.4	36.4
21	-0.2	44.9
22	0.0	54.2
23	+0.2	61.7
24	+0.5	67.3
25	+0.7	74.8
26	+0.9	81.3
27	+1.1	88.8
28	+1.3	93.5
29	+1.5	95.3
30	+1.7	100.0

**Mean = 21.841**

**SD = 4.788**

**Range = 20**

**Kurtosis = -.375**

**Skewness = -.389**

**Mode = 20.0**

**Table 21.7**  
**Fathers of Children with Cardiac Illness Time 1 Personal Problem Solving and Communication**  
**Affirming Communication Scale (N=92)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0-5	-2.6	3.3
6	-2.2	4.3
7	-1.8	7.6
8	-1.4	15.2
9	-1.0	17.4
10	-0.6	30.4
11	+0.1	50.0
12	+0.3	65.2
13	+0.7	80.4
14	+1.1	91.3
15	+1.5	100.0

**Mean = 11.348**

**SD = 2.438**

**Range = 10**

**Kurtosis = .143**

**Skewness = -.653**

**Mode = 11.0**

**Table 21.8**  
**Fathers of Children with Cardiac Illness Time 1 Personal Problem Solving and Communication**  
**Incendiary Communication Scale (N=92)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0	-1.7	5.4
1	-1.4	8.7
2	-1.1	15.2
3	-0.7	34.8
4	-0.4	41.3
5	-0.1	60.9
6	+0.3	73.9
7	+0.6	79.3
8	+0.9	84.8
9	+1.3	92.4
10	+1.6	93.5
11	+1.9	96.7
12	+2.3	97.8
13	+2.6	98.9
14-15	+2.9	100.0

**Mean = 5.163**

**SD = 2.999**

**Range = 14**

**Kurtosis = .300**

**Skewness = .609**

**Mode = 3.0**

**Table 21.9**  
**Fathers of Children with Cardiac Illness Time 1 Personal Problem Solving and Communication**  
**Total Scale (N=92)**

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-6	-3.1	1.1
7-9	-2.5	2.2
10	-2.3	3.3
11	-2.0	5.4
12	-1.8	6.5
13	-1.6	7.6
14	-1.4	12.0
15	-1.2	14.1
16	-1.0	16.3
17	-0.8	18.5
18	-0.6	21.7
19	-0.4	31.5
20	-0.2	41.3
21	0.0	46.7
22	+0.2	57.6
23	+0.4	68.5
24	+0.6	75.0
25	+0.8	80.4
26	+1.0	85.9
27	+1.2	92.4
28	+1.4	94.6
29	+1.6	96.7
30	+1.8	100.0

**Mean = 21.185**

**SD = 4.970**

**Range = 24**

**Kurtosis = .383**

**Skewness = -.629**

**Mode = 22.0**

**Table 21.10**  
**Mothers of Children with Diabetes Time 1 Personal Problem Solving and Communication**  
**Affirming Communication Scale (N=72)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0-8	-1.8	2.8
9	-1.4	12.5
10	-0.9	34.7
11	-0.4	48.6
12	+0.1	61.1
13	+0.6	73.6
14	+1.1	86.1
15	+1.6	100.0

**Mean = 11.806**  
**SD = 2.060**  
**Range = 7**  
**Kurtosis = -1.177**  
**Skewness = .120**  
**Mode = 10.0**

**Table 21.11**  
**Mothers of Children with Diabetes Time 1 Personal Problem Solving and Communication**  
**Incendiary Communication Scale (N=72)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0-1	-1.8	4.2
2	-1.4	11.1
3	-0.9	27.8
4	-0.5	40.3
5	0.0	62.5
6	+0.5	77.8
7	+0.9	87.5
8	+1.4	94.4
9-10	+1.8	97.2
11-15	+2.7	100.0

**Mean = 5.000**  
**SD: 2.182**  
**Range: 10**  
**Kurtosis: .254**  
**Skewness = .460**  
**Mode = 5.0**

**Table 21.12**  
**Mothers of Children with Diabetes Time 1 Personal Problem Solving and Communication Total**  
**Scale (N=72)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0-12	-2.5	1.4
13-14	-2.2	2.8
15	-1.7	5.6
16	-1.5	9.7
17	-1.2	13.9
18	-1.0	19.4
19	-0.7	27.8
20	-0.5	38.9
21	-0.2	50.0
22	0.0	58.3
23	+0.3	61.1
24	+0.6	69.4
25	+0.8	79.2
26	+1.1	87.5
27	+1.3	94.4
28	+1.6	97.2
29-30	+1.8	100.0

