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A POLICE PEER COUNSELOR USES REALITY THERAPY

Brion L. Emerson
J. Scott Hinkle

Peer counseling could be defined as a systematic attempt to provide psychological “first aid” to individuals in time of personal or professional crisis. Peer counseling, itself, is not new and has taken place regularly for years in society as friends help friends with their problems. Formal peer counseling programs with trained peer counselors are somewhat new and the number of such programs has expanded. One area in which peer counseling has expanded is the field of law enforcement.

Peer Counseling in Law Enforcement

Due mainly to the nature of the work, law enforcement agencies have become increasingly aware of the need for peer counseling programs. Administrators realized that officers were frequently affected by the various traumas to which they were exposed. In 1981, the Los Angeles, California Police Department (LAPD) started the first peer counseling program in a law enforcement agency (Klyver, 1983). The LAPD found that even though police officers were reluctant to seek professional assistance, they would seek their friends for help with their problems. This agency implemented a large number of regularly employed officers and civilians in its peer counseling program. Several other agencies, including the Greensboro, North Carolina Police Department, followed the LAPD’s innovative program.

In 1986, the Greensboro Police Department decided to enhance the concept by identifying the informal leaders within the Department currently functioning as “peer counselors.” These individuals were subsequently convinced of the value of such a program and provided with basic counseling skills training. These officers were later sent back into the employee population with increased counseling knowledge and the capability to become a better friend, or counselor, to those officers in need of service. The peer counseling program did not compete with or eliminate other mental health resources available to the Department, but rather complemented the more formal services.

Since the program’s inception, the concepts of control theory and reality therapy (Glasser, 1986) proved to be effective in working with police officers in many peer counseling situations, including events involving trauma. The following true-to-life case is an example of one such traumatic incident, and the role of a police peer counselor trained in control theory/reality therapy.

Case Example

On your way home from work you stopped at a local convenience store. As you paid for your purchase, a man with a gun came in and announced a holdup. He held the gun to your head while the store clerk got the money. He then shot the clerk and brought the gun back to your head. Just at that moment, a police officer came in the door, shot and killed the robber before he could kill you. Aside from the fact you were thrilled to be alive, you were very thankful for the action the officer took. There are several victims here: the clerk, the customer, and the police officer. This example deals with the police officer.

The Police Officer Victim

The police officer observed the crime and made the instant decision to shoot. The officer may or may not have heard the gun go off and probably does not know how many times shots were fired. The robber’s falling may have been perceived as if in slow-motion. The officer tried to save both the clerk’s and the robber’s lives with CPR, but they both expired. All of the officer’s senses came into play; however, the officer was still in control. Since enlistment in the Police Academy, the officer had a picture in mind of what to do in such a situation and how to react. The situation was handled just as imagined time after time.

As the events progressed at the convenience store, the officer’s sensory perceptions passed through a personal valuing filter. Positive, negative, and neutral values were placed on these perceptions of the incident as suggested by Glasser (1986).

Following the incident, the officer’s gun was taken and the officer removed to police headquarters. Two separate and distinct investigations were then conducted. One investigation determined if there was enough evidence for criminal charges to be filed against the police officer. The other determined if he violated any policies or procedures of the police agency. It is important to note that during the investigations, the officer was treated not as a fellow officer and friend, but like anyone who had just taken a life. The officer was advised of the right to remain silent and right to an attorney. The officer may have said, “Hey, I don’t need a lawyer. I just did my job as I’m paid and trained to do. I’m no criminal.” The officer’s emotional control faded and this was extremely painful for him (Glasser, 1986). He wanted this whole situation to be over with; however, it turned out to be just the beginning.

The officer’s friends and support system either avoided him or said things like “Way to go, Deadeye,” “Nice shot,” or “You really wasted that scumbag.” The press printed headlines like “Cops Strike Again.” Family members of the officer did not know what to say or how to act around him.

The officer’s behavioral system began to organize by struggling to gain control, decrease frustrations, and find the picture desired (Glasser, 1986). Subsequent behavior was similar to what other victims report. The shooting, or trauma, was replayed in the form of dreaming or nightmaring. In the dreams, the gun did not fire, or when it did fire, the bullet seemed to
drop out of the end of the barrel, other times the bullet did not stop the robber.

The officer may have chosen other feeling behaviors like depressing, angering or guilting. If he chose depressing, it may have helped him temporarily avoid coming face to face with fearful situations like civil action, the press, or possibly even prison.

The officer may have experienced loss of appetite, restless sleep, moodiness, loss of pleasure in activities once enjoyed, alcohol ing, or drugging.

According to Solomon (1987), these behaviors often last for up to seven days after the incident. For some officers, obsession with the incident may never change and it destroys them, but for most officers the need to survive takes over.

The Police Peer Counselor

The Peer Counselor's role during this early time is to provide support, to listen and to foster an attitude of trust. The victim officer does, or believes he/she does, the best in choosing powerful, painful feeling behaviors (Glasser, 1984). The police peer counselor, a reality therapist, knows the feeling component is only one of four that make up the total behavior. The counselor asked the officer if depressing or angering is helping him get what he wants. This encourages the officer to think about what he is doing.

The counselor assists the officer to talk about his anger, or fear, thus reducing some of its intensity. If angering, the counselor finds out with whom the officer is angry. The officer will be asked what the officer is doing with the anger. Other questions would also be asked, including: What is angering doing to or for you? Are you controlling your anger? Is your anger controlling you? And lastly, what will you do with your anger? Talking will help the officer clarify thoughts. As the peer counselor listens to the officer talk, the counselor will tend to regain some control. The counselor will get the officer to make a value judgment about what he is doing. When the officer decides that personal behavior is not helping obtain current objectives, the officer will be ready to make some plans (Glasser, 1986).

Alternative Plans

Helping the officer get involved in alternative plans such as physical activities like running or aerobics may be helpful. Getting the officer back to the police firing range would also be of benefit. Practice on the firing range may assist the officer in becoming reacquainted with a weapon and increase comfort and control level. A trip to the convenience store and scene of the shooting may also be helpful. The cliche “climbing back upon the horse and getting back into the saddle” has some merit here. Doing behaviors are seen as pleasurable and help the officer begin to feel more in control of his life.

Fitness for Duty

Up to this point, the officer has not returned to work due to being placed on administrative leave pending the outcome of the two investigations; this normally takes about three days. Fitness for duty is determined by evaluating if the officer has ceased victimizing and has undertaken effective doing behaviors. If the officer is deemed fit for duty and has returned to work, the scenario is not yet complete. The officer may continue to have difficulty for weeks, months or even years. There may be flashbacks, legal resolutions are more than likely, and possibly civil law suits ahead. According to Solomon (1987), between 50 to 80 percent of police officers involved in shootings or incidents with heavy trauma, leave the profession within two years after the incident.

Conclusion

Scenes similar to the one described are played out somewhere everyday. Law enforcement officers do their job and, in turn, become victims themselves. Peer counselors, utilizing reality therapy skills, are finding that helping officers get involved in positive doing behaviors is a key to their regaining effective control of their lives.
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PRACTICAL BOOK ON REALITY THERAPY

Using Reality Therapy

by Robert E. Wubbolding

This book is useful for anyone who wants to learn more about Reality Therapy. Whether you have had one day of training in Reality Therapy or are a master practitioner, you could benefit from this book. It is also useful for practicum supervisors who are seeking additional content for their supervising sessions.

Dr. Glasser states in the introduction: “He has integrated Control Theory and the practice of Reality Therapy and has made the result understandable and eminently useful to the reader. He breaks new ground by initiating a Reality Therapy model for marriage and family counseling. He has also integrated paradoxical techniques into the practice of Reality Therapy while explaining in the context of Control Theory why they can be effective.”

Available through Harper & Row.
AN UNDERSTANDING OF NEGOTIATION STYLES CONTRIBUTES TO EFFECTIVE REALITY THERAPY FOR CONFLICT RESOLUTIONS WITH COUPLES

Suzy Hallock

The author is a faculty associate of I.R.T. and is in private practice in S. Pomfret, VT. She was the initial R.T. trainer sent to Ireland, and teaches intensive weeks in Dublin and Cork.

Couples counseling offers counselors opportunities for eclectic application of reality therapy/control theory concepts in tandem with principles of negotiation. Glasser (1984) mentions negotiation and compromise as “all we have to work out our differences.” A control theory axiom which guides our work as reality therapists is “that it is impossible for any two of us to have the same pictures in our heads” (p. 26). This knowledge must become “an integral part of the way we deal with all those around us” (p. 44) if we want to take effective control of our lives.

Since pictures are often dissimilar, people have found behaviors which reconcile them to the pictures of others, or help them move toward a more shared picture. Negotiation specialists identify five general categories of conflict behavior:

- Avoidance
- Accommodation
- Competition
- Compromise
- Collaboration

One or a combination of these behavioral modes might be chosen by individuals in conflict. Some people appear to establish a pattern and use one mode, perhaps, which has helped them reduce past frustrations. Subsequent behavioral organization is predictable, and even if it doesn’t appear to work to any great degree in getting them what they want in a transaction, they may cling to it, thinking that eventually it will yield the results they seek. People who take effective control of their lives are apt to have awareness of the entire repertory of negotiation styles which enhances their ability to resolve conflicts.

Avoiding is a behavior which doesn’t really address the conflict. People who choose this behavioral style “let well enough alone” and tend to postpone, sidestep, or withdraw from the conflict. Lincoln and O’Donnell (1986) further define it as refusing to acknowledge the existence of the conflict or just ignoring it altogether.

EDITOR’S COMMENT

At the start of the eighth year of publication, the Journal of Reality Therapy is in fine shape, and seems to be meeting the interests and needs of its readers, judging by reactions and subscriptions. Based upon a recommendation by the Education Committee, a request has been made to devote the Spring 1989 issue primarily if not solely to a special issue devoted to the application of control theory in educational settings. With this in mind, we will give priority to articles based on reality therapy and practice in education submitted by January 13, 1989. Several articles in this issue serve as a basis for the education issue, notably those by PETERSON & TRUSCOTT, PARISH, RADDA, & BRATTER. The article by Bratter is particularly thought-provoking, and has particular relevance to those interested in public education, whether as providers or consumers.

In this issue, we are also pleased to add Jeannette McDaniel to the editorial board. Jeannette, from Springfield, MO., is a member of the National Board of Directors, and is active as a field faculty member of the Institute for Reality Therapy. From the Mid-America region, her addition adds a highly skilled teacher and trainer to our Board.
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There are times, however, when avoiding might be a very appropriate choice. In the midst of a true conflict, Glasser (1984) advises to wait and do a good job while waiting. While we wait, the world turns, and it gives the brain a chance to reorganize. Further, some initial avoidance may permit angering to subside, and disputants can later return to the conflict with more light and less heat.

Accommodating indicates a yielding to the other's point of view. While there are situations in which such behavior indicates a generosity or a willingness to preserve harmony, repeated use of this behavior might result in a person's mounting up enormous frustrations. Turning the other cheek is easier for some of us than the rest of us, but any of us who choose this over time run the risk of never being satisfied. In some relationships, one might accommodate the other often as a way of building up a ledger of what is owed. Later on, all these stored factors are presented as, "Since I did that for you, you must now do this for me." Most adolescents I see move away from accommodating their parents' pictures and seek to establish their own. Some begin to compete. Similarly, some spouses move away from accommodating a partner's picture(s) and venture forth to establish their own unless the new, emerging picture can be accepted within the shared relationship.

Competing characterizes many of our athletic contests and usually results in a winner and a loser. Lincoln and O'Donnell warn that this behavioral style "can lead to domination or eventual annihilation of one disputant by another." This "Might makes Right" mode characterizes people and groups with intense needs for power; what Glasser identifies as "the need to get others to obey us."

If compromising creates a two winner solution, it also creates a two loser situation. Lincoln and O'Donnell say this form "requires that in order for each of us to win something, each of us might also lose something, a loss we believe is necessary but unwarranted." Splitting the difference is a behavior many of us exercise when we bargain or haggle over a purchase price of a new acquisition. Sometimes getting and giving concessions strengthens a relationship; sometimes it erodes.

Compromising is perhaps the most familiar form of conflict resolution for many of us who think that half a loaf is more satisfying and less frustrating than no loaf at all. Characteristic of couples, this behavior does sometimes help meet love and bonding needs, whereas competition behaviors are more likely to move us toward meeting power needs.

But the behavior which most enriches our application of reality therapy/control theory concepts is collaborating. From Latin roots which literally mean to work together, collaborating is described by Lincoln and O'Donnell as "the belief that the interests of one party will not be satisfied unless the interests of the other is also satisfied, at least to some degree." In the search for a solution which meets the needs of both parties, two heads which are creatively reorganizing are better than one. Understanding your own needs as well as the needs of your partner, having the willingness to address the specific ways those general needs might be satisfied in the external world, and earnestly engaging in an open and communicative brainstorming session enhance this model. The collaborative spirit is sometimes difficult to attain. In fact, Glasser (1984) indicates that "our lives are a continual struggle to gain control in a way that we satisfy our needs and not deprive those around us, especially those close to us, of satisfying theirs."

The concept that love is characterized by relationships in which your partner's happiness, health, and satisfaction is as important to you as is your own has often been attributed to Henry Stack Sullivan. This relational dimension is well addressed in William Lederer's Marital Choices (1981) which claims its mission is to assist couples in reducing their levels of discontent and elevating their levels of relationship gratification. Further, Lederer states that "We hold that every marriage is unique because every person is unique." Replete with two winner exercises, the book suggests behavioral exchanges which contribute to a collaborative marital or relational style. Of particular interest is "The Anatomy of Authority and Power Allocation, or, Who is in Charge of What" chapter. Using charts to ascertain the relationship as it now exists in each partner's perception and charts which identify the marriage each would like to have, Lederer instructs partners to negotiate for change and mutual gain.

Glasser cautions us that "when people deride counseling as ineffective, what they are saying is that they do not want to negotiate — they want to control." Such people are employing only one behavioral style which is competing. In my work with couples, I have seen both males and females employ this behavioral choice with vigor. There may come a time in therapy to ask whether it is more important for one person to win than it is for the relationship to survive; in other words, "What do you really want?"

If couples really do want to negotiate for mutual gain, it is useful to help them learn principles of assertiveness, straight communication styles (including reflective and summative listening to be sure each has been understood by the other), and the collaborative spirit.

To illustrate the negotiation styles in a potential relational conflict, let us assume that Fran and Ray do not agree on how they want to satisfy their vacation picture this year. Ray wants to go back to the beach. Fran wants to visit parents who now live in a distant retirement community. Both Fran and Ray have strong arguments for individually held pictures. Ray says the long winter in Vermont is difficult, and the sun is restorative. Ray works hard and hopes for some lazy days on the beach to catch up on some reading. But Fran claims that aging parents want and need to see them. The parents have been a great support to the marriage; they have even made financial contributions to a new house for Fran and Ray.

Ray says that one of the parents is quite demanding and to spend the vacation with that parent would be tiring and no fun; hence, Ray's wants for rest, relaxation, and fun probably would not be possible. Fran claims that to go to the beach and lie in the sun would present real conflict since Fran believes that parents are more important than enjoying some sunshine.
In this competitive struggle, both Fran and Ray become polarized in their positions. The couple might use the avoiding mode to handle the stalemate, but, as the allotted time approaches, they may not be able to go anywhere since they did not make airline reservations in advance. Or, Fran may choose to be accommodating and say, “All right, we’ll go to the beach,” but thinks, “Next year we’ll do it my way.” Fran and Ray might choose to compromise and spend five days of their ten day vacation in each place. Although this is likely to result in higher transportation costs, they may be able to stay in the parents’ home and save some hotel costs so that they can still observe their budget.

However, if Fran and Ray choose the collaborative mode, each will listen to the other’s picture of the wanted vacation. Understanding that those pictures are vastly different, Fran and Ray will seek to find what there is to share — what they have in common — around the idea of a vacation. Additionally, they will each have to tolerate the partner’s picture and make a good faith attempt to understand how that picture would be need-satisfying for the partner. A frank discussion of values is useful.

Together, Fran and Ray decide that they will rent two cottages side by side at the beach and invite the parents to accompany them. In this way, Ray can log in a lot of beach hours and get the sunshine so sorely missed during the long winter. Fran will be able to see parents. Together Fran and Ray can work out how much time they want to spend with parents and each other (as individuals and together). Provided this picture is also satisfying for the parents, Fran and Ray have found a collaborative solution to their conflict.

One particularly collaborative practice is what Fisher and Ury (1981) call “the one text procedure.” Marital partners begin with entirely different pictures in their heads about a new house. In the process of negotiating, each asks the other many questions. An architect asks about their interests, e.g., not how big a bay window the wife wants, but why she wants it or what are her specific pictures? Is the purpose of the window to catch morning sunrises or afternoon sunsets? Does she care more about looking out or looking in? A list of interests, or wants, of the two spouses is drawn up, and each asks the other many questions. An architect asks about their interests, e.g., not how big a bay window the wife wants, but why she wants it or what are her specific pictures? Is the purpose of the window to catch morning sunrises or afternoon sunsets? Does she care more about looking out or looking in? A list of interests, or wants, of the two spouses is drawn up, and this draft is offered up for discussion. It is made clear that none of the parties are at this time committed to the draft. It is, instead, an organic, growing concept both parties will work on together. Side by side development of their own plan is likely to yield the greatest degree of procedural and psychological satisfaction for the partners. None of us likes to be told what we are going to do or how we are going to live. Glasser observes that while we may marry initially for love, the drive for power can take over in the struggle to take control of the relationship. My bay window is more important than anything you might want.

One such couple recently “graduated” from treatment but initially presented as having entered the separation phase. However, as Catholics, they were in conflict within their valuing filter. Although each viewed the situation as utterly impossible, through a combination of joint and individual meetings, we established the issues for therapy.

She saw him as a wimp, withdrawal, unexciting. Life with two little kids was drudgery and he should help around the house more despite working two jobs. She was using criticism to control him. He was afraid to assert any of his own wants and had chosen peace at any price since she used profane and abusive language when angering and he did not want his children exposed to these tirades. He felt so criticized by her, thinking of himself as unable to do anything right, that he was no longer making sexual advances. She believed that, in general, the male should be the sexual initiator but the female could encourage sexual activity by being receptive. She wasn’t feeling receptive. And despite her stated preference for a husband who would be nontraditional about household tasks, she claimed a preference for traditional romance.

Together we explored the myths and realities of marriage. Inevitably these include reference perceptions or pictures based on families of origin practices as well as cultural influences, and behavioral choices (such as taking intimate and fun time together, exchanging cherishing behaviors, renegotiating the power allocation of functions within the relationship, and finding appreciations and affirmation of partner strengths). This couple chose to revitalize some old behaviors they had once shared, such as playing chess and taking rides in the car. She was highly visual and aesthetic; things had to “look” a certain way. He was very auditory, spoke in a gentle tone of voice, and played the guitar (which he had given up but resumed during therapy). We discussed differences in their pictures around many marital challenges: sexual satisfaction, child rearing, birth control, interior decorating, family rituals, and even who drives the car and when.

His chosen behaviors for managing conflict were avoiding and accommodating. She was competing and powerful. She was invested in being right and always having her pictures met. She did not acknowledge that his pictures were different, and even did not seem at first to understand that he had pictures at all. Together they decided that their most used behaviors for attempted conflict resolution were not working and they moved toward more collaborative and compromising styles. Strengths they had as a couple were that both were intelligent and they did have a shared picture of healthy children. Although this couple had 24 sessions, many couples make excellent gains in as few as 3 sessions. Most benefit from 6 to 12 sessions.

There will be times, of course, when an issue might not be resolvable. In these situations, Glasser’s advice to us is that we “learn to share what we have in common and accept, or at least tolerate, the pictures we don’t share.” If we truly understand that each of us is unique, we might have to agree to disagree, mindful of our own needs and wants, but also remaining respectful of the other. During the final therapy session, the aforementioned woman said, “I never knew how much work marriage was, and more importantly, I never knew how to do the important work.” In my view, conflict resolution (reconciliation of pictures and/or creation of a new, shared picture) is part of the important “work” of relationships. Every couple has to strike their own comfort zone with choice and content of negotiation style and solution.

One such couple recently “graduated” from treatment but initially presented as having entered the separation phase. However, as Catholics, they were in conflict within their valuing filter. Although each viewed the situation as utterly impossible, through a combination of joint and individual meetings, we established the issues for therapy.
While understanding and mastering conflict resolution behavior can be very satisfying, there can exist a kind of saturation level which suggests that there are literally no shared pictures for strength building in the relationship. It has been my experience that the harder the couple has to work, the less compatible their pictures are, and the more the relationship is in jeopardy.

For this reason, I had serious concerns about this particular couple's ability to look toward a positive future together. However, a six month post therapy check up yielded enthusiastic comments from both husband and wife. "We are doing better than we ever have," each commented. There are couples, of course for whom endless negotiations seem a bleak choice. Compatibility seems evasive or there is an unwillingness to learn to negotiate needs together.

The task at hand for these relationships often becomes separation counseling. Although such relationships are sometimes characterized by power inequities, the collaborative spirit can ease acrimony, provide optimal transition, and yield psychological satisfaction. Separations which are mediated in this way, rather than "terminated" by a litigated, competitive divorce enable the participants to maintain better control. Although each negotiation may hold a kind of reorganization, the task and choice to negotiate can become an organized learned behavior which enhances the behavioral repertory of an effective person.

An understanding of negotiation styles is therefore useful for the counselor who helps a couple identify conflict resolution behaviors they are presently using and then further helps the couple expand their behavioral repertory to include the collaborative model. The success of that model is dependent on the couple's understanding of basic needs and pictures. Further, the successful teaching and application of the collaborative mode within the therapy process best assures its continued use as couples take control of the important work of conflict resolution. The collaborative model best assures couples of power equity and maintains an atmosphere in which loving behaviors and feelings abound.

**Bibliographical References**


**APPLYING REALITY THERAPY TO TROUBLED MARRIAGES THROUGH THE CONCEPT OF PERMANENT LOVE**

Richard W. Conner

*The author is senior pastor of the First United Methodist Church in Millersville, Pennsylvania.*

I am writing this article to share a methodology in marriage counseling, using the concept of "permanent love" found in the book *Permanent Love* by Edward E. Ford and Steven Englund. The purpose of this article is not to give a summary of this excellent work, nor will it explain the important concepts in detail. Instead, it will describe how I have used *Permanent Love* in a four month marriage counseling contract.

**THE CONTRACT - FIRST SESSION**

When a couple comes to me, I begin by attempting to discover what both parties want. What are the inner world pictures they have of marriage, specifically their marriage relationship?

What is a good marriage like? What is their marriage like? Is their marriage satisfying their needs? Do they want to stay married? (Sometimes "yes" - sometimes "no").

During the first two months, I create plans which flow out of the "permanent love" concept from the book. By the time we get to the third, especially the fourth month, the couple within the framework of "permanent love" will be creating their own plan and making their own decisions.

If the couple agrees to our meeting together, bi-weekly for four months, and makes a commitment to work hard and complete all assignments each time before we meet, then I make my promise to help.

**THE FIRST MONTH - Step #1: "What a couple can do together"**

The first step in building "permanent love" is for the couple to begin doing things together once again. In figure 1 we see that if a person is doing a lot of negative thinking about his/her partner and sharing few if any activities to satisfy or meet his/her partner's needs, the resulting behavior will be a lack of the "feelings of love". If the couple are to change their feelings, the couple must change what they think and do.

**Possible Assignments**

1. Read the material on step #1 from the book. We will discuss it in the next session.
2. For 1 hour the first week, person A is to share with person B what he/she understands to be the content of step #1 from the book. This is a teaching activity, just sharing with little or no discussion. Person A talks while person B listens.
Sick love: **----**

Emotional/physical / ~ ;;ttle or no "feeling"/ ~Iove_

Negative pictures of spouse and the relationship. Don't want to do things with spouse anymore. Arguing, nagging “Get off my back.” Sick picture of self.

Few or no activities as married couple. Little or no need satisfying or sharing.

3. Each week the couple are to go out on a “date”. They choose what to do/where to go, remembering some kind of activity the two of them enjoyed and then go out together. While on this date, I ask that there be no discussion of the problems of their marriage.

This third assignment is not going to be easy for many couples facing marriage difficulties. I remember a husband, sitting next to his wife and saying, “You mean in order to come to this marriage counseling, I am going to have to begin to do things with her again?” Yes, “permanent love” sees such activities together, as clearing small patches of ground in lives with unsatisfied needs and cluttered with poor behaviors. (Ford and Englund, 1979, p. 41).

4. Before the next appointment, during the second week, assignment #1 above is changed. This time person B shares the content of step #1 while person A listens.

SECOND SESSION

We meet now for the second time to share the material found in step #1. Depending on the couple, the assignments will be similar for the following two weeks as well, except for the following:

**Possible Assignments**

1. This time person A is asked, once again for ½ hour, to share on any subject of interest to him or her, except the marriage relationship. Once again this is not problem solving. One person talks while the other listens, and the next week person B takes his/her turn.

2. For the next two weeks, the quality of the dating experiences is enhanced. As made clear in *Permanent Love*, what are the differences between “active” pleasure and “passive” pleasure? Active pleasure would not be watching television. Instead, it would be such activities as playing games, hiking, bird watching, dancing, that is not passively watching life go by (Ford and Englund, 1979, p.31). They choose what to do and then do it, once again, without discussing or working on their marriage problems.

3. Read the material in step #2.

With the completion of these assignments, the couple are now ready to begin the second month of the “permanent love” plan. Please notice that during the first month there has been little discussion of problems, difficulties, “tell me what’s wrong with your marriage.” Instead, the first month is one of “breaking the ice.”

THE SECOND MONTH-Step #2: “What you can do on your own”

**THIRD SESSION**

The second month of the “permanent love” contract is step #2, “What a person can do on his/her own.” Most persons in troubled marriages have poor feelings of self worth (power). As explained in this second step, before an individual can tackle the challenge of a relationship with another person in life, he/she needs to strengthen himself/herself in what is called “aloneness”. (Ford and Englund, 1979, p. 61).

**Possible Assignments**

1. Each person is to bring a list of what he/she is good at doing alone. What do you like? What would you like to do alone?

2. Repeat the assignment of one person sharing with the other the contents of step #2. Once again, time for sharing is to be limited to ½ hour.

3. Date once a week, two or three hours of a sharing activity. Hopefully, by this second month the couple will even begin to enjoy these dates. (fun)

**FOURTH SESSION**

At this session, we would continue sharing the contents of step #2 and reviewing the success of the completed assignments.

**Possible Assignments**

1. During the next two weeks, each person is asked to practice one half hour each day “alone” in what *Permanent Love* calls “creative solitude” (Ford and Englund, 1979, p.70).

With one couple, I remember how the husband chose to go fishing while his wife stayed at home with the children. For him this was “creative solitude”. It doesn’t matter if he caught any fish, only that he was alone, strengthening himself. His wife chose to go to the library and read while he stayed at home. This was a whole night that belonged to her, and she was able to do it two or three nights a week. It had been years since she picked up a book, something she wanted in her life but was neglecting.

2. So much time is being spent on “creative solitude”, I ask for only one date during this two week period; but they may want to be dating more and more. It’s up to them.

3. Read the material in step #3.
THE THIRD MONTH - Step #3: “Conversation”

FIFTH SESSION

The third month of the permanent love contract is learning the third step of “conversation”. Permanent Love teaches that conversation is not just communicating or sharing “talk”, such as “pass the milk”. The couple are already communicating in the sharing exercises in the previous two steps above. Now we are ready to discuss what they would like to see changed in the way they live and behave.

Feelings do not tell us very much about who we are in our life journey. Feelings can be very deceptive. Nevertheless, feelings do serve as a good indicator of what inner world pictures are or are not being satisfied. (Ford and Englund, 1979, p.83).

Possible Assignments

1. Using the same model we have been using above, for this step, in the half hour sharing session together, person A shares with B, “Because of the feelings I have inside of me, this is what I would like us to do differently in our marriage.” For example: “I angered when you bought the truck without consulting me”. “I want to be involved in such future decisions”. He/she is permitted to say whatever the feelings are and what needs to be changed, while once again, person B is the listener. Person B is not to comment except to make sure he/she understands. During the second week it is person B’s turn.

This is so important to the healing of a marriage. What a disaster it is when you have inner pictures that are important to you, and you cannot communicate them to your partner. Or to make matters worse, your partner feeling only his/her needs or wants, says something like, “That’s not how you feel.”

2. What is your plan to continue “creative solitude”?
3. What do you want to do about dating?

SIXTH SESSION

Following the pattern above, we meet to continue the third step and review success in the assignments.

Possible Assignments

1. For our next session, make a list of the “positive attributes” you recognize in your marriage partner. Can writing these down help a person see his/her mate in a different light, possibly as a need fulfilling person once again?
2. What would you like to do about “creative solitude”?
3. What would you like to do about dating?
4. Read the material in Step #4

Hopefully, as we come to the end of this third month, if the assignments have been done, and with the passing of a three month period of time, the feelings resulting from new behaviors will go a long way toward healing.

THE FOURTH MONTH - Step 4: “Working out difficulties-compromising”

SEVENTH & EIGHTH SESSIONS

For the first time in our counseling together, we begin to share together many of the problems the couple felt that they had when they came for help, and resolve these problems by using the problem solving model of Identifying the Problem; Evaluate what “you” are doing about it; Is there an alternative behavior for you; and Do it and see if it works. If the couple are handling the first three steps, step four is done with “strength in the bank”. Ford and Englund, 1979, p. 103) In step #4 the couple are taught how to share, listen, and compromise.

For sessions seven and eight, I ask the couple to work on “the plan” for their life together. Here I am listening to what they want and what they are going to do.

Not surprisingly to me, I have seen “problems” that three months earlier were “major crises” or “big problems”, now quite manageable.

RESULTS

Over the past two and one half years, I have used Permanent Love with fourteen couples. Four couples did not finish the four months. Out of these four couples, three chose divorce. One couple is staying married “fighting it out”.

I believe the above results are good. Some couples come to their pastor, already having made up their minds that the marriage is over. However, it is still necessary to come in order to say to themselves, their families, and to the community, “We even went to the pastor, and it didn't do any good.”

Ten couples finished the four months. Out of these ten, one couple chose divorce. However, because this couple did so much sharing in our four months together, they were not antagonistic toward one other.

Nine couples finished the counseling sessions and are staying married; and I believe, with the skills of permanent love.

American people love marriage. According to a Lou Harris poll taken this summer “the widely circulated idea that about one out of two American marriages will end in divorce is wrong by a wide margin”. In actuality only one out of every eight marriages fail. Ninety per-cent of all American men get married, while 95% of American women choose to do so. Out of those who chose divorce, 60% remarry within four years. (Harris Associates, 1987)

We love marriage. How good it is when we choose a relationship that includes permanent love.
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To counsel in a way that is fully ethical and responsible, it is necessary to be able to recognize and handle potential suiciding behavior and suicidal threats in a direct, thorough, and circumspect manner. In a previous discussion of suicide, I described specific questions to be asked in assessing the lethality of the death threat (Wubbolding, 1987). This was followed by an account of a specific intervention by counselors in which one client chose the “positive doing symptom” of staying alive (Wubbolding, 1988). The importance of detailed knowledge and comprehensive skill in handling suiciding behaviors is not only in the interest of clients and their families, but it is also to the advantage of the counselor. Szasz (1986) states that the issue of suicide is one of the leading reasons for malpractice suits. It is no wonder that Corey (1988) remarks “The evaluation and management of suicidal risk is a source of great stress for most therapists.”

The purpose of this article is to provide the practitioner of reality therapy with added knowledge about behaviors preliminary to suicide as well as to present mistaken notions about suicide, thus enabling counselors to carry out their ethical responsibilities when dealing with suicidal clients.

Recognizing Preliminary Behaviors:

Lonsway (1972) noted that “almost no one commits suicide without letting others know how he is feeling... of any ten persons who kill themselves, eight have given definite warnings of their suicidal intentions.” In discussing adolescent suicide, Capuzzi (1988) states, “any behavior which, for a particular adolescent, is a decided change should be noted.” In terms of reality therapy, when a person substitutes “I give up” and “Negative Symptoms” for “I’ll do it” and “Positive Symptoms”, (Wubbolding, 1981), there could be danger of suicidal ideation.

“Negative Doing Symptoms” include fighting, drop in grades, breakdown in relationships, loss of a relationship, running away, drug abuse, promiscuous sexual behavior, problems in eating or sleeping. McBrien (1983) adds that previous suicidal attempts or making a will (for adolescents or children) can be indicative of danger. Finally, suicidologists generally point to the giving away of prized possessions as a sign of possible suicide in young people. Capuzzi (1988) describes verbal cues, including: “I can’t go on”, “I’m not the person I used to be”, “You won’t be seeing me around anymore”, “life is too much to put up with”, and others.

“Negative thinking behaviors” include: wanting to escape from situations that appear intolerable, wanting to join a friend or family member who had died, wanting to gain attention, wanting to end a conflict, wanting revenge, wanting to punish survivors. (Capuzzi, 1988).

“Negative feeling behaviors” most often associated with suicidal threats are depression and depression-related feelings such as apathy, indifference, and hopelessness. The feeling of depression, though often accompanying suicidal “doing” and suicidal “thinking” behaviors, can serve as an attempt to relieve the suicidal danger. (Gernsbacher, 1983). It is thus crucial that the therapist follow the client carefully when the depression lifts.

Wrobleski (1984) summarizes her view of the danger signs: 1. Talking about suicide. She states that over 80% of people who kill themselves have made “presuicidal communications” about it. 2. Giving away possessions. Some suicidal persons give away their treasured possessions before they commit the final act. 3. Putting affairs in order, paying off debts, or putting closure on personal affairs can be another sign of the impending suicidal action. 4. Saying goodbye. Wrobleski states that this is usually not discovered until after the suicide. Such persons might have “made a systematic effort to contact the people who meant the most to them” 5. Person suddenly seems much better. Often people attempting suicide feel better when they now have a “solution” to their problems.

It should be evident that change in total behaviors is more subtle than it might appear at first. What would generally be seen as “Positive Symptoms” can be reframed as negative, i.e., as related to suicide if they indicate a change in behavior. Thus, the theme of change should be noted as being indicative of possible suicide vulnerability (Brown, 1987).

The Suicide Prevention Center in Dayton, Ohio, has provided an even more detailed “Lethality Assessment” that should be used discretely by a professional, not given to a client. It is presented here to provide proximate danger signs of suicide. They state: “THESE SIGNS, SEEN EVEN ONLY ONCE, REPRESENT A VERY HIGH LETHALITY”.

| - Giving away of personal possessions | YES NO |
| - Discussion and/or making of suicide plans | YES NO |
| - Discussion and/or gathering of suicide methods | YES NO |
| - Previous suicide attempts or gestures | YES NO |
| - Scratching, marking body, other self-destructive acts | YES NO |
| - Death themes throughout spoken, written and art works | YES NO |
| - Expression of hopelessness, helplessness, and anger at self and world | YES NO |
| - Use of dark, heavy, slashing lines, unconnected bodies in art work and doodling | YES NO |
| - Statements that family and friends would not miss them | YES NO |
| - Recent loss through suicide | YES NO |
| - Sudden positive behavior change following a period of depression | YES NO |
Grob, Klein & Eisen (1983) broaden the perspective even further in the search for signs indicating the possibility of suicide. A survey of 80 high school professionals identified the signs of potential vulnerability: "manifestations of depression, verbal and written cues, isolation and self-destructive behaviors". They divided the factors into three categories: Familial, Individual, and Sociocultural, stating "lack of parental support and alienation from and within the family were key risk factors. Many school professionals pointed to parental absence or unavailability through separation, divorce, or long work hours. Adolescents in such families were often seen as unprotected without adequate role models". They also noted the importance of poor communication and alcoholism in the family as increasing the danger of suicide. Respondents further emphasized low self-esteem, substance abuse, acting out behaviors, poverty, ethnic and racial differences as factors central to the danger of suicide.

Finally, signs of suicide characterized by change in behavior should be dealt with directly and discussed by the therapist with the client. If the threat is assessed as serious, appropriate and responsible action/intervention should be taken.

Myths about Suicide:

1. "Talking about suicide will precipitate it".

   Discussing the possibility of suicide is an ethical responsibility. To bring it into the open neither causes an increase in the likelihood of suicide nor does a therapist "put the idea" in the mind of the client. Bonner (1987) states that not asking about suicide "ignores (the fact) that suicide is the outcome of a lifelong process of living, interacting, and transacting with the world, coping and not coping with the problems of living". She adds: "Suicide comes to make sense in a person's desperation and pain, not because someone asks them if they are thinking about suicide".

2. "If people talk about suicide, they won't do it".

   It should be clear from the above information that persons thinking about killing themselves make explicit or veiled threats. All such threats should be taken seriously and dealt with explicitly and directly.

3. "The therapist has complete ability to prevent suicide".

   The study of control theory recognizes that while it is possible to influence another human being, it is impossible, short of holding him/her in bondage, to force any choice. Additionally, understanding suicide as the final act of destructive lifestyle points toward the conclusion that therapists need not feel totally responsible for a client's suicide.

   In summary, the goal of this third article on suicide as a professional issue is to present warning signs or cues that should be heeded, attended to, and confronted by an ethical counselor. Knowing these cues and recognizing the false notions surrounding suicide can assist reality therapists in dealing with and preventing suicide attempts in responsible ways.
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Pete’s Pathogram was originally conceived to supplement the old Reality Therapy Chart as a visual aid to facilitate the process of helping clients gain control of their lives (Peterson & Parr, 1982). The Pathogram was designed to provide clients with a graphic illustration of the energy they were exerting in meeting their basic needs. The relationships of each pathway to each other was also portrayed.

Reality therapists were first introduced to the notion of pathograms at the 1982 International Reality Therapy Convention in Houston, Texas. The 1982 issue of the Journal of Reality Therapy contained the first published article referring to Pete’s Pathogram. Please see figures 1-3 as examples of the current pathogram. Since that time the feedback from clients using pathograms in the practice of reality therapy has been very positive. Apparently others have found pathograms to be a useful tool in helping clients to determine specific areas of their lives that they wish to change. Also, pathograms have proved to be fun and a source of motivation for clients to get started on a plan to improve their lives. In addition to the clinical merits, pathograms have been reported to be a valuable teaching aid for instructors teaching the concepts of reality therapy. However, the utility of the original pathogram for research purposes was limited because of the lack of any consistent numerical scale.

There does not seem to be any doubt that we need to develop methods and instruments to measure the concepts of control theory and the effectiveness of the reality therapy process. Therefore, Pete’s Pathogram has been developed and modified in an attempt to make the instrument more potent and versatile as a research tool.

Developmental Stages

We consider the original Pathogram as the first developmental stage. A second developmental stage was completed before the new charts were distributed by the Institute. Basically, the second pathogram was designed to maintain the clinical utility of the original pathogram while adding a consistent numerical scale for each genetic need. This allowed researchers to plot individuals’ profiles for perceived need, time invested and success achieved for each basic need on a scale of one to ten. The instrument was utilized much the same way as the original pathogram. It continued to be a useful visual aid to obtain focus and commitment with individuals, couples and families. Persons who are interested in more elaboration on the clinical use of pathograms are referred to the Fall, 1982 Journal of Reality Therapy.

The Stage II Pathogram was utilized to compare the profiles of undergraduate educational psychology students preparing to become certified teachers with the profiles of experienced certified teachers in regard to perceived need, time invested and success achieved for each genetic need. The purpose of the research project was to ascertain the potential of the pathogram for research and to establish a basic needs profile for each of the groups.

The subjects for the study included 114 experienced practicing public school teachers who were attending one of two inservice workshops on applying the concepts of reality therapy to the classroom conducted by the senior author and 86 undergraduate education majors who were enrolled in one of three sections of Educational Psychology classes also taught by the senior author. They were asked to plot their profile on a scale of one to ten in regard to their perceived need, time invested and success achieved for each genetic need.

The data were submitted to Statistical Package for the Social Sciences computer analysis. All the descriptive measures of central tendency were computed along with the percentage of respondents at each level for each sub test. Also, the data were statistically analyzed by the computer employing the t-test to determine the significant differences between means within and between groups on each variable. The .05 level of confidence was accepted as statistically significant.

The results of this first attempt to use the pathogram for research were encouraging. We discovered very little difference between the groups. The profiles were quite similar in all areas for each genetic need. However, teachers perceived themselves as enjoying more success than students in regard to achievement/worth (power) and teachers reported a greater need to participate in a variety of activities than did students. We also noted significant differences within each group on eight different combinations of perceived need, perceived success and time invested on each genetic need. The length of this article does not allow us to go into more detail on the results of developmental stage II. We will provide tables and figures illustrating the results of developmental stage II which actually proved to be quite consistent with the earlier results of stage I.
Methodology

The research design for stage III was a replication of the second developmental stage. The purpose of the research was to collect data to compare the profiles of undergraduate education majors with the profiles of experienced certified teachers in regard to perceived need, time invested and success achieved for each genetic need. We wanted to confirm the potential of the pathogram as a research instrument and to establish a basic needs profile for each of the groups.

The subjects for the study included 51 undergraduate education majors enrolled in one of two Educational Psychology classes taught by the senior author and 53 experienced certified teachers attending an inservice workshop on applying the concepts of control theory and the process of reality therapy to the classroom also taught by the senior author. Both groups were instructed on the notion of genetic needs as defined in the Control Theory-Reality Therapy Workbook. Subjects were asked to plot their profile on a scale of one to nine in regard to their perceived need, time invested and success achieved for each genetic need.

The data were submitted to Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Computer Analysis. All the descriptive measures of central tendency were computed along with the percentage of respondents at each level for each sub test. T-test (SPSS-X) was employed to analyze the mean differences between students and certified teachers (t-independent) and within student and teacher groups (t-paired). Corrected alpha levels were utilized to make statistical decisions (Bausell, 1986). The .05 level of confidence was accepted as statistically significant. Table 1 presents the data gleaned between the groups, Table 2 presents the results within the student group and Table 3 provides the data within the teacher group. The profile for the student group is illustrated in Figure 1. Figure 2 presents the profile for the teachers' group. Figure 3 shows a comparison of the profiles between the groups.

Results

One significant difference was identified between the student and teacher groups. The difference occurred within the genetic need for freedom. Both groups reported similar perceived needs and success rates for freedom activities. However, teachers invested significantly more time than students in searching for such activities. Table 1 presents the results obtained between the groups.

There were several significant differences identified within each group. Table 2 presents the statistical data gleaned from the student group. There was a significant difference between students' perceived high need for belonging and the amount of time they invested in satisfying the need. Also they do not seem to be enjoying the level of satisfaction desired in regard to the belonging need.

Students reported a greater perceived need for power than the actual level of success enjoyed in satisfying their power needs. In addition, students also reported investing significantly more time in pursuing power needs with less satisfaction for their efforts.
Students’ perceived need for freedom outweighed the time they were able, or willing, to invest in locating freedom activities. In addition, students reported a significantly higher perceived need for freedom than what they actually enjoy.

Students also felt that they invested more time in searching for fun activities than they needed to (perceived need) but were still experiencing less success than they deserved.

Students reported non-significant differences within several genetic needs. Students reported no discrepancy between time invested and perceived power needs. For the amount of time invested, students reported success in fulfilling their freedom needs. The results indicated similar perceived needs and success rates in the need for fun. And finally, for the amount of time students felt they invested in belonging, they reported an adequate success rate.

Table 3 presents the significant differences identified within the teacher group in several areas of genetic needs.

Teachers indicated they possessed a strong perceived need for belonging, invested less time in this need, and reported significantly lower success rates for sensing a feeling of belonging.

Teachers reported a greater perceived need than time available for investment in the power need. Success rate in fulfilling their power need was reported by teachers as significantly lower than either perceived need or time available for investment in satisfying this need.
Teachers reported a higher perceived need for freedom than the time they had available to invest. Reported success rates for enjoying freedom activities was significantly lower than perceived need or time invested in freedom needs.

Teachers felt they invested more time in searching for fun activities than they perceived an actual need for. They also reported a lower success rate than they perceived a need for.

Teachers reported non-significant differences in the following areas of genetic needs. Teachers reported adequate success rates for the amount of time invested in fulfilling their power needs. Teachers indicated that they were matching their perceived need for fun by reporting success in this area significantly lower than they perceived an actual need for. They also reported a lower success rate than they perceived a need for.

Within each of the four basic psychological needs, both student and teacher groups indicated that their perceived needs were strongest, followed by amount of time invested and success attained in that particular need. Apparently, the greatest perceived need for both teacher and student groups is belonging, followed by freedom, power, and fun. The greatest amount of time invested by teachers was in fun, followed by belonging, freedom, and power. On the other hand, students invested most of their time in seeking fun activities, followed by belonging, power, and freedom. The greatest

### Discussion

The results of the between groups data analysis revealed an interesting trend in the data. As might be expected, due to similarities in training and career choices, the profiles derived for each of these groups resembled each other closely.

Within each of the four basic psychological needs, both student and teacher groups indicated that their perceived needs were strongest, followed by amount of time invested and success attained in that particular need. Apparently, the greatest perceived need for both teacher and student groups is belonging, followed by freedom, power, and fun. The greatest amount of time invested by teachers was in fun, followed by belonging, freedom, and power. On the other hand, students invested most of their time in seeking fun activities, followed by belonging, power, and freedom. The greatest

### Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Certified Teachers and Ed.Psy. Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Certified Teachers</th>
<th>Ed.Psy. Students</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Ed.Psy. Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belonging</td>
<td>Need</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Need</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Need</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>Need</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>-4.62</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>-4.62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>-4.62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 (corrected alpha)
Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations for Certified Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belonging Need</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Power Need | 6.66  | 1.44  | 5.51    | 52 | .00*|
| Time     | 5.75  | 1.68  |         |    |    |
| Success  | 6.66  | 1.44  | 7.32    | 52 | .00*|
| Time     | 5.75  | 1.88  | 2.03    | 52 | .05 |
| Success  | 5.35  | 1.54  |         |    |    |

| Freedom Need | 6.90  | 1.54  | 5.09    | 52 | .0001|
| Time       | 5.77  | 1.69  |         |    |    |
| Success    | 6.90  | 1.54  | 7.56    | 52 | .00*|
| Time       | 5.77  | 1.89  | 3.18    | 52 | .002*|
| Success    | 4.83  | 1.91  |         |    |    |

| Fun Need   | 5.73  | 2.09  | 6.07    | 52 | .00*|
| Time       | 7.09  | 1.64  |         |    |    |
| Success    | 5.73  | 2.09  | 1.79    | 52 | .08 |
| Time       | 7.09  | 1.64  | 2.32    | 52 | .00*|
| Success    | 5.33  |         | 6.58    | 52 | .00*|

*Significant at .05 (corrected alpha)

individual needs in freedom, which they ranked highest, and that there is limited success for the amount of time they are investing in searching for freedom. This may be even more true for certified teachers who now have professional obligations and full time jobs to attend to.

Several significant differences within the student group were identified. It may be that the students' academic obligations are interfering with their personal lives making it more difficult to accomplish a sense of belonging. In addition, continual striving to earn their teaching credentials may result in a feeling of not yet possessing a sense of belonging to the teaching profession until they are successful at their academic endeavors.

Within the genetic need for power, students reported a greater perceived need for power than the actual level of success they enjoyed. Furthermore, students reported investing significantly more time in pursuing power needs with less satisfaction for their efforts. This becomes more understandable when students are viewed in context of their academic obligations. Students often feel somewhat powerless to control their lives due to the limited amount of decision making they are able to participate in. For example, professors hold extreme power over students in a variety of ways, such as in determining what students will study, when projects will be completed, the date of exams, and the final grade they will receive. In turn, students may pursue power over other areas of their lives, such as interpersonal relationships.

Students' perceived need for freedom was rated as significantly higher than the time they were able or willing to invest in seeking freedom activities. Once again this may be a reaction to the time constraints put on students by their academic obligations. In order to fulfill their obligations it may be necessary to put their freedom needs in the backseat for long periods of time. For similar reasons, students may be reporting lower success rates and less time invested in fun activities than their perceived needs would indicate.

Many significant differences were identified within the teacher group on the four basic psychological needs.

Teachers rated their perceived need for belonging as higher than time invested or perceived success. The teaching profession is currently struggling for public acceptance and in order to develop a sense of belonging, it is conceivable that teachers are feeling the need to become more cohesive and friendly within the profession.

Teachers rated their perceived need for power as higher than either the time invested or success rate attained in seeking power. Teachers appear to feel they invest the time but are generally unsuccessful in attaining power. This may be a result of the current state of affairs within the teaching profession (i.e., the profession coming under national scrutiny and policy change).

Within the need for freedom, teachers also rank their perceived need for freedom as significantly higher than time invested, which in turn they ranked as significantly higher than their perceived success rate at attaining freedom. This finding may support the between groups finding; that professional obligations may somehow impinge on teachers' sense of freedom.

Teachers rated their time invested in fun as significantly higher than their perceived need for fun. Once again, success rate was ranked as significantly lower than time invested and perceived need. Perceived need for fun and time invested in searching for fun were not rated as significantly
different. This may indicate that the teacher group felt it was investing either enough time or, perhaps the only time available, searching for fun activities to meet their needs. If this is the case perhaps it is not the quantity of time that is lacking, but the quality of the time invested.

**Conclusion**

Pete's Pathogram proved to be a useful research tool while retaining its clinical utility. The authors efforts to quantify the genetic needs however will not end with this study. Plans are in progress to develop a more descriptive instrument that will yield a concrete score for each genetic need. Also, data are being collected from other population groups. As the pathogram becomes more sophisticated and we learn more about how to quantify the genetic needs the research potential will increase and the clinical utility will improve.

**References**


---

**THE DEPLORABLE STATE OF EDUCATION IN THE 1980’s: THE NEED FOR RADICAL EDUCATIONAL REFORM**

*Thomas E. Bratter*

The author is President of The John Dewey Academy, Great Barrington, MA., and is a long time advocate of the principles and process of reality therapy.

**The Crisis Continues to Proliferate**


Symbolically, the supports to the bridge from ignorance to wisdom, from immaturity to maturity systematically have been corroding. Criminally, there has been no attempt to repair the decaying. The problem is not self-correcting. Parents, politicians, and educators have been complacent. While there have been persistent warnings and criticism, there have been no concerted efforts to correct obvious flaws. Predictably, the supports to the bridge now are weak due to the benign neglect; and consequently, admittedly radical remediation must be applied or else the bridge will destroyed. No longer is it possible to paint with rust retardant. Instead, the supports must be replaced.

**In The Beginning: Teaching Was An Honorable Profession.**

Tragically, education attained its zenith during the first century in Colonial America. Teaching indeed, was an honorable profession. Individuals were invited to teach on the basis of intellectual competence and moral integrity. Teachers remained responsive to the needs of students and their families. The profession was consumer oriented. At the conclusion of each academic year, teachers wrote lengthy individual reports which, in part, influenced whether or not they would be invited back to teach. Teachers assumed responsibility for student failures.

Before the eighteenth century concluded, teachers assumed more power. They became arrogant. Instead, teachers began to indulge themselves by using either letter or numerical grades and subtly abdicated responsibility for student failures. Perhaps the most important grade was "Deportment" which provided teachers with their most potent weapon — i.e., intimidation. "Conform or else be punished." Since teachers no longer earned or deserved respect of students, they adopted oppressive tactics. Physical violence was justified for disruptive, non-conforming students who dared to talk or to fidget. Fear became the primary disciplinary tool. Falk (1941) suggests, "Fear was conceived as the only force which would
make men amenable to dominion... It was natural to believe that children, too, should be controlled by violence or the threat of violence.”

Indeed as Cubberley (1948) reports, many years ago a German schoolmaster summarized his 51 year career by noting he had delivered:

11,527 blows with a cane, 124,000 blows with a rod, 20,989 blows and taps with a ruler, 136,715 blows with the hand, 10,234 blows over the mouth, 7,905 boxes on the ear, 1,115,800 raps on the head, and 22,763 notabenes with the Bible, Catechism, singing books and grammars. He had 777 times made boys kneel on peas, 613 times on a triangular piece of wood; had made 3,001 wear the jackass and 1,701 hold the rod up, not to mention various more unusual punishments he contrived on the spur of the occasion.

Teachers no longer were “invited” to teach and continue at the pleasure of the community. During the late 1800’s, teachers needed credentials which became the sole determination rather than the humanity, the persona, the moral fiber of the individual. It was inevitable, in retrospect, once credentialling was implemented that a curriculum would be devised to ensure replication which no longer permitted the teacher to remain creative, humanistic, spontaneous, alive, and relevant.

During the 1800’s, teachers were not prepared or equipped to contribute to the common good of the community — i.e., its survival. Pioneers were forced to devote virtually all their energy to survival issues such as hunting, farming, building, cooking, making clothing, etc. Manual labor required strength, endurance, stamina, resilience and perseverance. The competitive and competent toiled diligently and performed vital tasks. In contrast, the weak and less competent taught and supervised children so parents could work without interruption. “Those who could did, those who could not taught.” Education experienced its first crisis in credibility but no one really noticed because they were too preoccupied building a nation and fighting the elements. Fortunately, as Kaufman (1984) reports, there were notable exceptions but the majority of teachers were neither respected or trusted. Irving (1880) immortalized the infamous Ichabod Crane, a caricature, who became a symbol for the incompetence of educators. Quite clearly, the “brightest and the best” males sought other occupations. Teaching was supported by competent and compassionate females.

The Women’s Liberation Movement of the 1970’s permitted hordes of capable females to free themselves from the shackles of the classroom to enter industry to compete against males. The massive departure of female teachers created an unanticipated vacuum which forced schools desperate for teachers drastically to reduce teaching standards. Goodlad’s (1983) sobering conclusion that, “Teachers are widely reported to be frustrated, burned out, uncertain as to what is expected of them, and suffering from low morale” is a realistic appraisal of the current crisis which confronts education. Goodlad suggests that, “Many of those personnel coming into teaching today appear to be less well prepared intellectually and academically than their counterparts of earlier time.”

Education continues to plummet. Tragically, the nadir still has not been reached. Compounding the labor shortage has been the encouraged premature retirement of experienced educators. School districts, in an effort to conserve tax dollars, prefer to employ less qualified teachers who receive less compensation.

Not that the College Entrance Boards measure much that is valid, but test scores have dropped precipitously during the last two decades. Teachers simply no longer can teach fundamental academic skills. In truth, if tested against Hirsch’s (1987) cultural literacy criteria, the overwhelming majority would be judged illiterate. With the popularity of television, which has become an indispensable babysitter, children now opt to watch colorful cartoons rather than read. Adolescents watch “soap operas,” and more recently, pornography provides explicit, exciting visual stimulation. Television is scintillating and titillating, which addicts its viewers. Criminally, children are labelled hyperkinetic as Schrag and Divoky (1975) have protested. Today, the newest diagnosis contained in the revered DSM III is “Attention Deficit Disorder” which ignores the frightening reality that the students’ ability to concentrate coincides with the time between commercial breaks on television.

Teachers are boring. The curriculum to which they are to conform is trite, reductionist, irrelevant, and obsolete. Really, is it any wonder when viewed from this perspective that students ingest psychoactive substances which permit them to escape from the banal, mechanical, and sterile utterings of passionless and lifeless teachers who do not deserve any respect, trust and admiration?

The Union: The nemesis to Quality Education.

During the last decade of the twentieth century, unquestionably the biggest nemesis to relevant, realistic, responsive education is the Union which protects the incompetent and pathological. The Union encourages mediocrity because it does not recognize and reward superior teaching and academic excellence. Collective bargaining reduces all teachers to the lowest common denominator which is antithetical to good teaching. Public indignation and pressure need to be applied to the Union to cease and desist protecting those teachers who lack the technical skills and/or are so malignant that students are deprived of their right to learn.

A Purge: The Partial Solution.

If teaching is to survive, there must be a purge of at least 30% who are incompetent, pathological, and malcontent. Massive surgery needs to be performed which will remove the malignancy, though it will produce permanent scarring. Teachers who are guilty of malpractice and moral turpitude must be removed from the classroom so they no longer insidiously threaten the ruination of a once honorable profession. Students are being deprived of an education. They are being brutalized. They are being raped of their dignity. Consequently, when some students who constantly are being criticized and condemned wish to preserve their sanity and dignity, they have no option but to reject the system by prematurely discontinuing
their education. This is a crime. It is impossible to assess the devastating impact that impaired, miscast and misguided teachers have on their fellow professionals. Scandalously, the net result is the demoralization of the compassionate, conscientious and competent who feel disgraced and disgusted by the mediocre. Knowing how difficult it is to remove an impaired teacher, many prefer to join the conspiracy of silence rather than to risk the disapproval, wrath and possible retaliatory law suit for defamation of character or harassment.

Obviously there need to be safeguards, because the potential for abuse directed toward those whose political beliefs may be different exists. The infamous Salem Witch Trials and the McCarthy hearings cannot be ignored. Like it or not, Teacher Associations need to adopt a code of ethics which provide tangible guidelines for technical competence and for moral, professional, and personal behavior. Should teachers abdicate their responsibility to provide objective criteria by which individuals can be assessed, most assuredly both the public and politicians, who already recognize the crisis, will do so in their absence. Any teacher, no matter how heinous the allegation, is entitled to a fair hearing and to be given the opportunity to rebut specific and tangible charges. Rather than to lose control, Teacher Associations need to appoint regional boards comprised of elected administrators, teachers, and “lay persons” to ensure justice will be done. This type of peer review will ensure everyone’s interests will be protected. Stated succinctly, no longer can the Educational Cartel afford to ignore the ugly reality that a proliferating number of malicious teachers threatens the profession.

Parents need to listen to student assessments to discern whether either remedial or corrective action is necessary. Parents can question other students to confirm valid concerns, and of course, communicate with other parents to ascertain whether the problem involves others or is idiosyncratic. Any parent can protest verbally or submit documentation regarding the alleged offense(s) to the school administrator who can substantiate or dismiss the claim. It might prove feasible for the school system to appoint an Ombudsman. School administrators need to become responsive, rather than engaging in cover-ups, to student and citizen complaints. The school superintendent will be required to perform vital functions by exerting leadership rather than being relegated to passivity by attending meetings ad nauseum. School superintendents by virtue of their experience and expertise are the ones who need to oversee this crucial process. Similar to coaches, who are held accountable to a team’s performance, school superintendents will be judged accordingly.

Once probable cause exists, depending on the specifics and the gravity, individual strategies and solutions can be proposed. Obviously for the most flagrant violators, immediate dismissal will be indicated. Should the offender refuse to comply to specific suggestions by becoming indignant or intransigent, removal from the classroom and re-assignment must be considered. The dysfunctional educator could be assigned to hall monitoring, study halls, play ground supervision or any other administrative or bureaucratic tasks. For those who are well-intentioned but may be somewhat deficient, team teaching might be a feasible remedy. It might be possible to convince a retired educator or a qualified volunteer to enter the classroom under the “supervision” of the less effective educator. It might be possible to encourage the students to assume an active responsibility to teach others.

Even if it were possible to have such a purge, there sadly is no guarantee that replacements will be as good or any better. Hordes of talented, committed, idealistic college graduates need to be enticed to teach. There ought to be financial incentives for those who have already demonstrated a capacity for academic excellence. Most assuredly, there exists a free market in athletics, despite the owner’s objections, so that players can negotiate the best possible individual deal.

From 1960 to 1980: A New Breed of Students.

Adolescent students today are too savvy and sophisticated to be duped by educators. The Congressional Quarterly (1970) asserts:

Student disorders during the 1968-69 school year gave warning of what to expect in the year ahead . . . A new assertiveness, incredibly brazen by standards of the past, has obviously taken hold of the adolescent captives of the compulsory education system . . . But its contempt for authority and its roughshod manner of expressing grievances are unsettling, almost frightening to the elders of the school and community. Even when motivated by youthful idealism, the challenge to authority thrown down by young militants has helped to create an atmosphere in many schools conducive to the release of aggressive impulses of less benign origin.

Due to the protests in the 1960’s and 1970’s, students have blown the lid off Pandora’s Box never to return to silent or subservient status. Bratter (1976) writes:

Historically, revolution has occurred when people have believed there is something to revolt against. The tyranny of the classroom has been a rallying cry for students for many years. The instructor who rigidly insists there is only one correct answer thus encourages destructive student dissent.

Bratter (1979) suggests that, “Educators have replaced the police as the enemy. The classroom and the corridor have become the battleground.” Any classroom where there are discipline problems must be considered prima facie evidence that the teacher is in trouble. There can be no justification to deprive students of their rights to be educated because they were unlucky to be scheduled with an impaired or incompetent teacher. Unless these malignant teachers are removed, predictably, during the 1990’s (rightfully so) school districts will be sued for breach of contract — i.e., failing to provide a reasonable and realistic education.

Glasser (1989) is guilty of idealistic education when he proposes teachers become managers and are underpaid. Glasser’s solution is premature because sadly many teachers do not possess the skills or charisma
to manage. Indeed, educators need to take control of their personal lives before assuming the awesome responsibility to produce catalytic conditions conducive for students to grow cognitively, psychologically and morally. Sadly, Silberman’s (1970) scathing criticism still remains valid:

It is not possible to spend any prolonged period visiting public school classrooms without being appalled by the mutilation visible everywhere — mutilation of spontaneity, of joy in learning, of pleasure in creating, of sense of self. . . . Because adults take the schools so much for granted, they fail to appreciate what grim, joyless places most American schools are, how oppressive and petty are the rules by which they are governed, how intellectually sterile and aesthetically barren the atmosphere, what an appalling lack of civility obtains on the part of teachers and principals, what contempt they unconsciously display for children as children.

Bruner (1971), more generous and objective than Silberman, echoes a similar sobering sentiment. Education “had passed into a state of crisis. It had failed to respond to changing social needs — lagging behind rather than leading.” No longer can American society afford to pretend, “All is right with education.” Our educational system no longer is preeminent. This is no secret. The carefully worded final report of the National Commission of Excellence in Education (1983) decries mediocrity. The title of the eighteen member panel appointed by the Secretary of Education is more direct and ominous: “An open Letter to the American People. A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform.” Beck, Namuth & Wright (1988) in Newsweek entitle their lead article, “A Nation Still at Risk” though they conclude schools can still be saved.

Epilogue: The End or a Beginning?

Undeniably, education is at a precarious precipice. Boyer (1983), who recognizes education simply is not producing the final results needed and desired, idealistically and naively suggests:

The potential of technology is to free teachers from the rigidity of the syllabus and tap imaginations of both teacher and student to an extent that has never been possible before. Today, teachers and school librarians can capture instructional materials — films, video cassettes, computer programs — and fit them appropriately into the curriculum . . . . The promise of the new technologies is to enrich the study of literature, science, mathematics, and the arts through words, pictures and auditory messages. To achieve this goal, technology must be linked to school objectives.

Boyer is correct. However, what the respected Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching report fails to consider is the dire condition of education. While most will find Skinner’s (1984) solution too cynical or radical, nevertheless the psychologist makes a valid point when he urges the introduction of teaching machines which can educate. Sadly, many do not comprehend the realistic legitimacy of Skinner’s concern. If teachers continue to fail to teach, why not replace them by machines, which is a lesson already discovered by industry. The assembly line of mass production, which thrust America into the modern machine age, gradually eroded so it became dysfunctional. The unions had ample warning but failed to offer any corrective remedies. Suddenly, the assembly line worker was identified as a casualty and became expendable. Technology produced the robot which replaced the worker. The elevator operator, like the dinosaur, is extinct because the profession failed to adjust to changing times — i.e. automation. Less than a quarter of a century ago, the motto in the military’s basic training is that the soldier was “the ultimate weapon.” No more; technology has surpassed the capabilities of the best trained human being. The message is becoming clearer. Perhaps the classroom of the twenty-first century will have teaching machines “lecturing” and “instructing” students. The benefits make bureaucrats drool. Teaching machines can grade standardized tests OBJECTIVELY. Teaching machines will replicate perfectly the curriculum so all have “equal opportunity to learn.” Teaching machines do not complain. Teaching machines do not demand salary increments. Asimov (1960) philosophically ponders whether or not computers will replace persons in the evolutionary process. A quarter of a century later, Asimov now knows the answer. Unless the classroom teacher is prepared to accept the challenge to make education vibrant and relevant, he or she deserves to become extinct. The mandate is clear: Start teaching or be replaced. It still is not too late. There is an element of choice. A purge of 30% now no longer appears so radical but instead is an absolute necessity.
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The question has often been asked, “What is the goal of psychological counseling?” According to William Glasser (1980; 1984), who originally developed the process of reality therapy, psychological counseling or therapy should help individuals take more effective control of their lives by utilizing fewer less efficient behaviors (which may satisfy some needs but also create others), and by replacing the less efficient behaviors with efficient ones (behaviors which satisfy one or more needs without creating new ones).

Interestingly, the goal of educators is basically the same as therapists since they, too, seek to help individuals take more effective control of their lives. Generally, however, both therapists and teachers have to realize that people will resist learning what they don't want to learn, but that teaching and counseling will become effective as soon as people who hurt discover they can learn a better way (Glasser, 1980).

Of course, helping people discover better ways is the main fare in the counseling setting, as is attested to by many of the case studies reported by Naomi Glasser (1980) in her book entitled What Are You Doing? In contrast, however, few such instances have actually been reported where similar results have been achieved in the classroom.

In light of this paucity of data, Parish (1987b, in press a.) has written articles suggesting how reality therapy - like procedures, generally associated with the counseling setting, should also be applicable to the classroom setting. Briefly stated, these articles promote the notion that people may not be responsible for what happens to them, but that they are responsible for the way that they deal with what happens to them. In addition, Parish (1988 a, b, c) has suggested specific teachable concepts that, if implemented properly, should be able to guide students into taking more efficient control of themselves and their actions. To date, two studies by Parish (in press b, c) have shown that these teaching approaches are indeed useful in helping students develop such control in terms of their self-concepts, level of internal control, and perceived interactions with others.

In the present study, the same methods and dependent variables will be used as in the two previously mentioned studies, but they will be used with teachers (rather than with college students) in order to determine if such effects can also be found in a more mature, and possibly more cynical population. To this end the present study is directed.
Method

A total of 23 practicing teachers (17 females and 6 males), employed by two school districts in north central Kansas, voluntarily participated in all three phases of the present study. These teachers did so as part of an in-service experience provided through the Office of Continuing Education at Kansas State University.

Phase 1. On October 12, 1987 at 9:00 a.m. these teachers (in a counterbalanced fashion) completed the following inventories:

The Rotter (1966) Internality-Externality Scale,

The Parish, Bryant and Shirazi (1976a; 1976b) Personal Attribute Inventory to measure their self-concepts,

The Parish (in press d) Love/Hate Checklist to measure their interpersonal behaviors as they perceived them.

Each of these instruments has been found to be highly reliable and valid, and has been successfully used in the past by Parish (in press a, b) to reflect change in college students who had been taught similar concepts.

Phase 2. Once the above mentioned inventories were completed, the teachers were presented an all-day in-service training session on October 12, 1987, and a follow-up all-day session on February 8, 1988, during which instruction was provided to help them (1) to better understand themselves, and (2) to take more efficient control of their lives. As noted earlier, this material was principally derived from Parish (1988a, b, c), who basically emphasized that individuals must make personal commitments to take control, that we are as we act, and that what we do is more a function of our own choice and not a result of undue external pressure from others. Between sessions the teachers had the opportunity to practice some of the ideas and/or strategies that had been proposed during the first in-service session.

Phase 3. At the end of the second session on February 8, 1988 the teachers participating in this study once again completed the same inventories they had responded to at the outset of the first session.

Results

A series of t tests were performed in order to compare pre-and post-course scores across the following variables:

Regarding the respondents' internality-externality scores \( (t = 4.90, df = 22, p < .0001) \), the mean post-course score \( (X = 6.43) \) was found to be significantly lower (i.e., more internally oriented) than their mean pre-course score \( (X = 13.48) \).

Similarly, using the Personal Attribute Inventory, the self-concept scores \( (t = 3.45, df = 22, p < .01) \) on the post-course inventory \( (X = 2.87) \) were found to be significantly lower (i.e., more positive) than the respondents' pre-course scores \( (X = 5.43) \).

Finally, the teachers' perceptions of their interactions with others \( (t = 5.74, df = 22, p < .0001) \) were found to be significantly lower (i.e., more loving) on their post-course ratings \( (X = 5.17) \) as compared to their pre-course ratings \( (X = 13.37) \) on the Love/Hate Checklist.

Discussion

In the present study teachers were able to develop greater internal control, increase their self-concepts and perceive that their actions had become more loving toward others. These findings are comparable to those reported earlier with college students (see Parish, in press b; c), and suggest that classroom instruction regarding the use of reality therapy-related strategies can help individuals (i.e., both teachers and students) take more effective control of their lives.

Having achieved these results in the educational domain, it seems clearer that there really is little difference between what can occur in the classroom and in therapy, especially group therapy. After all, in both instances we're teaching; the question is "Are we teaching efficient behaviors, and are our students and/or clients discovering how they can implement what we say or do in order to gain more efficient control of their lives?" Teachers and therapists need to think about this, and then do something about this . . . efficiently.
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EXTENDING THE THERAPEUTIC ALLIANCE: MENTORSHIP

Henry T. Radda

The author is Dean of Students at The John Dewey Academy, Great Barrington, MA.

"Wanted: Psychotherapist who is willing to be a responsible role model, who possesses integrity, and is prepared to become personally involved and continue academic and psychological growth. This individual must have the courage to articulate personal values to a population of non-trusting, skeptical, bright, alienated adolescents who perceptively criticize the inconsistencies and hypocrisies of adults. This therapist must be willing to withstand the obnoxious, manipulative and disguised defenses of these adolescents while simultaneously teaching them to establish healthy interpersonal relationships." This job description highlights the primary personal requirements for those who work at The John Dewey Academy. The philosophical basis of this residential therapeutic high school has been described by Bratter, Bratter and Radda (1986).

The psychotherapist who works with alienated acting-out adolescents who often engage in self destructive behavior, often needs to extend the treatment alliance to effectively help this difficult to treat population. Bratter (1987) briefly introduces the concept of psychotherapist as mentor which extends the traditional treatment relationship. This paper will investigate some of the principles of mentorship and in so doing provide justification for humanistic innovation.

Glasser's (1965) description of the personal qualities of the therapist suggests mentorship:

The therapist must be a very responsible person-tough, interested, human, and sensitive. He must be able to fulfill his own needs and must be willing to discuss some of his own struggles so that the patient can see that acting responsibly is possible though sometimes difficult. Neither aloof, superior, nor sacrosanct, he must never imply what he does, what he stands for, or what he values is unimportant. He must have the strength to become involved, to have his values tested by the patient, and to withstand intense criticism by the person he is trying to help. Every fault and defect may be picked apart by the patient. Willing to admit that, like the patient, he is far from perfect, the therapist must nevertheless show that a person can act responsibly even if it takes great effort. (p.22)

When compared to the more traditional analytical and non-directive approaches to treatment, it becomes evident how revolutionary and humanistic Glasser is. According to Corey (1982), the role of the traditional psychoanalyst is to stay anonymous and objective. Philips-Jones (1982) in her study of mentors describes:

Traditional mentors are often strict, demanding individuals who expect a great deal from their proteges, and who in return, go considerably out of the way to help their usually younger colleagues. The relationships are almost always primary ones that foster strong emotional ties. (p.80)

Her description of a mentor echoes Glasser's definition of a therapist regarding explicit expectations for improved functioning, remaining involved with the individual, and providing specific strategies how to succeed.

Levinson (1978) describes the mentor as teacher, sponsor, host, guide, exemplar, counselor, and most important developmentally as the "good enough" parent. Philips-Jones (1982) describes the mentor as teacher, encourager, model, advocate, and a bridge to maturity. Brown (1987) describes mentorship as:

Mentorship stands in my estimation as teaching and learning at their entwined best. In life span, it lies beyond the early totality of the family, beyond schooling as informational display without personal involvement, beyond the simple task-orientation of the workplace annoyed beyond the subjective focus of psychotherapy. With concentration on the world at large, it succeeds like nothing else in the cultivation of individual excellence. (p.13)

Humm and Riessman (1988) describe some of the dimensions of mentor as: role model, counselor, guide, coach, buddy, facilitator, advocate, surrogate parent, and tutor.

These adolescents are trapped in a catch 22. They need to trust and be trusted, to care and be cared for, but they have learned from past relationships not to care or trust. Furthermore, they have antagonized significant others who find it virtually impossible to trust, respect or like them. Glasser (1965) states the therapist needs to overcome this barrier i.e., to prove he/she can be trusted. The alienated adolescent simply will not heed the advice of an "expert" who may be a psychiatrist, psychologist, principal, teacher, or counselor. These adolescents are not impressed by titles; rather, they relate to the persona instead of the title. In order to protect themselves from being hurt or rejected and to ensure their survival, these disenfranchised trust no one including themselves. The therapist/mentor must be prepared to demonstrate personal integrity and vulnerability. The burden to establish credibility is that of the professional.

The charisma of the therapist, discussed by Woodward and McGrath (1988), is necessary during the early phases of treatment with adolescent substance abusers to establish contact. Charisma is the ability to project self confidence which inspires others to trust and have faith in the charismatic individual. The charisma of the therapist can be a sincerely confident belief that the adolescent is capable of change and success. The restoration of hope is potent medicine. The charisma fills a void in alienated adolescents giving them an internal reason to trust and accept the therapists' advice.
The concept of mentor has been immortalized in Homer's (1581, 1942) Odyssey. Before leaving to fight a war, Odysseus entrusted his son, Telemachus, to his good friend, Mentor. Mentor accepted the role of parent surrogate. He was trusted by Telemachus, and when Telemachus needed guidance he consulted Mentor.

The role of "good enough" parent has been described by Levinson (1978, p.99), "He fosters the young adult's development by believing in him, sharing the youthful Dream and giving it his blessing, helping to define the newly emerging self in his newly discovered world." This parent surrogate role and good enough parent describes a person whom the adolescent can trust. The adolescent becomes convinced of the continued commitment to his/her growth by the therapist/mentor, who continually encourages and reinforces the belief by raising expectations that the adolescent is capable of success. The healthy part of the adolescent starts to trust but is consumed by fear of rejection, betrayal, and abandonment. Consequently, the unhealthy part of the adolescent defends against the intimacy. The therapist/mentor needs to understand this process. These adolescents perpetually test the therapist until convinced the individual genuinely cares for them and wants to help. When the therapist extends the treatment relationship to include the role of mentor, certainly the adolescent can sense the added commitment.

Encouragement can be a potent therapeutic tool. Frank (1968) has defined encouragement as the ability to inspire with courage, hope or resolution. The mentor gives this gift of personal endorsement which is catalytic because the therapist is trusted. This is especially relevant to these adolescents who often times are depressed and demoralized. The therapist/mentor must attempt to inspire adolescents not only to believe in themselves but also to want to excel and in so doing justify their lives themselves. An example follows:

Before attending The John Dewey Academy, Peter had been expelled from three schools. Consequently, he viewed himself as an unworthy academic and personal failure. After initial questions, I helped him revisit a time when he had been responsible, when his dream to attend college was realistic. Sadly, due to his self-destructive and impulsive behavior, Peter stopped trying. He jeopardized his future by ingesting LSD. Rapport was established virtually immediately when I disclosed my personal failures. Peter identified with me and in so doing felt he might be able to succeed. Much to his parents amazement, when Peter disclosed his desire to attend an Ivy League college, I replied that if he really worked diligently we would exercise all the school's resources and best efforts. Peter began to dare to dream he is capable of achieving his potential. In one year, Peter has progressed to the point where next month he will submit his application to three Ivy League colleges.

Bandura (1977) suggests modeling may be a principle catalyst of psychological change. Humm and Riessman (1988) write, "One of the most important ways in which a mentor influences a mentee is by modeling adult behavior." Bratter, Bratter and Radda (1986) have described and demonstrated the importance of responsible role models in work with alienated acting out adolescents. The principle of modeling has been demonstrated in the self-help therapeutic community movement by Sugarman (1974) when he describes role models and their impact:

In long talks the junior resident expresses his problems as well as he can and the more senior one "identifies" with him. That is, he talks about similar situations in which he has found himself, and describes how he felt. As the newer resident listens and hears the other describe the same feeling that he had but was hardly aware of, and that he has probably never heard "anyone" talk about previously, a strong feeling of trust develops. He feels concern from the older resident. The two start to know each other as individuals as a result of these conversations. This means that, in this relationship at least, the barrier of authority is slowly broken down. Not only do they overcome the "authority factor" as an obstacle preventing newer residents from getting to know and understand the senior one, but the latter now starts to have a definite influence over the newer resident, who wants to emulate his "role model" and make him proud of his protege. (p.62)

Modeling subtly begins when the adolescent starts to trust the therapist/mentor and identifies with the professional by emulating positive and productive behavior. There is a desire to model certain attitudes and speech patterns. This identification becomes more obvious when the treatment relationship is solidified. Davidson (1974), a psychoanalyst, contends that in working with adolescents it may be necessary to allow identifications with the therapist if therapy will be meaningful.

The psychotherapist who is reluctant to share his/her own resolved personal experiences ignores a most potent incentive for personal change. Jourard (1958) and Weiner (1983) discuss the positive aspects of being genuine with the client through self-disclosure. The therapist/mentor presumably has achieved more success than the person in therapy and can share struggles - the successes and failures. The specifics of how to succeed may be precisely what the adolescent needs. Alienated adolescents can be helped by the therapist who is willing to be transparent and convincingly will demonstrate that it is possible to remain responsible and honest even when conditions are difficult. The therapist/mentor can demonstrate how constructively and creatively to relate to frustration, alienation, love, hurt, and friendship in responsible ways.

The therapist/mentor is similar to a good coach, who is willing to offer specific suggestions how to improve individual performance. The good coach will be tough, persistent, and demanding of the best the athlete has to offer. Anne Sullivan's relationship with Helen Keller demonstrates the determination, knowledge, responsible concern, and toughness necessary to help an individual change.
The greatest problem I shall have to solve is how to discipline and control her without breaking her spirit. I shall go rather slowly at first and try to win her love. I shall not attempt to conquer her by force alone; but first I shall insist on reasonable obedience from the start. (Lash, 1980)

Anne Sullivan was frustrated in her early attempts to help Helen Keller because the family indulged the child and remained over-protective. Sullivan had no choice but to confront Helen’s parents who inadvertently were sabotaging all efforts to help their child. Anne asked to work with Helen alone for two weeks without parental involvement and interference. After that period Helen was more disciplined. Anne knew she needed to be tough and demanding and that feeling sorry for Helen would not help her. The outcome of Anne Sullivan’s method has been reflected in the accomplishments of Helen Keller. If Anne Sullivan were permissive and allowed Helen to do as she pleased, Helen Keller never would have graduated from Radcliffe College. Anne Sullivan was persistent, demanding, caring, and loving.

Many proteges according to Philips-Jones (1982) praise mentors who were extremely demanding of them. She describes how these mentors were respected for their consistency and guidance. In working with alienated acting-out adolescents, the therapist needs to be unrelenting in demanding responsible behavior. The therapist needs to define and set limits which provide the structure these adolescents need to achieve excellence. Some may criticize this approach as being too simplified and mechanical. There is justification to program success, because as Glasser (1969) mentions, these adolescents have a failure identity which produces a negative concept of self. Once adolescents succeed, hopefully success becomes a positive addiction (Glasser, 1976). The mentor becomes the “good enough” parent who cares enough not to accept excuses but to insist that the adolescent work more diligently. Once a strategy has been agreed upon and a commitment made, it should not be minimized. These adolescents need to be held accountable to themselves or else they will lack the incentive to improve. This responsible concern demonstrates the continued support and interest in the mentee and his/her dream.

The mentor/therapist guides the adolescent how to “play the game”. These adolescents tend to be self-destructive. This advice can help them deal with every day problems, i.e. how to study effectively, work when they don’t feel like it, talk to a teacher they fear. These daily problems when solved may bring increased self-confidence. Bratter (1977) discusses the role of the therapist with alienated adolescents as advocate. He points out that these adolescents because of their self-destructive behavior may have closed many opportunities. The advocate may be able, for instance, to help a student present a case demonstrating his/her responsibility to a college and then assist the student to obtain admission. These students, after proving themselves to the mentor/therapist, may need this new chance. It is imperative that this advocacy role be done after the adolescent has stabilized his/her responsible behavior. The adolescent again will be supported and reinforced for his/her behavior by this type of action.

The therapist/mentor can teach helpful skills, i.e. logical thinking and social skills to the adolescent. To their credit, Glasser (1965) and Ellis (1972) recognize how important direct teaching is to therapy. Ellis (1972) teaches his clients logical methods of dealing with problems. Bandura (1977) embraces teaching rather than the therapy model. Cognitive therapists view teaching new behaviors and attitudes more important than the traditional goal of providing insight. Levinson (1978) says: “the mentor acquaints the mentee with knowledge of the values, customs, resources, and cast of characters that the mentee will need to have knowledge of to maximize chances of success.” Philips-Jones (1982) describes; “Mentors are knowledge-providers and skill-builders, and after the all-encompassing blessing of encouragement, teaching is what most of them do best” (p.38). Acting out alienated adolescents need to be taught not just academic facts. There is a void in their lives. The therapist/mentor can teach them healthy interpersonal skills, how to care about another, how to demonstrate love, how to be a friend, what is responsible behavior, and how to present themselves in a class or job.

Conclusion

The therapist/mentor model has proven successful at The John Dewey Academy. The concept of therapist/mentor has been used for a select group of bright alienated angry acting out/in adolescents but is believed to have applicability for other treatment populations. These adolescents, if they are going to change their self-destructive patterns, often require extensive therapeutic intervention. These adolescents have many latent talents and abilities covered by self defeating hedonistic lifestyles. The professional who chooses to help these adolescents to begin to help themselves must be willing to accept the awesome therapeutic burden to serve as a responsible role model and teach them how to succeed. The actively involved therapist/mentor describes some of the creative ways to extend the traditional therapeutic alliance.
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