



Family Counseling from an Integrative Systemic Perspective: Developing a Theoretical Model of Family Resilience, Emotion Regulation, and Contextual Adaptation

Wafa Abdullah Al-Qaisi

Dr.
Associate Professor, Department of Kindergarten, Seiyun University
Yemen
ORCID: 0009-0001-9181-5218; Wafa848@gmail.com

Abdelkader Makhoulf

Dr.
Department of English, Faculty of Letters, Languages and Arts, Nour Bachir University
Center, El Bayadh
Algeria
ORCID: 0000-0001-6898-5975; a.makhoulf@cu-elbayadh.dz

Keywords

family counseling, systemic perspective, family resilience, emotion regulation, contextual adaptation, family therapy, differentiation, cultural context

Abstract

Family counseling has witnessed considerable expansion in the use of systemic approaches that view the family as an interacting relational unit rather than merely a group of individuals living within the same household. Nevertheless, theoretical development in family counseling has often remained distributed across approaches that focus on family structure, boundaries, and roles; others that emphasize family resilience and the family's capacity to cope with crises; and approaches concerned with emotion regulation, while the contextual, cultural, and social dimension has received varying degrees of attention. This theoretical article aims to develop an integrative model of family counseling that brings together four interrelated components: systemic organization, family resilience, emotion regulation, and contextual adaptation. The article proceeds from the central assumption that family adaptation cannot be adequately explained through a single individual or relational variable. Rather, it develops through reciprocal and circular processes in which family relationship patterns interact with emotional processes, resilience resources, and the demands of the social and cultural context. To achieve this objective, the article adopts an integrative theoretical approach based on an analytical reading of foundational and contemporary literature in family therapy and counseling, family systems theory, differentiation theory, family resilience theory, models of emotion regulation, the ecological perspective on adaptation, and recent literature on the effectiveness of systemic interventions and cultural adaptation. The article proposes a theoretical model based on the concept of "integrative systemic adaptation," whereby the family is understood as a dynamic system that reorganizes its resources, structure, and emotional patterns in response to internal and external stressors. The model proposes that the effectiveness of family counseling is related to its capacity to work simultaneously at the level of family structure and relationships, emotional regulation, resilience resources, and contextual and cultural fit. The article also presents a set of theoretical and counseling principles that can be empirically tested in future research, particularly in Arab and Maghreb contexts.

Citation

Al-Qaisi, W. A., & Makhoulf, A. (2026). Family counseling from an integrative systemic perspective: Developing a theoretical model of family resilience, emotion regulation, and contextual adaptation. *Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems*, 9(10), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.56334/sei/9.10.4>

Licensed

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by *Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems (SEI)*, under the auspices of IMCRA – International Meetings and Conferences Research Association (Azerbaijan).

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

 <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Received: June 11, 2026**Accepted:** July 14, 2026**Published Online:** September 20, 2026

1. INTRODUCTION

Understanding contemporary family problems is no longer possible through viewing the individual as the sole unit of analysis. A problem that appears in the form of anxiety in one child, conflict between spouses, difficulty in fulfilling the parental role, or withdrawal by one family member may be associated with a network of relational, emotional, organizational, and contextual processes that extend beyond the individual. From this perspective, systemic thinking brought about a fundamental shift in family counseling and therapy by moving attention from the question "Who is experiencing the problem?" toward more complex questions: How is the problem constructed within a network of relationships? How is it maintained? What function might it serve within the family system? And what resources enable the family to reorganize itself in response to stress?

Systemic thinking represented an important epistemological transformation in the study of the family. From this perspective, the family is not merely the sum of its members but a system of reciprocal relationships in which individuals' roles, boundaries, patterns of communication, and responses are continuously shaped through processes of mutual influence. Minuchin's (1974) work contributed to highlighting the importance of family structure, boundaries, subsystems, and alliances, whereas Bowen (1978) focused on multigenerational emotional processes and the concept of differentiation of self within the family emotional system. Recent reviews indicate that differentiation of self remains one of the central concepts in systemic research, with a substantial body of research linking it to psychological health, marital quality, and intergenerational relationships, although longitudinal and causal evidence concerning the effectiveness of interventions aimed at changing it remains limited (Calatrava et al., 2022).

However, subsequent developments in family counseling have shown that focusing exclusively on family structure is insufficient for understanding the family's capacity to continue functioning and adapt. Families may experience the same stressful event with different levels of cohesion and resilience. One family may have limited material resources but possess clear communication, a strong social support system, and shared beliefs that help it reinterpret the crisis. Another family may have greater economic resources but experience rigid interactional patterns, difficulties in emotional expression, or limited capacity to negotiate roles and responsibilities. This is where the concept of family resilience becomes particularly important as a dynamic process rather than a fixed characteristic.

In this context, Walsh (2015/2016) presented an influential conceptualization of family resilience as a set of processes that enable families to confront crises, adapt to them, and regain a degree of organization and growth. Her framework is based on three interconnected domains: family belief systems, organizational patterns, and communication and problem-solving processes. This conceptualization is particularly important for family counseling because it shifts practice from focusing on deficits and dysfunction toward identifying resources and capacities that can be developed within the family. A recent review by Tetlow et al. (2024) confirms that the concept of family resilience has increasingly been incorporated into interventions directed toward families, while emphasizing the continuing need for greater conceptual and practical consistency in its use.