**Mean = 21.806**

**SD = 3.931**

**Range = 17**

**Kurtosis = -.530**

**Skewness = -.220**

**Mode = 20.0**

**Table 21.13**  
**Fathers of Children with Diabetes Time 1 Personal Problem Solving and Communication Affirming**  
**Communication Scale (N=62)**

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-6	-2.7	1.6
7-8	-1.6	8.1
9	-1.1	17.7
10	-0.6	35.5
11	-0.1	59.7
12	+0.4	74.2
13	+0.9	85.5
14	+1.4	95.2
15	+1.9	100.0

**Mean = 11.210**  
**SD = 1.951**  
**Range = 9**  
**Kurtosis = -.177**  
**Skewness = -.045**  
**Mode = 11.0**

**Table 21.14**  
**Fathers of Children with Diabetes Personal Problem Solving and Communication Incendiary**  
**Communication Scale (N=82)**

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0	-2.2	1.6
1	-1.8	4.8
2	-1.4	8.1
3	-1.0	22.6
4	-0.5	40.3
5	-0.1	59.7
6	+0.3	71.0
7	+0.7	80.6
8	+1.1	88.7
9	+1.6	95.2
10	+2.0	98.4
11-15	+2.4	100.0

**Mean = 5.290**  
**SD = 2.370**  
**Range = 11**  
**Kurtosis = -.232**  
**Skewness = .282**  
**Mode = 5.0**

**Table 21.15**  
**Fathers of Children with Diabetes Personal Problem Solving and Communication**  
**Total Scale (N=62)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0-14	-1.8	4.9
15	-1.5	11.5
16	-1.3	16.4
17	-1.0	19.7
18	-0.7	27.9
19	-0.5	37.7
20	-0.2	44.3
21	0.0	54.1
22	+0.3	63.9
23	+0.5	72.1
24	+0.8	82.0
25	+1.0	90.2
26	+1.3	91.8
27-28	+1.6	96.7
29	+2.1	98.4
30	+2.3	100.0

**Mean = 20.918**

**SD = 3.891**

**Range = 16**

**Kurtosis = -.560**

**Skewness = .053**

**Mode = 19.0**



**Table 21.16**  
**Families of Native Hawaiian Ancestry Personal Problem Solving and Communication Affirming**  
**Communication Scale Overall**  
**(N=189)**

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-1	-3.7	1.1
2-3	-3.0	1.6
4	-2.4	3.2
5	-2.0	6.3
6	-1.7	7.4
7	-1.3	9.5
8	-1.0	17.5
9	-0.6	28.6
10	-0.3	40.2
11	0.0	52.4
12	+0.4	71.4
13	+0.7	83.1
14	+1.1	89.4
15	+1.4	100.0

**Mean = 10.857**

**SD = 2.907**

**Range = 15**

**Kurtosis = 1.447**

**Skewness = -.945**

**Mode = 12.0**

**Table 21.17**  
**Families of Native Hawaiian Ancestry Personal Problem Solving and Communication Incendiary**  
**Communication Scale Overall (N=184)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0	-2.6	.5
1	-2.2	1.1
2	-1.8	6.0
3	-1.4	11.4
4	-1.1	17.9
5	-0.7	32.6
6	-0.3	47.8
7	+0.1	59.8
8	+0.5	75.0
9	+0.9	88.0
10	+1.8	92.4
11	+1.7	95.7
12	+2.0	98.9
13-15	+2.4	100.0

**Mean = 6.734**

**SD = 2.576**

**Range = 13**

**Kurtosis = -.249**

**Skewness = .027**

**Mode = 8.0**

**Table 21.18**  
**Families of Native Hawaiian Ancestry Personal Problem Solving and Communication**  
**Total Scale Overall (N=189)**

