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Editor's Comments
Larry Litwack

This issue marks the start of the 29th year of publication for the Journal. That means that this will be the 57th issue of the Journal that I have edited. During that time, I have had the good fortune to be helped by a great number of people - especially the authors of the hundreds of articles that have been published, the members of the editorial and advisory boards, and the support from Northeastern University and National-Louis University in helping produce and mail the Journal.

I am particularly indebted to several individuals who have facilitated my growth and development over the years - starting with Perry Good and Al Katz who were my first RT instructors in the late '70s, this list includes some individuals who were constantly supportive of my efforts. This includes Tom Bratter, John Brickell, Naomi Glasser, Adrian Gorman, Diane Gossen, Robert Renna, Joshua Ritchie, Adrian Schoo, Bob Wubbolding, and the leadership of the William Glasser Institute-Australia.

Since 1980, when I became RTC, I have been closely connected with the William Glasser Institute. I started the Journal because I felt there needed to be a public forum for the ideas of internal control psychology as exemplified by reality therapy and choice theory. I served for three years on the WGI Advisory Board to more closely ally with the movement. Although we may have disagreed at times over article or editorial content, I always felt that the Institute was supportive of my efforts.

Perhaps my greatest satisfaction over the years in addition to the Journal has been being the leader in introducing reality therapy to Israel. Since the late 1990s, I have been going to Israel at least once a year to conduct training there. Working with Joshua Ritchie, we have been able to develop a cadre of supervisors and trainers who hopefully will continue the training and development in the country.
Now it is time to move on. This will be the last issue under my editorship. I made this decision for a variety of reasons. Perhaps the major reason was that the cost of the Journal has always been defrayed by individual and library subscriptions, accompanied by orders from WGI-England, WGI-Australia, and the William Glasser Institute in California. Considering the current financial status of WGI, (at one time membership was in the 14-1500 range) the cost of printing and mailing the Journal to its members has become a burden that WGI no longer feels able to afford. Although still supportive of the Journal, the suggestion has been made to develop the Journal as an on-line publication. I felt that such a move would be an excellent time to have the Journal move under new leadership.

I am happy to report that Dr. Thomas Parish has agreed to assume the editorship of the Journal, effective as of the start of 2010. Tom has been a long-time contributor to the Journal, and is well aware of the challenges that lie ahead. The new mailing address as of January 1st for the Journal will be 4606 SW Moundview Drive, Topeka, Kansas 66610-1602., tel no. 785-862-1379. I of course will be available to help Tom in any way I can to facilitate the transition. Back issues up to and including this issue will continue to be available from me. The Resource Guide including material from 1981-2007 will also continue to be available through me. Those of you who may be interested in working with Tom as reviewers, members of the editorial board, etc. are encouraged to contact him.

I am reminded of the words of John Silber, former president of Boston University, and one-time candidate for governor of Massachusetts, who had the misfortune of saying during his gubernatorial campaign (referring to the elderly) “When you’re ripe, its time to go.”. My thanks to all of you.

Cynthia Palmer Mason and Jill D. Duba
Both authors are on the faculty of the Department of Counseling and Student Affairs at Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this manuscript is to examine the application of Reality Therapy in schools. The basic components of the American School Counseling Association's National Model and also the core tenets of Reality Therapy are reviewed in terms of pertinent literature. This is followed by a focus on the delivery system of the national model. Lastly, specific emphasis will be placed on the potential impact Reality Therapy can have on student academic achievement, personal/social development, and career decision-making skills when applied to each program component.

In 2003, the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) published the ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs (Wittmer & Clark, 2007). Using the best practices over the last fifty years, the national model was developed during a summit in 2001 by the leadership of ASCA, national school counseling leaders, school counselor educators, practicing school counselors, state guidance coordinators, school district guidance coordinators, and representatives from the Education Trust. Much of the work incorporated in the framework was previously done by Drs. Norm Gysbers, C. D. Johnson, Sharon Johnson, and Robert Myrick (Wittmer & Clark, 2007).

This model provides a foundation, a delivery system, a management system, and an accountability system for professional school counselors (Wittmer & Clark, 2007). The ASCA National Model's framework includes the three domains of academic achievement, career decision-making, and personal/social development. Perhaps the most significant change for school counselors in the 21st Century has been the expectation for them to spend a larger percentage of their time in the classroom using developmental guidance lessons to support and enhance academic achievement. In fact, because of the need for counselors to impact academic achievement, university training programs have changed from a theory based preparation to an education based preparation (House & Martin, 1998).

Effective school counseling programs have structural components and program components (Wittmer & Clark, 2007). The structural components provide the ideological underpinnings for the entire program, and should be written by an advisory committee composed of administrators, counselors, teachers, parents and community leaders. The Mission Statement and the Rationale Statement are in this element. The Mission Statement outlines the purpose of the program. This narrative includes a set of principles which guides the development, implementation, and evaluation of the entire program. Following the writing of the Mission Statement, the advisory committee develops the Rationale Statement. This document clearly presents the reasons for having a comprehensive, developmental counseling program in place. It also explains how the program will benefit the students, the faculty, the parents, and the specific community being served. The Program Components of the ASCA National Model will be reviewed in the paragraphs that follow.

All activities that counselors perform to deliver the ASCA National Model are framed within four program components (guidance curriculum, individual planning, responsive services, and system support). Each component makes specific contributions to enhance academic achievement, career decision-making, and personal/social development for students (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006). For instance, the Guidance Curriculum complements the academic curriculum. Its purpose is to provide preventive, proactive lessons to promote positive mental health and enhanced academic achievement for all students. Guidance lessons and activities that focus on relationships, integrity, self-esteem, self-discipline, goal-setting, study skills, time management, anger management, careers, decision-making, and the importance of acquiring a quality education support and enhance the school instruction program.

The Individual Planning component consists of activities that help students to plan, monitor, and manage their own learning and personal career development. Within this element, students explore and evaluate their education, career options, and personal goals. School counselors work closely with students on an individual basis and update their files after each intervention.

The Responsive Services component provides individual counseling, small group counseling, consultations, and referrals to meet the immediate needs and concerns of students. This element of the counseling program is available to all students and is often initiated by students.
Putting in his/her quality world (Glasser, 2001). The choice of a therapist must be the kind of person the client would consider most to connect with. For therapy to be successful, a therapeutic relationship has been established, the counselor is able to instill a sense of hope in students. Once the therapeutic relationship has been established, the counselor assists students in gaining a deeper understanding of the consequences of their current behavior. At this point, students are helped to understand that they are not at the mercy of others, are not victims, and that they have a range of options to choose from.

A basic goal of Reality Therapy is to help clients learn better ways of fulfilling their needs. The procedures that lead to change are based on two specific assumptions (Glasser, 1992). The first assumption is that their present behavior is not getting them what they want; the second assumption is that humans are motivated to change when they believe they can choose other behaviors that will get them closer to what they want.

Reality Therapy emphasizes the importance of the therapeutic relationship which is the foundation for effective counseling outcomes (Wubbolding & Brickell, 1999). Counselors are able to develop positive relationships with clients when they possess the personal qualities of warmth, sincerity, congruence, understanding, acceptance, concern, openness, respect for the client and the willingness to be challenged by others (Corey, 2009). These characteristics allow school counselors to function as advocates who are able to instill a sense of hope in students. Once the therapeutic relationship has been established, the counselor assists students in gaining a deeper understanding of the consequences of their current behavior. At this point, students are helped to understand that they are not at the mercy of others, are not victims, and that they have a range of options to choose from.

Choice Theory emphasizes that beginning shortly after birth and continuing all through life, individuals store information inside their minds and build a file of wants called the Quality World. The Quality World consists of people, activities, events, beliefs, possessions, and situations that fill personal needs (Wubbolding, 2000). People are the most important component of each Quality World and these are the individuals clients care about and want most to connect with. For therapy to be successful, a therapist must be the kind of person the client would consider putting in his/her quality world (Glasser, 2001). Choice theory explains that everything we do is chosen and every behavior is our best attempt to get what we want to satisfy our needs (Glasser).

Services provided in this component help students to resolve personal concerns that could possibly impede their academic concentration and achievement if left unattended.

The System Support component provides management activities that support the total school counseling program. These elements include professional development, staff and community relations, consultations with teachers and parents, program management, advisory council activities, and research and development.

Effective school counseling programs are 100% programs with all counselor activities fitting into one of the four program components. Counselors at each level must consider the specifics of their particular school setting and decide the percentage of time to devote to each program component (Wittmer & Clark, 2007). The focus of ASCA National Model school counseling programs is clearly on the academic achievement, personal well-being, and equity of opportunity for all students. Now that the basic components of the ASCA National Model have been reviewed, the following paragraphs will address the core tenets of Reality Therapy.

Reality Therapy is a method of counseling and psychotherapy that was developed by William Glasser (1965). Validated by research studies, this theoretical approach has been successfully taught and practiced in the United States, Canada, Korea, Japan, Singapore, the United Kingdom, Norway, Israel, Ireland, Germany, Spain, Slovenia, Croatia, Italy, Colombia, Kuwait, Russia, Australia, New Zealand, and Hong Kong (Wubbolding, 2000). In addition to other areas, Reality Therapy has been effectively applied to schools (Glasser, 1990, 1993), parenting (Glasser, 2002), and counseling and therapy (Wubbolding, 2000, 2004; Wubbolding & Brickell, 1999).

Choice Theory is the underlying theoretical basis for Reality Therapy. According to Choice Theory, all human beings are motivated by five genetically encoded needs - survival, love and belonging, power or achievement, freedom or independence, and fun - that drive us all our lives (Glasser, 1998). Glasser believes the need to love and belong is the primary need and also the most difficult need to satisfy because the involvement of another individual is required to meet this desire.

Choice Theory emphasizes that beginning shortly after birth and continuing all through life, individuals store information inside their minds and build a file of wants called the Quality World. The Quality World consists of people, activities, events, beliefs, possessions, and situations that fill personal needs (Wubbolding, 2000). People are the most important component of each Quality World and these are the individuals clients care about and want most to connect with. For therapy to be successful, a therapist must be the kind of person the client would consider putting in his/her quality world (Glasser, 2001). Choice theory explains that everything we do is chosen and every behavior is our best attempt to get what we want to satisfy our needs (Glasser).

A basic goal of Reality Therapy is to help clients learn better ways of fulfilling their needs. The procedures that lead to change are based on two specific assumptions (Glasser, 1992). The first assumption is that their present behavior is not getting them what they want; the second assumption is that humans are motivated to change when they believe they can choose other behaviors that will get them closer to what they want.

Reality Therapy emphasizes the importance of the therapeutic relationship which is the foundation for effective counseling outcomes (Wubbolding & Brickell, 1999). Counselors are able to develop positive relationships with clients when they possess the personal qualities of warmth, sincerity, congruence, understanding, acceptance, concern, openness, respect for the client and the willingness to be challenged by others (Corey, 2009). These characteristics allow school counselors to function as advocates who are able to instill a sense of hope in students. Once the therapeutic relationship has been established, the counselor assists students in gaining a deeper understanding of the consequences of their current behavior. At this point, students are helped to understand that they are not at the mercy of others, are not victims, and that they have a range of options to choose from.

Reality Therapy provides the delivery system for helping individuals take more effective control of their lives. The acronym WDEP is used to describe the basic procedures of Reality Therapy. Each letter refers to a cluster of strategies that are designed to promote change: W=wants and needs; D=direction and doing; E=self-evaluation; and P=planning (Wubbolding, 2000). The following paragraphs will focus on the delivery system of the ASCA national model which includes the activities, interactions, and areas in which counselors work to enhance the lives of boys and girls. Within the delivery system there are four program components: school counseling curriculum, individual student planning, responsive services, and system support (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006). Specific emphasis will be placed on the potential impact Reality Therapy can have on student academic achievement, personal/social development, and career decision-making skills when applied to each program component.

School Counseling Curriculum

The School Counseling Curriculum program component is used to impart guidance and counseling content to students in a systematic way. Activities in this component focus on student's study and test-taking skills, post-secondary planning, understanding of self and others, peer relationships, substance abuse education, diversity awareness, coping strategies and career planning (ASCA, 2006). Guidance lessons are usually presented to students in
regular classroom settings. School counselors work with the Steering Committee and the School Community Advisory Committee to decide on the competencies (knowledge and skills) students should acquire at each grade level (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006). This curriculum allows counselors to be proactive rather than reactive in their attempt to meet student needs.

School counselors are actually responsible for the development and organization of the school counseling curriculum (Wittmer & Clark, 2007); however, the cooperation and support of the faculty, staff, parents and guardians are necessary for its successful implementation. This is one of the reasons why Reality Therapy practitioners can be most effective in schools. Reality Therapy emphasizes the importance of the personal qualities of warmth, sincerity, congruence, understanding, acceptance, concern, openness and respect for each individual that therapists must possess. These characteristics that pave the way for school counselors to develop positive therapeutic relationships with students also help them to gain respect, cooperation, and support from parents, guardians and those who work within the schools.

When deciding on specific lessons and activities for the school counseling curriculum at each grade level, Reality Therapy practitioners consider the five basic needs that all humans possess (survival, love and belonging, power or achievement, freedom or independence, and fun). Special attention is always given to love and belonging which Glasser (1998) believes is the primary need. These basic needs make up the Quality World for each individual. This personal world consists of specific images of people, activities, events, beliefs, possessions and situations that fulfill individual needs (Wubbolding, 2000). People are the most important component of the Quality World. For a successful therapeutic outcome, the counselor must be the kind of person a client would consider putting in his/her Quality World. As Reality Therapy practitioners interact with students, their personal characteristics enable them to appeal to one or more of each student's basic needs.

Before focusing on the importance of academic achievement, personal/social development and career information; Reality Therapy practitioners work at involving, encouraging and supporting all students to help them feel that they are cared for and actually belong to this specific group and this particular school. This interaction helps to build trust. It is through this relationship with the therapist that clients begin to focus and learn from them.

As guidance lessons are presented from the structured curriculum, school counselors at each grade level focus on the underlying characteristics of reality therapy (Corey, 2009). They begin by emphasizing choice and responsibility. Students are taught that they choose all that they do and are responsible for what they choose. Reality therapists challenge students to examine and evaluate their own behavior. Students are encouraged to consider how effective their choices are with regard to their personal goals for academic achievement, personal/social adjustment and career development. After class discussions, students are taught to make better choices—choices that will help them to meet their needs in more effective ways as they strive to develop better relationships, increased happiness and a sense of inner control of their lives (Wubbolding, 1988).

**Individual Student Planning**

When this program component is properly implemented, P-12 school students will graduate from their respective secondary schools with more realistic plans for the future. This is a service whereby counselors focus on goal setting, academic planning, career planning, problem solving and an understanding of self (ASCA, 2006). Each school year, counselors at all levels should schedule at least one individual planning session with each student in their assigned group. It is important for parents to be invited to attend these sessions as their involvement and support are vital for student motivation. This cycle of counseling begins with the counselor's efforts to create a positive working relationship with each student. The personal characteristics of each counselor are assets as he/she works to develop a meaningful therapeutic relationship with each counselee. When this relationship is an understanding and supportive one, it provides a foundation for effective outcomes. Client involvement is important. Reality therapy practitioners use attending behaviors, listening skills, suspension of client judgment, facilitative self-disclosure, summarizing and focusing to create the type of climate that leads to client participation. Once the involvement has been established, counselors focus on the specific procedures that lead to change in behavior.

The cycle of counseling proceeds with the employment of the WDEP system. Students are encouraged to explore their wants, needs and perceptions in the areas of academic achievement, personal/social adjustment and career development. This is followed by an exploration of their total behavior in each of these areas and their personal evaluations of how effective they are in moving toward what they actually want. Students are asked if their present behavior has a reasonable chance of getting them what they want now, and if they believe it is taking them in the direction they want to go (Wubbolding, 2000).

Standardized test scores, semester grades, and personal preferences are considered as student goals are reviewed. According to Glasser (1992), individuals are motivated to change when they are convinced that their present behavior is not getting them what they want and also when they believe they can choose other behaviors that will get them closer to what they want. When students decide to change, this is their choice. When they determine what they want to change, Reality Therapy practitioners are able to help them formulate structured plans for change. Wubbolding (2000) uses the acronym SAMIC to capture the essence of an effective plan: simple,
opportunities that serve to meet all five of the Basic Needs.

Individual student planning sessions usually end with a summary of what has been agreed upon during the interview. Two copies are made of student plans when they are revised: one copy is placed in the student's folder and the other copy is given to the student. Unless a definite date has been scheduled for the next meeting, counselors are encouraged to consult with counselors as needed during the remainder of the school year.

Responsive Services

School counselors are called to respond to the immediate needs and concerns of their students. Such responses may include the provision of information, peer mediation, referrals, counseling, or consultation. Further, the ASCA National Model provides specific criteria or objectives of Responsive Services. Such objectives can be met through the use of basic Choice Theory concepts.

Prevention Education to Address Life Choices

The first criterion of Responsive Services states, "Every student K-12 receives prevention education to address life choices in academic, career, and personal/social development" (ASCA, 2003, p. 114). How can a school counselor provide prevention education through a Choice Theory lens? Dr. Glasser writes, "Education is not acquiring knowledge; it is best defined as using knowledge" (1998, p. 238). Further, the value lies in applying what has been learned, rather than collecting a mental cabinet of knowledge and data. So perhaps the initial step is re-thinking about what is important to teach. From a Choice Theory perspective, there are two essential elements or questions. First, how can school counselors provide opportunities for students to address life choices in various areas in real time? Second, how will the counselor provide good experiences for students as they learn how to address life choices?

The opportunities are endless depending on how creative one is. However, for the purpose of brevity, ideas for Choice Theory based opportunities are outlined below specifically as they relate to a school counselor's call to provide responsive services to all students in the areas of academic achievement, career development, and personal/social adjustment. In addition, these opportunities are meant to set the context for enjoyable experiences for all involved, teachers and students alike.

Academic development. The opportunities suggested are based upon the assumption that if one of the five basic needs is not being satisfied, misery will follow (Glasser, 1998). In a school system, misery is typically related to academic difficulties, a lack of interest and motivation, and failure. Consequently, school counselors are urged to consider the uniqueness of each student, while providing opportunities that serve to meet all five of the Basic Needs.

a. Survival and Health (physiological needs). Mental and emotional stressors are directly linked to organic responses within the body.
   i. Teach students stress and relaxation coping mechanisms as a part of the health education curriculum
   ii. Lead students through brief relaxation techniques prior to all examinations
   iii. Teach appropriate thought reframing and cognitive restructuring, and its relation to pulse rate and the body's stress response

b. Love and Belonging
   i. Hold multiple small and large group parties, celebrations, and groups in order to solidify relationships; goal of groups can be learning the 14 habits (See Rapport, 2007)
   ii. Use basic counseling skills so that they are better able to relate to students on an intimate and friendly level
   iii. Teach students basic counseling skills so they are better able to relate to others
   iv. Develop partnerships among students (accountability, studying)

c. Self-Worth/Power
   i. Set up activities so that all students can achieve. Encourage the use of open book tests
   ii. Provide flexible learning activities so that all students can be empowered
   iii. Encourage leadership positions among all students (see Fox & Delgado, 2008, Secret Agents’ Club). Students who appear introverted and withdrawn should be sought to serve in such positions.

d. Freedom
   i. Teach the students the WDEP system. Help them use it.
   ii. Curriculum, Reading: Students can select from a list of books as required reading
   iii. Curriculum, Math: Set up role-play scenarios that would encourage students to use math abilities (i.e., paying at a restaurant, figuring the tip for any given service, developing a budget based on career choice)

e. Fun: All of the exercises above could include elements of fun depending on the attitudes of all participating.

Career development. All students should be tutored and encouraged to complete the Choice Theory Career Rating Scale, Figure 1 (based off of Glasser’s Choice
Theory Needs Rating Scale). Group discussions and individual sessions should be available for students to talk about how their career choices meet their Basic Needs. Another option is holding an annual career fair. Employees from the community can serve as representatives of any given career. While there are plenty of opportunities for students to learn from these representations, students also are put in a place where they can practice relationship skills as they inquire about their careers of interest.

After such a fair, students can be encouraged to choose one particular career. The following outline serves as a method of encouraging awareness about how one's career choice will impact flexibility in choices and options on a day to day schedule.

1. Students are asked to review career choice in terms of potential salary, schedule, and training.

2. Various cases will be distributed related to potential circumstances that could arise in adulthood such as a need for a new car, personal or family illness, marriage, family obligations, etc. Students will need to consider how their chosen line of work and job either poses challenges when such personal issues arise or allows for flexibility.

3. Students take the Choice Theory Career Rating Scale for Children and Adolescents to evaluate if such a career choice fits their needs.

This is only one example of how creativity can be applied within a Choice Theory framework. Counselors and teachers are encouraged to consider others.

**Personal/Social Development.** The authors suggest the use of the [Choice Theory Needs Rating Scale](#). School counselors can use this as a back-drop for discussing personal and social matters. For example, if a student is struggling with making friends, one would investigate where the student's need strength falls within the Love and Belonging scale. Next, the student would be asked to rate his or her present need satisfaction within this scale. (Given the presenting problem, we could assume that one's need satisfaction rating is going to be less than the rating given for the need strength on this given scale.) The counselor could inquire about what steps would be important and essential in moving the client's need satisfaction rating up closer to the need strength rating. For example, let's say the student's need strength rating for Love and Belonging was a 10, however the student's need satisfaction rating on the same scale was a 4. The counselor might respond, "No wonder you are not feeling so good about making friends. You really want to have more friends; however, that is not working out so well for you. You are not very satisfied with the situation right now. Let's say that next week, instead of being satisfied at a number 4, you moved up to a 5. So you were a bit more satisfied. What would you have done that week in order to feel more satisfied with making friends and being a friend?"

This is one way in which the Choice Theory Needs Rating Scale can provide a context for conversation with students about their desired personal and social development, as well as what they are currently doing to meet related goals.

**System Support**

School counselors are called to manage activities and maintain the total counseling program. This involves collaborating with colleagues, as well as providing professional development opportunities to staff. From a Choice Theory perspective, the heart of successful collaboration includes good, healthy, and effective relationships among those collaborating. Healthy relationships are possible because there are healthy and happy people in them.

Glasser (1998) asserts that there are particular characteristics of people who can maintain healthy relationships. First, people in such relationships are healthy and happy individuals. That is, they understand that the only behavior they can control is their own (so they are not using what Glasser refers to as External Control Psychology). They do not experience misery because they are not involved in blaming others for their feelings or in the business of trying to control or manipulate others to think or act in certain ways (Glasser, 1998, p. 19). Further, they take responsibility for their feelings. Healthy people do not blame others when they are feeling upset, dismissed, or misunderstood. More specifically, positive behaviors are used that include choosing to care, support, listen, negotiate, befriend, love, encourage, trust, accept, esteem, and welcome while refraining from destructive ones such as choosing to coerce, compel, force, reward, punish, boss, manipulate, criticize, motivate, blame, complain, badger, nag, rate, rank or withdraw (Glasser, 1998, p. 21). In order to maintain and encourage such healthy relationships, school counselors might consider conducting a brief presentation to staff related to the harms of External Control Psychology in relationships, as well as what behaviors contribute to healthy collegial relationships.

In addition to upholding the above mentioned healthy behaviors, school counselors who are required to establish and maintain system support within the school are encouraged to do so within a Lead Management framework. By following the four essential principles of Lead Management, school counselors can provide an enjoyable system of collaboration that only serves to enhance relationships among everyone in the school system.

1. The school counselor engages all colleagues in an ongoing honest discussion of both the cost of the work and the quality that is needed for the system support to be successful. In other words, all stakeholders (members of the system support team) are invited to contribute their ideas without pressure to conform. All members of the team are educated on
the elements of healthy relationships and the above mentioned positive, as well as destructive behaviors.

2. The school counselor models the job so that all stakeholders can see what she/he expects. One way of assuring this is by involving oneself in an introspective process. For example, this might include asking oneself the following questions: (a) is my counseling with students based within a Choice Theory framework; (b) are my one-on-one relationships with colleagues consistent with what I am expecting within this system; (c) am I open to feedback about how I am leading the group, as well as feedback regarding the struggles of the stakeholders.

3. The school counselor does not micro-manage but believes that all stakeholders are responsible for evaluating how they are contributing to the system support. Stakeholders feel welcome to voice their concerns and struggles to the school counselor.

4. The school counselor accepts every opportunity to teach that the quality of the school system support is based on continual improvement. That is, the road towards quality is a journey rather than a destination. Consequently, the school counselor remains focused and hopeful at all times.