At the same time, emotion regulation has gained increasing importance in family psychology. Family relationships involve not only cognitive and behavioral exchanges but also dense networks of emotional experiences. The ways in which family members perceive, identify, express, and regulate their emotions can shape interactional patterns

within the family. Gross (1998) developed an influential model of emotion regulation showing that individuals can influence emotional processes through situation selection, situation modification, attentional deployment, cognitive reappraisal, and response modulation.

The importance of this dimension becomes particularly evident in parent-child relationships. A systematic review by Zitzmann et al. (2024) found that difficulties in parental emotion regulation are associated with several dimensions of parenting, while also noting conceptual and methodological variation in how these processes are assessed. This suggests that emotion regulation should not be treated as an individual skill isolated from the family, but rather understood as a process occurring within attachment, socialization, and everyday interactional relationships.

In addition, families do not exist in a vacuum. Every family system develops within a particular social, economic, cultural, and institutional context. The meanings of marriage, parenthood, authority, independence, solidarity, privacy, and interdependence may be shaped by the social environment in which a family exists. Families are also influenced by social, technological, economic, and institutional changes that may exceed their direct capacity to control. Consequently, transferring a counseling model from one context to another without examining its appropriateness may lead to misunderstandings of the problem or to interventions that do not adequately correspond to the system of meanings organizing family life. Recent literature on cultural adaptation of behavioral interventions emphasizes the importance of distinguishing potentially general therapeutic mechanisms from culturally situated elements, while attending to issues of equivalence and cultural fit.

The systemic model also has an increasingly developed empirical basis. Carr (2025) reviewed evidence from meta-analyses and systematic reviews concerning systemic interventions for problems in which children or young people are the primary focus and demonstrated the breadth of evidence concerning family therapy, family-based interventions, parent training, and other systemic formats. Another review has addressed evidence concerning couple therapy and systemic interventions for adult-focused problems and has likewise indicated the broad application of systemic interventions across multiple psychological, health, and relational problems (Carr, 2025).

Despite this development, a theoretical gap remains in that the literature often treats systemic organization, family resilience, emotion regulation, and cultural context as adjacent rather than integrated dimensions of a single theoretical system. Family structure explains how relationships are organized; resilience explains the family's capacity to respond to crises; emotion regulation helps explain processes occurring within interaction; and the contextual perspective demonstrates that these processes cannot be separated from the social and cultural environment. Yet the question that has received insufficient theoretical development is how these levels can be integrated into one model without reducing one of them to another.

The present article addresses this gap and proposes that family counseling requires an integrative model that conceptualizes adaptation as a circular process involving four interconnected levels: family-system organization, emotion regulation, mobilization of resilience resources, and adaptation to context. Accordingly, the article addresses three main theoretical questions: How can these components be integrated into a single systemic framework? What mechanisms connect them? And what implications follow for family counseling practice and future research?

The central argument advanced in this article is that family resilience should not be understood as a capacity independent of structure, emotion, and context; emotion regulation should not be reduced to an individual skill; and contextual adaptation should not be regarded as merely a cultural addition to practice. Rather, family adaptation develops through continuous interaction among these levels. Consequently, family counseling that is consistent with an integrative systemic perspective is one that simultaneously works toward reorganizing relationships, improving processes of shared emotional regulation, developing resilience resources, and achieving greater fit between family responses and contextual demands.

2. Theoretical Framework for Family Counseling from an Integrative Systemic Perspective

2.1 From the Family as a Collection of Individuals to the Family as a Relational System

Systemic thinking is based on a fundamental principle: human phenomena cannot be fully understood when their elements are isolated from the network of relationships within which they are organized. Family therapy drew directly upon this transformation, and individual behavior came to be interpreted in relation to patterns of interaction within the family. In the structural approach developed by Minuchin (1974), the essence of the problem lies not only in observable behavior but also in the way family relationships are organized, the boundaries of subsystems, levels of authority, and patterns of alliance, closeness, and disengagement. Intervention, therefore, does not simply seek to help one individual change his or her response; it seeks to modify the interactional pattern that allows the problem to persist.

Bowen's (1978) theory provides a complementary dimension by conceptualizing the family as an emotional system extending across generations. The concept of differentiation occupies a central position in this framework. An individual with a higher level of differentiation can maintain a degree of autonomy in thinking and feeling while remaining emotionally connected to others, whereas lower differentiation may increase an individual's susceptibility to emotional fusion and automatic responses to family anxiety. The broad review conducted by Calatrava et al. (2022) supports associations between differentiation and domains such as psychological health, marital quality, and intergenerational relationships, while emphasizing the need for further longitudinal and causal evidence.

However, a systemic perspective does not imply that all individual behavior is simply a direct reflection of the family system. The relationship between the individual and the family is reciprocal. A family member may contribute to changing an interactional pattern, just as the family pattern can influence that individual's responses. Thus, an integrative perspective does not replace individual explanations with family explanations; rather, it connects the two levels within a reciprocal process.