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-3	3.4	1.0
4-6	-2.8	1.5
7-8	-2.3	2.5
9	-2.1	4.1
10	-1.9	6.1
11	-1.7	7.1
12	-1.5	8.1
13	-1.3	11.7
14	-1.0	14.2
15	-0.8	21.8
16	-0.6	27.9
17	-0.4	34.5
18	-0.2	43.7
19	0.0	52.3
20	+0.2	62.9
21	+0.5	69.5
22	+0.7	79.2
23	+0.9	85.8
24	+1.1	89.8
25	+1.3	93.9
26	+1.5	96.4
27	+1.7	98.0
28-30	+2.0	100.0

**Mean = 18.843**

**SD = 4.664**

**Range = 25**

**Kurtosis = .714**

**Skewness = -.601**

**Mode = 20.0**

**Table 21.19**  
**Single-Parent Families of Native Hawaiian Ancestry Personal Problem Solving and Communication**  
**Affirming Communication Scale (N=109)**

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0	-3.6	.9
1-2	-2.9	1.8
3-4	-2.2	4.6
5	-1.9	9.2
6	-1.6	10.1
7	-1.3	11.9
8	-0.9	16.5
9	-0.6	27.5
10	-0.3	36.7
11	+0.1	52.3
12	+0.4	70.6
13	+0.7	83.5
14	+1.0	89.9
15	+1.4	100.0

**Mean = 10.817**

**SD = 3.043**

**Range =15**

**Kurtosis = 1.226**

**Skewness = -1.033**

**Mode = 12.0**

**Table 21.20**  
**Single-Parent Families of Native Hawaiian Ancestry Personal Problem Solving and Communication**  
**Incendiary Communication Scale (N=109)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0-1	-2.7	.9
2	-1.9	4.6
3	-1.5	11.1
4	-1.1	16.7
5	-0.7	30.6
6	-0.3	45.4
7	+0.1	59.3
8	+0.5	75.0
9	+0.8	88.0
10	+1.2	90.7
11	+1.6	95.4
12	+2.0	99.1
13-15	+2.4	100.0

**Mean = 6.824**

**SD = 2.564**

**Range = 13**

**Kurtosis = -.141**

**Skewness = .016**

**Mode = 8.0**

**Table 21.21**  
**Single-Parent Families of Native Hawaiian Ancestry Personal Problem Solving and Communication**  
**Total Scale (N=109)**

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-3	-3.3	.9
4-6	-2.6	1.8
7-8	-2.2	2.6
9	-2.0	5.3
10	-1.8	7.9
11	-1.6	9.6
12	-1.4	11.4
13	-1.2	14.0
14	-1.0	15.8
15	-0.8	22.8
16	-0.6	26.3
17	-0.4	32.5
18	-0.2	42.1
19	-0.1	51.8
20	+0.3	64.0
21	+0.5	70.2
22	+0.7	78.9
23	+0.9	84.2
24	+1.1	89.5
25	+1.3	94.7
26	+1.5	96.5
27	+1.7	99.1
28-30	+1.9	100.0

**Mean = 18.746**

**SD = 4.828**

**Range = 25**

**Kurtosis = .478**

**Skewness = -.670**

**Mode = 20.0**

**Table 21.22**  
**Two-Parent Families of Native Hawaiian Ancestry Personal Problem Solving and Communication**  
**Affirming Communication Scale (N=80)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0-4	-3.9	1.3
5	-2.2	2.5
6	-1.8	3.8
7	-1.4	6.3
8	-1.1	18.8
9	-0.7	30.0
10	-0.3	45.0
11	0.0	52.5
12	+0.4	72.5
13	+0.8	82.5
14	+1.1	88.8
15	+1.5	100.0

**Mean = 10.913**  
**SD = 2.729**  
**Range = 15**  
**Kurtosis = 1.916**  
**Skewness = .269**  
**Mode = 12.0**

**Table 21.23**  
**Two-Parent Families of Native Hawaiian Ancestry Personal Problem Solving and Communication**  
**Incendiary Communication Scale (N=80)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0-1	-2.2	1.3
2	-1.8	7.9
3	-1.4	11.8
4	-1.0	19.7
5	-0.6	35.5
6	-0.2	50.0
7	+0.2	60.5
8	+0.5	75.0
9	+0.9	88.2
10	+1.3	94.7
11	+1.7	96.1
12	+2.0	98.7
13-15	+2.5	100.0