Please see Glasser, 1998, chapter 11 for an exhausted explanation of this concept.

DISCUSSION

The United States spends more money on education than other major countries, but failed in 2000 to rank among the top ten countries for student performance in mathematics, science, and reading (Feller, 2003). Also, current trends in youth related issues include increased dishonesty; a growing disrespect for parents, teachers, and other authority figures; increased cruelty; a rise in prejudice and hate crimes; a decline in the work ethic; increased self-destructive behaviors which involve premature sexual activity, substance abuse, and suicidal tendencies; and a decline in the perception of importance of personal and civic responsibility (Wittmer & Clark, 2007). These data are indicative of a need for a transformed perspective.

The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs was developed by state and national school counseling leaders. It includes the three domains of academic achievement, career decision-making, and personal/social development. All activities that counselors perform to deliver the ASCA National Model are framed within four program components (guidance curriculum, individual student planning, responsive services, and system support). This model is both comprehensive and developmental.

The school counseling program is important and so are the counselors who will implement it. We believe that Reality Therapy practitioners have the potential to impact student academic achievement, career decision-making, and personal/social development most effectively for two specific reasons. First, Reality Therapy training emphasizes the importance of the personal qualities of warmth, sincerity, congruence, understanding, acceptance, concern, openness, and respect for the individual. These characteristics help school counselors to build trust and develop positive therapeutic relationships with students. This is vital. Second, Reality Therapy practitioners understand and are able to teach students the basic principles of Choice Theory, Basic Needs, and the Quality World. This knowledge will provide an added sense of self-esteem, self-worth, inner peace, and self confidence.

We have outlined a number of activities Reality Therapy practitioners could use in all four program components to enhance academic achievement, career decision-making, and personal/social development. Also, we developed a Choice Theory Career Rating Scale for Children and Adolescents. Counselors can use this scale as a guide for discussing career interest as well as personal and social matters.

Effective school counselors and school counseling programs are vital to our society. We recommend that school districts purchase copies of The Quality School (Glasser, 1990) and The Quality School Teacher (1993) for all administrators and members of the faculty. We also recommend that school districts incorporate Reality Therapy training as a part of the required professional development for all school personnel. These efforts could move school counseling from the periphery of school programs to a position of leadership in all areas that impact student growth and development (Education Trust, 2003).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs and their Definitions</th>
<th>STRENGTH AND SATISFACTION RATING SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Love and Belonging:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need for interpersonal contact, working together with others, and the potential for developing long term relationships and friendships. To feel wanted and approved of by classmates, as well as by authorities.</td>
<td>Need Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Worth/Power:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need for a sense of empowerment, competence, and opportunities for personal effectiveness in the school environment. A connection between one’s personal sense of achievement and worthiness with similar experiences in the home, school, and community. Opportunities for leadership and management roles.</td>
<td>Need Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freedom:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need for autonomy, independence, and limited restrictions in the school environment and in the home. Opportunities for spontaneity and change in all areas of one’s life.</td>
<td>Need Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fun and Enjoyment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need for balance between work and pleasure. Sufficient opportunities for enjoyable and fun experiences within the context of school, home, and community.</td>
<td>Need Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survival &amp; Health:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe physical environment at home and school. An environment that is a supportive context for one’s mental and emotional health. Family income that adequately provides for enhanced educational opportunities, personal self-care, leisure activities, and vacations.</td>
<td>Need Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article is two-fold. First, a brief review of the unique characteristics of inter-religious couples, as well as the common negotiations made in such relationships will be provided. Second, salient counseling implications will be presented, with the introduction of the Basic Needs Genogram as a possible technique in working with inter-religious couples. A case conceptualization and discussion will follow.

Consider the following example. Jane has a high need for power. She satisfies this need by serving on various church committees throughout the year. When she is unable to attend those committees, or feels guilty about how much time she is dedicating, she may experience dissonance between her need for power and her inability to serve or her choice to feel guilty (respectively). Jane is married to Joe. Joe's need for power, on the other hand is quite low. However, his need for love and belonging is very high (higher than Jane's). Joe is a Humanist and does not practice in an organized religion. Although he can appreciate Jane's dedication to church; he has begun to complain about her time spent on Sunday at church. He feels "threatened" and "deserted." She responds by feeling guilty and becoming angry at Joe. They both agree they need counseling.

The above example involves more intricacies than it appears to present. Consequently, Professional Counselors are behooved to consider the complexities involved in working with inter-religious couples. First, a general understanding of the challenges couples face, and the negotiations needed to maintain a successful relationship is required. Second, counselors should be willing to educate themselves about various religious backgrounds whenever they are working with someone whose life is informed by his or her faith (Duba, 2008). In addition, counselors should be aware of appropriate techniques that are suitable for the religious related challenge or conflict.

The purpose of this article is two-fold. First, a brief review of the unique characteristics of inter-religious couples, as well as the common negotiations made in such relationships will be provided. Second, salient counseling implications will be presented, with the introduction of the Basic Needs Genogram as a possible technique in working with inter-religious couples. A case conceptualization and discussion will follow.

Inter-religious Couples

The frequency of inter-religious marriages is on the rise. For example, a survey conducted in 2001 suggested that one partner in every 23% of Catholic marriages, 33% of Protestant marriages, 27% of Jewish marriages, and 21% of Muslim marriages does not identify with that particular religious faith (Kosmin, Mayer & Keysar, 2001). Although the number of inter-religious marriages in the United States is a minority compared to religious homogeneous relationships, Professional Counselors are behooved to understand the complexities of such couples.

Many studies suggest that inter-religious couples tend to experience less marital satisfaction than their counterparts (Lehrer, 1999; Parsons, Nalbone, Killmer, & Wetchler, 2007). If one is aware of the factors found to be associated with marital satisfaction, this becomes clearer. Consider the following: communication, moral values, faith in God, forgiveness, equity, togetherness, intimacy, love, sexual intimacy and commitment (Bryant, Conger, & Meehan, 2001; Fincham & Beach, 2002; Frame, 2004; Weigel & Ballard-Reisch, 1999). Religious tenets and faith perspectives can provide benchmarks or standards, if you will, for many of the above mentioned factors.

The sexual dimension of a religious couple's relationship often is informed by their faith. For example, guidelines for sexual intimacy are clearly defined by the Catholic Church. That is, every act of marital intercourse should be one that is open to new life. Further, it is a context for both partners to become one loving organism where each is giving oneself freely to the other (Duba Onedera, 2008). However, this matter becomes complex if a Catholic is married to a Protestant. Both Liberal and Conservative Protestants tend to believe that there is not a biblical condemnation of contraception (Zink, 2008). How an inter-religious couple communicates and negotiates their sexual relationship will factor into their overall marital satisfaction.

The degree of perceived equity may differ in couples who share varying religious viewpoints. For example, Islamic teachings give direction for role equity. Partners may be perceived as "equals" in the marital relationship, however their role expectations within the marital, as well as family unit differ (Altareb, 2008). When an individual is informed by his or her religious traditions and guidelines, and is unwilling or unable to negotiate with his or her
partner's different set of religious tenets, it is no wonder why the marital satisfaction dwindles.

Religious beliefs also inform persons about how to resolve moral decisions. Sharing similar beliefs unites couples and can make for an ease in decision making that inter-religious couples may not benefit from. For example, the typical view of abortion from a Liberal Protestant Christian standpoint is that the individual's right to make a responsible, prayerful decision regarding the termination of pregnancy should be honored. Consequently, decisions made between two Liberal Protestant Christian partners versus one Liberal Protestant Christian partner and a Buddhist partner would be quite different, with the latter's decision making process being much more complicated. The complexities of decision making between partners being informed by two different religious perspectives can be challenging, tiresome, and may lead to resentment.

Religious persons also tend to participate in religious related activities. This can become exigent for inter-religious couples, however. Consider the challenges of negotiating the celebration and attendance of different religious holiday functions together (i.e., Christmas, Hanukah). How will Jewish and Christian partners negotiate what religious symbols are displayed in the house in December? How will the Christian partner respect and honor the meaning his/her Jewish partner ascribes to Hanukah, especially in a society where this holiday is held second to Christmas? How will a Christian partner participate in Hanukah related activities without feeling that his/her Christian identity is being threatened; how does this impact the relationship?

There is not enough space to address the multiple complexities that inter-religious couples may encounter. What appears to be significant however is the degree to which partners align with the tenets of their religion and their ability to negotiate and show respect for each other's beliefs. Lehrer and Chiswick (1993) suggested that it is not whether or not partners are of the same religion or denomination, but rather how compatible they were upon marrying. This compatibility "dominates any adverse effects of differences in the religious background" (p. 400). This suggests that during the counseling process, it may be helpful to inquire about how couples came to such agreements or negotiations upon marrying.

The Counseling Process: The Essential Elements

Basic Treatment Goals

The goal of treatment when working with inter-religious couples may best be focused on helping couples learn how to work and talk through the particular problem, rather than solving it. Religious differences are likely to be "perpetual;" that is, issues that may never be solved per se. Gottman (1998) underscores the importance of finding ways to talk about these "perpetual problems." More specifically, coming to an understanding of the meaning each person ascribes to his/her position is what counts. Consequently, the treatment goals should move couples to a place where they can enter and maintain a conversation about the differences impacted by their varying religious perspectives, rather than trying to conform to the other's position.

When communicating about differences or perpetual problems, it is important that couples maintain particular stances. Such stances include a state of curiosity, interest, openness and flexibility (Biever, Bobele, & North, 1998). Further, partners must be willing to negotiate while being able to mentally reorganize their religious experiences and beliefs in a manner that allows space for another perspective (Lara & Duba Ondera, 2008; Waldman, 2005). Couples should be asked to verbally agree to the above mentioned stances both inside and outside of the counseling context. The Professional Counselor also should inform the couple that when she/he perceives that one individual is breaking the agreement, an intervention will be made. Such an intervention might include a gentle encourager, or asking the partner to reestablish him- or herself by taking a deep breath or revisiting the overall counseling goals.

The Basic Needs Genogram: A Tool for Exploring Meaning behind the Religious Conflict

Generally speaking, genograms provide a springboard for conversation about one's family history and experiences. Through the use of this technique, clients, as well as their counselors can begin to identify patterns of behaviors, values, and attitudes across generations (Duba, Graham, Britzman, & Minatrea, 2009, p. 16). Such awareness often promotes behavioral changes and behavioral shifts on the part of clients. When using a Basic Needs Genogram, clients become further acquainted with how their family history has impacted how their own basic needs are and have been met. Further, the Basic Needs Genogram is a tool that can motivate persons to consider about how their "picture albums" have been formed and maintained throughout generational lines. These "picture albums" hold images of how one wishes to satisfy the five basic needs: love and belonging, power, freedom, fun and enjoyment, and survival. Individuals are most "healthy" if you will, when their basic needs are being met (Duba et al., 2009). Further, choices (behaving, thinking, feeling, and physiologicing) are made to meet these needs.

Inter-religious Couples

Wubbolding (1988) suggests that marital discord is directly related to an incongruence or lack of commonality between and among the wants or "picture albums" of each partner. Further, this discord is maintained by either or both of two conditions. First, one partner wants the other partner to complement his or her own pictures. Second, this individual (the one wanting the harmony) is
The use of a BasicNeeds Genogram in a religious context can serve two objectives. First, this technique can bring about greater awareness about the strength of any given basic need, specifically in the context of family patterns and expectations. Second, the Genogram sheds light on how religion informs individuals within the family about how to meet those basic needs. That is, the relevant question being, what religious hints or clues are contained in the family “picture albums?”

Comparing and contrasting each partner’s Basic Needs Genogram can lead to change in the marital relationship. An encouraging counselor can challenge each partner to challenge and modify his or her own “picture albums” in ways that bring greater accord to the overall relationship (Duba et al., 2009). This can be done by restructuring how the Basic Needs are satisfied by considering the following: (a) how one’s personal religious beliefs and values (versus the consideration of only those expected within a family context) impact how the basic needs are met, (b) the congruence between family expectations and one’s personal incorporation of religion into his or her life; and (c) how the basic needs are currently helping him or her get what is wanted in the marriage. Finally, partners may develop new “pictures” based on their increased insight or upon developing similar activities or ways of getting their individual needs met.

In summary, individuals are moved to consider new processes or new pictures that continue to have individual and personal meaning within a religious context. However clients also are encouraged to examine how they may have unconsciously “adopted” meaning or patterns from the family system which are neither helpful nor supportive of the current relationship. For the remainder of this article, an inter-religious couple (without any identifying information being used) will be presented to illustrate how the Basic Needs Genogram can be used as a tool to break the dissonance between both partners.

**Case Example**

Evan and Annie were married four years ago in a large Catholic wedding. Annie grew up in a very tight knit Catholic family. In fact, even during her marriage, she attended weekend mass with her parents. Christian holy days and holidays such as Good Friday, Easter, and Christmas were spent with extended family members. Further, big celebrations were held in honor of those members receiving the sacraments of baptism, communion, and marriage. It was normal to have at least 300 attendees at any given wedding. Not only was the family connected through such religious traditions, but Annie remarked that there is this “invisible undertone that God holds us all together; crosses and other symbols are usually in every room of everyone’s home. You just know you are all in it together, one big Catholic family that will stay together no matter what.” Evan, on the other hand, did not grow up with his faith as intertwined into his family like at Annie’s. He called himself a “Reform Jew” and believed that although his faith was “rock solid”, he believed that peace between different groups was much more important than discussing differences and advocating for his position. Evan appreciated how close Annie’s family was and wished he came from such a tight family.

Evan and Annie had a very large Catholic wedding which included a Catholic mass, and several Jewish wedding traditions. After the conclusion of the mass, Annie and Evan expressed their marital commitment under a chuppah. The entire ceremony was completed with the Jewish wedding tradition of breaking the glass. Both partners believed that their wedding was an incredible way of symbolically bridging their different faith perspectives.

**Presenting Problem**

Annie was feeling “disengaged from Evan” and was wondering if they made a “serious mistake in getting married.” Annie reported that she resented the fact that Evan would never be able to participate in the mass with her; and that she and him would have to raise their future children in both faith traditions. She also had a difficult time understanding why Evan would not even consider learning more about her faith, especially when he did not seem as committed to Judaism as she was to Catholicism. When asked what her thoughts were about this prior to getting married, Annie remarked that she “was immature and never really thought about it.” Evan, on the other hand felt betrayed, and was beginning to experience resentment towards Annie for focusing on this four years into the marriage. Further, he was angry as he felt she was implying that his faith and beliefs were “not as important as hers”, and although he did not practice Judaism consistently throughout his childhood, it was still an “essential part” of who he was.

**Case Conceptualization**

The first goal of using a Basic Needs Genogram with Evan and Annie was to explore the need strengths of varying family members, as well as how religion affected how members satisfy those needs. We explored this more in depth by considering how their religious perspectives, again within a family context, informed them about how to meet those needs. The arduous process was bringing about change in the marital relationship. Each partner was responsible for considering the restructuring of how his or her needs were being met (based within a more personal religious framework) and whether or not they could use their faith to construct new ways of meeting these needs (namely, the changing or altering of their picture albums).
The religious and family influences on basic need strengths. A review of Annie’s need strengths illustrated strong comparisons to most of her close family members. For example, love and belonging was a high need for everyone in her immediate family. Upon exploring her extended family, strong family ties were noted and seemed to extend directly from her maternal grandmother, who was a strong Catholic, and very much loved by every member of the family. In addition, all members of her immediate family, as well as those within her mother’s immediate family were practicing Catholics. Annie’s need strength for Power and Achievement also was very high. A very strong emphasis on education, career excellence and financial security was present in her family of origin. Annie considered this further and explained that from a religious perspective, she was taught that with prayer and dependence on God, she could do anything. Her family values and personal views helped satisfy her need for Power and Achievement. She trusted that. In a sense, she also believed that God wanted certain things for her; “He wants me to be happy.” However, she also noted that this drive for power and inner control came at a cost to some of her family members (e.g., having to live far from family due to job, divorce, marriage later in life). Annie reported that despite these negative consequences, everyone in her family managed to work through the challenges and are for the most part, content with their lives. Finally, Fun and Enjoyment also were high on her basic needs. Annie reported that her family was for the most part, a very generous, happy and loving group. Everyone tried at least to model good, Catholic values and they had fun doing it! She wanted to continue this.

Evan’s Basic Needs Genogram also was revealing. First, he had high need strengths for both Power and Achievement, and Freedom. This was illustrated across the family as well. All members of Evan’s family were successful in their careers. However, Evan noted that most of his family members (including extended) were not happy, or at least not as happy as he had witnessed Annie’s family members to be. He summed this up by saying, “We learned that you just succeeded. That’s it. Happiness is not something you need. Just do your work. Help your neighbor and, in the mean time, mind your own business.” He realized that because of this attitude, it was sometimes difficult for him to understand why Annie was so “bent on being happy all of the time.” Freedom was valued by the family as well. Evan believed that being a Reformed Jew allowed for religious freedom, as well as personal freedom. Evan was encouraged to consider that there were other ways of meeting his need for Power and Achievement than what he was accustomed to.

Personal restructuring and marital modification. The restructuring of meeting one’s basic needs did not occur within one counseling session. It was a process, something that took trial and error in terms of trying new “personal-
CONCLUSION

Working with inter-religious couples takes time and patience. There are various ways in which to work with couples facing struggles associated with the differences in their faith perspectives. Use of the Basic Needs Genogram with a religious focus is just one way in which couples can experience greater awareness of their own basic needs in the context of the family system in a religious context. Such awareness is the foundation for negotiation and behavioral change in order to negotiate through religious based differences.
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ABSTRACT

Research recognizes the role of values, beliefs and other character dispositions in the enactment of leadership. Researchers on Servant Leadership have identified a set of character attributes alongside a well described list of actions of servant leaders in motion. This research reports on the Choice Theory based coaching processes used to help the first author develop total behavior that is congruent with that of a Servant Leader. The first author is referred to as the leader and the second author as the coach.

Leader: Servant-leadership described for me a way that a leader could profoundly respect other human beings and yet still operate to achieve organizational goals. Greenleaf describes Servant Leadership in terms of its effect on others:

"Will all of the people touched by that leader’s influence grow as persons? Will they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more likely themselves to become servants? And what will the effect be on the least privileged in society; will that person benefit or, at least; not be further deprived?" (1970)

As I read further, I realized that a servant leader’s vision for leadership was integral to the character of that person. For me, that would mean. ‘I do servant leadership because of my character (who I am)’. So if, “who I am” was to be the motivating force behind my action as a servant leader, then I would need to change that “who I am” so it automatically motivated the actions and thinking of a servant leader.

The question then was: “How do I change who I am?”

Coach: The leader’s agenda for personal change needs to be clearly defined and the coaching processes need to continually refine that agenda into what becomes the vision for leadership. As a coach, my agenda does not concern itself with the content of the leader’s vision, although I could not agree to help the leader become less effective or more damaging to meeting the needs of others. My agenda was to maximize the effectiveness of the coaching to allow for change at the level of Total Behavior.

Leader and Coach: Together we agreed that the agenda for change would consist of building congruence across the elements of Total Behavior (as indicated in Figure 1) and with an enactment of the character of the servant leader. The choice of actions was described in the literature (Page and Wong, 2006) and would be used in a planned way in each leadership context. The choice of thinking would arise from the quality world images and beliefs of the leader and, over time, these would become clearer and more congruent with what the literature described as the character of the servant leader. The physiology would be used as an indicator of congruence of action, thinking, and needs meeting while acting as a servant leader in each context.

Leader: I knew from my reading of the literature (Laub, 1999; Abel, 2000; Russell and Stone, 2002; Sendjaya and Sarros, 2002; Stone, Russell and Patterson, 2004) that the first step toward effective leadership is self awareness. My agenda and the permission I had given the coach would mean an intense increase in my level of self awareness and my effectiveness at interrogating that further for myself. If I wanted to be a leader who remained humble, served the growth of others and was effective in meeting my own needs, I would need to become absolutely aware of the processes for achieving that as well as how to restructure my inner realm. For me, the absolute agenda was to achieve a consistent state that was reinforced by the mind-body system in action. The uncomfortable physiology of incongruent behavior would mean work needed to be done.
I realized that this was a kind of false humility. I shifted my thinking to a definition of humility that made me in my wholeness (needs and all) that this could only exist. I did this as an act of humility but the net result was clearly unsustainable and in the long term did not bring out the best in me. I realized that this was a kind of false humility. I shifted my thinking to a definition of humility that included allowing others to be themselves, indeed supporting others to become more of themselves—more effective, closer to their vision. And it was through meeting me in my wholeness (needs and all) that this could happen.

Table 1: Questions used to understanding physiological responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding Physiological Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Did you need to feel more connected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Did you need to be free to/free from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Were you feeling safe, organized, on top?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Did you need to feel useful, powerful, and effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did you need some fun, to be stretched, inspired?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What did you need?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What was this feeling about specifically?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What do you think it’s telling you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. When have you had this physiology/feeling before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is this a response to a new situation/plan or action?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Coach: What I needed was access to the leader as close as possible to the time that the uncomfortable physiology made its presence felt. This would enable me to help him evaluate what the ‘message’ from the physiology was while it was fresh. I asked questions like those in Table 1. |

| Leader: In most cases I was quickly able to identify what the message was through my thinking. In some cases, the logistics of making contact with the coach meant I could not examine the physiology for some days. While I learned to do it for myself, I occasionally could find no ways to understand the confusion within. On both of these occasions the coach had me use the processes in Table 2 to make progress. |

Table 2: Reading Physiology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Physiology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relive the situation (Visual, Auditory, and Kinesesthetic) mentally and then ask: “What am I thinking about the world? What am I thinking about myself?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Model possible responses based on likeliness (I am feeling X and therefore could be thinking 1,2,3,...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 3rd person scenario the situation - what others might have been thinking in that same situation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Leader: Planning to satisfy a need is good in theory, but leadership required me to work in some pretty testing situations. I would often experience uncomfortable physiology as a need was challenged but I would suppress it rather than attend to it. I did this as an act of humility initially, but I noticed that, over time, I would become less resourceful and less effective in my behaviors when my needs were left unattended to. I needed some coaching to evaluate how I could remain humble and yet provide for my own needs and thus stay effective and resourceful. |

| Coach: What was obvious to me was that the leader had some beliefs that meant he had to suppress his needs—meeting behaviors in order to remain humble. This was clearly unsustainable. Ultimately, we would need different behaviors and adjustment of beliefs if this was going to work. I began by offering some questions he could ask himself in context as he noticed the uncomfortable physiology. He was habitually using the questions in Table 1 very effectively for himself by now. |

| Table 3: Questions for prioritizing needs/wants (Wubbolding, 2000) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritizing Needs/Wants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can I agree to meet this need/want later/in another way/in another context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Would it be most helpful for me to pursue meeting this need/want here and now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do I need to stop what I am doing to meet this need and then come back to this situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Could I change/expand my QWIs for meeting this need in this context?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Leader: I could answer the questions and often found another time or place to meet my needs. I could not see how choosing behavior that would help to meet my needs in that context would help progress the situation. I believed that we could resolve a difficult situation more quickly if I didn’t make it more complex by imposing myself on it. I felt very uncomfortable, often sick, but I still would not choose to prioritize my needs or choose a different behavior. |

| Coach: Some self evaluation on the leader’s construction of ‘humility’ allowed for a shift of mindset. I asked, “Do you believe that bringing all that you are to a problem will help progress it?” |

| Leader: “Yes” |

| Coach: “Are you an important part of the solution, both in the long and short term?” |

| Leader: “Yes” |

| Coach: “So does the solution need to meet your needs as well? In order for it to be sustainable?” |

| Leader: “Yes” |

| Coach: “But you are not putting your needs on the table, are you?” |

| Leader: “No” |

| Coach: “So, is it likely that a shaping of the initial problem that does not include your needs will result in a solution that meets them?” |

| Leader: I realized my erroneous thinking here. I was simply writing myself out of the problem as if I did not exist. I did this as an act of humility but the net result was unsustainable and in the long term did not bring out the best in me. I realized that this was a kind of false humility. I shifted my thinking to a definition of humility that included allowing others to be themselves, indeed supporting others to become more of themselves—more effective, closer to their vision. And it was through meeting me in my wholeness (needs and all) that this could happen.
Evaluating QWIs
1. Can I include a person's current response to me as QWI for what I want?
2. What might the person's behavior mean? (Avoid labeling)
3. How would I see myself acting/thinking so that I am embodying this QWI?
4. Is what I want desirable or realistic?
5. Is there a real chance of getting it in the near or distant future?
6. How likely is it that the world around me will change to meet my desires?
7. How possible is it to make the changes in my own behavior that I want to make?
8. Is there anyone around to whom I want to be closer? (Wubbolding, 2000)

Evaluating beliefs - Meta model
1. How do I know that..?
2. How does doing X mean that Y?
3. What would happen if I did/didn't?
4. What is stopping me from..?
5. What would happen if I did/didn't?
6. Do I really mean all, every or never? Surely there might be exceptions!
7. Compared to what?
8. About whom, about what?
9. Who, specifically?
10. Who, how, what is ..ing? (Turn the nominalization back into a verb)
11. How, specifically?
12. What, specifically?
13. How would X lead to Y?
14. How does his/her doing X cause me to Y? (Bandler & Grinder, 1975)

Figure 2: Questions for evaluating quality world images and beliefs
genuinely happen. It was beholden on me then, to bring my whole self, honestly, to the table in a way that supported others but did not require me to shrink back from my needs fulfillment.

Coach: I proposed some easing of the pace at this point, but the leader in question had grasped a fundamental aspect of the relationship between his needs, quality world images and beliefs that opened up more territory. Together we went on to unpack the nature of the quality world, thinking and beliefs (see Figure 2).

Leader: I had realized my beliefs heavily shaped my prioritizing and I wanted to know which other beliefs might be getting in the way of me feeling good. I realized my thinking was a window into my quality world and the beliefs that were operating. In fact, if I filter down, the quality world has specific images, beliefs and values stacked in it. What I needed was a way to evaluate both the images and the beliefs.

Coach: I offered a series of questions to help evaluate the images.

Leader: Because I had a background in Neuro Linguistic Programming, I realized that the Meta Model was perfect for evaluating the beliefs I had. Figure 2 shows the breakdown of the way we constructed our thinking.

Coach: The quality world questions (1-3) represent some thinking about others’ behavior, the leader’s interpretation of it, and his agenda of remaining congruent no matter what others do. Reading other’s behaviors needs to be done through the understanding that their behavior is about them. The leader read behavior as about him and his effectiveness as a leader. That meant if they resisted, he was ineffective.

I asked him to evaluate his quality world images for effectiveness from the perspective of how much control he had over them. I asked him if he could or wanted to control other’s behaviors. The response was negative, so I then asked if he thought he could choose other images for effectiveness that were less contingent on external control.

Leader: I realized that if my vision was to truly motivate me in every context, be achievable and connected to the acting and thinking of a servant leader, it would have to be as internally controlled as possible. Thus the more of my quality world images were centered on what I could control without being coercive or manipulative, the more effective it would be (See figure 3).

Leader: So while I had a vision for the service we offered, a vision for the way my team would operate and how they would grow, the components I had most control of were the processes I set up in relating to others and the way I behaved. In fact over time, I became increasingly internal in terms of my vision - describing my quality world images, beliefs, values, thinking and acting, all in terms of servant leadership.

Coach: In fact it was in the act of describing his vision for himself as leader that led to a complete picture of what the leader was trying to do. One day, the leader came to me with Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4: Connecting needs and beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NEED</th>
<th>BELIEF/QWIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Through humility: I am free of the reactions to others’ opinions and choices. I am free to be me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Love and Belonging</td>
<td>Through humility: I can put others in a place of honour and reverence and so listen to them and learn from them – thus improving my sense of connection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>Through humility: the purpose of others can shine, thus enabling them to grow. This is my purpose and my legacy and enables me to ‘survive’ in the longer term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Through humility: I empower others to be successful thus ensuring my own purpose is fulfilled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fun &amp; Learning</td>
<td>Through humility: I am free to engage with others in learning (creating new solutions) and thus expanding my own skills repertoire.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Connecting behavior with needs and beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONNECTED TO NEEDS THROUGH BELIEFS (REF. TABLE 4)</th>
<th>ATTENDANT ACTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Listening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5 Questioning to construct an understanding of the follower’s constructs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Asking evaluative questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 4 Owning own QWIs, beliefs and values – discerning and claiming/exclaiming projections/meeting own needs through self.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Structuring tasks, processes and relationships to build growth and success for others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Engage in higher order thinking and intuitive evaluations to support improved solutions for all.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5 Be open to all input and respect that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Building self evaluative &amp; self directive skills in others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leader: In order to be an effective servant leader, consistently in any context, I need to have beliefs and quality world images that meet my needs and cause me to take the actions I want to take. In fact, if this is to be automatically motivating, the more needs a quality world image is connected to, the more likely I am to prioritize it. I have to really believe that prioritizing it will meet my need or I won’t prioritize it (Table 4).

Coach: I saw the leader had done some significant
mental work to arrive at these beliefs. I asked him to use his physiology to check in with how ‘true’ they felt. I also pointed out that to really consolidate those beliefs (which were really interpretations of reality), he would have to activate them through thinking and acting in context and seeing if they are supported in the real world.

**Leader:** They increasingly were. In fact, I realized that the attendant behaviors (Table 5) consistently resulted in what I saw as the effects of real leadership. My team was increasingly self motivated to take action that improved their performance.

**Coach:** The object of the exercise was to increase the likelihood of choosing a particular total behavior. The total behaviors were integral to the leader’s vision and almost entirely internally controlled. Yet he experienced his actions as becoming increasingly effective in leading others and as totally congruent with his vision.

**Leader:** In fact, so did my team, as is evidenced by the responses to the surveys of my behaviors. Table 6 shows the mean results of 14 respondents in my team at two points of the research (12 weeks apart). I asked them to rate their perceptions of my behavior on a 5 point Likert scale (strongly disagree – strongly disagree). With a mean of 4.07 in each round I think they agreed.

**Coach:** But he wasn’t satisfied with that. He wanted to know what questions would help him create the answers in Tables 4 and 5 for other qualities he wanted to embody. The resulting questions are shown in Figure 4.

**Leader:** Leadership demands ongoing action. I had chosen a particular way of enacting my leadership and over the time of the study, the uncomfortable physiology decreased in frequency and intensity. Based on the survey results and the congruence I experienced in action, I was realizing my vision in my daily action. Over time I realized I was most effective in familiar contexts but I needed to be adaptable. Figure 5 describes the acting and thinking I carried with me as a way of remaining resourceful when my needs were challenged, thus giving myself the best opportunity to remain congruent with my vision while creating new behaviors if I needed to do so.

---

**Table 6: Means and Standard Deviations on survey of Servant Leader Behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Round 1 Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Round 2 Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t (df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coach:** The project stretched my understanding of how choice theory could be applied to achieve some extraordinary results. Being a big Dr Suess fan, I found myself thinking:

"Oh the places he’ll go and the thinks he will think."
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ABSTRACT

The five basic needs of choice theory provide a predominantly blank canvas [the quality world] which must be filled with the array of satisfying human experiences [quality world images] (Glasser, 2000). The capacity to erase, recolor and recompose this canvas allows us ultimately to determine the nature of our own quality worlds. This article explores the draw toward releasing form based quality world images and replacing them with formless yet ultimately more satisfying images.

Maslow (1968), in his book ‘Toward a psychology of being’, proposed a hierarchy of needs, and stated in the introduction that a higher psychology is “… centered in the cosmos rather than in human needs and interest, going beyond humanness, identity, self-actualisation ….” (pp. iii-iv). In other words, Maslow realized that people can get stuck in identity and self-actualization since these are centered around the self, and not outside it such as through a level of awareness or mindfulness that lifts the individual above this limited world. The ego self is attached to identity (form) and constantly seeks being in control of what it wants (Tolle, 2005). This hinders awareness (or mindfulness) and living in the present moment. Tolle (2005) maintains that, in the world of form, getting what is wanted will never satisfy personal needs since it is associated with identity, and the ego self by its nature keeps wanting more.

The “I’ll be happy when I have that brand new sports car” form-based view places satisfaction in an attainable or unattainable future place. This view not only limits the joy experienced in the present moment, but even if the car is obtained, it satisfies briefly since there are always bigger and better things to be wanted. Desire, as such, is a barrier to happiness.

The formless or mindful state seeks a level of independence from the external world of form. Images become less about objects, expectations and self, and more about principles, values, relationship awareness and perceptions of the world as unified. In essence, this allows a no-error signal state that Glasser describes as a result of the Tenth Order Perception (1981, 114-115). Ultimately, this leads to a satisfaction that neutralizes the ravenous, self-serving appetites and replaces them with a satiation that is likely to bring longer and more permanent peace.

The needs associated with the ‘new brain’ (Glasser, 2005) [power, fun, belonging and freedom] may arguably be of a higher order than the one of the ‘old brain’ [survival]. This thought is in line with Maslow’s hierarchy of needs and it might be argued that higher needs are potentially spiritual by nature and implicated in the human desire for choice, purpose and responsibility (Wubbolding, 2000) or morality. Also, it has been suggested that in addition to these five needs, there are needs for comprehending reality (a worldview) and spirituality (rising above the self, the will to live in the present moment) (Litwack, 2007; Schoo, 2005). If the draw toward the formless and more spiritually mature images is driven by the search for true satisfaction, then it might be argued that the apparent spiritual need is at once built into existing needs and requires quality world images that meet the whole set of needs in unison. Thus, the quality world images themselves thus become the pathway to a mindful existence.

It can be argued that the perceptual system is influenced by responding to the needs since enhanced values, beliefs and knowledge (factual, experimental and spiritual) do filter and color or rate information that comes in from the outside world differently. The perceptual system, then, becomes the ally of the transforming quality world by filtering for more satiating images.

Society expects that people will behave in responsible ways to get what they want, that is by fulfilling their needs and not interfering with the needs-satisfaction of others. In this way, need and responsibility may be diagonally opposed. The former may be egocentric and related to the world of form if the quality world is full of form based images. In this case, needs-fulfilment is directed in a centripetal direction (inwards) by wanting to attract or control more and more. Responsibility here is defined as allowing others to meet their needs. We are arguing here that a world view (belief) that behaving responsibly is valuable will facilitate responsible behavior. This is the seed of the desire for the formless. So, the latter (i.e. responsibility) is related to the formless and is directed outwards as an awareness or mindfulness.

Going beyond a self-centered needs-satisfaction can provide a sense of wholeness, peace, faith and purpose. Lack of presence in the present moment is likely to impede
this journey and may manifest itself by the following:

- Not being able to raise awareness beyond the extent of one's own personal needs;
- Not being able to have faith in the flow of life;
- Lack of personal vision;
- An awareness that one's life lacks meaning;
- Fearing to know and develop oneself;
- Not recognizing opportunities to change and grow as a result of the challenges that life offers;
- Using negative ways of thinking that prevents one from seeing chances to positively change; and
- Not being able to see the big picture.

It seems reasonable that there must be a balance in satisfying needs in order to optimize health and well-being. Through counselling or self-evaluation, one can identify the areas that need to be worked on so that the perceptual system and the behavioral system can be effectively influenced via increased awareness and more effective thoughts, deeds, emotions and physiology. Greater awareness or mindfulness may lead to empathy, more positive and flexible behaviors, enhanced relationships with others and interdependence. Interdependence requires skilful interplay between needs-fulfilment and responsibility as an opportunity rather than an obligation. Thus mindfulness becomes the means through which one’s desire for needs-satisfaction and responsibility are met.

In his address to the 4th International Conference of Reality Therapy, Wubbolding described the notion of a relationship filter that sits as a third filter between the two filters choice theory has (i.e., total knowledge and valuing). In his chapter on the order of perceptions, Glasser placed relationships as the sixth order in the hierarchy of perceptions (Glasser, 1981). Moreover, he maintains that every higher level needs to include all levels below it. Universal oneness is the highest level. Therefore, we want to propose that it is the level of mindfulness that makes people aware of relationships, and that it is the mindfulness that influences the sensitivity of the two filters that are part of the perceptual system.

Choosing mindfulness, through the perceptual filters and the quality world images we adopt may lead to greater inner peace and happiness, and perhaps a sense of wishlessness.
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ABSTRACT

This article constitutes a keynote address delivered by Robert E. Wubbolding at the Fourth European Reality Therapy Conference – Edinburgh, Scotland, June 23-26, 2009 with delegates from 18 countries. The topic of the address included a review of past and current prideworthy accomplishments of Dr. Glasser and the membership, key questions regarding the future of The William Glasser Institute, collective action required, five components for insuring future stability of the WGI, allusions to research validating reality therapy, and causes for celebration and confidence.

The British historian Arnold Toynbee said that America is a large friendly dog in a small room. Every time it wags its tail, it knocks over a chair. I’ll try my best not to knock over any chairs. As we begin the 4th European Reality Therapy Conference here in Edinburgh, we owe a special thank you to John Brickell and Adrian Gorman and the entire committee for organizing and administering what promises to be one of the most significant conferences in the history of choice theory and reality therapy. Thanks also to Linda Harshman, executive director of The William Glasser Institute for her unceasing dedication to the WGI. And most especially our gratitude extends to Dr. William Glasser for his monumental contributions that have enriched so many lives, and to his wife, Carleen, for her support and inspiration.

Many years ago there was a king and a queen who ruled their empire with justice and wisdom. They wished to pass to their children the wisdom of the ages so that the future of the kingdom would continue in the same spirit. And so they commissioned their advisors to travel around the world consulting with philosophers and other learned individuals. They were instructed to consult the great libraries of the world and to return with a summary of the wisdom of the world. After years of research, the advisors returned and informed the royalty that they could summarize the wisdom of the world in three sentences:

1. There ain’t no free lunch.
2. This too shall pass.
3. Count your blessings not your afflictions.

KEY QUESTION

The central issue for us at this conference is: “Where will the WGI be in 5, 10, 20 years or more? How will we, the membership, sustain and extend our work and our mission?” I suggest that what we do here and what we say here should not remain here. What we do here and what we say here could well determine our future. There are many reasons to be hopeful which I will enumerate below and a few reasons for concern.

During this conference I strongly urge all of us to discuss both formally and informally how we can maintain the institute, and how we can work to fulfill its mission. Many people around the world, especially all of us at this conference, have donated time, talent, and resources in practicing and teaching choice theory and reality therapy, thereby earning both respect and appreciation. Delegates from every continent except Antarctica attending our annual international conferences demonstrate the universal appeal and effectiveness of CT/RT/LM. In fact, 18 countries are represented at this conference. Moreover, and equally important, is the fact that we now have institutes in approximately 25 countries as well as several regional associations all linked to The William Glasser Institute.

COLLECTIVE ACTION

We need to address several specific issues as we face the future. I suggest this approach be in a calm, rational, respectful, circumspect, and altruistic manner. There is a Scottish proverb, “Two things never to be upset about. What you can help and what you cannot.” This approach should be collaborative. Our collective wisdom is our greatest insurance. As the Welsh say, “No one knows less than he who knows all.” And so several questions arise.

1. How can we extend and develop the seminal ideas of choice theory and reality therapy without corrupting them or misapplying them? Are the theory and practice an open ended or a closed system?

My suggestion is that the theory and practice are open ended. In the book Reality Therapy for the 21st Century (2000), I suggested that we teach a third filter in the perceptual system. John Brickell and I elaborated on this in a recent article in the International Journal of Reality Therapy (2009). First, we label incoming information and
then put a value on it. And yet, it seems, that we are able
to value information only if we see that it has a relation-
ship to other information. We label an object as a “chair”.
Subsequently, we see it as having positive value. But we
can only place a positive value on it if we see, for example,
its relationship to a desire for comfort or its relationship to
our family history, making the chair an heirloom. Thus, it
makes sense to interject a relationship filter between the
total knowledge filter and the valuing filter. Choice theory
clearly allows for this development.

2. How will we answer objections to choice theory and
reality therapy? We can expect challenges and
disagreements and even frontal attacks. Such criti-
cism is a good sign, a sign of being noticed. There is
an Irish proverb, “Strife is better than loneliness.”
Some examples that I have encountered include:

a) a website stating that reality therapy is not effective
in the field of corrections. When I contacted them
and pointed to research validating reality therapy,
they chose to reject documentation indicating the
effectiveness of reality therapy in corrections.

b) an official document circulated in a state in the
United States describing effective and ineffective
modalities for reducing recidivism in the area of
drug treatment. Among the effective modalities
were: emotional skill development, cognitive skills
and behavioral skills. This sounds a lot like reality
therapy. Among the treatment types showing no
clear evidence of reduced recidivism were: reality
therapy, psychoanalytical therapy, and 12-step
programs. Imagine that, 12-step programs are inef-
tective. Tell that at an alcoholics anonymous
meeting and wait for the response.

c) in a recent chapter in a manuscript that I reviewed
for a book publisher, the author stated that reality
therapy placed insufficient emphasis on the external
world, especially as it impacts people feeling discrim-
inated against. This objection represents a distortion
of genuine choice theory principles. The author was
willing to make the changes that I suggested and
when the book is published the chapter will more
accurately represent choice theory.

d) implications & statements by members of the helping
professions that CT & RT do not apply
cross-culturally or do not apply to groups whose
cultural value is not congruent with an internal locus
of control. This objection is so patently false that
even a neophyte trainee could demonstrate with a
role-play simulation specific ways to effectively work
with clients whose world-view is described as lacking
a sense of internal control.

It is not enough to imply, “This is what we teach, take it or
leave it.” We need to be able to respond with convincing argu-
mentation. Failure to do so will relegate us to the status of
footnote. back-waters and exclusion from the professional
world. Finally, we need to answer a major objection that reality
therapy lacks a research base. I will discuss this issue below.

FIVE LEGS OF THE CHAIR

If we are to be a headline in 5, 10, 20 or more years
hence, we need to maintain and strengthen five legs to the
institute chair: credible theory, delivery system, organiza-
tional commitment, respected training program and
evidence of effectiveness.

1. Credible theory: We have a detailed, comprehensive,
only and universal theory (Glasser, 1998). It will
undoubtedly grow and expand while maintaining its
connections with foundational principles, e.g., internal
motivation, behavioral choice and the centrality
of human relationships.

2. Delivery system: reality therapy constitutes the
methodology for implementation of choice theory. Glasser and Glasser (2008) have stated, “We now
wish to state publicly that teaching the procedures
(the WDEP system) is integral to training partici-
pants wishing to learn choice theory and reality
therapy and is particularly effective in our training
programs . . . choice theory is the track and reality
therapy is the train.”

3. An organization of committed and dedicated individ-
uals and sub-groups such as the regions in North
America, the institutes in various countries and
regional associations such as the European
Association for Reality Therapy whose contribution
is something we can brag about. In future decades
these organizations will evolve and new ones will
emerge. It is our responsibility to insure the cohesion
of these groups.

4. Respected training program: Closely connected with
the organization is a clearly defined but flexible
training program conducted by qualified faculty and
guided by unambiguous boundaries within which
instructors agree to work (Programs, Policies and
Procedures Manual, 2009). To insure the survival of
the WGI and to foster its mission, this training
program needs to be based on the principle of
continuous improvement. It also needs to be adapted
to the changing expectations of school personnel,
mental health workers, as well as a wide range of
specific professions.

5. Evidence of effectiveness: It is an indisputable fact
that a body of research validates the effectiveness of
choice theory, reality therapy and lead management.
Nevertheless, we need ongoing, extensive and
controlled studies conducted on current educational,
mental health and business issues. Specific recom-
recommendations can be found in the book Reality
Therapy for the 21st Century (Wubbolding, 2000).
Several studies below illustrate the efficacy and wide application of reality therapy.

Lojk (1986) found that 84% of former residents of a community based correctional program achieved partial or full rehabilitation. Glasser and Wubbolding (1995) described Dr Glasser’s early work in a mental hospital as achieving success in the release of long-term mental patients. Chung (1994) studied the use of reality therapy with juvenile delinquents in Hong Kong and found that in a brief amount of time they enhanced both self-esteem and social coping skills. Rose-Inza Kim has facilitated 250 research studies on reality therapy and choice theory between 1986 and 2006. Kim, R-I and Hwang (2006) conducted a meta-analysis of 43 studies addressing self-esteem and locus of control comparing an experimental group with a control group and found a significant increase in self-esteem and internal locus of control. Other studies worth noting include research focusing on educational applications (Hinton, Warnke & Wubbolding, 2009), (Wellen & Abbott, 2005), (Report on the Status of Murray High School, 2006). An anecdotal remark by Kelly Witt (2008), mental health specialist, summarizes the practical effectiveness of reality therapy with “chronically and persistently mentally ill people”. In her annual review her supervisor remarked, “Although we aren’t doing a controlled study, the consumers that you are working with and using reality therapy with have shown sustained changes in their lives.”

Clearly, sound evidence exists to support the use of reality therapy applied to mental health and to education. Loyola Marymount University, in the future, will coordinate research studies. Other individuals such as the Glasser Scholars, organizations and institutes will also provide added prestige and credibility to reality therapy.

CAUSES FOR CELEBRATION AND REJOICING

While there are many causes for concern about the future such as a decreased number of basic and advanced trainings, a bright future seems probable for several reasons.

1. Glasser Scholars Program: in March 2007 at the suggestion of Emerson Capps, EdD, advisory board representative from the Sunbelt region, the Glasser Scholars Program was approved. The WGI has funded the entire certification process for 12 university professors with the expectation that they conduct and publish research studies on CT/RT/LM. The Glasser Scholars Program was a competitive process whereby a board committee selected these outstanding scholars from a worldwide pool of applicants. Five of them received their certification here in Edinburgh and 7 more will be certified in the August (2009) certification week to be held in Cincinnati, Ohio, USA.

2. Endorsement by the European Association for Psychotherapy (EAP): A seven-year journey led to the endorsement by the EAP of reality therapy as a scientific and valid theory in June 2008 in Brussels, Belgium. This effort was led by Leon and Boba Lojk, assisted by Arthur Dunne, Jimmie Woods, John Brickell as well as many others throughout Europe. Also included was the endorsement of the European Association for Reality Therapy (EART) as an accrediting body. These endorsements can be offered only to scientific and proven theories that have organizations in six European countries. William Glasser institutes or reality therapy associations exist in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Finland, Ireland, Slovenia, and United Kingdom. These achievements are worthy of imitation around the world as they can be adapted on a national or regional level. As an institute, we are forever indebted to Leon and Boba Lojk, whose unselfish and generous leadership as well as personal sacrifice provide a model commitment for all of us.

3. The Loyola Marymount University (LMU) Program: Present at this conference are a number of leaders of The William Glasser Institute of Research and Mental Health at LMU. Accolades to Cheryl Grills, PhD, Bradley Smith, Cherie Schenck, Joan Pohas, Michelle Anderson, PhD, Sharon Coulter, and Meagan Beasley. The LMU program includes research in mental health, training students and faculty as well as specialized training for such groups as addictions counselors and even prison inmates.

4. A renewed commitment to research as evidenced by the presentations at this conference, the work of Janet Morgan, PhD, the Glasser Scholars Program and the work conducted at LMU.

5. The International Journal of Reality Therapy edited by Larry Litwack since 1981: Under his determined leadership, the journal has grown to be an eminent resource for students and researchers around the world and has provided a forum for institute members and others wishing to demonstrate their creativity and research findings.

6. A solid and dependable staff at the California office: Guided by the steady hand of the executive director, Linda Harshman, the WGI office provides a beacon lighting the way of organizational development throughout the world.

7. The international character of the WGI and the cross-cultural applications of CT/RT/LM: As stated above, we can take pride in our many international organizations and in our efforts to increase cultural adaptations. Instructors from Australia, Colombia, Ireland, Korea, United Kingdom and United States led the certification week in Colorado Springs, CO in 2008. The three certi-
fication groups this year in Edinburgh included instructors from Australia, Ireland and United Kingdom. The conference itself included delegates from 18 countries. Our 25 institutes around the world are less than the 135 institutes of the Milton Erickson Institute, but we are gradually extending our reach.

We can be proud of our past and present, hopeful about the future with the caution that “There ain’t no free lunch”. Our sustainability depends on our willingness to work together and to conduct a growing number of intensive weeks. Counting our blessings includes acknowledging that the current economic downturn will eventually pass. After all, one of the wise principles adapted by the king and queen mentioned earlier is “This too shall pass”.

**OUR CHOICES**

In order to flourish in the future we need to examine our overall direction and more specifically our options. Current and future choices include strengthening our structures, supporting research and answering objections to choice theory, reality therapy and lead management.

1. During this conference and in subsequent months and years at formal meetings and informal gatherings, I suggest that we take steps to establish structures and to strengthen existing structures to insure the unity of the institute and to enhance the quality of our relationships. The strength and success of the 135 Ericksonian Institutes is their unity. They remain part of the vine, not severed branches. We can learn from this outstanding example and avoid the mistakes of other organizations. This unity adds to our credibility and prestige in that the complete unit is greater than the sum of its parts especially in the eyes of organizations outside the WGI.

2. Our second choice is not only to support research studies but to incorporate their findings into our teaching so that our students understand that we teach a verified system, not mere speculations.

3. Our third major choice to insure a prosperous future is to admit that there are limitations to choice theory and reality therapy and that not all criticisms are groundless. This includes using our creativity and knowledge to answer objections in an accurate and professional manner.

Operationalizing and implementing these choices will require decisive plans, a willingness to compromise based in a steely determination and belief that we have a responsibility to future generations who study, learn and teach RT/CT/LM. Armed with these qualities, the future of the WGI looks bright.

**CONCLUSION**

Finally, our choice is CYA: Choose Your Attitude. When we were in school many of us memorized the first paragraph of Charles Dickens’ book The Tale of Two Cities:

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair.

How we perceive the age to come and how the WGI is perceived by others depends on the choices we make. If we, as leaders, fulfill our responsibilities and even go beyond them by choosing wisely; our perceptions and the perceptions of others will be the best, the wisest, the most credible, the season of light and the spring of hope. In other words, it is up to us to pass on to future generations an accurate and vital theory and practice, thereby fulfilling the vision of the founder of reality therapy, Dr. William Glasser.
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ABSTRACT

This article, the first in a series of two, is one of two keynote addresses presented to the 4th European Reality Therapy Conference in Edinburgh, Scotland June 23, 2009. It traces the development of CT/RT organizations in Europe and their essential role in achieving the coveted recognition by the European Association for Psychotherapy of reality therapy as a scientific and valid system of psychotherapy. This accomplishment represents a 10-year journey spearheaded by the author, Leon Lojk and his wife Boba, as well as a committee of representatives from Ireland, United Kingdom, Croatia and Slovenia. The next article will be the second half of the keynote and will be a detailed description of the European Association for Psychotherapy.

Greetings to all! Today, I would like to speak about the following topics:

I. Choice Theory and Reality Therapy adherents as a world-wide group.

II. The European Association for Reality Therapy (EART): Why we need this organization.

III. The recognition of reality therapy as a scientific psychotherapeutic school.

I. CHOICE THEORY / REALITY THERAPY ADHERENCE

As an enthusiastic supporter of choice theory/reality therapy and as the Chair of the European Association for Reality Therapy (EART), I have the honor to welcome the leaders from The William Glasser Institute and delegates from fifteen countries around the world. Unfortunately, Dr. Glasser cannot attend because of recent surgery. We all wish him a rapid recovery.

What has brought us to Edinburgh from all parts of the world? The answer is clear: our commitment to choice theory/reality therapy and all its applications. When I declare myself an enthusiastic supporter of CT/RT, people ask me why am I so enthusiastic. Isn’t this an exaggeration? Isn’t CT/RT just one among many theories about human beings and their behavior?

Looking from the theory from the outside, it may seem to be one theory among many. However, in my personal experience, as I pursue its principles in everyday life, I have concluded that CT/RT provides guidelines for living a happy life, and are superior to many guidelines of other theories that I’ve studied.

There is a large range of the important pictures in my Quality World which I pursue: relationships with people that I love, with people I work with, friends like you, as well as pictures concerning the wellbeing and survival of mankind. CT/RT has become my philosophy of life.

CT/RT has been proven to be very successful in personal relationships and in small groups such as school classes, working groups, etc. But the question remains: is CT/RT capable of improving complex larger societies, the largest system - mankind? Well, we do not know yet, but we hope it could be capable at least in an indirect way. So far, it is more or less Utopian and by its definition, we are aware that we cannot reach an ideal state. But observing global problems of the world, it certainly provides a good direction and goal.

Attraction of CT/RT

What is the attraction of CT/RT to me personally? Dr. Glasser has been opposed to the following:

• conventional theories about mental health that he believes deprive human beings of personal autonomy, responsibility and dignity;
• psychological systems that are based on external control of behavior. He has stressed, in this way, the dignity of clients and encouraged many of us who lived in totalitarian systems by showing that societies such as those described in George Orwell’s book 1984 cannot exist for a long duration;
• the growing attempt to confront human unhappiness by chemical regulation thereby helping persons with unusual behaviors and those who reject this kind of treatment, as well as children who cannot reject it. He also warns that modern society could end up in Aldous Huxley’s words “a brave new world” or a ‘pharmacracy’ in the words of Thomas Szasz.
• choice theory causes “mental dissonance” in the minds of people with the conventional external control perceptions; creates nervousness among professionals who subscribe to well-established methods for “healing psychopathological” behaviors; not the least nervousness is that of paternalistic politicians and dictators.
The following is a quotation from the newspaper in the former Yugoslavia. It was a politically motivated attack on me, but because there was nothing to accuse me of, they focused on reality therapy. I tried to apply it in a Group Home for behaviorally and emotionally disturbed youth. I wrote about this in the *Journal of Reality Therapy* in 1986.

"The situation is even more oppressive... at least on paper, dedicated to the so-called reality therapy. This unusual approach to treatment and re-education which has, due to its senselessness, no equal in the current psychological and psychiatric practice...Strength, firmness, toughness, and hard-heartedness are prevalent among required characteristics of the therapist. The main goal is responsible behavior; the dominant feature of human relations is the conflict of the responsibility... It doesn't search for cause, reasons, and motives of somebody's behavior since realization is its objective. RT doesn't want to know how or why, no excuses are accepted. Examining conflicts and solving them is of no interest; conflicts are being suppressed by force if there is no other way. The gist of RT is manipulation of people, exercising power upon them, its purpose being presentation of a responsible façade."

Could you imagine something more at odds with true CT/RT? I then made a promise to myself that I would correct this opinion about RT in this part of the world.

The predominant 'sin' of RT is that it opposes the traditional understanding of human behavior within a framework of linear efficient causality. Dr. Glasser has been opposed to this widespread opinion from the year 1965, teaching that behavior - including the most unusual - is purposeful. CT accepts the ideas of natural teleology, explaining the behavior of the human being in the frame of final circular causality. Natural teleology explains (without using or opposing the deity or philosophic teleology) the enigma of all living organisms that care about their own future and the future of their posterity.

**Critiques of CT/RT:**

Some critics with a Social Darwinism perspective believe that cooperative relationships based on satisfying the need for love and belonging as anticipated in CT are pure Utopia. They forget that through the long history of mankind the individuals who did not know how to cooperate at least in small groups did not survive. From the perspective of choice theory, the need for belonging is genetic. Today, with the potential use of extremely destructive weaponry and with global ecologic problems, we must learn to better cooperate.

Critics who rigidly believe in science reproach CT for not being scientific enough. They have forgotten the difficulty of judging what is scientific; the observer (with her/his filters) cannot be excluded even from the hardest science. Albert Einstein said: "A theory is not built on observation. In fact, the opposite is true. What we observe follows from our theory." (Quality world?)

The same holds true for cognitive neuro-scientists and their marvelous discoveries of the material substrata of behavior. The interpretation of these discoveries depends on the scientist's fundamental understanding of the human being.

Benjamin Libet, a cognitive scientist writing about free will, proposes that the process of initiating voluntary action occurs in an unconscious part of the brain, and that just before the action is initiated, consciousness is recruited to approve or veto the action. On the other hand, two psychologists Richard Gregory and Vilayanur Ramachandran state: "Our conscious mind may not have free will, but it does have free won't." Doesn't this remind you of Dr. Glasser's statement that our creative system offers us many solutions, but we are responsible which one we choose?

There are innumerable and various explanations about human behavior. With new discoveries of the miracle of the brain, there will be more, not less, such ideas in the future. However, because we want to live our lives as happily as possible, choice theory provides guidelines. Teaching these valuable ideas comprises the mission of The William Glasser Institute.

**II. THE EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR REALITY THERAPY IS OUR CONTRIBUTION TO THE WGI VISION**

As you may know, the EART was organized to spread Choice Theory, Reality Therapy, Glasser's Quality Schools and Lead Management in Europe more efficiently. In this way, we believe the European Institutes and Associations have become stronger and more influential throughout Europe.

**An outline of the history of EART**

- In Portoroz, Slovenia in May 1997 at the 1st European International Conference, the idea of the EART was presented to Dr Glasser, Linda Harshman Executive Director of WGI, the attending faculty and individuals certified as RTC. (400 persons)
- September 24th 1999 the Slovenian and Croatian RT Associations founded EART
- March 25th 2001 the Institute for Reality Therapy United Kingdom joined the EART
- January 15th 2003 The William Glasser Institute Ireland joined the EART
- May 23rd 2004 Bosnia and Herzegovina Association joined the EART
- June 10th 2006 Finnish Association joined the EART

We now wish to invite other RT associations and institutes from other European countries to join us. We believe if you have not yet organized an institute or association, you are welcome to do so and join us.
After we founded the EART, we started to organize European International Conferences, faculty retreats, workshops and working group meetings on a regular basis to spread the efforts and finances to all EART members:

A short outline of the work of EART
- May. 2001 2nd European International Conference in Zagreb, Croatia
- June. 2004 3rd European International Conference in Dublin, Ireland
- Sept. 2006 Faculty Retreat in Izola, Slovenia
- Dec. 2007 meeting of the Working Group in Dublin, Ireland
- Sept. 2008 Faculty Retreat in Dubrovnik, Croatia
- Oct. 2008 Workshop in Dublin, organized by Cork County Ireland organizers, Slovenian and American Quality Schools exchanged experiences
- Dec. 2008 meeting of the Working Group in London, United Kingdom
- June, 2009 4th European International Conference in Edinburgh, Scotland
- Sept. 2010 Faculty Retreat in Finland (planned) and Annual General Meeting with acceptance of EART documents.

Looking to the future
Having many European organizations offers an encouraging possibility to younger members. You will see EART sponsoring various programs for the development of mental health, Glasser Quality Schools, lead management, happier family life, etc. We hope to apply for financial support from the European Union Developmental Fund. In Slovenia, we have recently applied for financial support for choice theory focus groups. We await the response.

As you can see, there is still a lot of work to do in EART!

III. Reality Therapy: A RECOGNIZED PSYCHOTHERAPEUTIC SCHOOL IN EUROPE
This recognition is the biggest success of the EART. Since June 2008, Reality Therapy, matching rigorous criteria for scientific validation established by European Association for Psychotherapy (EAP), was recognized as a scientific psychotherapeutic method and EART is recognized as the European Wide Accrediting Organization (EWAO).

If you were in Brussels that sunny day in June 2008, you would have seen in the historic square a very happy group of people. You would recognize Arthur Dunne and Jimmie Woods from Ireland, John Brackell from UK, Boba Lojk and me from Croatia and Slovenia, celebrating the success of the EAP Committee's endorsement.

Here in Edinburgh we can, for the first time, celebrate together with you the CT/RT Community from around the world the recognition of reality therapy as a psychotherapy school in Europe. This conference, the 4th European Reality Therapy Conference in Edinburgh, is something special, even historical; we see ourselves as a part of a historical movement. At this conference, selected individuals will be awarded for the first time the Certificates for the achieved title 'Reality Therapy Psychotherapist'. This success shows that joined together in EART, we have gained the respect of other professional groups and individuals; together we have grown stronger. No European reality therapy institute or association can succeed alone.

Why pursue this goal?
Still, some may ask why pursue and apply to become a recognized psychotherapeutic school? Why such an effort to gain a psychotherapeutic title? This is a reasonable question.

The EART and all reality therapy institutes and associations around the world desire a much longer reach and hope to achieve many other goals. Persons trained in reality therapy are helpful in many areas outside psychotherapy. They apply the system in their professions as well as to individuals not in need of psychotherapeutic help through teaching and in the context of the Glasser Quality School. We seek to demonstrate that reality therapy is not an inferior system as implied by the newspaper article quoted above. Because of the criticisms and more especially because of the strengths and universal applicability of reality therapy, my promise to teach CT/RT is solidly based.

To further understand why we decided to gain this status, it should be noted that there were many other modalities of psychotherapy accepted by EAP at that time such as: transactional analysis, gestalt, existential analysis, person-centered psychotherapy, psychoanalysis and many others. Moreover in Croatia, Slovenia and Bosnia, the rigorous demands of the psychotherapy program have attracted even more people to join the certification program and thereby achieve the credential Reality Therapy Certified (RTC).

The certification program has also become more attractive for those who do not plan to become psychotherapists. The 5 or 10% of future psychotherapists among all RTCs could have an important role in attracting participants into the certification program and in applying CT/RT in other areas of life.

Because of their CT/RT training and because of other accomplishments, RTCs and Faculty of long standing the European Certificate of Psychotherapy (ECP) has been given to 9 people in Slovenia, 8 in Croatia and 2 in Bosnia and Herzegovina including 10 psychologists, 7 social workers, 1 psychiatrist and 1 medical doctor.
According to our judgment, the EAP presented an historic opportunity. In 2008, after a decade of determined preparation and continued effort, we have achieved our goal: the recognition of reality therapy as a psychotherapy school in Europe!

The European Association for Psychotherapy (EAP): What is it?

The EAP (see also: http://www.europsyche.org) represents 128 organizations (30 National Umbrella Organizations, 18 European-Wide Accrediting Organizations for Psychotherapy) from 41 European countries and more than 120,000 psychotherapists. Membership is also open for individual psychotherapists.

Based on the “Strasbourg Declaration on Psychotherapy of 1990” the EAP represents high training standards, scientifically based, and stands for a free and independent practice of psychotherapy. In accordance with the aims of the World Health Organization (WHO), the non-discrimination accord valid within the framework of the European Union (EU) and intended for the European Economic Area (EEA), and the principle of freedom of movement of persons and services, the undersigned agree on the following points:

1. Psychotherapy is an independent scientific discipline, the practice of which represents an independent and free profession.
2. Training in psychotherapy takes place at an advanced, qualified and scientific level.
3. The multiplicity of psychotherapeutic methods is assured and guaranteed.
4. A full psychotherapeutic training covers theory, self-experience, and practice under supervision. Adequate knowledge of various psychotherapeutic processes is acquired.
5. Access to training is through various preliminary qualifications, in particular human and social sciences.

SUMMARY

With the relentless effort of committed adherents, reality therapy is now recognized by the EAP as a valid scientific system. I have tried to provide a brief history of how this recognition has occurred emphasizing the role of the EART in achieving this monumental acknowledgement and alluded to my role in this process.
Choice Theory and Psychoeducation for Parents of Out-of-Competition Adolescent Athletes
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Abstract

Psychoeducational training for parents of adolescent athletes using a choice theory framework provides an attractive form of group work. Competitive adolescent athletes require opportunities beyond sport to achieve identity status. The purpose of this discussion is to encourage sport psychology consultants to use choice theory principles in psychoeducational group settings when attempting to improve parent–adolescent relationships for adolescent athletes who are out-of-competition.

Introduction

The growth of youth sports in the United States has resulted in an assumption that participation results in the development of psychological skills that can be transferred to all areas of life. When involved in sports, young athletes are exposed to a variety of challenges that can affect the relationships within the family of origin (Morgan and Giacobbi, 2006). Many parents who are active mentors to their athletic child have had limited experience in fostering the positive benefits that can be derived from athletic competition. Parental influence on the development of the child can contribute to the fulfillment of the child’s potential. In many families, adolescents have disengaged from family activities, preferring to become involved in video games, the internet and movies (Petitpas, Cornelius, Van Raalte and Jones, 2005). Family relationships can decline when stressful experiences found in competitive athletics dominate family interaction (Hellstedt, 1990).

The Athletic Family and Group Therapy

The “athletic family” has become a popular phenomenon in the United States (Hellstedt, Rooks and Watson, 1988). Early researchers described athletic families by the amount of time, finances and emotional support that was given to the athletic participation of the children. Today, over 47 million young athletes compete in organized sport, while a major concern is the negative behavior of parents toward their athletic children (Petitpas, Cornelius, Van Raalte and Jones, 2005; Shields, Bredemeier, LaVoi and Power, 2005). The contribution of a negative parental influence on adolescent athletes may be a factor in the development of disassociated behavior found in parent–adolescent relationships (Glasser, 2002). Glasser (2001, 2005) believes the origin of the majority of problems is poor relationships. The need for a psychoeducational program that can address the relationship of adolescent athletes and their parents appears timely.

Reality Therapy and Choice Theory

Choice theory contends we all have the ability to choose our behaviors. The individual seeks to satisfy the five basic needs of (a) survival, (b) love and belonging, (c) power, (d) freedom and (e) fun (Glasser, 1998). The individual creates a quality world that includes one’s pleasures in the present and desires for the future. The unique features of an individual’s quality world are based on (1) his/her system of beliefs, (2) experiences and (3) people he/she wishes to be with (Glasser, 1998).

The quality world is our own picture that we can manipulate by removing images that no longer generate pleasure and replacing them with new images that fulfill our basic needs. Rapport (2007) has defined Glasser’s 14 habits that are divided into positive and negative styles of communicating in a relationship. They include negative habits: criticizing, complaining, threatening, blaming, nagging, punishing and bribing. Glasser (2002) believes we need to replace the negative behaviors with communication that is: caring, trusting, listening, supporting, befriending, encouraging and negotiating. Reality therapy is the application of the information found in choice theory. Reality therapy has been utilized effectively in group situations with a diverse range of concerns that include those who feel their lifestyle is no longer satisfying (Wubbolding, 2000). Change in behavior is promoted through an insistence on self-evaluation. The group leader challenges the group members to take responsibility for their actions (Corey, 2007). Total behavior consists of how one acts, thinks, feels, and reacts physiologically (Glasser, 1998, 2001). Choice theory suggests we are in control of what we do by having control over what we think and how we act.

Psychoeducational Approach

An important aspect of the psychoeducational approach appears to be its attraction to those who wish to avoid the label as a patient (Ryglewicz, 1991). The recipients of the material presented in this educational group...
are parents who believe they can improve their ability to help their family and adolescent athlete succeed in life and sport. Despite parents who may deny psychological issues concerning their behavior toward their adolescent athlete, an important aspect of this group is to support the client's needs. Martindale and Collins (2005) consider the congruence between the client's needs and leader's theoretical orientation to be an important contributor to the type of professional activity undertaken. In the United States, parents can have a close relationship with the coach. They are often called upon to be both parent and coach to their family athletes' team. Coaching has become synonymous with performance enhancement with a national organization now dedicated to promoting coaching as a reputable educational service for a wide variety of topics (ICF, 2007). The implication that members of this group are seen as pathological subjects is not congruent with the theoretical framework found in Choice Theory.

Sport and the Family

Sport has become an integral part of the family in the United States. The psychological development of many young people is enmeshed in the process of achieving success in sport (Bergin and Habusta, 2004). This phenomenon has been described as a family intensive sport environment (Hellstedt, 1990). The family invests both time and financial resources into the development of the family athlete, which can result in a change in the structure of the family.

Parents play an important role at almost every level in sport. The sight of parents on the sidelines of youth and school based sports competition is common. The growing cost and time involved in supporting an adolescent athlete out-of-competition may be contributing to inappropriate parental behavior and disengaged parent-adolescent relationships (Gustafsson, Kentta, Hassmen and Lindquist, 2007). Adolescent involvement in competitive sport is a cycle of training and in-season competition. The continual growth of in-season competition has led to a greater intensity due to a shortened training season (Raglin and Wilson, 2000). Parental influence may play a greater role in the life of an athletic adolescent out-of-competition due to the intense relationship that can develop between the athlete and coach in-competition (Morgan and Giacobbi, 2006). The importance of the parental-adolescent connection is bound in the healthy development of the child while supporting the desire for athletic success. Harwood and Swain (2002) suggest messages concerning achievement are transmitted to the adolescent by “behavioral cues, values, reward systems and beliefs” (p.112).

Adolescent Control

In many situations the intense training for competition finds the adolescent living in a world controlled by ambitious parents and coaches. The athletes' lives are directed by teachers, parents and coaches with little opportunity of expressing control over their lives. Adolescence has been described as a stage that is driven by industry and identity (Erikson, 1966; Marcia, 1960). The opportunities for adolescent athletes to seek new experiences beyond sport are limited by the restricted world in which they are the central participant. Despite claims that sport can enhance character and life skills (Klug, 2006), parental input can have a significant influence on the type of psychological development experienced by an adolescent athlete.

Parental Behavior

Docheff, Conn and James (2004) describe negative behavior which is exhibited by parents in the competitive sporting environment. The most interesting aspect of their account is the inability by some parents to understand the negative impact their behavior may have upon the psychological development of the adolescent athlete.

The negative impact on the adolescent athlete appears to be confirmed by research that suggests 21% of adolescent athletes prefer their parents to stay at home while they participate in competition (Shields, Bredemeier, LaVoI and Power, 2005). Parental goals for the family athlete are not always congruent with the desires of the young athlete. Collins and Barber (2005) interviewed elite adolescent female athletes, and found those parents that placed the greatest amount of significance on winning had the highest confidence while also expressing the most cognitive anxiety. In a similar study, soccer players reported a high level of parental influence on competence and motivation (Babkes and Weiss, 1999). These athletes expressed greater levels of capability and internal motivation when they believed their parents exerted lower levels of pressure. Bergin and Habusta (2004) found little difference between mother and father goal orientations for their sons playing ice hockey. This is insightful when one considers the media portrayal of ice hockey as a male driven aggressive sport. Similar to previous findings, the ice - hockey players expressed comparable goal orientations to their parents. White (1998) believes goal orientations of young athletes can be found in the influential people in their lives, namely their parents.

Although the young athletes may adopt a similar approach to training and competition as their parent, adolescent athletes may be aware of goal differences between themselves and their parents (Bergin and Habusta, 2004). When these differences in goal orientation occur, the parental-athletic adolescent dyad may become embroiled in stress (Shield et al., 2005).

Self-Determination

Burn-out in sport has been explained by the self -determination theory which suggests an inability to form healthy relationships, a lack of autonomy, and perceived
incompetence can result in low levels of internal motivation and initiative (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Social factors such as parental influence can contribute the level of self-determination of the adolescent athlete (Ntournanis, 2001). In a review of research concerning burnout, perceived control and enjoyment were found to be significant factors contributing to motivation in sport (Goodger, Gorely, Lavallee and Harwood, 2007).

Out-of-competition training has intensified for the adolescent athlete. Goodger et al. (2007) identified three studies that suggest a negative mental health profile can be related to the demands of training. The adolescent that is overwhelmed by controlling parents, demanding training schedules, and the pressure of academic standards may withdraw from family relationships to a world that provides stimulating experiences of self-controlled choices (Reed, 2001). Parents who pressure their family athlete with criticism often have high expectations of their athletic performance (Goodger et al. 2007). The pressure felt by the adolescent athlete can result in emotional exhaustion and eventual withdrawal from sport. The stress resulting from sport-related involvement can have a damaging effect upon the family.

It is common to see adolescents involved in video games and the internet while the remaining family members interact. The introduction of cable and satellite television plus the addition of hand held video games has provided the adolescent athlete with some of the tools for self-determination without the need to relate to the outside world. (Reed, 2001, Petitpas et al. 2005).

**Out-of-Competition versus In-Competition Communication**

When addressing the needs of an adolescent athlete out-of-competition, a parent must be receptive to a variety of social situations that the adolescent may desire to experience beyond those found in competitive sport. The search for diverse experiences is fueled by a search for identity (Erikson, 1960). Adolescent athletes are restricted in the time they can devote to new experiences. The high volume of training by elite adolescent athletes in the off-season can limit the choices they can make concerning their daily activities. Parents can play a significant role in averting foreclosure by providing an environment that fosters decision-making skills (Marcia, 1966). The opportunity for adolescent athletes to develop initiative is often suppressed by coaches during competition (Petitpas et al. 2006). The adolescent athlete can live a life that is dominated by parental and coach relationships that are overpowering (Gustafsson, Kentta, Hassmen and Lindqvist, 2007). This can lead to adolescent athletes having little control over their lives. Out-of-competition communication that focuses on placing greater amounts of responsibility on the adolescent athlete could improve identity formation and increase initiative. This form of developmental growth is valued in life and competitive sports.

Although in-competition communication for parent of adolescent athletes is beyond the scope of this discussion, differences exist. When in-competition, the adolescent athlete must correct problems quickly. The time-sensitive nature of many sports provide an opportunity for parents to support their adolescent athlete with a positive, hopeful outlook. The parents’ role is to assist the coach by communicating with their adolescent athlete with language that leads to answers rather than development of concerns (Morgan and Giacobbi, 2006).

**Choice Theory and a Solution-Focused Framework**

The selection of Choice Theory promotes a solution-focused framework which has the capacity to address three main areas. The first, being the ability to improve the relationship between the parent and adolescent athlete. It is assumed the outcome of this improvement will enhance family relationships. The second is to provide opportunities for adolescents to have a perception of some control over their life (Goodger, Gorely, Lavallee and Harwood, 2007). This will enhance the motivation and fun found in sport. The final goal is to educate the social support of the athlete so that the athlete's movement towards self-identity can be experienced.

**The Group Leader Using Reality Therapy/Choice Theory**

The group leader using reality therapy/choice theory as a framework will focus on developing a relationship with each member in the initial stages of the group sessions. An important aspect of these opening sessions is to model behavior while actively encouraging all members to evaluate their own actions (Corey, 2004). Once a friendly relationship has been established, the leader then attempts to get members to recognize how their actions have led to their present problems and how they can make better choices. This working stage is designed to help members evaluate how much they want to change their behavior. The leader uses these sessions to teach the group choice theory. The final stage is used to help members formulate realistic goals which will lead to achievement (Corey, 2004). It is important for the leader to create a non-judgmental atmosphere which allows members to develop ownership of their plans that can be measured.

**Advantages of Implementing this Type of Program**

The topic of communication between parents and their competitive children has been ignored. This offers an opportunity for Reality Therapists to provide a service that has immense potential. The non-pathological nature of this type of psychoeducational group is attractive to those who resist help when classified as a mental health patient. The psychoeducational presentation lends itself to
an “educational coaching” climate that is familiar to the participants. This is an opportunity to actively seek those who are in need of psychoeducation through the attraction of competitive sport.
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ABSTRACT

The differences in student performance outcomes following three instructional methods were investigated. Twelve 7th grade students within a Life Science class were administered a pre-instructional quiz and post-instructional quiz on three consecutive days. Each day involved a different instructional method including overhead, overhead with PowerPoint, and overhead with PowerPoint followed by a promise of receiving candy after the post-instructional quiz. The results suggest that promising the students an apparent item of their quality world may increase performance outcomes. Concurrently, increased performance outcomes may suggest that the promised item was within the student's quality world. The results further suggest that because the promise was verbalized after instruction and before assessment, students may not consistently express, through assessment, what they have learned.

The quality world has been described by Glasser (1998a) in his seminal book, Choice Theory: A New Psychology of Personal Freedom as a “personal world... made up of a small group of specific pictures that portray, more than anything else we know, the best ways to satisfy one or more of our basic needs” (p. 45). The five basic needs, as developed by Glasser (1998a), include: (a) survival; (b) love, loving sex, and belonging; (c) power; (d) freedom; and (e) fun. Glasser (1998b) further explained the quality world in his book, The Quality School: Managing Students Without Coercion, when he wrote:

Beginning shortly after birth, we learn to remember all that we do, or all that happens to us, that feels very good. We then collect these very pleasurable memories into what is best called a quality world, and this memory world becomes the most important parts of our lives. (p. 62)

Given the above description of the quality world and its potential importance in the lives of humans, it may be useful for people to determine the content of their quality world. Through this determination, people may be better informed about how to live a more satisfying life by learning what is in their quality world and then consciously including these items within their life. A method for determining what items are within the quality world was implemented by Frey (2005) with the use of the Pre-Special Education Major’s Assessment of Life Quality During Senior Internship and a Need Strength Profile. The former instrument measured the subjects’ knowledge of the concept of a quality world following formal instruction. The latter instrument measured the general importance of the five basic needs to individuals’ lives, as well as how much those needs were being implemented in their lives. Through this methodology, the subject became aware of the possibility of a quality world, as well as whether or not they were successful at manifesting quality-world items within their life.

Similarly, this method of learning about the quality world through instruction and assessment was also utilized by VanVleet (2008) during a graduate-level psychology class entitled, Choice Theory, at Elmira College in upstate New York. However, VanVleet (2008) further requested that students pictorially represent the quality world by drawing the “(1) the people we most want to be with, (2) things we most want to own or experience, and (3) the ideas or systems of belief that govern our behavior.” Additionally, VanVleet (2008) asks students to answer a list of questions which broaden their quality-world perspective and added to their already acquired knowledge of their five basic needs. Some of these questions included: (a) “What do you work hard for?”; (b) “What would you like your life to be like?”; and (c) “What is valuable to you?”

The above examples indicate that there are methods by which individuals may determine what is within the quality world. However, although it may be important for individuals to know what is in their quality world so that they may enhance the quality of their life, it may also be important to know what is in the quality world of others. Through this knowledge, the ability to enhance other peoples’ lives may become possible by providing these with items within their quality world. This ability to enhance another person’s life may be especially important for teachers who have the opportunity to enhance the quality of life for their students. However, Glasser (1998) wrote that, “teachers...don’t know about the quality world and how vital it is for the children to keep them [teacher and what they teach in it]” (p. 250). Moreover, this lack of teacher knowledge pertaining to the quality world may be especially detrimental to students during the middle school years. Glasser (1998a) describes how during middle school, as opposed to elementary school, there is less one-on-one time from teachers and increased teacher coercion. This situation may lead many students to beg...
to remove school from their quality world, and this removal may be recognized by teachers as a resistance to school work and directions. Glasser (1998a) emphasized this situation when he wrote, “All you get from coercion is resistance, no matter where it is used” (p. 246). Moreover, resistance from students is often followed by school disciplinary action which further engenders resistance and the removal of school from the student’s quality world. Pearce (1992) supported the ineffectiveness of coercion when he wrote, “Surprisingly little learning takes place from willful, forced attempts to make a child learn” (p. 143).

Glasser (1998a) maintains that although many students may begin to remove school from their quality world during middle school, “The process... can be reversed comparatively easily at this early stage” (p. 250). His recommendations for preventing and reversing this trend include “give them [students] a little more attention, for example, a friendly greeting in the morning...an assignment they can do, help them to do it well, and then a little praise for doing it” (p. 251). Glasser (1998a) further suggests that “Good teachers know how to give students what they need, and it doesn’t take that much time” (p. 251).

Given these recommendations, the results of this study demonstrate that it may take a teacher only a few minutes to potentially increase student performance outcomes by including an aspect of the student’s quality world within lesson plans. In turn, the increased performance outcomes may suggest that the teacher had indeed found an item which was part of the quality world of the students. Through this process, teachers may be able to discover many items within the quality world of the students and this may assist the teachers with further increasing student performance outcomes, as well as assisting students with maintaining school within their quality worlds. Additionally, the results of this study suggest that by promising a quality-world item to students prior to assessment and after instruction, not only may performance outcomes increase, but it may be possible to determine if students have been learning more than previous assessments have indicated.

Initial Study

The initial questions of this study were: (a) to what extent do three different instructional methods affect student performance outcomes, and (b) to what extent does choice of instructional method affect student performance outcomes. The three instructional methods included: (a) overhead-facilitated instruction with no choice, (b) overhead and PowerPoint-facilitated instruction with no choice, and (c) the choice to receive one or the other instructional method. It was hypothesized that the average post-instructional quiz scores following the three instructional methods would show a progressive trend toward higher scores, but would not be statistically significant.

Although the above described study was intended to be fully implemented, due to experimental error on Day 3 of the study, the choice of instructional method was not implemented. Given that situation and the inability to repeat the study due to time constraints, it was not possible to evaluate the above research hypothesis and thus this article may not be considered a formal research report. However, this situation does not diminish the importance of the results of this study; results which were so unexpected and consistent that reporting them became an obvious choice.

Method

Subjects

The subjects of this study were 12 middle school students within a Period One class of 7th grade Life Science. These students comprised the entire class. The approximate age range was 12 to 13. There were 10 females and 2 males. None of the students were receiving educational assistance to address cognitive and/or emotional challenges. The middle school was located in upstate New York.

Procedure

This study was a required assignment during a student-teaching placement in the Fall of 2008. This 60 day student-teaching experience was the concluding requirement for initial certification to teach biology and general science in New York public schools. Elmira College in Elmira, New York was the tertiary institution offering the student-teaching class. To obtain permission for this study, the Cooperating Teacher communicated with the school administration.

During Day 1 of the study, the students completed an ungraded 10-question quiz (i.e., 10-point quiz) prior to any instruction. This pre-instructional quiz contained content from the Ecology Unit, relating to the Water Cycle. There were six multiple-choice questions and four true-false questions. All multiple-choice questions were the first six questions on the quiz and the true-false questions were the concluding four questions. After the pre-instructional quiz, all students experienced an overhead-facilitated instruction, pertaining to the Water Cycle, with overheads created from the Ecology Packet. This instruction was followed by a graded 10-question quiz (i.e., post-instructional quiz) also based on the Water Cycle. The pre-instructional quiz and post-instructional quiz contained identical questions and answers. However, the order of the questions on the two quizzes was randomly different. Also, the placement of the answers within the multiple-choice questions was randomly changed for each question. The multiple-choice questions remained the first six questions and the true-false questions remained the concluding four questions on the post-instructional quiz.

During Day 2 of the study, the same general procedure from Day 1 was followed. However, the instruction
involved an overhead and PowerPoint-facilitated instruction, and the content was based on Biome Succession. To accomplish the PowerPoint-facilitated instruction, the overheads were scanned and placed within a PowerPoint presentation so that the students experienced the slides twice; once on the overhead and once on the PowerPoint.

During Day 3 of the study, the same general procedure from Day 1 and Day 2 was followed, but the content was based on Photosynthesis. Moreover, it was intended that the students would be provided with the opportunity to choose between the overhead-facilitated instruction or the overhead and PowerPoint-facilitated instruction. However, due to experimenter error (i.e., the experimenter forgot to perform the procedure), the students were not informed about a choice of instruction. Thus, instead of having a choice, the students were provided with another day of overhead and PowerPoint-facilitated instruction with no choice. Because of this procedural flaw, it was not possible to determine if student choice may influence their performance outcomes.

Following the completion of the Day 3 post-instructional quiz, the students were debriefed, as a group, and informed of the intent of the study. Until the debriefing, the students were only aware that the three days of quizzes were an Elmira College requirement which the Student Teacher had to fulfill.

Unplanned Procedure

Because the class had participated in three consecutive quizzes over three days, it was decided, after the study started, to provide the students with candy, as a reward. The students were informed of this reward after the Day 3 instruction and before they were provided with the Day 3 post-instructional quiz. Moreover, the candy was hidden in the back of the room until after the post-instructional quiz so that the students would not be distracted by the candy during the instruction. Thus, until they were informed about the candy, there was no way the students could have known they would be receiving candy, especially since they were the first Life Science class of the day and would not have been able to hear about the candy from previous classes.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 15, was utilized for most of the statistical analysis of this study. However, the percentage of variance ($r^2$) was computed from a formula obtained from Gravetter and Wallnau (2007).

Results

Table 1 shows the mean pre-instructional quiz scores (Pre) and mean post-instructional quiz scores (Post) from each of the three days of this study. Standard deviations (SD) and standard errors (SE) are also provided. The means are based on 12 quiz scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 12$ students for each day. Scores are based on quizzes with a maximum score of 10.

Table 2 shows the differences (D) between the mean pre-instructional quiz scores (Pre) and mean post-instructional quiz scores (Post) from each of the three days of this study. The $D = 2.0$ for Day 1 was statistically significant, $t(11) = 4.69, p < .001, r^2 = .67$. The $D = 1.9$ for Day 2 was statistically significant, $t(11) = 3.62, p < .004, r^2 = .54$. The $D = 4.2$ for Day 3 was statistically significant, $t(11) = 6.00, p < .0001, r^2 = .77$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 shows a comparison of the differences (D) between the mean post-instructional quiz scores (Post) from each of the three days of this study. The D = 1.3 between Day 1 and Day 2 was statistically significant, t(11) = 2.53, p < .03, r² = .37. The D = 2.0 between Day 1 and Day 3 was statistically significant, t(11) = 6.13, p < .0001, r² = .77. The D = 3.3 between Day 2 and Day 3 was statistically significant, t(11) = 6.04, p < .0001, r² = .77

Table 3

Comparison of the Differences Between the Mean Post-Instructional Quiz Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1/Day 2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1/Day 3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2/Day 3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

Table 2 shows the differences between the mean pre-instructional and mean post-instructional quiz scores for all three days of this study. These differences were all statistically significant which may be seen as an expected result due to the well-known effect of instruction on learning new information, especially when this information was not part of the formal curriculum for these students until 7th grade. However, the Day 3 mean post-instructional quiz scores (i.e., these quizzes were preceded by the promise of the candy) were noticeably larger with a mean of 9.8 out of 10 possible quiz points. This was a 4.2 point increase over the pre-instructional quiz mean of 5.6 points, as opposed to the mean increase of 2.0 points and 1.9 points from Day 1 and Day 2, respectively. Additionally, the .62 point standard deviation associated with the mean post-instructional quiz score of 9.8 from Day 3 is reflective of the small variation in quiz scores between students. In fact, the actual scores for the Day 3 post-instructional quizzes were: (a) eight students scored 10 out of 10, (b) two students scored 9 out of 10, (c) one student scored 8 out of 10, and (d) one student scored 4 out of 10. The student who scored 4 out of 10 had recently moved into the school district and was bilingual, speaking both Spanish and English. These circumstances may partially explain the low quiz score. Lastly, the percentage of variance (r²) for the Day 3 difference between the mean pre-instructional and mean post-instructional quiz scores was r² = .77. Thus, over 75% of the variance may be explained by some effect within the Day 3 procedure, as opposed to the smaller percentage of variances of r² = .67 and r² = .54 for Day 1 and Day 2, respectively.

Table 3 shows that the differences between the Day 1 and Day 3 mean post-instructional quiz scores and the Day 2 and Day 3 mean post-instructional scores were statistically significant and noticeably larger than those for the differences between Day 1 and Day 2. Moreover, the percentage of variance for the differences between the Day 1 and Day 3 mean post-instructional quiz scores and the Day 2 and Day 3 mean post-instructional quiz scores were r² = .77 and r² = .77 which are both noticeably larger than the r² = .37 for the differences between Day 1 and Day 2.

Considered collectively, the above statistics indicate that on Day 3, something happened which may have contributed to a significant increase in the mean post-instructional quiz scores. Because the only salient variation on Day 3, as opposed to Day 1 and Day 2, was the addition of a promise of candy, it is possible that this promise was the main reason for the large mean differences on Day 3. Additionally, the placement of this promise within the class activities indicated a remarkable interpretation of the results. As the Method section described, the promise of candy was not provided until after the pre-instructional quiz and instruction had been completed. Also, the candy was hidden in the back of the room so that there was no way the students could have known they would be receiving candy, especially since they were the first Life Science class of the day and would not have been able to hear about the candy from previous classes. Thus, it appears that the promise of the candy, provided after the instruction, may have been involved with motivating the students to express what they had learned during the instruction. They did not know about the candy prior to the pre-instructional quiz, as may be further supported by the mean of 5.6 for these quizzes. They did not know about the candy before the overhead and PowerPoint-facilitated instruction, the method which the majority of the students voted was not their choice of instruction (i.e., they may have been less motivated to learn during this lesson than if they experienced the overhead-only instruction). Again, given these circumstances, it appears that the promise of the candy may have motivated the students to express what they had learned. This implies that their previous post-instructional quiz scores from Day 1 and Day 2 may have been lower, in part, because the students were not expressing what they had learned.

When a literature search was performed to locate information about a lack of motivation to express, through assessment, knowledge and understanding which students had already acquired, nothing was found. This search was conducted in the library of Elmira College utilizing multiple databases and several different keyword arrangements. Thus, although there may be literature...
which pertains to students’ lack of motivation to express, through assessment, what they already know, it appears that this literature may be small in number. This situation may indicate that the results of this study are unique and may represent a novel way of viewing student learning, as well as how assessment functions within a public-school educational setting.

**Quality World, Student Motivation, and Coercion**

Given these results, the implication is that students may, in some cases, be unmotivated to express their learning (i.e., performance outcomes), even after they have successfully learned the information. One reason for this possibility may be that the students do not care about grades to an extent expected by teachers and educational administrators. This lack of care may be one way of indicating that the students have taken grades out of their quality world which may further indicate that the students are beginning to take school, in general, out of their quality world. Glasser (1998b) explained this possibility when he wrote, “The reason that many students do not work hard in school is that they do not have a picture of schoolwork in their quality world” (p. 64). Additionally, Glasser (1998a) wrote that, “some of the most capable students were doing very little in class because they had turned off in middle school” (p. 235) and being “turned off” may be indicative of removing school from their quality world. Glasser (1998a) further cites that as many as 75% of students were purposefully not performing well and that this percentage may be “less than 5 percent in many large inner-city schools” (p. 235).

To account for this lack of motivation by students, Glasser (1998a) asserted that “this low figure is due to coercion” (p. 235). Recall that within the introduction of this article, coercion was described as a primary reason for students to begin to take school out of their quality world and it appears that this removal may predominantly begin within the middle school years. Glasser (1998b) described a process which ensues when coercion is implemented within schools when he wrote, “The child knows when he or she is being coerced. As soon as this occurs, the child’s main agenda becomes resistance, the personal power struggle between teacher and pupil begins, and education is left behind” (p. 30). When “education is left behind”, the valuing of grades by students may naturally decrease and school, in general, may continue to be removed from the quality world of students. Glasser (1998b) cautions that “Unless we can get rid of coercion, we will not make even a dent in the problems of education. Anything that even smacks of coercion will not be admitted to anyone’s quality world” (p. 73).

Given the possibility that coercion may lead students to take school out of their quality world, it may be important to explore possible solutions to this situation. One potential and obvious alternative may be for teachers to decrease coercion within schools. Glasser (1998b) wrote that the creation of “a work situation that is warm and friendly and...noncoercive” (p. 55) may facilitate the ability of “Students [to] quickly realize that this teacher is not their adversary” (p. 55). Glasser (1998b) further recommends that “To get into the students’ quality worlds, the teacher... [adds] kindness, courtesy, and humor to whatever they ask the students to do” (p. 77).

**Unmotivated to Express Knowledge and Understanding**

As described above, coercion from teachers may lead students to no longer value grades (i.e., taking grades out of their quality world) which may lead to low grades. Given these low grades, it may be common for teachers and administrators to believe that the students have not learned. The possibility that the students do not desire to express what they have learned because that expression has no value for them may never enter the conversation and thus may not enter instructional practices. As indicated previously within this discussion, no literature could be located which suggested that students were unmotivated to express their acquired knowledge and understanding within assessments. It appears that the focus of previous research has been about assessment being indicative of what had been learned.

To provide some insight into the possibility that students may not express their full knowledge and understanding on assessments, the phenomenon of state-specific learning will be examined. Pearce (2002) described state-specific learning as suggesting that “the emotional state we are in when learning takes place becomes an integral part of that learning” (p. 33). Pearce further explained that:

> the emotion experienced while learning something becomes part of the learned pattern. When we exercise that learning, even years later, the same emotional hormones will fire on cue, for they are as much a part of the neural pattern as is the learned material...The result is that we may find ourselves reluctant to recall what we actually know. (p. 34)

Given the potential existence of state-specific learning, it may be possible that the reluctance to recall learned information, as described by Pearce (2002), may also apply to assessment situations and may partially explain why students may not express their full knowledge and understanding on assessments. Thus, a reluctance to recall learned information may partially be associated with avoidance of the negative emotional states which accompanied the learning and that these negative emotional states may be common for many students due to coercion.

**Students May Learn More Than Presumed**

If students are not expressing their full knowledge and understanding on assessments, is there information which suggests that students may be learning more than what is currently believed within public schools? Standing (1957) wrote that Marie Montessori believed that “children possess different and higher qualities than those we usually attribute to them” (p. 39). More specifically, Brown (2006) quoted Montessori from her 1949 book, The Absorbent...
Mind: "education is not something which the teacher does, but that it is a natural process which develops spontaneously in the human being" (The Absorbent Mind, 8)" (Brown, 2006, p. 23). Pearce (1992) appears to support a natural learning process when he wrote, "Just provide a child with the appropriate environment—one with acceptance, love, protection, and appropriate stimuli—and you can't prevent the brain from learning. Learning is what it's designed to do" (p. 135). Brown (2006) further quotes Pearce from his 1977 book, Magical Child: 'to approach learning consciously, we think we or the child must do the work of learning, but that is a biological impossibility. The greatest learning that ever takes place in the human mind...takes place in the first three years of life without the child ever being aware of learning at all.' (The Magical Child, 168) (p. 248)

Brown (2006) further asserts that:

Within the first two years of life, a baby exhibits incomparable motivation and brilliance...[and] children are born with a passion that will guide them to their brilliance; it's just that most children are denied the opportunity to find it...How much greater, then, are our individual talents, passions, and brilliance... (p. 248)

Given the above perspectives, it may be reasonable to believe that some students do learn more than assessments may indicate, but due to some motivation-related factors, these students do not express their knowledge and understanding through assessment. This potential situation creates a challenge within public schools involving teachers and administrators beginning to address how to motivate students to express more of what they know. A first step for this challenge may be to determine if a lack of expression is occurring on assessments. The results of this study may suggest a means by which this lack of expression may be discovered.

For example, if a teacher would like to know if students are learning more than previous assessment has indicated, the teacher may decide to administer a similar assessment which is preceded first by instruction and then by a promise of an item which may be within the quality world of the students. The teacher would have to determine the amount of mean difference between the previous and new assessment which may be indicative of students not expressing acquired knowledge and understanding. However, the differences would probably have to be marked, as were those reported in this study. Interestingly, the above process may also suggest that the promised item was indeed within the quality world of the students if the new assessment scores were noticeably higher than the previous assessment scores. Through this process, the search for student quality-world items may progressively increase the repertoire of items within the teacher's instructional tool box. These items may then be incorporated into lesson plans at various stages, not just between instruction and assessment, to determine which items work best in which situations to create the desired instructional outcome. As Glasser (1998a) wrote "A good experience with a good teacher is the key to learning anything well" (Glasser, 1998a, p. 248). Perhaps the inclusion of quality-world items within lesson plans may create a "good experience" for students and the concomitant perception of the teacher as a "good teacher". This may in turn assist students with keeping school within their quality world.
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Footnotes

1. If it may be essential to describe loving sex as requiring the use of safe sex because without a concern for another's health and safety, it may be impossible to infer the existence of love.

2. One aspect of the administration of the pre-instructional and post-instructional quizzes that was not discussed within this article was that three other Life Science classes also received the same quizzes. This was done to maintain instructional consistency among the Period One, Period Four, Period Six and Period Nine classes. The mean of the Day 3 post-instructional quiz scores, in comparison to the Day 1 and Day 2 post-instructional quiz scores, was similarly large for the other three classes. However, these data were not analyzed because they were not part of the original research design and thus did not have the same controls.

3. The decision was made to ask the students, following the Day 3 post-instructional quiz, what their instructional choice would have been and the majority of the students voted for the overhead-facilitated instruction, only.

The author may be reached at pmhillis@yahoo.com
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ABSTRACT

The William Glasser Institute provided choice theory/reality therapy certification scholarships to 13 individuals working in post-secondary education in order to ensure that teaching of choice theory and reality therapy is accurate and up-to-date, and to increase the growing body of research on reality therapy and choice theory that addresses the efficacy of both the theory and the practice. This is the second of two articles to examine the actual impact of this program on participants' teaching practices and scholarship activities, especially manuscripts submitted to professional journals that examine the efficacy of choice theory and reality therapy.

In the fall of 2007, the Board of Directors of the William Glasser Institute established the Glasser Scholars Project to (1) help ensure that instruction in choice theory and reality therapy is accurate and up-to-date; (2) to provide training to university faculty as a means to facilitate purpose number one; and (3) to increase the growing body of research on reality therapy and choice theory that addresses the efficacy of both the theory and the practice (Glasser Scholar Project, n.d.).

Thirteen university faculty members involved in teaching, training, and conducting research in the Education, Counseling Social Work, Counseling Psychology, Rehabilitation and related disciplines were accepted as Glasser Scholars. The progress of the Glasser Scholars on these objectives through their Advanced Intensive Week was reported in the Spring 2009 issue of this journal (Burdenski et al., 2009). This article will demonstrate the further progress this group has made with expanding the body of research on choice theory/reality therapy and disseminating choice theory and reality therapy principles in their teaching roles. The 13 faculty members were identified in Part 1 of this article and represent the authors listed above.

To assess the impact of the intensive training on the Glasser Scholars' teaching, supervision, and research activities, the participants were asked to respond to three questions within one week of completing the Certification Week. What follows are excerpts from participants' written responses presented in alphabetical order:

1. How did training in reality therapy (RT) and choice theory (CT) in the Advanced Intensive Week (AIW), Advanced Practicum (AP), and Certification Week (CW) further improve your ability to teach reality therapy principles in your counseling theories or other didactic counseling courses?

Mark J. Britzman

Counselor education is an exciting endeavor, yet it can become an overwhelming experience for both students and faculty. Students often appear very distressed trying to understand, retain, and then master a myriad of information with the desired outcome to help others. My training as a Glasser Scholar allowed me to better synthesize much of the information students are taught throughout a 48-hour Master's Degree program by incorporating a conceptual framework that is not only retained more easily, but is effective in helping clients move closer to their vision of a better life.

Specifically, introducing the WDEP process empowered students to become more confident and competent. This framework helps the students determine what their clients truly want, whether the clients' choices are taking them in a direction that gets them closer to their perception of a quality life, better evaluate choices, and develop and take ownership of a more effective plan.

Becoming an ethical and competent counselor does not necessitate exposing students to over 400 different counseling approaches. Paradoxically, choosing to make the learning process more complex appears to stymie students' natural helping skills and pre-developed intuition. Choice theory and reality therapy are very pragmatic and effective. Counseling students can quickly incorporate the theory to help diverse clientele and then become more artful using this approach as they gain additional experience.

Thomas K. Burdenski, Jr

I teach a course on brief therapy at my institution every fall semester. The intense use of role plays to learn and refine the skills of choice theory/reality therapy at every phase of my certification process has convinced me that this is a very powerful teaching and learning tool. I have been incorporating role plays more into that course
and every course I teach because I feel so much more competent at helping students grow and learn this way.

Prior to becoming a Glasser Scholar, I did not consider CT/RT to be a brief therapy because the academic literature is dominated right now by references to solution-focused, narrative, and cognitive-behavioral therapies. Perhaps CT/RT has been taken for granted by some since it has been around since the 1960's. I now dedicate half of my class in brief therapy to CT/RT and I find that it is not only a brief therapy, but that it is ideally suited for use in schools because the emphasis is on internal control and taking responsibility for one's choices—very critical ideas that nearly all educators can support.

Moreover, since this theory emphasizes actions and thinking, not feelings and physiology, and the present and future instead of the past, it is perceived as less threatening than counseling theories that promote detailed client/student histories or exploration of feelings. Moreover, choice theory is not merely a counseling theory; it is a philosophy of living and teachers and administrators can easily embrace these principles without having to wear the “counselor” hat. As evidenced by quality schools, entire institutions can adopt CT/RT principles.

Willa J. Casstevens

I have experienced personal and professional growth during the Glasser Scholar process. Throughout the Advanced Intensive and Certification weeks, structured role plays that included clinical feedback were particularly helpful to me, and I can now guide students in CT/RT role play exercises and provide them with appropriate and supportive feedback. Further, the clinical feedback/supervision provided during our training weeks modeled choice theory's lead management approach to supervision and classroom management, an approach I've embraced in teaching at the university level.

I have made additions to the social work program graduate curriculum at my university as a result of this training and exposure to CT/RT: the foundation curriculum now incorporates a group work text that includes CT/RT, and the advanced graduate curriculum incorporates one of Dr. Glasser's books on counseling. I anticipate that my use of CT/RT material in the classroom will increase over time.

Gloria S. Cisse

In retrospect, it is a journey. I have been moving closer and closer towards becoming a person who can effectively practice principles associated with CT/RT. During Certification Week our group facilitator read “Oh the Places You Will Go” by Dr. Seuss. It was an accurate description of my personal experience through this process. I have brains in my head and feet in my shoes and I am capable of assisting my students, clients, children, etc.

in making more effective choices. What this means is that there are more tools in my tool belt. Tools that guide the exploration of a client's quality world, walking a client through the CT chart, using the resources in the environment in assisting clients to include me in their quality world, allowing clients/students/etc. to know they can and do choose their total behavior.

Jeri L. Crowell

Through the Basic and Advanced Intensive Weeks and Practica, I was academically and clinically prepared for certification. Basic training in the concepts and application of choice theory/reality therapy had enabled me to discuss theoretical principles when teaching my courses, but it was the complete process that has assisted me to fully integrate practical underpinnings in my work as a university professor and as a clinician.

Taking part in role plays, readings, and discussions reinforced that I was learning and enabled me to integrate this knowledge into my teaching in more meaningful ways and enhanced my motivation and preparedness. Even though role plays are supposed to be practice, I think we all find that there is something real about our work in those situations, both as client and counselor or educator. This particular aspect of our training has validated the use of role plays in my teaching, as one goal of the Glasser Scholars project is to ensure that the theoretical and counseling concepts are being taught correctly.

Much of the discussion at the conference in Edinburgh centered around maintaining the William Glasser Institute in the next generation and beyond. One part that we as Glasser Scholars play is in the assurance of correct and appropriate teaching and practice of choice theory, reality therapy, and lead management. Our European colleagues taught me about relationships that cross cultural boundaries, and how this theory impacts academic and clinical work around the globe.

Jill D. Duba

The modeling of the instructors was the most beneficial. They consistently used lead management skills to supervise, instruct, and mentor. This provided the foundation for how healthy relationships are defined by Glasser. I will use this in my own teaching and advising. For example, I have decided to become flexible with assignment due dates in one of my upcoming courses this fall as a “trial run.”

Michael Dyson

I work in the field of teacher education and as such prepare teachers to teach in local, national and international communities. As a result of my own learning in choice theory (CT), reality therapy (RT) and lead management (LM), I now view my role as a teacher educator, and as a Glasser Scholar, through a totally new lens. I now
recognize how important it is, for the future of humanity that the principles incorporated in CT, RT and LM are thoroughly embedded within all teacher education programs. Humanity is at a crossroad and schools as we know them in the Western world are struggling with enormous social and relational problems.

I recognize that one way to overcome these problems is to use the positive connecting habits to replace the deadly habits and to replace external control psychology with the positive principles embedded in choice theory. Teachers are seeking support and are increasingly acknowledging that the techniques associated with the assertive control of other humans are no longer applicable in this world of rapid change. A workable solution for all teachers is to learn the principles of choice theory and incorporate the techniques of lead management and reality therapy within their practice.

Brenda Faulkner

The continual exposure to the principles and procedures of CT/RT and lead management through the AIW, AP and CW has heightened my awareness of the simplicity and relevance of this theory. Certification Week illustrated the enormous versatility in application of the CT/RT and lead management and it was enriching to be a part of the process.

Sylinda B. Gilchrist

The Glasser Scholars program has been one of the most valuable training opportunities that I have experienced in my career. The knowledge and training I received from participating in this program has enhanced my teaching and counseling skills. In addition to learning the theoretical concepts thoroughly, the opportunity to apply the concepts in role plays made me a practitioner of CT/RT in my professional and personal life. As I completed the certification process, I realized that my knowledge of CT/RT has increased significantly, which caused me to expand my study of other theories so I can comprehensively train my students to use CT/RT and other counseling theories. The Glasser Scholars program has made me a more effective professor and counselor.

Mary A. Graham

The experience I had in the AIW, AP and Certification Week provided a depth of knowledge regarding reality therapy and choice theory that I had not previously had. This training experience assisted me in continuing to develop a deep level of theoretical understanding of the principles of CT/RT as applicable to my teaching and practice with clients.

A second very enriching experience I was afforded was the opportunity to work with an expert in the field of CT/RT, John Brickell. John served as my Advanced Practicum supervisor and I appreciated the opportunity to work with an individual with such deep knowledge, commitment and compassion toward the field of counseling. John was an excellent role model in the process of working with students in a supervisory capacity. He lent his expertise and enthusiasm to my growth as an educator and counselor. These are processes I will emulate with my students in supervision and teaching at the university level.

Based on my experience in the AIW, AP and Certification Week, I not only feel extremely comfortable teaching and supervising emerging school and community counseling students in the theoretical constructs and principles of CT/RT. I do it with a recognizable enthusiasm. This enthusiasm, as noted by my students, has encouraged them to learn more about the theory and practices related to CT/RT.

Neresa B. Minatrea

After attending this series of CT/RT trainings, I have provided numerous short trainings for local community agencies, undergraduate and graduate level courses. All of the graduate level courses, which I teach include CT/RT (e.g., Counseling Theories, Group Counseling, Counseling Social and Cultural Diversity, Techniques, Substance Abuse Counseling, Mental Health Practicum and Internship). The trainings and practicum experience provided me the knowledge and skills to not only teach the principles, it also supplied me the proficiency level to conduct role plays and supervise graduate students using the philosophy of CT and techniques found in RT.

The training enhanced my abilities to work with practicum and internship students in two ways. Initially, the training increased my ability to synthesize and convey the CT/RT beliefs and principles in a manner increasing students’ capacity to comprehend the philosophy and techniques. This was accomplished through conversation, diagrams, and role-plays. Frequently, even though students read CT and RT textbooks, they were unable to generalize to their work with clients and their own life.

Next, I had a new way of managing students. The principles in CT and RT were applied during supervision when discussing their cases and practicum/internship experiences. The principles of WDEP were used when exploring student counselors and client relationships, clients’ impasse, and clients’ progress. When discussing cases with student counselors, exploring their total behavior proved most helpful in increasing self-awareness. Lastly, these principles were applied in classroom management and afforded a new way of providing a template for discussing conflicts, assignments, and course content. This style enhances choices and students’ ownership of their learning.

Cynthia Palmer Mason

The training I received in reality therapy (RT) and choice theory (CT) during Advanced Intensive Week,
Advanced Practicum, and Certification Week has improved my teaching effectiveness in my Counseling Theories course and also my School Practicum course. The teaching, assigned reading, role-play activities, and group discussions have enhanced my knowledge and skills with CT/RT. This more in-depth understanding allows me to teach the basic principles of choice theory, basic needs, the quality world, and lead management in a more meaningful way as I stress the importance of the personal characteristics that pave the way for developing positive therapeutic relationships with students.

Because of this training, I have changed the format for my classes: I now use more group discussions and role-plays. My students appreciate the experience they gain from role plays and this has been reflected in my site evaluations which have gone from good to excellent. General comments from students in my counseling theories course usually mention my knowledge, skill, and enthusiasm for teaching the course, whereas specific comments from students in my school practicum course indicate that they feel more confident in actual counseling interviews with students during their practicum experience because of the role plays and discussions they were able to participate in during the class.

My knowledge of CT/RT has greatly increased, and the advanced training enabled me to add to my awareness of the more subtle dynamics of CT/RT. I have also garnered new skills and abilities in my ability to actually employ this knowledge with my internship students who are using CT/RT. I am better able to teach my students beyond the realm of mere techniques and lead them into more awareness of the philosophy of the theory, and how the practice evolves from this philosophy.

An important area of growth was in my ability to employ role plays much more effectively with my students, in terms of using CT/RT principles and techniques, but also in simple mechanics of staging the role plays and structuring them, such as using the “Round Robin” and setting brief time limits.

In the Certification Week, I became much more aware of how meaningful and impacting lead management can be, and made the connection on how it can be used within the graduate courses I teach. I plan to implement several lead management strategies beginning in the fall 2009 semester, and look forward to evaluating the outcomes.

2. How did training in reality therapy (RT) and choice theory (CT) in the Advanced Intensive Week, Advanced Practicum, and Certification Week help you establish or build your research/publication agenda? How about research plans or proposals targeted at reality therapy (RT) and choice theory (CT) specifically?

Mark J. Britzman

The Glasser Scholar process helped me become more accountable for my continuing education. After reading numerous books and research articles related to choice theory and reality therapy, I was able to incorporate the framework successfully in my own counseling practice. Furthermore, submitting counseling tapes and internalizing the helpful feedback from Certified Reality Therapists (e.g., faculty members) was also extremely helpful concurrently with incorporating the theory into each class that I teach. This learning process generated new ideas and ways to help others.

Because of this growth-enhancing experience, I successfully wrote and published a book entitled Pursuing the Good Life (Britzman, 2008) and developed a website with the plan to send out useful blogs on a consistent basis (i.e., ). I also had the opportunity to collaborate with other Glasser Scholars and published two articles in this journal (Duba, Graham, Britzman, & Minatrea, 2009; Burdenski et al., 2009). I am currently developing a relationship assessment that will be used in a variety of contexts including but not limited to couples enrolled in my pre-marital classes.

Thomas K. Burdenski, Jr

The biggest gift to me personally has been the opportunity to build personal relationships with the other scholars, including one from my own institution, who are interested in doing collaborative research. While I like doing research, I don’t like doing it as a “lone ranger,” the process is much more fun when I get the chance to share the tedium and long delays of gratification inherent in academic research.

For example, I have been involved with research projects in which the manuscript was hung up in the review process for longer than a year. It is hard to stay enthusiastic about research when the process drags on and on like that. It is much more enjoyable to share the triumphs and tragedies with colleagues that I have a personal connection with (better satisfaction of my belonging needs).

I have been involved with two research articles involving the Glasser Scholars project alone (Burdenski et al., 2009) and Brenda Faulkner and I have done a quasi-experimental study on the effects of teaching CT/RT to specially admitted freshmen at Tarleton State University. We hope to show that teaching CT/RT helps college students to better identify and satisfy their basic needs, perform better in the classroom, and improve their chances of staying in school and receiving their degrees. The results look very promising.

I am currently talking with other Glasser Scholars about more CT/RT related research projects, including the topic I presented at Certification Week—using CT/RT with couples and families. While my ideas are still formu-
I have relationships with like-minded people that I know and trust and with whom I want to share the “scholar’s journey” with.

Willa J. Casstevens

I have enthusiastically pursued a community based program development project using choice theory and the WDEP model for RT since completing my Basic Week as a Glasser Scholar. The results from my pilot project at a single local agency led me to apply for Extension, Engagement and Economic Development funding from my land-grant university. This grant award provided funds to continue the program development project and expand it to another three local agencies in the state.

The graduate and undergraduate students employed by the grant are engaged in using CT principles to successfully engage clients in their own health and wellness program development at these agencies. I am presenting the project at a national conference this fall, and anticipate documenting and writing about long-term outcomes. In addition to this, the Glasser Scholar experience provided an opportunity to collaborate on writing and research with colleagues who are also interested in these principles.

Gloria S. Cisse

There are research/publication opportunities everywhere! I have thought about conducting research but now there is a definite direction. I am planning to research the effectiveness of CT/RT with children surviving sexual abuse, adult perpetrators of family violence and sexual abuse. I want to investigate the use of lead management with organizations. Finally, I would like to use CT/RT with families in community and report on the effectiveness on this population. I see some of these opportunities because I work with many of these populations.

Jeri L. Crowell

Training as a Glasser Scholar has been a boon to my research agenda. Previously I found it difficult to focus my scholarly efforts. My Certification research was a culmination of my work with first year students and the theory, utilizing practical aspects of the WDEP in supervision. This training helps to instill theory into counselor training in specific and concrete ways, while also assisting trainees to self-evaluate as they develop professionally. My future research will be with clinical and conceptual applications of all three parts of our training – choice theory, reality therapy and lead management.

My participation in Edinburgh enabled me to interact with international colleagues and to see new perspectives. Infusing discussions about cultural relativity also strengthened my resolve to understand more about the ways in which I could make an impact on all of my students and in the counseling literature. Receiving invitations from colleagues to collaborate on research also fuels my resolve to validate this theoretical perspective to others in the counseling profession, and to my colleagues in education. People I met from Finland and Australia have already done wonderful work with quality schools, which I believe we can advocate more of in this country.

More evidence on the practice of quality schools may move our American educational system to promote healthier relationships in all domains and improve the morale of all stakeholders, from teachers to the children who need positive role models and increased developmental assets. It is my honor to be a Glasser Scholar and I propose to develop research to further develop and validate the theory and practices.

Jill D. Duba

I had been struggling with a research agenda since the Advanced Intensive Week. It was not until listening to the various presentations during Certification Week that ideas finally began to click. I would like to thank one of my Glasser Scholar colleagues in particular who has really helped me shape the research agenda I will pursue over the course of this upcoming year.

Michael Dyson

Since the Advanced Intensive week in Cincinnati, 2008, I have been committed to developing and extending my research profile as a Glasser scholar. I have written one new paper since the Advanced Intensive and presented it at the European and International conference in Edinburgh in 2009. I now have plans to publish this paper in a peer-reviewed journal. My future research plans, as a Glasser scholar involves extending the current body of knowledge about RT, CT and LM with a focus on providing evidence of success with effective, purposeful and practical research in a number of educational settings. The research question that I will use to guide my endeavors is the following: “What is the observable impact and how are the learning outcomes improved when CT, RT and LM are used with ‘difficult’ students in primary (elementary) school settings?”

A mixed method approach will be used to follow through with exit graduates from my current university. These graduates will be monitored and provided with ongoing scaffolded support, as they enter their chosen profession. Their ongoing efforts will be documented to record perceived progress using a LM framework, which will be developed as part of the research project.

A second research direction is my desire to become known in both the Glasser and wider academic worlds as a potential supervisor/examiner of higher degrees (Masters and Doctorates) that have a particular focus on the work of William Glasser, the William Glasser Institute, and the Center for Reality Therapy.
Brenda Faulkner

When I returned from Certification Week, I reflected on the insertion of “spirituality” into the discussion of reality therapy/choice theory and its possible relevance. Since the crux of CT/RT and lead management is relationship building, I became curious about the strong correlation between Judeo-Christian principles and CT/RT compelling me to pursue research in this area. I believe that this is an application for CT/RT that could be beneficial to a huge portion of the population that may not have been introduced to CT/RT and lead management.

Sylinda B. Gilchrist

When I began the Glasser Scholars program, my goal was to develop a resource that would teach school counselors how to use CT/RT with students. After training some school counselors on CT/RT concepts, I collaborated with some middle school counselors to examine the use of CT/RT principles with a select group of underachieving students. As a result of this program, I developed a resource guide entitled “Choice Theory: Using Choice Theory and Reality Therapy to Enhance Student Achievement and Responsibility” (Gilchrist, 2009).

The resource guide was published by the American School Counselor Association in June, 2009. This 40 page guide includes a discussion of CT/RT principles, seven lessons that can be used with students during individual and/or group counseling programs, and tips for parents and teachers. My goal is to repeat this study with another middle school in fall 2009.

Mary A. Graham

The choice theory and reality therapy training in the AIW, AP and Certification Week were extremely beneficial in relation to my research agenda and focus. Being a non-tenured faculty who is expected to publish can be a daunting task. Through this experience, I have created professional relationships and access to a strong level of research collegiality and support I would not have otherwise had. To date, these experiences have provided me the opportunity to co-author two articles and develop several new ideas to pursue with colleagues (Duba, Graham, Britzman, & Minatrea, 2009; Burdenski et al., 2009). It is rare in higher education there is an opportunity to sit among colleagues that are like-minded and focused on similar research agendas.

The CT/RT training in the AIW, AP and Certification Week provided such opportunities. It is difficult to express the gratitude I have in being given the opportunity to participate as a Glasser Scholar. Prior to this experience I felt as if I were on my own in developing and pursuing publications. I now feel I have a group of individuals that are open, willing and excited to co-research and publish on topics related to CT/RT.

Neresia B. Minatrea

This series of trainings and practical experience afforded me knowledge and understanding of CT/RT principles; thus, the courage to write and submit articles and research. I co-authored a research project integrating Animal Assisted Therapy (AAT) and RT measuring treatment outcomes between two groups of individuals addicted to poly-drugs (Minatrea & Wesley, 2008). This research has been accepted in one international journal (Minatrea & Wesley, 2008), and one journal in England (Wesley, Minatrea & Watson, 2009). Also, we have presented at a world, a national, and several state and regional level conferences. Additionally, my co-researcher obtained his doctorate from the study.

Another research project involves using RT in play therapy. The text has been outlined and after my RT practicum experience, I sense a greater competency to complete the project and a higher motivation to contribute to the growing body of material related to RT. Lastly, a research project was developed with three other RT scholars. This project involves the efficacy of RT in a University clinic. This will be an outcome study occurring over the next several years.

Because of collaborating with RT scholars, my most recent research project surfaced. This study measures treatment outcomes in using RT or Solution Focused Therapy in a Family Counseling Clinic sponsored by the University. This undertaking involves training and supervising mental health practicum/internship students, coordinating four faculty, and involving individuals living in the community. Through networking with other RT scholars and my team of four researchers, this research plan has been discussed, enhanced, and formalized to an achievable project. Furthermore, in discussing the project with other scholars, there appears to be increased energy and dedication to completing the research among our team.

Cynthia Palmer Mason

My training in reality therapy and choice theory in the Advanced Intensive Week, Advanced Practicum, and Certification Week has inspired me and provided a research topic that I enjoy focusing on. Since completing the AIW, I have confined my research efforts to choice theory and reality therapy exclusively because I believe we can use these theoretical concepts and principles to enhance our work with boys and girls in P-12 school counseling programs where the primary goal is to improve academic achievement, personal/social adjustment, and career development for all students.

At this time, my colleague (Dr. Jill Duba) and I have submitted one article that has been accepted for publication in the International Journal of Reality Therapy (Mason & Duba, 2009); we have submitted an article (Introducing choice theory Principles and the choice...
theory Career Rating Scale for Children and Adolescents) to the Kentucky Counseling Association Journal; and we are doing the final editing on a manuscript (Using Choice Theory Principles and the Choice Theory Career Rating Scale for Children and Adolescents to Enhance Academic Achievement for Minority Youth) we plan to submit to the Multicultural Journal of Counseling and Development.

As a result of our work in this area (CT/RT), we have developed a Choice Theory Career Rating Scale for Children and Adolescents (based on Dr. Glasser's Needs Rating Scale) that we believe will be a tremendous help to P-12 school counselors as they work with boys and girls. This tool can provide meaning and structure to counseling interviews. We have a number of projects we hope to do. Our next goal is to write a proposal for a grant that will provide the resources we need to complete an extensive research project on lead management.

Tammy F. Shaffer

My research agenda is more clearly defined, and I have plans to pursue clinical research on counselor efficacy examining theory/models of counseling utilized by student interns. I also want to examine how music may be used to help clients explore the WDEP throughout the counseling process, as well as after discontinuation of treatment.

3. Please share freely how participating in the Glasser Scholars program, including the basic and advanced intensive weeks, the beginning and advanced practice, completion of Certification Week, collaborating with other scholars, and working with the trainers and staff of the William Glasser Institute and the Center for Reality Therapy has changed you in any way (both personally and/or professionally)

Mark J. Britzman

Participating in the Glasser Scholar process has reenergized my passion for the counseling field. I believe I have improved my own counseling skills and I have more confidence demonstrating these newly acquired competencies to students in class, who seem to appreciate a faculty member who can take the mystery out of the helping process by teaching counseling skills that can be demonstrated and emulated successfully.

The most wonderful aspect of the Glasser Scholar experience, however, has been the life-long relationships I have developed with colleagues in the helping profession from throughout the world. I now have not only colleagues, mentors and resources to ensure choice theory continues to be very relevant, but also friends who can help me move closer to my quality world.

Thomas K. Burdenski, Jr

I have been very moved by how my trainers and supervisors in CT/RT, Dr. Robert Wubbolding, John Brickell, Pat Robey, and Sylvester Baugh live what they teach. There has been a spirit of caring and personal investment in me and my peers since the very start of the Glasser Scholar process. I have also been very impressed by how far positive feedback can go with building confidence toward new skills. In the past, I thought it was my job as a counselor educator to identify students’ mistakes and point them out to them. While making corrections may be part of my role, I certainly do not need to rely on fault-finding so much to help my students grow and learn.

A third aspect of my journey that stands out for me is the dedication to service to others exhibited by the staff and trainers of the William Glasser Institute and Center for Reality Therapy. When working with nationally known leaders with RT/CT, I thought I might encounter some of the “hero worship” that I have witnessed with other leaders in the counseling profession. Instead, I have experienced an atmosphere of humility by the leaders of the WGI and Center for Reality Therapy. While we are all human and have our faults, it has been an inspiration to be around others who have committed their lives to service and making the world a better place.

Willa J. Casstevens

On a personal note, choice theory has changed my teaching in very positive ways. I enjoy my time in the classroom using choice theory and lead management approaches – this was not true when I took a “boss management” approach to the milieu. After a few “relapses” into the latter approach in the classroom, I coordinated with a colleague specializing in adult education, which has helped me to consistently maintain a CT/RT approach to teaching.

This newfound enjoyment in my role as an educator has contributed to my decision to stay in academia: I am a relatively recent PhD, and prior to my Glasser Scholar experience and exposure to CT/RT, I was seriously considering a return to social work practice. My students have reason to be grateful for this opportunity – as I certainly am! In addition, the opportunity to network and meet like-minded professionals has been invaluable. It has led to friendships and collegial relationships that I very much hope will continue over time.

Gloria S. Cisse

As I mentioned earlier, this entire process has been like the beginning of an exciting and challenging journey. Certification week in Scotland was another part of this journey. Meeting CT/RT practitioners from around the world was a phenomenal experience. Being introduced as a “Glasser Scholar” was incredible! It did not dawn on me how important we were until the last night of my trip in
Scotland. Jeri and Michael insisted that I attend the reception. Sandi began my introductions and Bob took over when it was apparent I was drowning. Maggie is an incredible trainer. She offered examples that were usable and transferable. She gave us herself and it was magnificent! They are in my quality world.

We are all internally motivated (Glasser, 1998). On the last day of our week with Adrian, Bob, Sandi, John and the other trainers, I remember thinking “this is how you use lead management, choice theory, reality therapy. You must become the ideals. You have to practice so much that it becomes second nature.” What the Glasser Institute had done when they recruited us was put us into the hands of very capable individuals who would be incredible examples of CT/RT who could help us put the concepts, principles, and ideals into our quality worlds.

I remember thinking “how else would I agree to do all this extra work if it were not for believing in these ideals modeled by Bob, John, Sandi, and Adrian?” It may or may not have been intentional, but this is what I believe to have happened. If we are to assist others in changing, we have to become walking, breathing examples of choice theory/reality therapy. Change begins with me!

Jeri L. Crowell

My draw to the Glasser Scholar program was professional development, including interaction with Dr. Robert Wubbolding, who inspired me with his passion for reality therapy. The process of intensive training and subsequent practica emphasize what I perceive to be excellent pedagogy, as well as saturation required for developing confidence in theoretical application. The cohort model for the program reinforces relationships, so central to choice theory and to best practices in counseling. The experience of caring and expert supervision has validated my own orientation to supervision.

However, the most significant experience throughout the process came in the international venue at the conference in Scotland. Counselors from all over the world enhanced my training by sharing service delivery in other systems, choice theory applications in schools, and lead management in a variety of contexts. My intentions about training are expanded through conceptual development of the theory, and research partnerships in the U.S. and South Korea. I also came to appreciate what it meant to be a Glasser Scholar, as professionals from the Glasser and European Institutes honored our contributions thus far.

Besides these professional developments, my personal tool box is fuller and more ecological. I am a better teacher, counselor and supervisor. As a school counseling professor I instill many aspects of choice theory into my work, as it has created a structure of framing critical incidents into realistic, sound and caring opportunities. I am proud to be honored as a Glasser Scholar and look forward to future faculty training.

Jill D. Duba

Again, I want to highlight how incredible the trainers were. They were kind, open, flexible, encouraging, and fabulous coaches! This was an instrumental part of my learning process. In addition, I have found it amazing that a group of people (Glasser Scholars) could unite and connect in the short amount of time that we have. It’s as if I am part of a big family. We all have come to know each other’s strengths, personality traits, and even quirks; however all of this is known and expressed in very loving and appreciative ways. I am happy to be the “sister,” if you will of such an incredible “family.”

Michael Dyson

I now place more importance on learning the principles and skills of CT/RT/LM, and applying them in my own life, rather than just focusing on the teaching of the skills and principles. This change in heart has come about as the result of being immersed in the ideas of the William Glasser Institute and the Center for Reality Therapy and practicing them both during the intensives and practica. Meeting people from around the world in the intensives, and establishing warm relationships with these people, has been an awesome experience for me.

Without a doubt, all the people that I have met have been really dedicated people with a sincere commitment to improve the world. For the most part they do this through practicing the principles of choice theory in their own lives and working at reducing their personal use of external control psychology. It is for most of us a constant battle, but one which we can, as individuals win, if we continue to reflect on our own lives and take full responsibility for all our total behavior. I am not there yet but I am working towards it thanks to the wonderful opportunities afforded to me by the William Glasser Institute and Center for Reality Therapy and through all the wonderful people that I have met and had the pleasure to work with.

Brenda Faulkner

Truly the only way to describe the Glasser Scholar experience is in one word – honored. The opportunity to work with other counselor educator professionals from across the country and around the globe in such an intense fashion has been a once-in-a-lifetime experience. I feel that the synergy created within the group of scholars has enabled us to accomplish research and pedagogy we could not even imagine a mere two years ago. Personally, the study Tom and I conducted last fall with the at-risk college freshmen stretched me to great limits, but the results were beneficial to the students and to me (and hopefully to Tom as well!)
Sylinda B. Gilchrist

The opportunity to be a Glasser Scholar has been an honor and a privilege. As junior faculty, it was difficult for me to find my research passion; however, the Glasser Scholars program has given me a research agenda that I love studying and teaching. CT/RT has become my new passion. The opportunity to be trained by some of the icons of this theory has been a once in a lifetime experience that I will always cherish. I have grown not only from the trainings but also from the interaction of the other scholars. I appreciate the strong sense of collaboration and support that I experienced from my colleagues. We grew as CT/RT scholars and friends. I am grateful that I had the pleasure of being a Glasser Scholar; it has enhanced my life professionally and personally.

Mary A. Graham

Participation in The Glasser Certification week was an enriching personal and professional experience. I had the opportunity to attend the Certification Week in Edinburgh, Scotland prior to the International Conference. This experience lent itself to international collaboration, collegiality, insight, opportunity and friendship. It was inspiring to meet and speak with international colleagues who are adapting and applying the concepts of Choice theory and reality therapy in innovative, creative and culturally sensitive ways. The connections I have made throughout the 18-month reality therapy Certification process have been and are invaluable. I have placed a great deal of value on this experience and have great excitement and enthusiasm for the future of CT/RT.

Neresta B. Minatrea

The journey has been challenging at times and demanding; however, the end is very rewarding. Several points come to mind when evaluating the experience. First, it was rewarding to discuss other scholars' research plans, assist in revisions, and provide encouragement for them. This was a surprising need fulfilling benefit not initially anticipated. Next, the ability to convey CT philosophy and principles has increased and my graduate students are reaping the benefits.

Lastly, this training reminds me to identify my own “wants” in life, to ponder my own “doing” behavior, to “evaluate” what is working and not working in my own life, and to “do something different” when I am unhappy. The staff, practicum supervisors, trainers, and Dr. Wubbolding at the Glasser Institute exhibit compassion for the choice theory philosophy and superior skills in teaching and supervising these reality therapy techniques. I look forward to the day, I too will be among one of the practicum supervisors and instructors.

Cynthia Palmer Mason

Participating in the Glasser Scholars Program has been an honor and a pleasure for me. In fact, I consider this to be a highlight in my career. I have never been more enthusiastic about any theoretical concept than I am about CT/RT; there are so many possibilities for school counseling programs when the counselors who implement them have had this training.

The Basic and Advanced Intensive Weeks of training, the Initial and Advanced Practica, and the Certification Week were exceptionally well-planned with each focusing on specific concepts, role plays, and group discussions that enhanced learning and experience with CT/RT. Each scholar, each instructor, and each supervisor has left a lasting impression on me. My collaboration and interactions with them have inspired me. As a result of this training, I feel that I will be more effective in my efforts to prepare students for the challenges they will encounter as they begin their work in P-12 school counseling programs.

Tammy F. Shaffer

I have greatly enjoyed meeting and getting to know the staff and faculty of the WGI and the Center for Reality Therapy. I think I am much more proficient in my use of CT/RT, and have embraced it as much more than something I teach. It is something I live. I am using CT/RT to work through some significant life transitions, and have found it as a means to help my 10 year old daughter become more aware of the choices she has, and how she comes to the decisions she makes. I am using it in my role as clinical supervisor of my clinical intern students, as well as in my role of internships instructor. I have even had friends show interest in learning more about CT/RT!

CONCLUSION

Based on the responses of the participants in the Glasser Scholars program, it is clear that there is a great deal of momentum generated by training this group of scholars with the principles of choice theory, reality therapy, and lead management. Many research projects are in various stages of development and many manuscripts featuring the use of choice theory and reality therapy in a variety of settings are in process. The Glasser Scholars themselves seem to have great enthusiasm for spreading these ideas to the students in their classes and to colleagues in the counseling, teacher education, psychology, and social work professions.

Their personal investment in continuing to teach and disseminate Dr. Glasser's ideas is perhaps best illustrated in the number of Glasser Scholars who plan to continue their training as Practicum Supervisors for the William Glasser Institute—12 of the 13 scholars and all of the scholars living in the U.S. are planning to complete their Practicum Supervisor training with Dr. Wubbolding and
John Brickell as a cohort in November or at a later time. The final words of Dr. Robert Wubbolding's (2009) keynote address delivered at the Fourth European Reality Therapy Conference in Edinburgh seem particularly fitting for the Glasser Scholars to take to heart:

How we perceive the age to come and how the WGI is perceived by others depends on the choices we make. If we, as leaders, fulfill our responsibilities and even go beyond them by choosing wisely, our perceptions and the perceptions of others will be the best, the wisest, the most credible, the season of light and the spring of hope. In other words, it is up to us to pass on to future generations an accurate and vital theory and practice thereby fulfilling the vision of the founder of reality therapy, Dr. William Glasser. (2009)
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ABSTRACT

This paper examines suicide from two perspectives: William Glasser’s choice theory psychology and Jean Baechler’s eleven categories of suicidal meaning. While choice theory psychology explains total behavior in terms of motivation driven by basic needs, Baechler’s types are understood as neither motives nor causes but as problem solving strategies. These strategies are congruous with an understanding of how basic needs are fulfilled in choice theory psychology. These two lenses are used to illustrate that the basic needs of choice theory may be fulfilled by the act of suicide, a behavior generally understood to be at odds with the basic need of survival. As a case in point, the suicide of the fantasy writer, Robert E. Howard will be examined and analyzed using these two perspectives. Implications for the practice of reality therapy are discussed.

Defining Suicide

Choice Theory Psychology and Suicide

Choice theory psychology posits that all behavior is total behavior and is composed of thinking, doing, emotions and physiology (Glasser, 1998). These total behaviors are designed to get one closer to what one wants and fulfill one’s five basic needs. These five basic needs are composed of the physiological need of survival and the four psychological needs of love, recognition, excitement and autonomy. Synonymous terms are used to identify the needs. Love may also be understood as belonging or acceptance; recognition may be understood as power, control or achievement; while excitement may be understood as fun and learning; and autonomy may be understood as freedom, independence and choice. These five basic needs are the motivators of all human behavior. When the needs are met, then one is content and motivation for behavior is minimal. When the needs are not met, then one is miserable and motivation for behavior is increased. Contentment and misery are the affective indicators that act as the behavioral thermostat in the cybernetic (control) system of human behavior. These motivators may, however, conflict with one another. A high need for recognition may conflict with an equally high need of freedom (autonomy). This is often seen in the cases of celebrities whose fame limits their ability to move freely in public. The same is seen when a high need for autonomy conflicts with a high need for power (recognition) and the increased responsibilities that often accompany power reduce the opportunity for personal autonomy. The newly promoted manager may find herself with less time available for personal reflection and familial association.

The same is true for conflict between the physiological need of survival and the four psychological needs. While one may suppose that survival is preeminent among the basic needs, that survival supersedes the psychological needs, such is not the case. Suicide is an example of this and illustrates how the psychological needs may override the physiological needs. Indeed, that one may choose psychological satisfaction over physiological comfort is one of the defining characteristics of humanness. Animals do not possess the ability to calculate outcomes and form plans to achieve specific outcomes in the face of possible annihilation. Animals will always choose between fight or flight based on the possibility of survival rather than the possibility of satisfaction of basic needs. While suicide is an example of this humanness related to fulfilling basic psychological needs at the expense of survival, it is certainly not the only example.

Substance abuse is another example of how one may choose psychological relief over physiological maintenance. In the cycle of substance abuse and addiction, alcohol and other drugs (AOD) get to be pictures in the quality world, the psychological database of successful need’s satisfiers, in two ways: AOD relieve the misery of not fulfilling basic needs and/or the act of using AOD helps one fulfill basic needs. Regardless of the manner in which the construct is assimilated into the quality world, one will continue the total behavior of abusing until one chooses another construct to achieve satisfaction of basic needs or until the individual succumbs to the chronic, progressive and fatal behavior of abusing. These choices are rarely made by individuals ignorant of the physiologically destructive effects of alcohol and other drugs of abuse.

From the perspective of choice theory psychology, suicide is ultimately seen as an attempt to fulfill basic needs. That the physiological need for survival is in conflict with the psychological needs is irrelevant. Just as psychological needs may be in conflict, the psychological and physiological needs may be in conflict. The basic needs demand satisfaction and the human mind creates numerous ways to solve those dilemmas and fulfill those
demands, including the total behavior of self-destructing. How the basic needs are met through the act of self-destructing is perhaps better understood by using another lens to examine the behavior.

Baechler's Typical Meanings of Suicide

The French sociologist, Jean Baechler (1975), examined historical and contemporary cases of suicide and suggested that suicide had eleven typical meanings, divided into four broader categories: escapist, both as a form of flight (1) and as a way to avoid grief (2) and punishment (3); aggressive, understood as a type of crime (4) and vengeance (5), as well as a form of blackmail (6) and appeal (7); obblative, involving sacrifice (8) and transfiguration (9); and ludic, as an ordeal (10) or a game (11). In arriving at these classifications, Baechler defined suicide as "all behavior that seeks and finds the solution to an existential problem by making an attempt on the life of the subject" (p. 11). The problems one faces are termed existential "in order to indicate that they concern the whole of the subject's situation and are at the same time internal and external" (p. 13), where internal relates to "impulses or requests" (p. 12) and external is understood to be "prompted by real changes (which appear as modifications in the eyes of a neutral observer) in the environment of the subject" (p. 12).

Examples of Baechler's Types

Escapist suicides are understood as a form of flight (1) when individuals seek release from a situation that is deemed to be intolerable to them. Prisoners who attempt escape from confinement or individuals who attempt to kill themselves because they cannot any longer bear some sort of social stigma may fall under this category. A child that decides to attempt suicide because she is being bullied at school may be an example of this type.

Escapist suicides as a form of grief (2) are those in which one commits suicide after the loss of some part of oneself that is deemed essential to one's personality or one's normal mode of living. Death of family members may precipitate suicides with this meaning, where the family was a part of the self-image of the individual. Suicides in relation to acts that diminish one's self-esteem, e.g., being outed as a homosexual when one is thought to be heterosexual, are included in this meaning. This is distinguished from suicide as a form of flight because in the case of flight, it is the situation that is seen as unbearable, while in grief it is the loss of a particular thing that defines the case.

Escapist suicides related to punishment (3) deal with suicides which attempt to atone for real or imagined faults. Individuals who commit suicide because their grades in school are not seen to be sufficient are examples of this type of suicide.

Aggressive suicide with the meaning of crime (4) is one in which an attempt is made to commit suicide while involving others in the action. The increasingly all-too-familiar murder suicide, e.g., the Columbine High School massacre, is an example of this type.

Aggressive vengeance suicides (5) are those that are meant to elicit remorse from another person or bring shame on another person. Examples of this would include a jilted lover who commits suicide in order to cause remorse to her former partner, or an elderly parent who commits suicide in a nursing home in order to shame her children for placing her there.

Aggressive suicide with blackmail as the meaning (6) includes those intended to put pressure on others by denying them access to something that they desire (or are believed to desire). An example of this would be a young woman who overdoses on medication because her parents wouldn't buy her a car for graduation. The behavior is meant to punish, through emotional blackmail, her parents for refusing her what she wanted by denying them of her.

As the level of narcissism is seen to increase in our society, this particular type of suicide may also increase. The difference between this type of suicide and the example given in the escape as flight type is that in the flight meaning, the individual intends harm to herself while in the blackmail meaning, the individual intends harm to another.

Aggressive appeal suicides (7) are those in which one attempts to inform family or friends that one is in trouble. This is the classic "call for help" suicide attempt.

Oblative sacrificial suicides (8) deal with giving one's life in order to save others' lives or to gain something deemed superior to one's own life. Examples of obblative suicides would include a soldier throwing herself on a grenade in order to save her buddies, or an individual who believes a hostage situation will end grimly so she volunteers to take the place of a hostage.

Oblative suicides with the meaning of transfiguration (9) are undertaken to attain a state considered to be more desirable than the present condition. The classic Romeo and Juliet is an example of this, where both lovers prefer death and togetherness in an afterlife to life apart in the present. The scene in the movie, Thelma and Louise, where the women drive over the cliff, choosing to die in an act of freedom rather than submit to a life of restraint, is an example of the meaning of transfiguration.

Ludic suicides with the meaning of ordeal (10) involve attempts to prove oneself, either to oneself or to others. Young drivers playing "chicken" are an example of this meaning, as were duels in earlier times and the current academic fencing practice of the mensur. The mensur is included because the scars received from the ritual are sought after rather than avoided.

Ludic game suicides (11) are those that risk one's life for the purpose of playing a game that risks one's life. While this may sound rather circular, an example of this
would be Russian roulette. The sole purpose of playing the game is to put one’s life in jeopardy.

Assigning Motivation to Types

Baechler resisted assigning motivations to the particular types of suicide due to the possible variations of motivation capable within each type, but his definitions closely conform to motivations as understood in choice theory psychology, i.e., as solutions to current life problems. Baechler understood suicide to be one behavior among a variety of other possible behaviors that included “depressions, mental troubles, aberrant conduct” (p. 11) that are “alternative solutions to a fundamental problem” (p. 11). Choice theory psychology states that all total behaviors, including depressing, behaving in manners described in the DSM-IV-TR and otherwise behaving aberrantly, are designed to get one closer to what one wants and thereby satisfy basic needs. Suicide in choice theory psychology and Baechler’s definition of types is simply one manner of solving a problem.

To illustrate how basic needs may be implied within the types of suicidal meanings, possible motivations will be ascribed to the various types. While this is doing what Baechler sought to avoid and choosing motivations from a constellation of other possible motivations, the exercise is deemed to be useful in that it allows one to examine how suicide really is a problem solving strategy that fulfills basic psychological needs. A specific case will later be examined.

Examples of Baechler’s Types with Examples of Possible Motivations

Escapist flight suicides may be understood as fulfilling the need for freedom. The bullied school child feels oppressed and seeks a solution to that oppression through suicide. The total behavior of self-destructing fulfills the need of freedom.

Escapist grief suicides may be understood as also fulfilling the need for freedom, although in this case it is freedom from grief. The outed homosexual may find his life as a conservative government figure is compromised, especially if he has assumed the role of a heterosexual husband and father in order to further his career. The loss of his identity as a conservative role model may lead to grief and suicide as a way to escape that grief and loss of identity. Suicide is the solution to and freedom from the negative exposure he receives.

Escapist punishment suicides may fulfill the need for recognition. Unable to achieve the fame she desires through grade attainment, the failing student finds that recognition through suicide, especially if the suicide is spectacularly performed.

Aggressive crime suicides almost always fulfill the need for power. The Columbine killers sought fame through their actions and control over the outcome of their actions. Suicide by cop is another example of an attempt to fulfill the need for power/control.

Aggressive vengeance suicides also fulfill needs for power/control. The jilted lover who commits suicide seeks to cause the former partner to experience pain and remorse. This is an example of external control through the harming of oneself.

Aggressive suicide with blackmail as the meaning is another example of an attempt to meet the need for power/control. The young woman who overdoses because her parents wouldn’t buy her a car for graduation is attempting to punish her parents for refusing her requests. This is another example of external control through harming oneself.

Aggressive appeal suicides fulfill the needs for belonging and power. This type of suicide attempts to fulfill belonging needs through external control of family and friends without actually having to ask for help (the power aspect).

Oblative sacrificial suicides fulfill the need for love/belonging. The soldier who throws herself on the grenade is attempting to fulfill needs for love by sacrificing herself for her buddies, with whom she has a strong sense of belonging.

Oblative transformative suicides also fulfill needs for love/belonging and freedom and the example of Romeo and Juliet should be sufficient for this example. The lovers sought to have the need of togetherness fulfilled in the hereafter when they could not have it met in the present reality. Their solution to their problem of how to enjoy eternal love while being free from the social complexities which conspired to keep them apart was solved through the solution of suicide.

Ludic ordeal suicides fulfill the needs for power/recognition as well as excitement. The drivers playing chicken on the road are attempting to gain some amount of prestige through their behavior, while the possibility of losing one’s life in the process provides the excitement. While no lives have been lost during the menur, the possibility is present and the satisfying scar from the duel provides a visible mark of recognition.

Ludic game suicides may fulfill the need for excitement. The risk in Russian roulette is apparent and one is playing the odds with every spin of the cylinder. The need for excitement that drives the Russian roulette player is the same as that that drives the roulette or baccarat player, only the stakes are higher and therefore more exciting.

While Baechler’s objections to the assignation of motives to his types of suicides are well taken, the above exercise exemplifies how suicide may be understood as a solution to the problem of getting one what one wants and fulfilling basic needs. In suicide, one does not remove one’s own picture from one’s quality world. The picture of
The suicide of fantasy writer, Robert E. Howard, has been analyzed by family, friends, and fans since it occurred on June 11, 1936. Although it has been subjected to many types of analysis, it has not been studied as a solution to a particular problem, i.e., the motivations of basic needs as given in choice theory psychology or Jean Baechler’s suicidal types. The following treatment will examine the suicide through these lenses in an attempt to show how an understanding of both choice theory’s basic needs and Baechler’s types may be useful in treating suicidal ideations through the practice of reality therapy.

**Facts**

At the time of his suicide, Robert E. Howard was 30 years old. His mother, after an extended illness, had slipped into a coma some hours before the suicide and Robert had been told by an attending nurse that she was not expected to regain consciousness. Robert had previously been placed on suicide watch by his father, a physician, because of signs that he had resolved “not to see his mother die” (Hogan, 2009, Para 2). The facts of the incident, itself, are recorded by Robert’s father in a letter to Robert’s friend and mentor, the weird fiction writer, H. P. Lovecraft:

> It is barely possible through some other source that you may have heard of the death of Robert E. Howard, my son. If not, I will say that after three weeks of vigilant watching at his mother’s bedside, on the morning of June 11, 1936, at eight o’clock, he slipped out of the house, entered his car which was standing in front of the garage, raised the windows and fired a shot through his brain. The cook standing at the window at the back part of the house, saw him go get in his car. She thought he was fixing to drive to town as he usually did. When she heard the muffled sound of the gun, she saw him fall over the steering wheel. She ran in the house and called the physician who has in the house. The doctor was taking a cup of coffee in the dining room and I was talking with him. We rushed to the car and found him. We thought at first that it was a death shot but the bullet has passed through the brain. He shot himself just above the temple. It came out on the opposite side, just above and behind the left ear. He lived eight hours and never regained consciousness (Hogan, 2009, Para 1).

A typewritten note was found in Howard’s wallet: “All fked, all done, so lift me on the pyre/The feast is over and the lamps expire” (Finn, 2006, p.214). After some debate, it is generally accepted that the quotation came from a poem entitled “The House of Caesar” by Viola Garvin (Burke, 2007a).

Howard was predisposed to suicidal ideations and apparently made preparations for suicide several times during his life, each incident being precipitated by his mother’s failing health (Finn, 2006). Prior to his suicide, Howard made arrangements for his estate, borrowed a Colt .380 automatic pistol from a friend, asked a physician about the lethality of gunshot wounds to the brain and purchased a funeral plot for three with perpetual care (Burke, 2007b).

**Suicidal Type**

The suicide of Robert E. Howard is an escapist grief suicide. Although fans of the creator of such iconic characters as Conan the Cimmerian, King Kull of Atlantis, Solomon Kane, Bran Mak Morn and Steve Costigan may prefer to think of Howard’s suicide as an escapist flight type, the facts support those of a suicide related to the loss of a significant thing (the relationship with his mother) rather than from a general life situation.

Writing in the preface to Almuric, Lansdale (2007) undoubtedly speaks for many Howard aficionados when he states, “One gets the impression that Howard wanted to be free of all responsibilities, even the keeping of one’s brother, or in his case, his ailing mother” (p. 10), and he eloquently paints a picture of the flight suicide type when he states that Howard, “not so much out of depression, but out of sense of no more responsibility, a lust for dark freedom, lit a blue steel candle that threw him out of this world and unhindered him. Perhaps that snap of gunfire tossed him across the black void of space to one of his created worlds, like Almuric” (p. 10). Finn (2006) echoes the sentiment:

> Of course, he was affected by his mother’s health. For two people who had depended on each other so often in the past, how could her death not upset him? But the events that surrounded Robert’s life are too varied to ascribe so simple and ham-fisted a motivation to so deliberate and calculated an act. Robert’s reason overrode his inherent desire to live wide and free, like the pioneers and adventurers on the frontier. Unable to enact his grandest wishes, Robert chose to control his own destiny by opting out of his circumstances permanently.... Robert escaped his life when he wrote, and took his mind’s eye around the world, back in time, and to the distant past, with an intensity that has yet to be matched. Suicide was Robert’s final escape. It was the one, the only, thing that he could do, given his circumstances (pp. 225-226).

These are passionate defenses for a writer who deeply affected those who were drawn to the worlds he created. And they cursorily appear to be reasonable suppositions. How could the mind that spawned literary figures of such indomitable will choose to end its existence simply because of the loss of a loved one? The act was surely one of the same indomitable will, seeking release from the desperately ordinary existence with a new adventure into the unknown. Unfortunately, these scenarios are driven more by sentiment rather than by fact.

In One Who Walked Alone (1986), the biography of her relationship with Howard, Novalyne Price Ellis states that after suggesting Howard spread to others some of the responsibility he assumed for his mother’s care, Howard told her, “I guess you’ll never understand that life without her [Howard’s mother] isn’t worth living” (p. 305). She, again,
quotes Howard: “‘Life,’ he had said, ‘is not worth living unless you have a great love or a great cause, and I have neither’” (Price Ellis, p. 316). This clearly illustrates the type of escapist grief suicide in which the act is a response to the loss of a thing and not a general life situation.

And there is evidence from Howard’s writing that he was as capable of enduring the uneventful life. Goodrich (2006) notes that “Here, then, is a recurring theme among Howard’s heroes, from ‘Sailor’ Steve Costigan to Brekenridge Elkins to Conan himself: the ability to take incredible abuse and keep on going” (p. 30). Howard was able, at least, to endure his existence. He, like his characters, could take abuse and keep coming back for more. Howard was not seeking an escape from his situation in the world, an escape from possible ennui. He was seeking an escape from grief and the loss of his beloved mother.

**Motivation**

Relating motive to type, escapist grief suicides fulfill the basic need for freedom. Escapist flight suicides also fulfill the need for freedom. This is one reason that Howard fans may mistake the motivation behind the choice of suicide. Price Ellis (1986) almost gets it right but, in the end, mistakes Howard’s motives when she writes “He [Howard] could not believe in a woman’s love, no woman’s except his mother’s. And how could he find a great cause in a rotting civilization? He turned to books, read them, loved them, and understood them, but he didn’t know how to live the common, everyday life he dreamed about” (p. 316). She mistakes the need for freedom from grief (which has as its singular defining characteristic the broken bond of belonging and a longing for attachment) with the need for freedom related to flight (which has as its defining characteristic the desire to be unattached to an unbearable condition).

Escapist grief suicides are choices designed to free individuals from the emotional misery that accompanies the loss of defining personal characteristics or relationships. Basic needs satisfiers that have become pictures in the quality world are no longer available to fulfill the needs. The affective indicator that basic needs are unmet is misery. Suicide is one solution to the problem of misery. By self-destructing, the misery ends. One is freed from the misery by the act of suicide. Howard’s repeated preparations for suicide tied to his mother’s health are sufficient examples to illustrate that his behaviors were tied to her presence in his life and not a general state of living.

Howard’s behavior is an example that suicide is always a choice in a myriad of possible choices related to basic need fulfillment. Just as psychological needs are negotiated, psychological and physiological needs are also negotiated. Although needs strengths may influence proclivities, survival is simply another one of the five basic needs. The fallacy of life (survival) at all costs is an atavistic concept in human development. While it may still hold as a truism for animals without the mental development of humans, it finds no preeminent place in beings that are also driven by the basic needs of belonging, recognition, autonomy and freedom.

**Using Reality Therapy and Basic Types**

Baechler used the psychological autopsy to develop his model of suicidal types and although an autopsy has little value for the individual being dissected, the living may greatly benefit from the findings. Using Baechler’s types in the practice of reality therapy, one may begin to get a clearer picture of the complex motivations behind those types, as defined by the basic needs. The escapist suicide may be motivated by freedom but the freedom may be a sought after release from the misery of not meeting basic needs or freedom (flight) from general life circumstances. While the procedures that lead to change (the want-behavior-evaluation-planning cycle) may be engaged at any part of the cycle, asking clients what they want is a good place to begin the process and directly access the pictures in the quality world. When asking clients what they want, helping them to be specific about the pictures they see in their quality worlds, and/or assisting them in developing realistic pictures in their quality worlds becomes a significant task.

Using Baechler’s suicidal typology and choice theory psychology enables others engaged in reality therapy the opportunity to learn from Howard’s situation and apply that knowledge to other situations, helping individuals make better choices in getting what they want and fulfilling their basic needs. In the specific case of Robert E. Howard, recognizing the type of escapist grief suicide implicit in his behavior could have provided one trained in reality therapy the opportunity to engage him in the procedures that lead to change and develop realistic pictures of need fulfilling relationships in his life, relationships that fulfilled his basic psychological needs, especially for love/belonging. This is one value in looking at basic needs. Had Howard ever been asked what he wanted, it seems reasonable to suppose from his behavior that he would have wanted his mother’s condition to improve. One function of the therapist in this case would be to help him realistically assess the amount of control he had over that situation. Realistically, he had none. This would then lead to questions designed to determine what need was being fulfilled by his mother’s presence (what his mother meant to him in terms of basic needs fulfillment) and find other ways in which to fulfill those needs.

It is unfortunate that neither choice theory psychology nor Baechler’s suicidal typologies existed during Howard’s time. Had they been available, and had he chosen to take advantage of them, the world may have had more time with the talented young writer whose visions so greatly
fulfilled the needs of others. Hopefully, lessons can be learned from Howard's case and others may learn that although suicide is always a choice in fulfilling basic needs, the loss of an individual through self-destructing behaviors is always hurtful, not only to oneself, but also to others.
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The Movie Nanny McPhee and the Magic of Reality Therapy

Disobedient children get lost in the woods and gobbled up by witches, pigs who choose the wrong materials to build a house find themselves homeless, and a puppet who lies ends up with a very long nose. The use of fairy tales and fables to instruct children about the consequences of their actions is not a new phenomenon. However, advances in the study of psychology and the counseling process that have occurred since “Once upon a time” days shed new light on effective ways to guide children as they develop their decision making skills. For example, the children’s movie Nanny McPhee (Jones, 2006), although whimsical and magical in its approach, actually demonstrates a textbook like example of Reality Therapy. In fact, the principles of Reality Therapy (Glasser, 1998; International Journal of Reality Therapy, 2007) are followed so closely that one could legitimately question whether Emma Thompson, acting as Nanny McPhee, is portraying a nanny with magical powers, or a reality therapist.

Plot of the Movie Nanny McPhee

Cedric Brown (Colin Firth) is a widower with seven very unruly children living in the English countryside. His work as an undertaker does not cover the expense of raising such a large family, and he is in danger of going to debtor’s prison; consequently leaving the children at the mercy of work houses. His harsh and unyielding Aunt Adelaide (Angela Lansbury) has offered to continue providing financial support, but only on the condition that he marries within a month, so that his new wife can take great pride in their ability to chase nannies away. Eleven year old Simon (Thomas Sangster), seven year old Sebastian (Samuel Honywood), five year old Chienna (Holly Gibbs) and one year old Agatha (Hebe and Zinnia Barnes), however, their 18th nanny, Nanny McPhee does not scare so easily. A woman known as the ring leader of the children who also include ten year old Tora (Eliza Bennet), nine year old Lilly (Jennifer Rae Daykin), eight year old Eric (Raphael Coleman), seven year old Sebastian (Samuel Honywood), and one year old Chienna (Holly Gibbs) and one year old Agatha (Hebe and Zinnia Barnes). However, their 18th nanny, Nanny McPhee does not scare so easily. A woman with a startlingly unsettling appearance literally appears out of nowhere to discipline the Brown children. With the help of her magic stick, she begins the task of corralling the children and teaching them five important lessons.

In order to meet Aunt Adelaide’s demands and avoid losing his family, Cedric develops a plan to marry the garish and most unpleasant gold-digger, Mrs. Quickly (Celie Imrie). The children, not knowing the reason for his choice, immediately set about sabotaging their father’s courtship of this woman. After they succeeded in chasing her away, their father explains to them that marriage to Mrs. Quickly represented his last chance to keep the family together. The children then endeavor to entice Mrs. Quickly into marrying their father. A wedding is planned, Mrs. Quickly’s true colors emerge, and the children must quickly develop a plan that will save their family while also preventing their father from marrying this dreadful woman.

The Five Needs Addressed by Reality Therapy

Most fairy tales follow a concept that has become known as the rule of three, in which elements of fairy tales are structured in threes. For example, there are three wishes, three bags of gold, three tasks to complete, three little pigs, three billy goats’ gruff or Goldilocks and the three bears (Tedesco, 2004). However, the movie Nanny McPhee departed from this tradition. Instead of three lessons, Nanny McPhee told Cedric that his children needed to learn five lessons. These lessons were outlined as (a) To go to bed when they are told, (b) To get up when they are told, (c) To get dressed when they are told, (d) To listen, and (e) To do as they are told (Jones, 2006).

Reality Therapy is based on the premise that all humans choose behaviors in order to satisfy five basic needs (Glasser, 1998; International Journal of Reality Therapy, 2007). These needs include survival, belonging, power, independence, and fun (Glasser, 1998). None of those needs are being met by the Brown family when Nanny McPhee first arrives on the scene. However, as she begins teaching the children the five lessons she states they need, the five basic needs identified by Glasser are also met. In fact, the word “need” is arguably the most often used word in the entire movie. While there does not appear to be a direct connection between Nanny McPhee’s five lessons and Glasser’s needs, the children alter their behaviors and subsequently, their needs are met. When Nanny McPhee informs Cedric that his children have
learned lesson three, he responds with gratitude, “Just to get dressed when they’re told? I think they’ve learned a great deal more than that” (Jones, 2006).

The family’s survival is at risk. Aunt Adelaide has threatened to cut off the allowance if Cedric does not marry by the end of the month and he does not make enough money at his job to provide for his family. Frantic to save his family at any cost, Cedric develops a plan to marry the very eager widow, Mrs. Quickly. The children, unaware of the urgency for their father’s nuptials, and already adept at chasing unwanted nannies away, quickly devoted their talents toward the task of getting rid of Mrs. Quickly. Of course, they succeed, only to realize that by their actions, they have doomed their family to be separated from each other. They turn to Nanny McPhee for help and guidance as demonstrated in the following dialogue:

- Chrissie: Do something!
- Nanny McPhee: What would you suggest?
- Eric: Change what happens. By your stick! Make it undo itself!
- Nanny McPhee: I cannot. These are your own actions. Simon promised that you would accept the consequences.
- Nanny McPhee: You must undo it for yourselves.
- Simon: How? How?
- Nanny McPhee: Think. You are very clever children. Think.

Consistent with Reality Therapy, Nanny McPhee does not solve the dilemma for the children and they are left to develop their own solution.

The needs for belonging within the family group had also been threatened. Preoccupied with grief since the death of the children’s mother and overwhelmed with the prospect of losing his family, Cedric had become unavailable to the children he loved. He no longer took time to read stories with them, play cricket, or sing lullabies. He hired nannies to deal with them and the children began to believe that he no longer loved them and would even send them away to live with mean and scary Aunt Adelaide. The children’s misbehavior was an unsuccessful attempt to reclaim their father’s attention and meet their need for belonging. However, the choices they made by misbehaving did not succeed in drawing their father closer. It was only through learning Nanny McPhee’s lessons, altering their behaviors, and making different choices that they were able to reclaim the close relationship they previously experienced with their father.

The children’s misbehavior was also an attempt to meet the need for power, which is defined as a need for achievement, competence, and accomplishment (Glasser, 1998; International Journal of Reality Therapy, 2007). The children took great pride in the fact that they had chased away all the available nannies, and even tried to beat their record in how quickly they could succeed. They congratulated themselves and each other for finding creative ways of dispatching the nannies, such as pretending to eat their baby sister, Aggie. Reality Therapy reframes problem behaviors as strengths by “turning the tables” on clients (Wubbolding, 2000). Nanny McPhee managed to redirect the children’s creative misbehavior into problem solving skills. She often referred to the children, especially Simon, as clever. By not solving problems for them, she empowered them to solve their problems on their own.

The need for independence, or freedom, is described as the opportunity to choose and act on various options (Glasser, 1998; International Journal of Reality Therapy). The children’s misbehavior was an attempt to assert their independence. As Simon stated to his siblings after one of their early encounters with Nanny McPhee, “Since when have we decided to do what we’re told?” Nanny McPhee did not impose solutions or consequences on the children but rather, allowed them to make choices and then experience the consequences. The consequences were natural, but exaggerated by her magic. For example, when the children pretended to be sick so they would not have to get out of bed in the morning, Nanny McPhee’s magic made it impossible for them to get out of bed at all, thereby making the children accept responsibility for their choice. The children slowly chose to alter their behaviors based on the consequences and results of those behaviors. Nanny McPhee allowed the children to choose their own behaviors and experience the consequences for those behaviors, even if their choices did not get them the consequences they wanted in the end. When the children decided to get rid of Mrs. Quickly, Simon approached Nanny McPhee and asked her to not intervene in their plan. Even though Nanny McPhee knew that the children’s plan would backfire in the end, she agreed to let them choose and act on this option, as demonstrated in the following dialogue between Nanny McPhee and Simon:

- Simon: I...we need you to help us get rid of this woman, Mrs. Quickly.
- Nanny McPhee: It will not surprise you to hear that I cannot agree to that, Simon.
- Simon: Then, at least, will you promise to let us do whatever we have to do to get rid of her?
- Nanny McPhee: Are you prepared to accept the consequences?
- Simon: Yes.
- Nanny McPhee: You promise?
- Simon: Yes, yes, absolutely. I promise.
Nanny McPhee: Hmm. Then I will, as you put it, let you do whatever you have to do.

Simon: Thank you! Thank you!

The final need identified by Glasser (1998: International Journal of Reality Therapy, 2007) is the need for fun or enjoyment. Through play, people connect with each other (Glasser, 1998). The Brown family had not experienced much fun since the death of their mother. Cedric was preoccupied with work, and the children were preoccupied with finding new and creative ways to be disobedient. It was not until the end of the movie that a sense of enjoyment returned to the Brown family. A food fight, that tried and true staple of children's movies, served the purpose of providing fun for the Brown family. The children reconnected with their father and the movie concluded with a true fairy tale ending.

Implications for Counselor Educators

Using cinema as a catalyst for discussion and a teaching tool is an effective strategy when teaching counseling theories (Toman & Rak, 2000). Because the movie Nanny McPhee (Jones, 2006) follows the basic concepts of Reality Therapy so closely, it has applications for instructors of master level counseling theories courses. While videos of mock counseling sessions using different counseling theories, such as Reality Therapy, are available, this movie provides a different perspective. After reading the chapter on Reality Therapy from whatever text is being used in theories class, the students are asked to view the movie, either on their own or at a campus screening scheduled at a time other than their class time. While viewing the movie, students are asked to take notes about how different concepts of Reality Therapy are depicted in the movie. A worksheet (Appendix A) listing main concepts is provided to students as a guide. Students can be asked to write a case study of the Brown children from a Reality Therapy perspective, or they can bring their notes to class for discussion about the concepts as depicted in the movie. Students can be given assignments to identify the five needs of Reality Therapy as they are presented in the movie, to critique Nanny McPhee's skills as if she were a Reality Therapist, and to identify specific Reality Therapy techniques she uses throughout the movie.

By using a light-hearted and whimsical approach, the movie Nanny McPhee (Jones, 2006) presents the concepts of Reality Therapy as more accessible not only for counseling students, but for other professionals as well, such as teachers implementing a quality school. Parents can also view the movie with their children and discuss the importance of choosing behaviors aimed at facilitating attainment of their goals. Through the use of fantasy, as provided by Nanny McPhee, the concepts of Reality Therapy may become more real for counseling students.
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Appendix A

Nanny McPhee: Magical Nanny or Reality Therapist?

Be prepared to discuss how each of the following concepts of Reality Therapy is depicted in the movie.

1. The need for survival
2. The need for love & belonging
3. The need for power or achievement
4. The need for freedom or independence
5. The need for fun
6. Goal directed behavior to meet needs
7. The therapeutic relationship
8. The length of therapy
9. The setting of therapy sessions
10. Focus on the present, not the past
11. Paradoxical interventions
12. Accepting responsibility for choices
13. Reframing misbehaviors into strengths

The author may be contacted at Katrina.Cook@tamucc.edu
ABSTRACT

Generally speaking, most teachers have been adequately instructed regarding curricular issues, but have not been adequately instructed regarding how their teaching strategies may actually impact their students in various ways. For instance, “boss-type teaching strategies” vs. “lead-type teaching strategies” can produce drastically different effects on various students (Glasser, 1990). Furthermore, students also vary, and therefore require teachers to consider that fact before they ever begin to interact with them. For example, some students tend to be “conformists,” while others are “nonconformists,” or possibly “independent thinkers.” What teaching strategies will work with which students will be carefully examined and explained in this brief article. A helpful table will also be presented so that teachers can better visualize “what works best with which student and why this might be so.”

Teaching Strategies and Student Orientation: Match or Mismatch?

Teachers have typically been prepared to implement various curricula, but have generally not been taught regarding how to more effectively interact with their students. Notably, teachers are often unfamiliar with the fact that they may actually need to teach at least three different types of students, i.e., “conformists,” “nonconformists,” (or “rebels”), and “independent thinkers.” Stated simply, “conformists” tend to do as they are told, work hard to please those in authority, and meet or exceed any/all expectations provided them by their teachers and/or those in authority. “Nonconformists,” in contrast, will more likely do the opposite of what they are told, fail to please those in authority, and will less likely achieve expectations. Finally, the “independent thinkers” generally will seek to do “their own thing,” whatever that might be, regardless of what others might wish for them to do.

Realistically speaking, not all educational strategies work effectively with these three different types of students. More specifically, educators who see themselves as “Little Caesars,” “Napoleons,” or “Top Dogs,” often see their role in the classroom as being “boss-teachers” or as “the Sage from the Stage,” and therefore are likely to “give orders,” “demand compliance,” and/or “punish routinely,” unless their various expectations are met by their students. What type of student would comply with this type of teacher, and rarely, if ever, hesitate to do so? The answer is: “The CONFORMIST.”

Notably, however, the “nonconformists” are actually likely to do the opposite of what they’ve been told to do, if they are told to do these things in this manner. What happens here is that “PSYCHOLOGICAL REACTANCE” (Brehm, 1966) often occurs, and those who experience it will rarely—if ever—comply, but are much more likely to do the opposite of what they have been told to do by their “boss-teachers” since they usually hate/resent being told what to do. For instance, the senior author has often been told by some teachers that they (i.e., the teachers) have apparently lost control of their classroom, to which the senior author has asked, “Tell me, then, what student, in your estimation, has actually taken over control of your classroom?” That individual is likely to be a “nonconformist” who isn’t likely to be doing things because s/he thinks it’s the best possible choice, but because s/he is simply doing the opposite of what s/he has been “told” to do.

The “independent thinkers,” in contrast, generally march to the tune of their own drummers, and therefore may seem to comply with “boss-teachers” demands on occasion, but are simply choosing to do what they believe is the best thing to do. Of course, some “independent thinkers” may take a different tack from that of the teacher(s) in question, but they do so not out of spite, but because they think that their way is right. Naturally, “independent thinkers” can be “pushed too hard” by their “boss-teachers,” and when that happens, “psychological reactance” might once again occur, even causing “independent thinkers” to take up the attack against their “boss-teachers” and their perceived “inappropriate demands.”

So what should teachers do with their students? How should they act toward them in order to help their respective students to do their best, whatever that might be? According to William Glasser (1990), “lead-teachers” could actually benefit these three (3) types of students better. Here’s how that might be accomplished:

For “conformists,” “lead teachers” need to explicitly explain (1) what is expected, (2) how it can be done, and (3) how to evaluate their own efforts, to the best of their ability. Of critical importance, though, is that the “lead-teachers” not go too fast for “conformist” students, if they truly wish for them to do their best.

For “nonconformists,” “lead-teachers” need to offer choices, rather than proclaim ultimatums, and also show their students how they might plan their work, and then how they might work their plan. Furthermore, guidance may be needed to help each student to better understand
how s/he might evaluate every noteworthy aspect of his/her work. In so doing, “nonconformists” can’t blame their teachers for whatever they might have done, and therefore “psychological reactance” should not develop, nor be directed toward their “lead-teachers” since the “nonconformist” students—and not their teachers—were allowed to set their own goals, make their own plans, and evaluate their own work, leaving only them to blame for their own failures, and not their teachers’ actions.

For “independent thinkers,” then, “lead-teachers” simply need to maintain a “hands-off” policy as long as these students are progressing toward some worthwhile, self-appointed goal. Truly, for these self-directed students, “lead-teachers” definitely need to assume the position of being a “guide from the side,” for in so doing, these students will never engage in any psychological reactance as they diligently move toward the goals that they value and revere, and follow plans that they deemed to be appropriate and clear.

Table 1, which follows, will attempt to demonstrate how these teaching strategies and students’ orientations interact, which teachers and students should seek to understand, if they both wish to excel in their respective positions of responsibility.

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOSS-TEACHERS</th>
<th>LEAD-TEACHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What teachers do:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell/Require/Command w/Conformists</td>
<td>Don’t go too fast, and explain every task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance is likely achieved.</td>
<td>Psychological reactance can be avoided, &amp; more self-direction achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological reactance, and not compliance, will likely occur.</td>
<td>Psychological reactance can be definitely avoided, &amp; self-direction maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are self-directed,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but boss-teachers can foster psychological reactance in them if they try to force an issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As recommended by William Glasser (1990), effective teachers need to avoid being an adversary! A “boss-teacher” will ultimately destroy most, if not all, relationships in the classroom due to his/her quest for power. Their ineffective behaviors may actually cripple classroom cohesiveness, and as a result learning may less likely take place. So, try as you might, keep your goals in sight, and don’t push too hard, unless you are looking for a fight.

### Avoid Being an Adversary!

The use of “boss-type teaching” strategies often causes most of the discipline problems that we try to prevent or eliminate. Basically, teachers could meet resistance from students, since their instructions could set off a substantial amount of psychological reactance within their students, resulting in noncompliance to the teachers’ directions. According to William Glasser (1990), “boss-type teaching” behaviors may include the following:

1. Teacher sets the task to be done, and the standards to be met, without seeking any input from students.
2. Teacher tells, rather than shows, how to do the work.
3. Teacher inspects (or grades) the work, while students have little, or no say, in the matter.
4. Teachers often use coercion (usually punishment) to try to get students to do what they’re told, which often creates a very adversarial situation within the classroom and beyond.

Becoming friends and taking the trip together is essential. For in so doing, teachers will more likely encourage independent thought, self-resilience, and become a “true friend.” In turn, students will more likely work hard because they know that both of you expect “only the best,” and won’t settle for anything less (Parish & Rehbein, 2007).

### Seek to Become an Advocate or a Facilitator

Through “lead-type teaching” strategies, internal motives and personal goal-settings are emphasized, and doing one’s best is “Job #1.” To achieve these ends, here is what “lead-type teachers” generally do:

1. Teacher ask students for input regarding the work to be done, the time needed to do it, and what they are willing to commit to in order to achieve the various objectives of the course, whatever they might be.
2. Teachers show or model the job, or better yet, have a student from the class do so.
3. Teachers reveal the criteria for evaluation of assignments, and ask students to employ these standards, and to explain/work out differences when they are found to exist between their ratings.
4. Teachers serve as facilitators (or “guides from the side”), plus they work hard to remove obstacles that might impede the progress of their students.

Helping students to discover themselves and what they can do, is generally thought to be highly worthwhile, at least as a general rule. So keep your focus, and help them to do likewise, for in doing so, things will more likely go best for the students and their teachers too.
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