This is where the concept of circularity becomes important. If one parent interprets a child's behavior as deliberate defiance, the parent may become more controlling, which may lead the child to resist more strongly. The child's resistance is then interpreted as additional evidence of poor discipline, and the cycle continues. In this situation, the problem lies neither solely in the child's "defiance" nor in the parent's "strictness," but in the interactional cycle linking the two responses. The function of systemic counseling is therefore to help the family recognize this cycle and introduce change at one or more points within it.

2.2 Family Resilience: From Resistance to Collapse to the Capacity for Reorganization

One of the important developments in family literature has been the shift from focusing primarily on weaknesses toward examining processes that enable families to confront crises and continue functioning. Resilience is not the absence of problems, nor is it an automatic capacity to return to a previous state. Rather, it is an adaptive process that may involve reorganizing relationships, roles, and beliefs.

Walsh's (2015/2016) framework of family resilience offers an influential conceptualization based on three broad domains: belief systems, organizational patterns, and communication and problem-solving processes. Its significance lies in the fact that it does not assume a single definition of resilience. Instead, it proposes that families draw upon different resources according to the nature of the crisis, their available resources, and their history and context. The third edition of Walsh's work emphasizes the interaction among biological, psychological, social, and cultural factors in shaping pathways of family resilience.

This perspective reveals an important theoretical point: a resilient family is not necessarily one that does not experience conflict or stress. Resilience may be expressed in the family's capacity to manage disagreement, modify roles, mobilize external support, and reconstruct meaning following a crisis. Resilience thus becomes an ongoing organizational process.

Recent literature supports this direction. Tetlow et al. (2024) examined the use of the concept of family resilience in interventions involving families with children and young people and found that family resilience has become

increasingly incorporated into health and social programs, while emphasizing the need for greater conceptual consistency in its application.

For family counseling, this means that the question should not only be "What is wrong with this family?" but also "How has this family managed to continue functioning until now?", "What resources does the family already use?", and "Which patterns can be strengthened?" This shift changes the nature of the counseling relationship because the family becomes a partner in constructing solutions rather than merely the object of assessment.

2.3 Emotion Regulation as a Relational Process

The concept of emotion regulation is often used at the individual level, but its application to family counseling requires expanding the unit of analysis. An emotion experienced by one family member does not necessarily remain within that individual's psychological boundaries. It can circulate through tone of voice, facial expression, silence, withdrawal, proximity, blame, reassurance, and reinterpretation. The family therefore represents a context for shared emotional regulation.

Gross (1998) defined emotion regulation in terms of the processes through which individuals influence the emotions they experience, when those emotions occur, and how they are experienced and expressed. His process model allows emotion regulation to be understood as a sequence of points at which intervention can occur, ranging from situation selection and situation modification to attentional deployment, cognitive reappraisal, and response modulation.

When this model is situated within the family, another level of analysis becomes possible. Marital conflict, for example, does not involve only the explicit content of disagreement. It may include a sequence consisting of a triggering event, an interpretation of the event, increased emotional arousal, a defensive response, a counterresponse, and escalation. Effective intervention may therefore involve helping the family identify this sequence and introduce alternatives before escalation occurs.

This perspective is particularly important in parent-child relationships. Difficulties in a parent's emotion regulation may be associated with responses to child behavior, while the child's behavior may itself increase parental arousal. Zitzmann et al. (2024) showed that the relationship between parental emotion regulation and parenting is an expanding area of research, although considerable variation remains in conceptual definitions and measurement. This supports the need for a theoretical model that distinguishes individual emotion regulation from interactional emotional regulation.

Accordingly, the present article proposes the concept of "family emotional regulation" to refer to the capacity of the family system to manage reciprocal arousal and emotions in ways that allow dialogue, negotiation, and repair to continue. This does not mean that the family possesses a single "emotion." Rather, it means that reciprocal response patterns can create an emotional climate that influences family members' capacity to think and communicate.

2.4 Contextual and Cultural Adaptation

A systemic model cannot be complete if the family remains conceptually separated from the context in which it lives. Families interact with schools, workplaces, healthcare systems, neighbors, relatives, cultural and social institutions, and broader economic and legal structures. They are also influenced by social, technological, and economic changes that may exceed their immediate capacity for control.

Ecological perspectives help explain this relationship between the family system and surrounding environments. Bronfenbrenner (1979) conceptualized human development as occurring within nested environmental levels, such that an individual's experience cannot be adequately explained without considering relationships among these levels. In family counseling, this perspective makes it possible to avoid assigning complete responsibility to the family for circumstances that may be associated with external resources or social and institutional constraints.

It is important here to distinguish "adaptation to context" from "submission to context." Adaptation does not mean that families must always accept existing conditions. Rather, it means that they are able to determine what can be

changed, what requires negotiation, and what requires mobilization of external resources. In some cases, systemic intervention may therefore be directed toward changing the family's relationship with its environment rather than changing the family alone.