**Mean = 6.605**  
**SD = 2.603**  
**Range = 12**  
**Kurtosis = -.332**  
**Skewness = .047**  
**Mode = 5.0**

**Table 21.24**  
**Two-Parent Families 01 Native Hawaiian Ancestry Personal Problem Solving and Communication**  
**Total Scale (N=80)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0-3	-3.6	1.2
4-8	-2.5	2.4
9-10	-2.0	3.6
11-13	-1.3	8.4
14	-1.1	12.0
15	-0.9	20.5
16	-0.7	30.1
17	-0.4	37.3
18	-0.2	45.8
19	0.0	53.0
20	+0.2	61.4
21	+0.5	68.7
22	+0.7	79.5
23	+0.9	88.0
24	+1.1	90.4
25	+1.4	92.8
26	+1.6	96.4
27-30	+2.0	100.0

**Mean = 18.976**

**SD = 4.456**

**Range = 25**

**Kurtosis = 1.194**

**Skewness = -.474**

**Mode = 22.0**



**Table 21.25**  
**Rural Bank Employees Personal Problem Solving and Communication Affirming Communication Scale (N=743)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0	-3.4	2.7
1-2	-2.8	3.1
3	-2.5	3.6
4	-2.1	4.1
5	-1.8	5.0
6	-1.5	7.2
7	-1.2	10.4
8	-0.9	15.7
9	-0.6	22.4
10	-0.3	52.4
11	+0.1	60.0
12	+0.4	68.5
13	+0.7	76.6
14	+1.0	84.9
15	+1.3	100.0

**Mean = 10.807**

**SD =3.184**

**Range = 15**

**Kurtosis =2.022**

**Skewness =-1.047**

**Mode =10.0**

**Table 21.26**  
**Rural Bank Employees Personal Problem Solving and Communication Incendiary Communication**  
**Scale (N=740)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0	-1.4	13.6
1	-1.0	20.2
2	-0.7	36.2
3	-0.3	47.5
4	+0.1	59.8
5	+0.4	75.8
6	+0.8	86.0
7	+1.1	90.0
8	+1.5	94.1
9	+1.9	96.0
10	+2.2	98.4
11	+2.6	99.1
12	+2.9	99.2
13	+3.3	99.5
14	+3.7	99.7
15	+4.0	100.0

**Mean = 3.851**

**SD = 2.768**

**Range = 15**

**Kurtosis = .686**

**Skewness = .712**

**Mode = 2.0**

\*Note: A total scale score was not reported in this study

**Table 21.27**  
**Spouses of Rural Bank Employees Personal Problem Solving and Communication Affirming**  
**Communication Scale (N=413)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0	-2.6	6.8
1	-2.3	7.3
2	-2.0	8.0
3	-1.8	9.9
4	-1.5	10.7
5	-1.3	13.1
6	-1.0	15.3
7	-0.8	17.4
8	-0.5	20.6
9	-0.2	31.0
10	0.0	53.3
11	+0.3	63.4
12	+0.5	74.6
13	+0.8	82.6
14	+1.0	90.8
15	+1.3	100.0

**Mean = 9.954**

**SD = 3.892**

**Range = 15**

**Kurtosis = .937**

**Skewness = -1.138**

**Mode = 10.0**

**Table 21.28**  
**Spouses of Rural Bank Employees Personal Problem Solving and Communication Incendiary**  
**Communication Scale (N=413)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0	-1.4	10.7
1	-1.1	21.5
2	-0.7	32.9
3	-0.4	46.0
4	0.0	59.6
5	+0.4	70.2
6	+0.7	84.7
7	+1.1	90.6
8	+1.4	93.5
9	+1.8	96.1
10	+2.2	98.8
11-13	+3.2	99.0
14	+3.6	99.8
15	+3.9	100.0

**Mean = 3.990**

**SD = 2.794**

**Range = 15**

**Kurtosis = .790**

**Skewness = .714**

**Mode = 6.0**

\*Note: A total scale score was not reported in this study

**Table 21.29**  
**Investment Executives Personal Problem Solving, and Communication Affirming, Communication**  
**Scale (N=297)**

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0	-4.2	.3
1-3	-3.0	.7
4	-2.7	1.0
5	-2.3	3.4
6	-1.9	6.1
7	-1.5	9.1
8	-1.2	11.8
9	-0.8	21.2
10	-0.4	45.5
11	0.0	58.9
12	+0.3	68.7
13	+0.7	77.1
14	+1.1	86.2
15	+1.5	100.0

**Mean = 11.094**

**SD = 2.671**

**Range = 15**

**Kurtosis = .543**

**Skewness = -.500**

**Mode = 10.0**

**Table 21.30**  
**Investment Executives Personal Problem Solving and Communication Incendiary Communication**  
**Scale (N=298)**

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0	-1.5	9.7
1	-1.1	17.4
2	-0.8	28.5
3	-0.4	45.6
4	-0.1	55.7
5	+0.3	73.5
6	+0.6	81.2
7	+1.0	86.2
8	+1.3	89.6
9	+1.7	95.6
10	+2.0	97.7
11	+2.4	98.7
12	+2.7	99.7
13-15	+3.5	100.0

**Mean = 4.211**

**SD = 2.884**

**Range = 14**

**Kurtosis = .084**

**Skewness = .608**

**Mode = 5.0**

\*Note: A total scale score was not reported in this study

**Table 21.31**  
**Spouses of Investment Executives Personal Problem Solving and Communication Affirming**  
**Communication Scale (N=233)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0	-4.2	.9
1-3	-3.1	1.3
4	-2.8	1.7
5	-2.4	3.9
6	-2.0	5.2
7	-1.7	7.3
8	-1.3	10.3
9	-1.0	14.2
10	-0.6	30.0
11	-0.3	43.8
12	+0.1	54.9
13	+0.4	64.8
14	+0.8	79.8
15	+1.1	100.0

**Mean =11.803**

**SD =2.832**

**Range = 15**

**Kurtosis =2.013**

**Skewness = -1.154**

**Mode = 15.0**

**Table 21.32**  
**Spouses of Investment Executives Personal Problem Solving and Communication Incendiary**  
**Communication Scale (N=233)**

<b>Raw Scores</b>	<b>Standard Scores</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentiles</b>
0	-1.3	11.2
1	-1.0	21.0
2	-0.7	34.3
3	-0.3	48.1
4	0.0	60.1
5	+0.3	77.7
6	+0.6	82.0
7	+1.0	88.0
8	+1.3	92.7
9	+1.6	93.6
10	+2.0	94.4
11	+2.3	97.4
12	+2.6	97.9
13	+2.9	99.1
14	+3.3	99.6
15	+3.6	100.0

**Mean = 4.030**

**SD = 3.048**

**Range = 15**

**Kurtosis = 1.138**

**Skewness = 1.007**

**Mode = 5.0**

\*Note: A total scale score was not reported in this study



**Table 21.33**  
**Family Problem Solving Communication (FPSC): Select Published Reports**

<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Sample</b>	<b>N Count</b>	<b>Alpha Reliability</b>	<b>Validity Notes</b>
McCubbin, H.I., McCubbin, M.A., & Thompson, A.I. (1993)	Families of varying race: Caucasian (78), Asian (49), Hawaiian (37), & mixed race	200	.85-.89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affirming problem solving was a buffer for maladaptation in Caucasian families</li> <li>• Problem solving (incendiary communication) was a facilitator of maladaptation in Hawaiian families.</li> <li>• Affirming problem-solving communication was a buffer in mixed race families.</li> </ul>
McCubbin, H.I., McCubbin, M.A., & Thompson, A.I. (1995)	Native Hawaiian families	155	.85-.89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structural equation analysis revealed that family problem solving communication was inversely related to family dysfunction.</li> </ul>
McCubbin, H.I., & Thompson, A.I. (1989)	Investment executives of a regional investment firm with branch offices in sixteen states, & their spouses	311	.89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affirming problem-solving communication acted as a buffer for executives' emotional distress following market crisis &amp; for spillover of work stress into marital relationship.</li> <li>• Incendiary communication exacerbated problems such as: a) executives' distress following crisis, b) spouses' distress during &amp; after crisis, &amp; c) spillover of work stress into marital relationship.</li> </ul>
McCubbin, H.I., & Thompson, A.I. (1992)	Multiracial families	200	.85	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affirming communication was significantly related to family well-being for Caucasians, Hawaiians &amp; mixed, but not for Asians.</li> <li>• Incendiary communication was inversely related to family well-being for Caucasian &amp; mixed race families.</li> </ul>