The cultural dimension is particularly important in this regard. Concepts related to autonomy, parental authority, emotional expression, interdependence, and privacy may differ in meaning across contexts. Therefore, transferring a counseling approach from one cultural context to another requires examining whether its concepts, goals, and modes of communication are sufficiently equivalent and appropriate. Recent literature on cultural adaptation emphasizes that adaptation involves more than linguistic translation or modification of examples. It also requires examining concepts, values, expectations, the therapeutic relationship, and the fit between intervention mechanisms and the relevant context.

Accordingly, the present model does not propose to "add culture" to systemic family therapy as a separate layer. Rather, context is treated as an internal component of the interpretation of the family system itself.

2.5 From Multiple Approaches to Theoretical Integration

The scientific value of theoretical integration lies not in simply combining concepts but in specifying the relationships among them. If one states that a family is resilient, regulates its emotions, and adapts to context without specifying how these components interact, the result is not an integrated theoretical model but a list of concepts.

The present article therefore proposes that the relationship among the four components should be understood through a circular sequence:

Contextual demand or stressor → family appraisal and meaning-making → emotional arousal → family interactional pattern → emotional regulation or dysregulation → mobilization of family resources → reorganization of roles and relationships → adaptation to the situation → new experience that reshapes the family's understanding of the context.

This sequence is neither linear nor deterministic. The process may begin internally, such as through marital conflict, and then extend into the external environment. It may also begin externally, such as through job loss or illness within the family, and subsequently influence emotional regulation and family structure. The outcome may be adaptive or maladaptive depending on available resources, the degree of rigidity or flexibility, the meaning assigned to the event, and the family's capacity to access support.

Family resilience thus becomes a temporary outcome of an organizational process rather than a fixed characteristic. Emotion regulation becomes an interactional mechanism rather than merely an individual skill. Context becomes part of the system rather than a neutral background. Family structure, meanwhile, becomes the framework organizing the distribution of authority, resources, and emotions within the system.

3. TOWARD AN INTEGRATIVE THEORETICAL MODEL OF FAMILY COUNSELING

3.1 Theoretical Methodology of the Article

This article adopts an integrative theoretical approach based on a critical and synthetic analysis of relevant literature. It does not claim to constitute a systematic review in the strict procedural sense, nor does it present new empirical data or field-based findings. The literature was selected according to its direct relevance to the central components of the model: systemic theory, family structure, differentiation, family resilience, emotion regulation, ecological perspectives, cultural adaptation, and the effectiveness of systemic interventions.

The theoretical construction combines foundational works that shaped the field of family therapy and counseling with recent evidence examining or reviewing these perspectives. This approach aims to move beyond simply

presenting theories toward analyzing their points of convergence and identifying theoretical mechanisms that may explain the relationship among family organization, resilience, emotion regulation, and context.

The advantage of this approach is that it permits the development of a model that can be tested without presenting the model as an empirically established fact. The model proposed in this article should therefore be regarded as a composite theoretical proposition requiring empirical examination through future studies.

3.2 General Structure of the Model

The model is designated the "Integrative Systemic Model of Resilience, Emotion Regulation, and Contextual Adaptation." It is based on four central components:

Table 1. Core Components of the Integrative Systemic Family Counseling Framework

Component	Central theoretical question	Counseling focus
Systemic organization	How are relationships, roles, and boundaries organized?	Structure, boundaries, roles, alliances, interaction patterns
Emotion regulation	How does the family manage arousal and reciprocal emotions?	Emotional awareness, calming, expression, reappraisal, repair
Family resilience	How does the family mobilize its resources to confront crisis?	Beliefs, resources, communication, problem solving, support
Contextual adaptation	How does the family interact with its social and cultural environment?	Culture, institutions, social resources, external demands

Source: Authors' theoretical synthesis based on Bowen (1978), Minuchin (1974), Bronfenbrenner (1979), Gross (1998, 2015), and Walsh (2016).

These components do not operate independently. Disrupted family boundaries may increase emotional arousal; elevated arousal may weaken problem-solving capacity; impaired problem solving may reduce the family's ability to mobilize resources; and external pressures may increase rigidity within the family. Consequently, change in one component may create opportunities for change in the others.

3.3 Systemic Organization as the Structural Level

Systemic organization represents the level at which patterns of relationships among family members are established. It includes boundaries between parents and children, the marital relationship, levels of authority, distribution of roles, alliances, and patterns of closeness and distance. From Minuchin's (1974) perspective, the goal is not merely to make family members more capable of expressing their emotions, but to reorganize interaction when the structure is excessively rigid, excessively enmeshed, or unclear.

However, the integrative model rejects the reduction of family problems to structure alone. Boundaries may be clear while the family is facing a severe crisis that exceeds its available resources. A family may also be relatively resilient while living within an economic or institutional context that imposes substantial pressure. Structural assessment should therefore constitute a starting point rather than an endpoint.

3.4 Emotion Regulation as a Mediating Mechanism

The model proposes that emotion regulation represents one of the mechanisms through which family structure becomes expressed in everyday experience. Structure determines, in part, who communicates with whom, who has authority to make decisions, and how disagreement is expressed, but these structural arrangements become concrete experiences through emotional processes.

When family members are capable of tolerating arousal without rapidly moving toward attack or withdrawal, dialogue becomes possible. When arousal becomes excessively high, the capacity for reappraisal may narrow and

responses may become more automatic. Accordingly, intervention in emotion regulation does not simply mean teaching family members to "control anger." It means modifying the interactional cycle through which escalation is produced and maintained.

The counselor can therefore help family members identify the emotional sequence: What happened? How was the event interpreted? What emotion emerged? How was it expressed? How did the other person respond? And how did the second response reshape the first? This analysis moves the problem away from blame and toward process.

3.5 Family Resilience as the Capacity for Reorganization

In the proposed model, resilience does not emerge only after a crisis. It begins with how the family understands the crisis. If the family views the problem as evidence of its final failure, the range of perceived options may become narrower. If, by contrast, the family can reconstruct the meaning of the event, identify what is controllable, and mobilize its resources, the crisis may become an opportunity for reorganization.

Family beliefs are particularly important here. The meaning assigned to illness, academic failure, job loss, or marital conflict may influence the family's response. However, the model does not assume that "positive thinking" is sufficient to create resilience. Resilience also requires material resources, supportive relationships, communication skills, and access to institutions and services.

This point is important for avoiding an individualistic interpretation of resilience. Families cannot simply be instructed to "be more resilient" without considering the circumstances that constrain their choices. Resilience is not a substitute for material resources or social support; it is a capacity for adaptation that operates within real conditions.

3.6 Contextual Adaptation as a Negotiation Process

Contextual adaptation refers to the family's capacity to establish a functional relationship with its environment without losing its identity or decision-making capacity. This may involve seeking support from relatives, communicating with schools, using health or social services, organizing relationships with workplaces, or redistributing responsibilities in response to economic changes.

Contextual adaptation also involves negotiating cultural meanings. Counselors should not assume in advance that a particular value necessarily produces a positive or negative outcome. Instead, they should explore how the family itself understands that value, how it is practiced within relationships, and whether it contributes to solidarity or, under particular circumstances, becomes a source of conflict.

Cultural adaptation therefore becomes a dialogical process rather than the imposition of a set of rules on the family. Recent literature on cultural adaptation emphasizes that the challenge is not limited to modifying language or examples, but also involves examining whether the basic concepts of an intervention are equivalent and applicable in a new context.

The model consequently uses the concept of "contextual fit" rather than "cultural adaptation" in a narrow sense. Contextual fit requires attention to culture, but it also encompasses developmental stage, economic resources, family structure, institutional circumstances, family history, and the nature of the crisis.

3.7 Mechanism of Change in the Proposed Model

The mechanism of change in the model can be summarized through seven interconnected processes.

First: Reframing the problem.

The counselor moves from identifying an individual as the "problem holder" toward identifying the interactional cycle within which the problem appears.

Second: Mapping the relational system.

Roles, boundaries, alliances, communication patterns, sources of authority, and sources of support are identified.

Third: Identifying the emotional cycle.

The relationship among event, interpretation, emotion, response, and reaction is analyzed.

Fourth: Identifying resilience resources.

Strengths, supportive beliefs, relationships, resources, and institutions that can be mobilized are explored.

Fifth: Reorganizing interaction.

Family members are helped to experiment with new patterns of dialogue, negotiation, and response.

Sixth: Expanding contextual resources.

Intervention does not stop at the family level but considers opportunities to establish or strengthen links with external resources.

Seventh: Consolidating systemic learning.

The family learns how to monitor new interactional cycles and modify them when subsequent stressors arise.

These processes are not necessarily linear stages. The counselor may need to move from emotion regulation back to family structure, from the current problem to context, or from resources to the meaning of the crisis. The model is therefore circular rather than strictly sequential.

3.8 Differentiation as a Linking Concept

The concept of differentiation in Bowen's theory provides an important link between the individual and the system. An individual does not need to separate from the family to achieve autonomy. Rather, the individual needs the capacity to maintain a degree of emotional autonomy while remaining relationally connected. The review by Calatrava et al. (2022) found substantial support for associations between differentiation and psychological health, marital quality, and certain indicators of intergenerational relationships, while emphasizing the need for causal and longitudinal evidence.

In the present model, differentiation can be understood as a resource that supports emotion regulation. When an individual can think while emotionally aroused rather than respond immediately to the arousal, that person may be better able to participate in regulating the system rather than becoming absorbed in family anxiety. However, differentiation should not be reduced to an individual skill because its expression is also influenced by the relational context.

3.9 The Relationship Between Resilience and Emotion Regulation

The relationship between resilience and emotion regulation can be conceptualized as bidirectional. On the one hand, families require a degree of emotion regulation to use their resources and solve problems effectively. On the other hand, shared beliefs, social support, and clear role distribution may provide conditions that facilitate emotional regulation and reduce arousal.

Emotion regulation therefore cannot be treated as an isolated cause of resilience, nor can resilience be regarded simply as an outcome of emotion regulation. The two processes are interconnected. A family capable of calming escalation may become better able to solve problems, while successful problem solving may in turn reduce sources of emotional arousal.

3.10 The Relationship Between Resilience and Context

Resilience cannot be understood outside the environment. A resource functions as a resource only when it is available and usable. A family may have an extensive social network, but conflicts within that network may prevent

the family from benefiting from it. A family may have access to good institutional services, but economic, geographical, or informational barriers may limit their use.

Family counseling should therefore ask not only, "What resources does the family possess?" but also, "What resources can the family access?" and "What barriers prevent their use?" This shift protects the concept of resilience from becoming a discourse that places full responsibility for adaptation on the family.

4. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 The Theoretical Value of the Model

The central contribution of the model lies in its attempt to move beyond fragmentation across levels of analysis. Traditional systemic theories offer powerful tools for understanding relationships and structure; resilience theories explain the family's capacity to confront crises; emotion regulation models provide mechanisms for understanding emotional responses; and ecological and cultural perspectives expand analysis to include the environment. Yet bringing these elements together requires a logic that explains how they interact.

The proposed model provides such a logic through the concept of "systemic adaptation." Adaptation is not merely an end state but an ongoing process of reorganizing the relationship between the family and its environment. Consequently, change in one component can serve as an entry point for change in other components.

This perspective is consistent with contemporary developments in the systemic evidence base, which do not restrict family therapy to a single therapeutic model but encompass a range of family and systemic interventions that can be used according to the nature of the problem and context. Reviews by Carr (2025) demonstrate the breadth of evidence concerning systemic interventions for child-, youth-, and adult-focused problems.

However, the existence of evidence supporting the effectiveness of systemic interventions does not mean that every systemic model operates in the same way, nor does it mean that all components of the proposed model have been established causally. A distinction must therefore be made between the existence of an empirical basis supporting systemic therapy and certain of its components, and the validity of the specific integrative model proposed here. The latter requires future empirical testing.

4.2 From the "Problem Individual" to the "System Under Stress"

One important implication of this model is the reframing of the problem. If parents seek counseling because of a child's "aggressiveness," an individual approach may focus on the child's behavior and its causes. A systemic interactional approach, by contrast, searches for the cycle within which the behavior develops. Aggression may appear within a struggle over authority, during a family transition, or in a context of emotional difficulties affecting more than one family member.

This does not mean denying individual responsibility or ignoring individual psychological characteristics. Rather, it means avoiding reducing the problem to them. This is central to family counseling because changing the individual without changing the interactional cycle may allow the problem to reappear in another form.

4.3 From Deficit Treatment to Resource Development

The resilience perspective introduces another shift by redefining the counselor's role. Rather than functioning primarily as an expert who identifies deficits, the counselor becomes a partner in discovering and expanding resources. This does not mean abandoning professional assessment; rather, it changes the assessment question from "What is not working?" to "What is working partially, when does it work, and how can it be expanded?"

This orientation is consistent with Walsh's (2015/2016) focus on family processes and resources, as well as with the growing use of family resilience in family interventions.

However, an excessive emphasis on strength must be avoided. Focusing on resources should not lead to neglecting poverty, illness, unemployment, violence, absence of services, or institutional constraints. Resilience is not a substitute for social justice or material resources. It is a capacity for adaptation that operates under real conditions.

4.4 Emotion Regulation as a Bridge Between Structure and Behavior

Emotion regulation may be the most important component of the model from a procedural perspective because it constitutes a bridge between abstract structure and everyday interaction. Family boundaries do not appear in daily life as theoretical concepts; they are expressed through who speaks, who withdraws, who calms the situation, who escalates it, and who intervenes in the conflicts of others.

Work on emotion regulation can therefore provide the counselor with a concrete point of intervention. When family members learn to recognize escalation before it reaches its peak, reinterpret meaning, delay responses during periods of arousal, and express needs without accusation, structural reorganization may become more achievable.

This does not mean transforming family counseling into emotion-management training. Intervention must remain systemic because emotion itself develops within relationships. Zitzmann et al. (2024) demonstrated the importance of studying parental emotion regulation in relation to parenting, while also identifying conceptual and measurement variation. This further supports the need for theoretical integration.

4.5 The Cultural Dimension: From Formal Adaptation to Theoretical Fit

One potential error in family counseling is to treat culture as a list of fixed characteristics. It is not scientifically appropriate to assume that all families within one society share the same values or practice them in the same way. Nor is merely modifying language or using local examples sufficient to make an intervention culturally appropriate.

More important is understanding how the family itself interprets concepts such as respect, authority, autonomy, privacy, support, obligation, and responsibility. If a counselor views individual autonomy as an absolute therapeutic value, the counselor may misinterpret a family relationship in which connectedness functions as a source of support. Conversely, respecting family connectedness should not mean accepting control or eliminating individual voice.

The model therefore proposes the concept of "contextual fit" rather than "cultural adaptation" in a narrow sense. Fit requires examining culture, but also economic resources, family structure, institutional conditions, family history, and the nature of the crisis.

This is consistent with literature emphasizing that cultural adaptation requires attention to conceptual and functional equivalence rather than merely translating or modifying intervention techniques.

4.6 Practical Implications for Family Counseling

The proposed model can be translated into a practical framework for assessment and intervention. During assessment, the counselor should gather information across four interconnected levels. The first level is family structure: Who makes decisions? What are the boundaries? How are roles distributed? The second is the emotional level: How does escalation begin? How are anger, fear, or sadness expressed? The third is the resource level: What are the family's strengths? What support is available? Which beliefs help the family? The fourth is context: What external pressures exist? Which institutions interact with the family? What barriers does the family encounter?

The counselor does not need to address everything simultaneously. Instead, the most changeable point and the point most closely connected to the current problem can be identified. The appropriate entry point may be restructuring the parental relationship, training family members to pause before escalation, changing the meaning assigned to the crisis, mobilizing a support network, or addressing the family's relationship with an external institution.

This leads to an important principle: "multilevel intervention with a systemic dose." Integration does not mean using every technique in a single session. It means selecting the level of intervention according to the function served by the problem within the system.

4.7 The Role of Family Communication

Communication occupies a central position in the model because it represents the domain in which structure, emotion, resilience, and context intersect. Families require communication not only to exchange information but also to construct meaning, negotiate roles, regulate emotions, and solve problems.

It is important to distinguish the quantity of communication from its quality. A family may communicate extensively while repeatedly entering cycles of blame and defensiveness. Another family may communicate relatively little but know how to request support and respond to one another. Counseling should therefore focus on the interactional function of communication rather than simply increasing the amount of talk.

Silence should also be interpreted contextually. It may function as protection, withdrawal, respect, fear, or a strategy for avoiding escalation. Its meaning cannot be determined without understanding the interactional context.

4.8 The Counselor's Role: From Expert to Process Organizer

The proposed model requires reconsideration of the counselor's role. The counselor is neither simply an expert who provides ready-made solutions nor a neutral observer outside the system. Rather, the counselor temporarily enters the system and contributes to reorganizing the process of thinking and interaction within it.

This requires a high degree of awareness of professional assumptions. A counselor may hold preconceived ideas about what constitutes a "healthy" family, a "functional" marital relationship, or "appropriate" parenting. If these assumptions remain unexamined, counseling may become an imposition of a particular cultural model.

The integrative systemic approach therefore requires the counselor to formulate exploratory questions rather than provide direct answers, reframe conflict in ways that reduce blame, help family members observe their interactional patterns from an external perspective, and protect each individual's space within the counseling process.

4.9 Therapeutic Effectiveness and Limits of Inference

Recent evidence indicates that systemic interventions have a substantial and growing research base. Carr (2025) provided a broad review of systemic interventions directed toward child- and youth-focused problems and another review addressing adult-focused problems and relationships.

However, this evidence does not justify the conclusion that the model proposed here is effective because it has not yet been subjected to empirical testing. This methodological distinction must be maintained clearly. The present article offers a theoretical synthesis informed by existing evidence, but it does not transform evidence concerning the effectiveness of some systemic interventions into evidence supporting the effectiveness of this new model.

The evidence concerning family resilience and emotion regulation also requires greater conceptual and measurement consistency. Recent reviews have demonstrated variation in the definitions and measurement of resilience and differences in conceptualization and measurement in research on emotion regulation in parenting contexts. This suggests that one contribution of the proposed model may be to clarify its variables and processes before they are empirically tested.

4.10 Proposals for Future Empirical Testing

The model can be transformed into a coherent research program. An initial step could involve developing a measure of integrative systemic adaptation incorporating dimensions of family structure, interactional emotion regulation, resources, and contextual adaptation. Such an instrument should not be developed arbitrarily but through successive stages involving conceptual specification, item development and expert evaluation, examination of factor structure, and assessment of validity and reliability.

The relationships among the model's components could then be examined using longitudinal designs because the relationship between resilience, emotion regulation, and adaptation should not be assumed to remain constant at a single point in time.

Future research could also test whether improvement in emotion regulation precedes improvement in communication or whether the reverse occurs, and whether contextual resources moderate the relationship between family stress and adaptation. Families at different stages of the life cycle could also be compared because the challenges associated with family formation differ from those associated with childrearing or the transition of children toward independence.

In Arab and Maghreb contexts, qualitative studies could first be used to understand the meanings attached to differentiation, authority, solidarity, privacy, and family support. The findings could then inform the development of quantitative measures that are more appropriate to the relevant context. Such a sequence would be more consistent with an integrative perspective than importing ready-made measures without examining their conceptual equivalence.

5. CONCLUSION

This article sought to develop an integrative theoretical model of family counseling based on the central idea that the family is a dynamic system shaped by continuous interaction among structure, emotion, resources, and context. By bringing together systemic theory, the concept of differentiation, family resilience theory, models of emotion regulation, and ecological and cultural perspectives, the article proposed that family adaptation should not be understood as a fixed characteristic or the outcome of a single variable, but rather as an ongoing process of reorganization.

The main theoretical contribution lies in placing four components within a single framework: systemic organization, emotion regulation, family resilience, and contextual adaptation. The model does not assume a linear relationship among these components. Instead, it conceptualizes them as reciprocal processes that can strengthen or weaken one another. A family capable of regulating emotional arousal may become better able to solve problems; successful problem solving may increase resilience resources; available resources may facilitate the reorganization of relationships; and the external context may provide new resources or impose additional pressures on the system.

The model also emphasizes that resilience is not simply an internal family capacity. The availability of external resources and the family's ability to access them are part of the adaptation process. Family counseling should therefore not place full responsibility on the family for problems that are partly shaped by economic, institutional, or broader social conditions.

The model further emphasizes that emotion regulation should be understood relationally. Emotion is not an isolated individual event but can become part of an interactional cycle involving interpretation, response, reaction, and repair. Counseling can therefore intervene in the cycle rather than focusing exclusively on the individual who displays the symptom.

The contextual and cultural dimension prevents the model from falling into false universality. Counseling concepts do not operate independently of the meanings that families assign to relationships, roles, and responsibilities. Cultural fit therefore does not simply mean translating techniques; it requires understanding how the problem and its possible solutions are constructed within the context in which the family lives.

In light of recent evidence, there is a growing research base supporting the use of systemic and family interventions for a range of problems, as well as increasing evidence concerning the importance of family resilience and emotion regulation. However, this does not mean that the proposed model has been empirically validated. It is a theoretical model requiring development and testing, and this limitation is part of its methodological integrity rather than a weakness.

Accordingly, the next step should be to move from theoretical construction to a multistage research program beginning with qualitative studies, followed by measurement development, factor-structure testing, and longitudinal and experimental studies examining the relationships among its components. Future studies could also

examine the model's contextual fit across different cultural settings, including Arab and Maghreb contexts, while avoiding assumptions of cultural homogeneity within these settings.

At the professional level, the model can help family counselors move from treating symptoms toward understanding systems, from focusing on deficits toward identifying resources, from treating emotion as an individual problem toward understanding it as an interactional process, and from ignoring the environment toward incorporating it into assessment and intervention. In this way, family counseling becomes a process of reorganizing relationships, resources, meanings, and emotional processes in ways that enable the family to develop more flexible and contextually appropriate forms of adaptation.

Ultimately, the value of an integrative systemic perspective does not lie merely in adding another theory to existing theories. Its value lies in offering a more interconnected way of formulating the counseling question. When a family faces a crisis or conflict, the counselor should not ask only who is suffering, but also how relationships are organized around the problem, how emotions are regulated within the family, what resources the family can mobilize, and how all of these processes interact with the context in which the family lives. Addressing these questions together opens the way toward a conception of family counseling that connects the individual, relationship, system, and society within a continuous process of adaptation.

Declarations

Funding: no external funding was received

Conflict of Interest: The authors have not any competing interests.

Ethics Approval and Consent: Not applicable. This theoretical article does not involve human participants or identifiable personal data.

AI Use: “No generative AI tools were used in preparing this manuscript.”

6. REFERENCES

1. Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind: Collected essays in anthropology, psychiatry, evolution, and epistemology*. Chandler Publishing Company.
2. Bowen, M. (1978). *Family therapy in clinical practice*. Jason Aronson.
3. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
4. Calatrava, M., Martins, M. V., Schweer-Collins, M., Duch-Ceballos, C., & Rodríguez-González, M. (2022). Differentiation of self: A scoping review of Bowen Family Systems Theory's core construct. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 91, 102101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2021.102101>
5. Carr, A. (2025). Couple therapy and systemic interventions for adult-focused problems: The evidence base. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 47(1), e12481. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6427.12481>
6. Carr, A. (2025). Family therapy and systemic interventions for child-focussed problems: The evidence base. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 47(1), e12476. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6427.12476>
7. Fischer, R., Bailey, Y., Shankar, M., Safaeinili, N., Karl, J. A., Daly, A., Johnson, F. N., Winter, T., Arahanga-Doyle, H., Fox, R., Abubakar, A., & Zulman, D. M. (2024). Cultural challenges for adapting behavioral intervention frameworks: A critical examination from a cultural psychology perspective. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 110, 102425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2024.102425>

8. Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology*, 2(3), 271–299. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.271>
9. Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer Publishing Company.
10. Masten, A. S. (2014). *Ordinary magic: Resilience in development*. Guilford Press.
11. McCubbin, H. I., & Patterson, J. M. (1983). The family stress process: The Double ABCX model of adjustment and adaptation. *Marriage & Family Review*, 6(1–2), 7–37. https://doi.org/10.1300/J002v06n01_02
12. Minuchin, S. (1974). *Families and family therapy*. Harvard University Press.
13. Tetlow, S., Wallace, C., Thomas, M., Filipponi, T., Pontin, D., & Livingstone, A. (2024). A systematic review of the use of the concept family resilience in interventions with families with children and young people. *Public Health Nursing*, 41(2), 346–355. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phn.13287>
14. Walsh, F. (2016). *Strengthening family resilience* (3rd ed.). Guilford Press.
15. Zitzmann, J., Rombold-George, L., Rosenbach, C., & Renneberg, B. (2024). Emotion regulation, parenting, and psychopathology: A systematic review. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 27(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-023-00452-5>