**Table 21.33 (continued)**  
**Family Problem Solving Communication (FPSC): Select Published Reports**

Author(s)	Sample	N Count	Alpha Reliability	Validity Notes
McCubbin, H.I., & Thompson, A.I., Kretzschmar, H., Smith, F., Snow, P., McEwen, M., Elver, K., & McCubbin, M.A. (1992)	Female & male employees who are part of a longitudinal study of work, families & health	156	.85-.89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resilient (low health risk) &amp; vulnerable (high health risk) male &amp; female employees were compared.</li> <li>• Resilient male employees were correctly classified (84.6%) on the basis of work &amp; family predictors including 2 family problem solving factors.</li> <li>• Resilient female employees were also classified accurately (87.6%) on the basis of 2 problem solving factors.</li> </ul>
McCubbin, H.I., & Thompson, A.I., Elver, K., & McCubbin, M.A. (1994)	Native Hawaiian families	155	.89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the path analysis, family problem solving was inversely related to family dysfunction &amp; the central predictor of this outcome. Additionally, family problem solving is the central intermediary variable in path analysis through which hardiness, sense of coherence &amp; family schema operate.</li> </ul>

**Table 21.33 (continued)**  
**Family Problem Solving Communication (FPSC): Select Published Reports**

Author(s)	Sample	N Count	Alpha Reliability	Validity Notes
Thompson, A.I. (1994)	228 males & 621 females in a Midwest insurance firm as part of a longitudinal study on the impact of work, family & health	849	.87-.90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doctoral dissertation</li> <li>• Typologies were created to reflect problem-solving communication in the workplace &amp; in the family, thus creating four types.</li> <li>• The criterion were levels of health risk for men &amp; women separately.</li> <li>• Female employees with low FPS were at greater health risk.</li> <li>• Female employees who belonged to a work-family typology, that is high family &amp; high work communication (OCS), were at significantly less risk.</li> </ul>
Thompson, E.A., McCubbin, H.I., Thompson, A.I., & Elver, K. (1995)	Native Hawaiian families representing two-parent households (N=83) & single-parent households (N=114)	197	.89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family problem solving &amp; particularly incendiary communication significantly related to family distress for two-parent households.</li> <li>• Incendiary communication was also a significant predictor in single-parent households.</li> </ul>

# FPSC

## FAMILY PROBLEM SOLVING COMMUNICATION

---

*Romanian Version*

## FPSC FAMILY PROBLEM SOLVING COMMUNICATION ©

Marilyn A. McCubbin Hamilton L. McCubbin Anne L. Thompson

Citiți cu atenție enunțurile, după care alegeți varianta care este cea mai aproape de situația dvs. reală:

- 0 - Fals
- 1 - De cele mai multe ori fals
- 2 - De cele mai multe ori adevărat
- 3 - Adevărat

Când familia noastră se confruntă cu probleme și conflicte care ne supără, așa descrie reacțiile în felul următor:

- |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Ridicăm tonul și țipăm unii la ceilalți.  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2. Ne respectăm reciproc sentimentele.   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3. Discutăm problemele până când găsim o soluție.  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4. Ne străduim să facem în așa fel încât membrii familiei să nu se simtă răniți fizic sau emoțional. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 5. Evităm conflictele fără prea mare satisfacție.  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 6. Ne exprimăm sentimentele, subliniind cât de mult ținem unii la ceilalți                           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 7. Facem situația și mai dificilă prin ceartă și readucem în discuție problemele din trecut.         | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 8. Ne facem timp să ascultăm ce are de spus fiecare.   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 9. Ne străduim să fim calmi și să rezolvăm problemele discutându-le.                                 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 10. Ne supărăm, dar încercăm să depășim conflictele într-o notă pozitivă.                            | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |