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Abstract

The relationship between the therapist and the client is an important consideration for most models of therapy, with all models of therapy emphasizing the importance of establishing a positive therapeutic relationship. Quantitative and qualitative studies have shown that the relationship between the therapist and the client is a predictor of positive outcomes. However, different models define the preferred therapeutic relationship differently. This study was a qualitative exploration of a decentered and influential position of the therapist in narrative therapy. A video of a one-session narrative therapy case conducted by Michael White was analyzed using conversation analysis to answer the following research question: How, if at all, can White be seen to take a decentered and influential position in narrative therapy? The findings of this study provide more knowledge about White’s decentered and influential stance in narrative therapy. It is expected that this knowledge could be useful for education and training purposes, as well as for the improvement of clinical practice.

Keywords: decentered and influential, conversation analysis, narrative therapy
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Research shows that therapeutic alliance is one of the most important factors in successful outcome of therapy regardless of a therapeutic modality used by therapists and clients' presenting problems (Howard & Symonds, 1991; Lambert & Barley, 2001; Martin, Garske, & Davis, 2000). Even though most, if not all, therapeutic approaches emphasize the importance of creating and maintaining a collaborative, positive therapeutic relationship with clients, it is often unclear or insufficiently explained how it is done. Often times, these relational (or joining) clinical skills are assumed to be inborn or sufficiently possessed by therapists prior to any clinical experience versus something that therapists can develop and improve during their clinical experience and training. Therapists in training often hear requests from their supervisors to “go in the room and join” with their clients without really knowing which stance will lead them to the best possible outcomes. Therapists often face an impasse when they are unable to maintain and repair a therapeutic relationship during the course of treatment, and as a result of weak therapeutic alliances, clients are likely to drop out of treatment (Raytek, McCrady, Epstein, & Hirsch, 1999; Robbins, Turner, Alexander, & Perez, 2003; Robbins, et al., 2006; Sharf, Primavera, & Diener, 2010).

The question remains, how to create a positive relationship with clients? What needs to happen for the therapist to create the best possible condition for collaboration and respectful inquiry? How are therapeutic alliances not only initially created, but also maintained from the first session through the course of therapy?

One way to answer these questions is by closely examining the position or the stance of Master therapists who have demonstrated their clinical expertise in constructing
collaborative and respectful therapeutic relationships with their clients. This study focused on a decentered and influential position of Michael White in narrative therapy. More specifically, this study explored and described ways in which Michael White takes a decentered and influential position.

**Position of the Therapist**

Different therapists may take varying positions in relationship with their clients to achieve preferred outcomes. These different positions may be shaped by different factors. For example, therapists informed by first order cybernetic theories view “families as machines” and “therapists as repair person,” who makes “detached, objective assessments of what is wrong and fix the problems” by designing a strategic interventions to interrupt dysfunctional patterns (Freedman & Combs, 1996, pp. 3-4). In this worldview, a therapist’s position is that of an expert, given that he or she provides wisdom while his or her clients are receiving the expert knowledge without necessarily enhancing their personal agency.

On the other hand, therapists who are informed by second order cybernetic theories view themselves as a part of client-therapist system; they understand that “the environment as we perceive it is our invention” (von Foerster, 1973, p. 1). In other words,

the possibility of objectivity no longer exists for reality is understood as completely self-referential. That is, as we observe, we influence that which we are attempting to understand. Everything we see is filtered through our personal frame of reference and our very presence changes the context…the behavior we observe and the meaning we assign to it are our constructions. (Becvar &
This view acknowledges multiple realities and places even more responsibility on therapists about how they view people and their challenges, and what are the consequences about such views, and requires reflection on how they see their role in therapy and how they situate themselves in the relationship with their clients.

Parry and Doan (1994) stated that, “second-order cybernetics makes it clear that we can never even escape the influence of the perspectives and actions of whatever system we attempt to observe” (p. 24). Acknowledging therapist’s participation in the client-therapist system, Milan Systemic Family Therapy team developed practices, such as circular questions and hypothesizing, which promote therapists’ position in client-therapist system characterized by respecting multiple perspectives and neutrality. According to this theory, “the problem does not exist independently of ‘observing systems’ that are reciprocally and collectively defining the problem” (Boscolo, Cecchin, Hoffman, & Penn, 1987, p. 14) and “the therapists can never know a priori how a family should be” (p. 98).

Therapists operating from lineal epistemology might take an expert position in the relationship with their clients. They would try to find the root cause of the problem because they believe that all problems can be solved if the therapist discovers what causes a person to act in a certain maladaptive way, according to their modern theoretical assumptions. For example, cognitive therapists attempt to change dysfunctional cognitions and irrational beliefs (Beck, 1995; Beck, Rush, Shaw, & Emery, 1979). Psychoanalytically oriented therapists try to bring unconscious conscious by using techniques such as free association and dream analysis, by focusing on resistance and
transference and on restructuring of personality rather than solving immediate problems (Fenichel, 1972; Mitchell & Black, 1995). A position of behavioral therapist is described as a “controlling agent” (Skinner, 1953, p. 369) who aims to eliminate maladaptive or dysfunctional behaviors by operant conditioning.

Different therapists’ position in a relationship with clients can also be influenced by a therapist’s stance with regard to power, gender and culture (e.g., whose knowledge and voice is to be privileged in therapeutic process); their professional code of ethics and abidance to laws; their values, beliefs, biases, and previous experiences; their perception of people who seek their consultation (e.g., dysfunctional/functional, abnormal/normal, healthy/unhealthy, etc.); or their conceptualization of clients’ problems that are based on their model of therapy.

Therapists who are informed by narrative metaphor and social constructionist worldview are guided by the following assumptions, “1) Realities are socially constructed, 2) Realities are constructed through language, 3) Realities are organized and maintained through narrative, and 4) There are no essential truths.” (Freedman & Combs, 1996, p. 22). These therapists listen and respect multiple realities, explore dominant stories that have an oppressive or limiting effect for clients, privilege client(s) voice, focus on meaning instead of facts, ask clients to evaluate their problems and therapy and to take a position, and are reflective, transparent, and collaborative (Freedman & Combs).

This study utilized one particular template to explore the therapist’s position in a relationship with the client. White (2005) proposed a two by two matrix, which details four different therapeutic positions presented in the figure 1 below.
Figure 1. Michael White’s Model of Different Positions of the Therapist

The x axis of the matrix distinguishes between a therapeutic position which is centered versus decentered. A centered therapeutic position places the therapist at the center of the therapeutic interaction, whereas a decentered therapeutic position places the client(s) at the center of the therapeutic interaction. For example, a decentered therapeutic position is one in which “the therapist is not the author of people’s positions on the problems and predicaments of their lives” (White, 2007, p. 39). Rather, the client’s voice is privileged over the therapist’s expert knowledge.

A decentered position may be characterized by a not-knowing, curious, and respectful attitude in which therapists do not assume that they know the meaning of clients’ problems, what is important to them, and how they should live their lives. Rather, clients are invited to categorize and reflect on their experiences, and to take their
own stance how they prefer to live their lives. As a result of such inquiry, clients may experience “personal agency and the capacity for responsible action” (White, 2007, p. 289) and they may feel empowered “to pursue what is precious to them” (p. 59).

Therefore, a decentered position of the therapist is likely to create opportunities in conversation for more in-depth exploration of clients’ problems in relation to their preferences, which is usually different from what our clients experience in their lives. Often, our clients “have been simply subject to the meanings given and the position taken by others on developments of their lives” (White, 2007, p. 220).

People tend to judge themselves and others based on a contemporary cultural norms for what it means to be a “real” person, worthy, successful, normal, healthy, and so forth (White, 2002). In other words, “there is nothing in the mind that is not first in society” (Gergen, 2009, p. 92). Often, people try to achieve the qualities that are highly valued by their culture, and any perceived deviation can lead to self-criticism; feelings of inadequacy, personal failure, a sense of not being good enough, a sense of guilt, and exercising more self-control in order to become a better and more worthy person (Maisel, Epston, & Borden, 2004). A decentered position of the therapist helps in deconstructing and unmasking those cultural ideas and their role in clients’ predicaments.

In a centered position therapists take an expert role by diagnosing, intervening, and treating people based on their predetermined assumptions what would be the best cure for client(s) (e.g., changing their irrational thoughts, setting clear boundaries, enhancing differentiation of self). White (2007) believes that “when the therapist takes authorship in this way, the door closes on collaboration, and therapist is set up to feel burdened and exhausted while the people who are seeking consultation feel impotent” (p.
In addition, “when therapists do assume primary authorship in this way, it is common for them to enter into a ‘convincing mode’ in which their responses are primarily limited to giving affirmations, pointing out positives, and making attempts at reframing” (p. 233). This stance is characterized by modernist perspective or “positive explanation” of the world and assumes existence of therapists’ objectivity.

The y axis distinguishes between a position in which the therapist is influential versus a position in which the therapist is relatively non-influential. An influential therapist views their role as more active in stimulating the conditions for change and takes responsibility for enacting those conditions. White (2005) stated:

The therapist is influential not in the sense of imposing an agenda or in the sense of delivering interventions, but in the sense of building a scaffold, through questions and reflections, that makes it possible for people to: a) more richly describe the alternative stories of their lives, b) step into and to explore some of the neglected territories of their lives, and to c) become more significantly acquainted with the knowledges and skills of their lives that are relevant to addressing the concerns, predicaments and problems that are at hand. (p. 9)

On the other hand, a non-influential therapist sees himself or herself in a more conversational role, which incorporates non-directive responses to client statements. Examples of decentered and non-influential position can be found, for example, in collaborative language systems therapy in which “the therapist does not control the interview by influencing the conversation toward particular direction in the sense of content or outcome, nor is the therapist responsible for the direction of change” (Anderson & Goolishian, 1988, p. 385). Rather, the therapist, through dialogue,
collaborates with clients in order to understand them and “to involve oneself in the coevolution of understanding and meaning” (p. 385).

Therapists are active participants in therapeutic conversations and have a responsibility for creating conditions for preferred outcomes. “How therapists respond to people’s stories is critically important” (Duvall & Beres, 2011, p. 35). How they select and interpret what they hear, what they see or what they don’t see, and how they use knowledge and prioritize, it all has consequences in what might develop in a therapeutic conversation. Bateson (1972) in interpreting Kant stated that, “the most elementary aesthetic act is the selection of a fact” (p. 459). Depending on what they select and how therapists respond to clients’ stories, therapists may find themselves being useful to perpetuating clients’ problems or to even causing harm (e.g., re-traumatizing), which also inevitably affects their relationships. Gale (1996) explained that, “an individual’s action is not independent of the actions of others but is patterned in relationship to others’ actions” (p. 109).

Given that a therapist is a part of a therapist-client system, according to second order cybernetics, and that his or her role is to create positive relationships with his or her clients, it would be useful to explore in more depth a therapeutic conversation by looking at the position of the therapist. This study is focused on exploring a decentered and influential position, which is used in narrative therapy. However, this position is not limited to narrative therapists; it can be also used in other treatment modalities. It is not intention of this study to claim that this is the only useful stance in therapeutic conversation, but, rather, to discover how Michael White uses a decentered and influential position in his performance of narrative therapy with a family.
Research question

This qualitative research study addressed the following question: How, if at all, can Michael White be seen to take a decentered and influential position in narrative therapy?

Purpose of Current Study

The purpose of this study is to explore and better understand the performance of the decentered and influential position of the therapist in narrative therapy by studying Michael White’s talk. This study provides more details about different ways in which White can be observed to use a decentered and influential position. My decision to explore a decentered and influential position of the therapist is based on lack of research in this area, since creating and maintaining a positive client-therapist relationship or therapeutic alliance is an important factor in the successful outcome of therapy, regardless of a therapeutic modality used by therapists, and clients' presenting problems (Howard & Symonds, 1991; Lambert & Barley, 2001; Martin, Garske, & Davis, 2000). It is my clinical experience that this stance has a potential to create profoundly positive relationships with clients, which in turn led to positive outcomes.

The findings of this research may expand the scope and depth of knowledge in understanding how to relate with clients taking a decentered and influential position by providing the data that is rich in details. This knowledge could also help marriage and family therapists in training learn how to practice a decentered and influential position in order to establish positive relationships with clients and possibly avoid burnout (White, 2007).
I utilized a video recorded narrative therapy session conducted by Michael White consulting with a family and conducted a conversation analysis (CA) to answer the research question. White’s video narrative therapy session was used because he invented the idea of a decentered but influential position.

For the purposes of this study, I used conversational analysis (CA) method of qualitative analysis. CA is a useful research method for studying how relationships and identities are created through language, which is consistent with social constructionism and second-order cybernetics (Gale, 1996). Gale stated that,

CA is a qualitative research method that is inductive, discovery-oriented, and concerned with process (the “how” question); analyzes participants’ displayed understandings of interactions; and is iterative. There is continuous recursion between listening to segments of the talk, transcribing the segments, developing categories of patterns, and comparing these categories with subsequent segments of talk. (pp. 111-112)

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I introduced the current study. In Chapter 2, I critically examine and discuss the most recent relevant literature related to the research question. In Chapter 3, I present the details of the research process. The methodology section includes the following: selecting data, data collection, self-of the researcher, data analysis, and trustworthiness of the method. Chapter 4 will present detailed data analysis of short segments from the transcript of therapeutic conversation. Lastly, in chapter 5 I will reflect upon completed research and discuss implications of the study, future directions for research, and limitations of this study.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter, I examine the existing literature that is relevant to this study’s research questions. In the first part of the literature review, I explore different positions of the therapist in the therapeutic relationship with clients based on different linear and systemic psychotherapy approaches in counseling and marriage and family therapy field. In the second part of this chapter, I review findings of outcome research studies on therapeutic alliance and specific presenting problems. Finally, narrative therapy practices and assumptions are presented related to the position of the therapist in narrative therapy.

Part One: Therapeutic Relationships

Psychoanalysis

The relationships between therapists and clients have been scientifically studied since the time of Sigmund Freud’s psychoanalytic psychology in which he developed the concepts of transference, resistance, and countertransference (Horvath, 2001). Freud believed that the patient’s defense mechanisms block his or her repressed secrets, childhood memories, and unconscious wishes and that through free association those repressed feelings and thoughts can be analyzed (Mitchell & Black, 1995). Freud also believed that in a therapeutic relationship through the process called transference, patients project their conflictual feelings and thoughts, that constitute their difficulties, onto the analyst, who is then their object of love, longing or/hate (Mitchell & Black, 1995). Freud (1917) defined the concept of transference in the following terms:

We mean a transference of feelings on to the person of the doctor since we do not believe that the situation in the treatment could justify the development of such feelings. We suspect, on the contrary, that the whole readiness for these feelings is
derived from elsewhere, that they were already prepared in the patient and, upon
the opportunity offered by the analytic treatment, are transferred on to the person
of the doctor. (p. 442)

What this means is that what happens in the relationship between the therapist and the
client is a result of the clients’ unconscious projection of their repressed psychic
memories that are triggered in relationship with a therapist in which clients’ react to
therapists as they would to some other significant figure (e.g., their parent) from their
past. Freud (1912) believed that “the patient will wave the figure of the physician into
one of the ‘series’ already constructed in his mind” (p. 107) and the patient’s intense
feelings of affection or/and hostility toward the therapist is “justified neither by the
doctor’s behavior nor by the situation that has developed during the treatment” (Freud,
1917, p. 440). It appears that clients’ attitude toward the therapist has little or nothing to
do with the therapist’s actions toward them in their relationship.

Freud argued that, “the resolution of transference is synonyms with the resolution
of neurosis” (as cited in Bauer, 1994, p. 23). Hence, the main focus of psychoanalysis in
creating therapeutic change lies in analysis of transference and the analysis of resistance
(the impediments to free association) (Mitchell & Black, 1995). Freud (1917) suggested:

We overcome the transference by pointing out to that his feelings do not arise
from the present situation and do not apply to the person of the doctor, but that
they are repeating something that happened to him earlier. In this way we oblige
him to transform his repetition into a memory. By that means the transference,
which, whether affectionate or hostile, seemed in every case to constitute the
greatest threat to the treatment, becomes its best tool, by whose help the most secret compartments of mental life can be opened. (pp. 443-444)

Thus, Freud believed that therapist’s influence lies essentially on their suggestion in the process of transference and that patients can be cured when they become conscious of what is unconscious and when their repressions are lifted (Freud, 1917). According to White’s matrix on position of the therapist (as described in chapter I), the psychoanalytic therapists could be categorized as using a centered and influential position in the therapeutic relationship because they provide an expert interpretation of clients’ transference and resistance.

Freud acknowledged in his theory that the therapist can project his or her unfinished business onto their clients if their clients evoke in them negative emotional reactions, which he called countertransference. He believed that in order to prevent countertransference, analysis of the therapist’s unfinished business/psyche is needed (Horvath, 2001). It is assumed that by preventing countertransference, the therapist will be objective, neutral, and empathetic (Horvath, 2001), which is required for effective performance of psychodynamic therapy.

The psychotherapists who were influenced by Freud and stimulus response learning theory such as Dollard and Miller (1950) view the etiology of symptoms and therapeutic relationship in the following way:

If neurotic behavior is learned, it should be unlearned by some combination of the principles by which it was taught. We believe this to be the case. Psychotherapy establishes a set of conditions by which neurotic habits may be unlearned and non-neurotic habits learned. Therefore, we view the therapist as a kind of teacher
and the patient as a learner. In the same way and by the same principles that bad
tennis habits can be corrected by a good coach, so bad mental and emotional
habits can be corrected by a psychotherapist. (pp. 7-8)
More specifically in this learning process, in which clients are also supposed to achieve
insight, Dollard and Miller (1950) described the position of the therapist in the following
way:

The therapist shows exceptional permissiveness; he encourages the patient to
express feelings in speech (but not in direct action) in the therapeutic situation. He
does not condemn and is exceptionally able to tolerate the discussion of matters
that have caused the patient’s friends to show anxiety or disgust. The therapist’s
composure tends to be imitated by the anxious patient and thus has a reassuring
effect. When the patient has always received severe disapproval, the therapist’s
calm accepting silence is experienced as a great relief and a striking intervention.
In addition to the permitting free speech, the therapist commands the patient to
say everything that comes to mind. By free association technique the therapists
sets the patient free from the restraint of logic. The therapist avoids arousing
additional anxiety by not cross-questioning. By encouraging the patient to talk
and consistently failing to punish him, the therapist creates a social situation that
is exact the opposite of the one originally responsible for attaching strong fears to
talking and thinking. The patient talks about frightening topics. Since he is not
punished, his fears are extinguished. (p. 230)
Behaviorism

Behavioral therapists influenced by Skinner’s operant conditioning, Pavlov’s classical conditioning, and Bandura’s social learning theory believe that the positive therapeutic relationship is necessary for increasing compliance with treatment and for effective use of techniques, but not sufficient in itself for change in clients’ behavior (Corey, 2005). The main role of the therapist is to teach clients new skills through the provision of instruction, modeling, and giving feedback and homework assignments. In behavioral therapy, “therapists use behavioral techniques to change relevant current factors that are influencing the client’s behaviors” (Corey, 2005, p. 232). Behavioral therapists are active and directive, acting as consultants and problem solvers. The clients are expected to be active and motivated to change; they are asked to learn self-management strategies and to continue performing learned behavior or strategies from the session to their everyday life (Corey, 2005).

Unlike Freud, Skinner believed that “a concept of self is not essential in an analysis of behavior” (Skinner, 1953, p. 285). He said that, “If we cannot show what is responsible for man’s behavior, we say that he himself is responsible for it…Whatever the self may be, it is apparently not identical with the physical organism. The organism behaves, while the self initiates or directs behavior. Moreover, more than one self is needed to explain the behavior of the organism.” (Skinner, 1953, pp. 283-284). Thus, people have many selves and personalities or a “system of responses” (p. 285) shaped by reinforcements and punishments from their environment. “The concept of self may have an early advantage in representing a relatively coherent responsive system, but it may
lead us to expect consistencies and functional integrities which do not exist.” (Skinner 1953, p. 286).

The therapist’s position in behavioral therapy is that of a “controlling agent” (Skinner, 1953, p. 369) who initially has little power and needs to make sure that clients will come back to treatment. As his or her power increases during the treatment, the therapist becomes a source of reinforcement by proving positive reinforcements and also acts as a “nonpunishing audience” (p. 370) by avoiding punishments and objections. Skinner believed that “the appearance of previously punished behavior in the presence of a nonpunishing audience makes possible the extinction of some of the effects of punishment…The patient feels less wrong, less guilty, or less sinful” (p. 371). Hence, although behavioral therapists believe that a relationship with a client is not enough for change, they influence it by taking a stance in which they are avoiding punishments and providing reinforcements for what they select is important. These actions could be described as a centered and influential position as described by Michael White (2007).

**Cognitive Therapy**

Beck’s cognitive therapy is based on underlying assumptions that problems and psychological disorders are caused by illogical thinking, distortions of reality (e.g., as evident in paranoia and neuroses), and faulty information processing such as arbitrary inference, selective abstraction, overgeneralization, magnification and minimization, personalization, and absolutistic, dichotomous thinking (Beck, 1979; Beck, 1995; Beck, Rush, Shaw, & Emery, 1979). The role of the therapist is “to be able to empathize with the patient’s painful emotional experiences as well as to be able to identify his faulty cognitions and the linkage between negative thoughts and negative feelings” (Beck et al.,
1979, p. 35). The main assumption of this model is that changes in cognition will cause change in how the client feels and behaves. Furthermore, “therapeutic change is a result of clients confronting faulty believes with contradictory evidence that they have gathered and evaluated.” (Corey, 2005, p. 286).

Beck (1979) stressed that therapeutic collaboration is crucial for positive outcome of cognitive therapy. Rapport or “harmonious accord between people” (p. 51) is established when the client sees the therapist as someone,

a) who is tuned in to his feelings and attitudes, b) who is sympathetic, empathic, and understanding, c) who is accepting of him with all his “faults,” d) with whom he can communicate without having to spell out his feelings and attitudes in detail or to qualify what he says. (Beck et al., 1979, p. 51)

On the other hand, Beck et al. (1979) suggested that, “there is no standard set of behaviors that will induce a sense of rapport with the patient” (p. 52). Different responses and styles, for example, serious and detached or friendly and warm, would be more or less helpful for different clients in establishing rapport. How is that determined, Beck did not define. Regardless of that, cognitive therapists might be considered as taking a centered and influential position by applying their model of therapy.

**Cognitive Behavior Therapy**

In Ellis’s Rational Emotive Behavior therapy (REBT), therapist is a teacher who is often directive, persuasive, and confrontative (Corey, 2005). Both Beck and Ellis believe that clients have irrational thoughts; however, Ellis tried to persuade his clients that some of their thoughts are dysfunctional and irrational whereas Beck used more of a Socratic questioning to achieve the same. In addition, Ellis did not believe that a warm
relationship with clients is essential for a significant therapeutic effect (Ellis, 2003). On the contrary, contradicting clients based on their presented evidence, not hesitating to give their view, being one step ahead of a client, not being too sympathetic toward clients’ feelings, using strong language are some of the things therapists try to do (Ellis, 2011) in their assisting clients.

The underlying assumption of REBT is that emotional problems are the consequence of clients’ unrealistic and illogical thinking (e.g., their “musts,” “shoulds”) as well as their judgments of themselves based on their performance, in other words, their self-defeating beliefs (Ellis, 2011). An event in itself does not lead to emotional problems, rather, the client’s belief system does. Thus, clients are responsible for their problems and the goal of therapy is to change their irrational beliefs and help them achieve the unconditional self-acceptance, unconditional other acceptance, and unconditional life acceptance (Ellis, 2005). In addition, “REBT tends to teach clients rational and helpful behaviors” (Ellis, 2011, p. 198). Ellis (1976) criticized Freud’s and others idea of “ego” by saying that it has negative evaluating effects on people’s lives.

The self-rating aspects of ego, in other words, tend to do you in, to handicap you, to interfere with your satisfactions. They differ enormously from the self-individuating aspects of ego. The latter involve how or how well you exist. You remain alive as a distinct, different, unique individual because you have various traits and performances and because you enjoy their fruits. But you have "ego" in the sense of self-rating because you magically think in terms of upping or downing, deifying or devil-ifying yourself for how or how well you exist. Ironically, you think that rating yourself, your "ego," will help you live as a
unique person and enjoy yourself. Well, it won't! For the most part it will let you survive, perhaps—but pretty miserably! (Ellis, 1976, p. 345)

Given that the therapist is a teacher and a client is a student learning A-B-C model of changing his or her cognition (Corey, 2005), REBT therapists can be categorized as taking a centered and influential position in the therapeutic relationship with their clients.

**Humanism and Existentialism**

Humanistic and existentialist movements had influenced the development of several models of psychotherapy, such as Roger’s client-centered therapy, Perls’s gestalt therapy, Frankl’s logotherapy, among others. Humanism and existentialism both emphasize concepts such as choice, values, personal responsibility, autonomy, meaning, and purpose and believe that clients can make positive and constructive choices (Corey, 2005). They differ in that, “existentialists take a position that we are faced with the anxiety of choosing to create an identity in a world that lacks intrinsic meaning…(while) the humanists…take somewhat less anxiety-evoking position that each of us has a natural potential that we can actualize and through which we can find meaning.” (Corey, 2005, p. 166) Moving away from psychoanalysis and behaviorism, existentialism and humanism were considered a third force in therapy in 1960s and 1970s. The position of the therapist in models influenced by humanism and existentialism also differs from those in psychoanalytic, behavioral, and cognitive models of therapy.

**Client-centered Therapy**

Carl Rogers, who developed a client-centered model of psychotherapy, was interested in therapeutic alliance, more specifically, elements and conditions in psychotherapy that initiate constructive personality change (Rogers, 1957). Rogers
believed that providing a special relationship to clients is necessary and sufficient for therapeutic change to occur (Rogers, 1957). This therapeutic relationship is characterized by the therapist’s genuineness in the relationship, his or her high degree of unconditional positive regard, which includes acceptance and caring for the client, the therapist’s accurate empathic understanding of the client’s experience, and the client’s perception of the therapist’s acceptance and empathy for him or her. Rogers (1957) stated that this kind of relationship could be found in good friendships as well; however, the positive regard often becomes conditional. Rogers (1957) also believed that “diagnostic knowledge is not essential to psychotherapy” (pp. 101-102) and that therapists don’t need intellectual professional knowledge to be effective. His theory sees no essential value in interventions such as analysis of transference, free association, interpretation of personality dynamics, and so forth (Rogers, 1957).

Rogers had a significant influence on the practice of psychotherapy (Friedman & Schustack, 2003). He believed that “it is the client and not the therapist who best understands where the problems are and in what directions therapy should proceed” and he “viewed a person as a process – a changing constellation of potentialities, not a fixed quality of traits” (p. 317). However, he believed that the role of the therapist is to reflect back to client his or her incongruent feelings, and to help them become more mature and self-integrated (Friedman & Schustack, 2003). Rogerian therapists tend to be non-influential (non-directive) and relatively centered since they operate with a normative idea that clients should become more self-congruent and integrated, although what it means for each client might be different.
**Gestalt Therapy**

While Freud was focused on examining unfinished business from childhood that is repressed and constitutes intrapsychic conflicts, Perls’s Gestalt therapy focuses on here-and-now experiences of clients (how they behave now) rather than abstract talking about situations (why they behave as they do) (Corey, 2005). This approach to therapy is more experiential and promotes increase in self-awareness. For example, instead of talking about childhood trauma with a father, the therapist will ask the client to act as a hurt child and to speak to his or her father in an empty chair technique experiment as if the father were in the room. Perls believes that,

> No individual is self-sufficient; the individual can exist only in an environmental field. The individual is inevitably, at every moment, a part of some field, which includes both him and his environment. The nature of the relationship between him and his environment determines the human being's behaviour. With this new outlook, the environment and the organism stand in a relationship of mutuality to one another. (as cited in Kepner, 1980, p. 2)

Perls also believes that “clients have to grow up, stand on their own two feet, and deal with their life problems themselves” (as cited in Corey, 2005, p. 193).

In contrast to Perls’s way of working, contemporary Gestalt therapy stresses dialogue between client and therapist. The therapist has no agenda, no desire to get anywhere, and understands that the essential nature of the individual’s relationship with environment is interdependence, not independence. (Corey, 2005, p. 193)
Gestalt therapists pay attention to clients’ body language and use of language (e.g., their metaphors, language that denies power, language that uncovers a story), assist clients in increasing their self-awareness in present moment, create atmosphere in which clients can try new behaviors and new ways of being (Corey, 2005). They “do not force change on clients through confrontation. Instead, they work within a context of I/Thou dialogue in a here-and-now framework” (Corey, 2005, p. 200). They also emphasize the quality of the therapist’s presence. Perls (1976) suggested that the person of the therapist is more important than his or her techniques:

A Gestalt therapist does not use techniques; he applies himself in and to a situation with whatever professional skill and life experience he has accumulated and integrated. There are as many styles as there are therapists and clients who discover themselves and each other and together invent their relationship. (p. 223) Gestalt therapists are “willing to express their reactions and observations, they share their personal experience and stories in relevant and appropriate ways, and they do not manipulate clients” (Corey, 2005, p. 204).

The overriding aim of therapy as I see it is not simply to cure people (whatever "cure" may mean), nor is it to teach clients how to become more adept at manipulating the environment rather than themselves. Nor is the goal to enable each individual to develop a more differentiated and integrated self. It may be all of the above but the essential aim is to assist in the evolution of a self which can ultimately transcend the self. This means that at the core of personal development there is this central polarity: freedom and liberation on the one hand, and discipline and social responsibility on the other. It is the tension between these
opposites which permeates everything we do. (Kepner, 1980, p. 10)

Given that Gestalt therapists emphasize being aware and living in a present moment as well as identifying and working on “unfinished business from the past that interferes with current functioning” (Corey, 2005, p. 478), it seems that Gestalt therapists take a centered and relatively non-influential position in their work with clients.

**Adlerian Individual Psychology**

Alfred Adler, a founder of Individual psychology, believed that “we cannot think, feel, will, or act without the perception of some goal (Adler, 1924, p. 3). He stated,

Let me observe that if I know the goal of a person I know in a general way what will happen. I am in a position to bring into their proper order each of the successive movements made, to view them in their connections, to correct them and to make, where necessary, the required adaptations for my approximate psychological knowledge of these associations. If I am acquainted only with the causes, know only the reflexes, the reaction-times, the ability to repeat and such facts, I am aware of nothing that actually takes place in the soul of the man.

We must remember that the person under observation would not know what to do with himself were he not oriented toward some goal. (Adler, 1924, p. 3)

Thus, individual psychologists believe that “every psychic phenomenon, if it is to give us any understanding of a person, can only be grasped and understood if regarded as a preparation of some goal.” (Adler, 1924, p. 4) Adler also believed that “the psyche has its objective the goal of superiority” (p. 7) which is the main goal of every individual.

While Freud emphasized sexuality and aggression as motivational forces that drive human behavior, Adler saw people as motivated by social influences and success.
Adler also rejected Freud’s idea of division of personality into parts such as ego, superego, and id, because he believed that people are unitary organisms adopting holistic idea that “the total is greater than the sum of its parts” (Manaster & Corsini, 2009, p. 3). Individual psychology takes a relational view by looking at individuals’ social integration and concern. Because “we gain our standards from others; we do things because of others; and our lives are fully related to others…individuals cannot be studied in isolation” (Manaster & Corsini, 2009, p. 7). In addition, according to Adlerian theory, “healthy individuals are genuinely concerned about other people and have a goal of success that encompasses the well-being of all people” (Mangold, 2013, p. 4). On the other hand, “psychopathology results from lack of courage, exaggerated feelings of inferiority, and underdeveloped social interest” (p. 9). “Feelings of inferiority are common, normal, and functional, in that they serve as motivators to movement, but the direction taken as a result of suffering from inferiority feelings determines whether the subsequent behavior is useful or useless.” (Manaster & Corsini, 2009, p. 15). Adler (1964) claimed that, the origin of every neurosis is shown to lie in the individual goal of superiority always conditioned by painful life experiences of inferiority. The neurotic likes to consider himself a tragic hero in the human situation. The work of the therapist is to show the patient what he is actually doing and to transfer his egocentric interest to social activities and a useful life.

Adler was active and directive in therapeutic style and therapeutic relationship is considered important in “reawakening social interest” (Mangold, 2013, p. 9). One of the goals of therapy is to understand people’s motives, who they are and what they are after
The main aim of therapy is to develop sense of belonging and to assist in the adoption of behaviors and processes characterized by community feeling and social interest” (Corey, 2005, p. 100).

Adlerian therapists are assisting clients by identifying and correcting basic mistakes and faulty assumptions in their thinking such as: selfishness, lack of confidence, mistrusts, and unrealistic ambitions. They collaborate with clients in setting mutually agreed upon goals for therapy; they make comprehensive assessment of their functioning using family constellation questionnaire and early recollection diagnostic tool which explores how clients perceive themselves and others and how they see their future; they encourage self-understanding and provide insight; and they help with reorientation or reeducation of the clients in which “clients are encouraged to recognize that they are in charge of their own lives and can make different choices based on new understandings” (Corey, 2006, p. 111).

The relationship between the therapist and the client is not sufficient for change, but is considered “the foundation for facilitating change” (Bitter & Nicoll, 2000, p. 9). Even though Adlerian therapists try to establish egalitarian relationships with their clients by setting mutually agreed upon goals and collaborating during the process of therapy, they also take centered and influential position by acting as experts with ideas what needs to happen for an individual to be cured (e.g., changing their life goals, faulty assumptions, private logic, basic mistakes, lack of courage, etc.). Adler (1924) also said that, “Individual psychologists are in a position, if a proper procedure is observed, to get a clear conception of the fundamental psychic error of the patient at the first consultation. And the way to a cure is thus open” (vi).
Family Therapy Models

Cybernetic family therapy models had moved away from the linear, cause and effect way of thinking that is predominant in the field of psychology, and which states that the clients’ problems can be solved if we understand the root causes of them by objectively investigating clients’ histories (Becvar & Becvar, 2006). Family therapy models pay more attention to understanding how human behavior makes sense in their context by looking at interactional patterns, recursion, reciprocity, and shared responsibility in relationships and by assuming that individuals cannot be understood in isolation.

Systemic approaches in family therapy field can be divided into those that are mainly influenced by: a) cybernetics or work of Gregory Bateson (e.g., MRI, Milan Systemic, and Strategic Haley and Madanes), b) psychoanalysis (e.g., Ackerman, Object Relations, Bowenian, and Contextual), and c) von Bertalanffy general systems theory (e.g., Minuchin’s structural therapy). More recent family therapy approaches such as solution-focused brief therapy, narrative therapy, and collaborative language systems therapy are influenced by postmodernism and social constructionism.

The position of marriage and family therapists in relationship with their clients differs depending on their theoretical assumptions and their focus in therapeutic process, which is also influenced by guiding metaphors such as “systems,” “structure,” and “narrative” metaphors that organize therapists’ clinical work (Freedman & Combs, 1996). Freedman and Combs (1996) explained how in therapy with our clients “the metaphor through which we organize our work have a powerful influence on both what we perceive and what we do” (p. 1).
Mental Research Institute (MRI)

The MRI group moved away from Freudian theory that saw family as a source of psychic injury to looking at interactional patterns (Hoffman, 2002), which implies less blaming and less believing in individual deficits. The MRI therapy views “problem behavior not in isolation but in relation to its immediate context” (Fisch, Weakland, & Segal, 1982, p. 8). What this means is that it is not possible to understand behavior without looking at the context; each person’s behavior is maintained or changed by another person’s behavior in social interaction; and thus, “one cannot not communicate” (Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1967).

Moreover, to constitute a problem, a behavior must be performed repeatedly. A single event may have unfortunate or even disastrous consequences, but the event cannot itself be a problem, since a problem by our definition is an ongoing difficulty...(therefore) people’s attempted “solutions,” the very ways they are trying to alter a problem, contributes most to the problem’s maintenance or exacerbation. (Fisch, Weakland, & Segal, 1982, pp. 12-13)

Thus, MRI therapists believe that problems are maintained in recursive feedback loops of patterns of communication in which people try ineffectively to fix their problem.

MRI therapists take a centered and influential position given that “the therapist’s task is not just to understand the family system and the place of the problem within it but also to take action to change the malfunctioning system in order to resolve the problem.” (Fisch, Weakland, & Segal, 1982, p. 9). This model aims to assist people in getting unstuck from the interactional cycle of ineffective handling of problems by designing strategic interventions. Fisch et al., stated that,
The therapist must be an active agent of change. Not only must he get a clear view of the problem behavior and of the behaviors that function to maintain it; he must also consider what the most strategic change in the ‘solution’ might be and take steps to instigate these changes.” (p. 19)

Fisch et al. (1982) believe that “the client is not in a position to know how his problem should best be approached” (p. 22). Therefore, it is the therapist’s job to convince family members to apply strategic interventions designed by the therapist. Given that the therapist is an expert who is supposed to intervene in a family system, the great emphasis in this model of therapy is placed on ways to enhance maneuverability of therapist (Fisch et al.) and “selling” the task or intervention. Some of the tactics that provide therapists control over the treatment include “taking one’s time,” “timing and pacing,” “getting the client to be specific,” “one-downsmanship,” focusing on behavioral description of current problem, “who is doing what that presents a problem, to whom, and how does such behavior constitute a problem” (p. 70), and interventions such as “go slow,” “the dangers of improvement,” and other paradoxical interventions. The positive outcome of MRI model represents “the client’s report that he has been able to do something he had not been able to do while enmeshed in the problem” (p. 124). MRI therapists could be described as taking a centered and influential position according to Michael White.

**Milan Systemic Family Therapy**

Boscolo, Cecchin, Selvini Palazzoli and Pratta developed Milan systemic family therapy after studying Gregory Bateson and MRI’s ideas (Boscolo, Cecchin, Hoffman, & Penn, 1987). Milan systemic family therapy evolved over time from more strategic stance of a therapist to taking a “neutral” stance in interaction with clients with a use of
circular questioning and hypothesizing (Boscolo et al., 1987). However, the main, initial assumptions of this approach include that families are involved in “unacknowledged family games” in which “family members try to unliterary control each other’s behaviors” and therefore, “the task of the therapist is to discover and interrupt these games” (Boscolo et al., 1987, p. 6). The family games are described as a vicious cycle in which no one can clearly win or lose. Some of the interventions used by therapists to intervene are positive connotation, rituals, invariant prescription, and paradoxical interventions.

Milan systemic family therapy is a team approach that involves a structured interview sessions with a team behind the mirror. Sessions may be long and spread over several weeks due to “longer time period needed for a family system to show evidence of change” (Boscolo et al., 1987, p. 5). Initially, team included two male-female couples, one interviewing the family and one couple observing behind the mirror. Later, Milan practice changed into only one therapist interviewing the family. The interview with a family includes five stages: a) the presession during which the team discusses and comes up with initial hypothesis about family’s presenting problem, b) the session in which therapists will test and modify their hypothesis, c) the intersession or team consultation break during which therapists meet with their team to discuss their hypothesis and come up with intervention, d) the intervention stage during which the therapist delivers intervention, and e) the possession discussion in which team discusses family’s reactions to their intervention and formulates plan for the next session. (Boscolo et al., 1987).

The position of the therapist in this approach is influenced by three main concepts: hypothesizing, circularity, and neutrality. A therapist’s hypothesis is based on
information about the family and their presenting problem obtained prior to the first session and presents a starting point in therapist’s investigation. The therapist asks questions and listens to verify the validity of his or her hypothesis. If the initial hypothesis is false, the therapist will form a new hypothesis. “The essential function of the hypothesis consists therefore in the guide it furnishes to new information, by which it will be confirmed, refuted, or modified.” (Selvini-Palazzoli, Boscolo, Cecchin, & Prata, 1980, p. 2). The therapists also must come up with systemic hypothesis that “account for all the elements in a problem situation and how they link together” (Boscolo et al., 1987, p. 10). The hypothesis is based on how problem is connected to: each family member, to extended system, or/and to therapeutic or referring system.

The concept of circularity is most evident in Milan therapists’ technique of circular questioning, which is used to scan for difference. Selvini-Palazzoli et al. (1980) explained that “by circularity we mean the capacity of the therapist to conduct his investigation on the basis of feedback from the family in response to the information he solicits about relationships and therefore about difference and change” (p. 3). There are several categories of circular questions: questions about differences in perception of relationship, now and then questions, questions about differences of degree, hypothetical and future differences, etc. Selvini-Palazzoli et al. (1980) suggested that,

In fact, by formally inviting one member of the family to metacommunicate about the relationship of the two others, in their presence, we are not only breaking one of the ubiquitous rules of dysfunctional families, but we are also conforming to the first axiom of the pragmatics of human communication: In a situation of
interaction, the various participants, try as they might, cannot avoid communicating. (p. 4)

In addition to scanning for differences and verifying and adjusting hypothesis, circular questions are used to investigate “how each member of the family reacts to the symptom” (p. 6) and then how other family members react to that reaction.

Neutrality is third major guideline in performance of Milan systemic therapy (Selvini-Palazzoli et al. 1980) that shapes therapeutic posture. Boscolo et al. (1987) explained that what they mean by neutrality is “closer to multipositional than nonpositional” (p. 11) stance. The evidence of neutrality, as described by Milan group, is uncertainty from family members about on whose side was the therapist during the session. The therapist alliance shifts from one family member to another during the session as he or she asks another circular question. “The end result of the successive alliances is that the therapist is allied with everyone and no one at the same time.” (Selvini-Palazzoli et al., 1980, p. 6). Boscolo et al. (1987) explained neutrality as the following position of the therapist:

The therapist accepts family’s solutions as the only ones possible, logical, and congruent for the family at this moment…the therapist can never know a priory how a family should be, the therapist must act as a stimulus, a perturbation that activates the families capacity to generate its owns solutions. In a sense neutral position presents a double message to the family. It says the solution they have found has been perfect until now, but from this moment on they have entered into another interaction (the therapy) that will allow the therapist and the family to
invent together other possibilities from which new solutions may arise. (pp. 97-98)

In addition, Boscolo et al. (1987) said that when therapist is in neutral position, he or she is “free from family’s labels of good and bad... Therapist must view these labels as family attributes to be curious about, interested in, but not as facts to be believed. In this sense, neutrality operates as opposite of morality” (p. 98). Taking a neutral stance, according to Milan group, also means observing and neutralizing “any attempt towards coalition, seduction, or privileged relationships with the therapist made by any member or subgroup of the family” (Selvini-Palazzoli et al., 1980, p. 7).

Neutrality becomes a synonym with the effort to avoid induction by the family system and with the ability to move freely in therapy. Perhaps, for Milan group, “neutrality” does what keeping the therapist in hierarchical superior position does for therapists like Haley and Minuchin, without the authoritarian implications. (Boscolo et al., 1987, p. 12)

Although circular questioning, hypothesizing, neutrality, and use of reflecting team may classify Milan group more toward de-centered and influential position, their initial interventions such as positive connotation, prescribing rituals to act differently in order to change “maps;” paradoxical prescriptions such as “sacrifice intervention;” and their goal to change “the family’s punctuation, meaning the way a situation or event was constructed” (Boscolo et al., 1987, p. 13) could put them more into an expert and hierarchical position or/and centered and influential position according to White. However, when Boscolo and Cecchin separated from other two members of original team, they tried to improve their model by changing the practice and concept of positive
connotation into the logical connotations, by including O-team and T-team in their reflective team practice, by shifting from family system to including larger systems, from more intervening to model of questioning, and so forth (Boscolo et al., 1987).

**Strategic (Haley)**

Haley’s strategic therapy also focuses on communicational patterns, sequences of behavior, and therapeutic strategies such as delivering directives to change behavior of family members; however, Haley also believed in importance of hierarchical structure in family (Haley, 1980). Haley (1980) in his treatment of eccentric young adults suggested that, “For the therapist, it is important to acknowledge that a problem young person is behaving irresponsibly and must be required to take responsibility for his actions” (p. 43). He also believed that “to correct the mad behavior, it is necessary to correct the hierarchy of the organization so that the eccentric behavior is not necessary or appropriate” (Haley, 1980, p. 44). “The task is not to resolve all family problems, only the organizational ones around the problem young person.” (p. 46). Haley believed that “the therapist must be in charge” (p. 44) and take full responsibility for each case. Haley’s centered position in therapeutic relationship is evident in his guidelines how to work with young eccentrics:

The focus should be on the problem person and his behavior…The focus is on what to do now. It is assumed that the hierarchy in the family is in confusion. Therefore if the therapist, with his expert status, crosses the generational line and sides with the young person against parents, he will make the problem worse. The therapist should side with parents against the problem young person, even if this seems to be depriving him or her of individual choices and rights, and even if he or she seems too old to be made that dependent. If the young person does not like
the situation, he or she can leave and become self-supporting. (Haley, 1980, pp. 44-45)

Furthermore, Haley (1980) stated that, “everyone should expect the problem person to become normal and not excuse failure. The experts should indicate to the family that there is nothing wrong with the child and that he or she should behave like others of the same age” (p. 45). Other directives Haley designed for different problems can be found in his books Directive Family Therapy, Ordeal Therapy, and Problem Solving Therapy. Haley (1976) explained that directives in therapy have three main purposes:

First, the main goal of the therapy is to get people to behave differently and so to have different subjective experiences. Directives are a way of making those changes happen. Second directives are used to intensify the relationship with the therapist. By telling people what to do, a therapist becomes involved in the action…When they come back for the next interview, the therapist is more important than if he had not given a directive. Third, directives are used to gather information. (p. 49)

Haley believed that successful therapy involves a therapist who knows how to solve the problem and that “if therapy is to end properly, it must begin properly- by negotiating a solvable problem and discovering the social situation that makes the problem necessary” (Haley, 1976, p. 9). Thus, Haley emphasized the importance of conducting the first interview properly. This includes therapist inviting everyone who lives with a family to come to their first meeting, and conducting a structured interview that consists of four stages:
1) a social stage in which the family is greeted and made comfortable; 2) a problem stage in which the inquiry is about the presenting problem; 3) an interaction stage in which the family members are asked to talk with each other; and 4) a goal-setting stage where the family is asked to specify just what changes they seek. (Haley, 1976, p. 15)

Based on the assumptions (what therapists think) and interventions (what therapists do) in Haley’s strategic model of family therapy, these therapists’ position in therapeutic relationship could be described as centered and influential, according to White’s model that was defined in chapter I.

**Trans-generational Family Therapy Models**

While strategic therapists focus on here-and-now and solving the presenting problem (they engineer a solution), therapists informed by transgenerational models, such as Bowen, Contextual, and Object Relation Family Therapy which are psychoanalytically based, focus on insight and education, and how internalized experience is transmitted between generations.

**Bowen Theory/ Family Systems Theory**

Bowen was influenced by natural systems theory and assumed that “the human is a product of evolution and that human behavior is significantly regulated by the same natural processes that regulate the behavior of all other living things” (Kerr & Bowen, 1988, p. 3). These processes are described as two counterbalancing life forces: individuality that “propels individual to follow its own directives, to be independent and distinct entity” (p. 64) and togetherness that “propels an organism to follow the directives of others, to be independent, connected, and indistinct entity” (p. 65).
Bowen observed that, “the emotional functioning of individual members was so interdependent that the family could be more accurately conceptualized as an emotional unit” (Kerr & Bowen, 1988, p. 7). Rather than seeing individuals as mentally ill, Bowen conceptualized individuals on a continuum on their emotional functioning ranging from highly dependent and reactive individuals (undifferentiated) to those more autonomous in their emotional functioning (differentiated) (Kerr & Bowen, 1988). According to Kerr and Bowen, in order to improve one’s level of differentiation and reduce anxiety, a person needs to develop more awareness of and control over his or her emotional reactivity. Kerr (1984) suggested that, “an objective ‘coach’ is required to assist people with their parental families. People are never calm enough and objective enough when they begin such a project” (p. 21) and they need monitoring when they get lost. Kerr (1984) explained family systems theory in the following way:

It is a method of managing emotionality and feelings that depends on increased awareness and a gradual learning process. This learning seems to occur at several levels. At the “upper” levels the learning involves the development of new ways of thinking about the emotional and feeling process within oneself and as it exists in the environment. At the deeper levels it seems to involve a kind of deprogramming of one’s emotional reactivity, at least to some extent. (p. 20)

He also suggested that, “the capacity to have one’s behavior less directed by one’s emotional reactivity and skewed notions about others, and less directed by the emotional reactivity and biases of others about you, permits closer and more sustained contact” (Kerr, 1984, p. 22).
Kerr and Bowen (1988) stressed that “the level of differentiation of the self and the level of chronic anxiety strongly influence the vulnerability of a relationship system as a whole to symptom development” (p. 163). “Symptom development, therefore, depends on the amount of stress and on the adaptiveness of the individual or family to stress” (p. 112). Bowen believed that anxiety is transmitted over multiple generations and over time; when chronic anxiety is building up, the symptoms develop in family. More specifically, “the lower the level of basic differentiation and/or the higher the level of chronic anxiety, the more prominent the symptom” (p. 120). In addition, “the lower the level of differentiation, the more likely the family, when stressed, will regress to selfish, aggressive, and avoidance behaviors; cohesiveness, altruism, and cooperativeness will break down.” (p. 93).

Bowen also believed that “a family does not change from very good functioning to very poor functioning in one generation” (p. 13) and that “much of man’s virtuous behavior, as well as his dysfunctional behavior, is rooted in his evolutionary heritage.” (p. 22). People tend to manage high levels of stress and anxiety by emotional cutoffs, triangulation, binding of anxiety (e.g., drugs, alcohol, overeating, overachieving), by increased need for togetherness, projection, denial, and so forth (Kerr & Bowen, 1988). However, according to family systems theory, people can learn how to reduce their level of chronic anxiety that will lead to higher levels of differentiation of self. This learning “depends on having courage to engage emotionally intense situations repeatedly and to tolerate the anxiety and internal emotional reactivity associated with that engagement” (Kerr & Bowen, 1988, pp. 120-121).
Bowen believed that the therapist can and should be objective observer of different processes in family system, as well as that it is important for the therapist not to be triangulated by family members, which requires high levels of differentiation of self from his or her family of origin. When anxiety in any relationship becomes too high, third person (e.g., the family member, friend, therapist) is triangulated so that tension is reduced in the relationship by spreading the anxiety (Kerr & Bowen, 1988). Bowen believed that “triangles are a product of the undifferentiation in the human process. The lower the level of differentiation in a family, the more important the role of triangulating for preserving emotional stability” (Kerr & Bowen, 1988, p. 139). The solution to this problem is possible “if the third person stays in contact with the twosome but remains detriangualted, equilibrium will be restored to the twosome and an anxiety driven progression to symptom development is unlikely” (p. 146). Kerr and Bowen (1988) said that, “detrianguating is probably the most important technique in family systems therapy” (p. 150). They also pointed out that, “Nobody detrianguates completely from any triangle, but the process of achieving even small increments of change can result in some increase in one’s basic level of differentiation.” (p. 157).

Therapists informed by this model of therapy construct a genogram with a family to not only gather information about the family members and their relationships, but also to reduce the overall anxiety in a family system (Burnett, 2013). As a result of helping cool the emotional reactivity down, family members can become more “thoughtful and less reactive with one another” (p. 69). “By establishing the therapist’s own differentiated presence with the family, the therapist is able to affect the overall level of reactivity in the family. By not allowing herself to become ‘triangled’ by them, she is
showing that she is able to absorb some of the family’s relationship anxiety” (Burnett, 2013, p. 69). Bowenian therapists help clients “understand, challenge, and then better navigate the complexities of their complex family emotional system” (p. 70). The stance of a therapist in a therapeutic relationship with family members is described as objective and neutral, in which the therapist is coaching people how to better navigate their relationships in order to improve their differentiation of self and reduce their chronic and transmitted family anxiety (Baker, 2014). Given that the change is based on gaining new knowledge, insight, and understanding as well as implied preference for intellectual mode of functioning (responding rather than reacting), Bowenian therapists could be categorized as taking a centered and relatively non-influential position. They have ideas about what needs to happen for the family to function without symptoms, yet “the person of the therapist, rather than particular technique, is the primary therapeutic tool” (Becvar & Becvar, 2006, p. 151).

**Contextual (Boszormenyi-Nagy)**

Contextual family therapy is shaped by both individual psychodynamic and family systems sources such as patterns of communication, power, and transactions in families over at least three generations (Goldenthal, 1993). What is unique about contextual family therapy is its emphasis on individual’s needs for fairness in relationships and striving for balance between giving and receiving (Goldenthal). Thus, the role of contextual therapist is to help “people to think about fairness so that they can do something to increase the fairness of their relationships. Although insight into oneself and one’s relationships can be very helpful, direct action that brings relationships closer to balance of fairness is always necessary” (Goldenthal, 1993, p. 7).
Contextual therapists believe that people can be understood by assessing four dimensions of their life and relationships. These include: 1) existential facts, such as biological, cultural, historical, racial, and personal facts (e.g., losing parent at early age, growing up with divorced parents, having parent who is abusing substances, and etc.) which is important in uncovering injustices, 2) psychology, that provides information about individual cognitive and emotional functioning (e.g., their anxiety, depression, personality disorder, ego defenses, copying styles), 3) family transactions and power, which includes patterns of communication, coalitions, triangulations, boundaries, family roles, and so forth, and 4) relational fairness or ethical dimension, that is central in this approach and focuses on individuals right to give and receive, their use of constructive and destructive entitlement, their invisible loyalties, and possibility of destructive parentification involved in family (Goldenthal, 1993). For example, “constructive entitlement leads a person to enter into responsible give-and-take relationships.

Destructive entitlement leads person to act unilaterally in ways that may be destructive to others” (Goldenthal, 1993, p. 17). Destructive entitlement is believed to result from inadequate parenting, very early loss, any type of abuse, being victimized by oppression, and so forth. According to this model, acknowledging past or present injustices in person’s life is important because it reduces a person’s need to rely on destructive entitlement or parentification (Goldenthal, 1993).

In therapeutic relationship with their clients, contextual therapists are active and raise issues of relational balances. They advocate for all family members regardless of their presence in therapy. Using what contextual therapists call multidirected partiality, a therapist is not taking a neutral stance, but rather, is required “to work hard to see a
situation from the perspectives of each individual who are likely to be affected by the course of therapy” (Goldenthal, 1993, p. 19). In other words, “in contextual work, partiality can be more specifically defined as a therapist’s commitment to help everyone in his client’s relational world who is likely to be affected by therapeutic intervention” (Boszormenyi-Nagy & Krasner, 1986, p. 302). Goldenthal (1993) explained that, “a multidirected stance permits and even encourages taking sides, but requires the therapist to try to take all sides equally” (Goldenthal, 1993, p. 48). Timing, inclusiveness, empathy, crediting, and expectation that people care and do for one another are all aspects of multidirected partiality. “Multidirected partiality can eventually lead to a redistribution of intermember burdens and benefits, to a shift in transactions and roles, and, usually, to more responsive parental and marital care” (Boszormenyi-Nagy & Krasner, 1986, p. 304).

In order to develop a trusting therapist-client relationship and achieve multidirected partiality as therapeutic attitude, Boszormenyi-Nagy and Krasner suggested that, “a therapist needs personal freedom, conviction, courage, knowledge and skills, a capacity for empathy, and ability to claim his or her own private existence” (p. 400).

A therapist’s role is one of a concerned caretaker… he is needed authority to whom to talk, a wished for anchor point for security and stability, and a reservoir of trust…A therapist offers responsibility, skill, care, and the willingness to open up controversial, painful, shameful, and trying issues, earning trustability in the process…Part of a therapist’s usefulness has to do with nonspecific supportive help. (Boszormenyi-Nagy & Krasner, 1986, pp. 395-396)
In addition to multidirected partiality, contextual therapists use other interventions to address fairness issues in family relationships such as crediting, helping people acknowledge each other’s giving, giving room, lending weight, and exoneration (Goldenthal, 1993). Contextual therapists could be categorized as taking a relatively decentered and influential position, according to White’s matrix.

**Object Relations Family Therapy**

Object relations family therapy was greatly influenced by Freud’s psychoanalysis and object relation theory (Scharff & Scharff, 1987). This form of therapy “derives from psychoanalytic principles of listening, responding to unconscious material, interpreting, developing insight, and working in the transference and countertransference toward understanding and growth (Scharff & Scharff, 1987, p. 3). In addition to focusing on exploring intrapsychic of each individual in family in form of transference, object relations family therapists view family as an interrelated system and they explore contextual transference and countertransference in family system. These therapists “think of transference as the living history of ways of relating, influenced by the vicissitudes of infantile dependence and by primitive emotions of a sexual and aggressive nature that arise in pursuit of attachment” (Scharff & Scharff, 1987, p. 203). Thus, each individual brings his or her internalized object relations patterns from previous relationships to current relationship. The therapist sees problems in current relationship as a result of psychic development in early parent-child relationship and internalized object relations.

The relationship between the therapist and the client(s) is at the center of the object relations therapists’ clinical work (Scharff & Scharff, 1987). Object relations
therapists “provide a holding function that allows the family to move toward truly understanding each other at the core” and provide interpretation that helps family members to “modify their internal object relations system” (Scharff & Scharff, 1987, p. 62). The goal of object relations approach is to:

expand family’s capacity to perform the holding functions for its members and their capacities to offer holding of each other. Thus, the pairing of the process of providing understanding of their overall situation with the process of helping each of them to have more understanding and compassion for each other forms the essential of the task, which is analogues to, and derives from, the mother’s paired tasks of creating the mothering environment while communicating with the baby’s internal world. (Scharff & Scharff, 1987, p. 62)

Scharff and Scharff (1987) described the therapeutic relationships in the following way:

The object relations approach, like the process of raising children, is a matter of being with our patients. Our attempts to share our understanding are more than language. They are our ways of both holding the whole family and getting in touch with the family’s core. Our interpretations are intended to let the family see what we are doing to understand them and to bear their anxieties. At the same time, the interpretations offer the family and its members the opportunity to respond to us, to look us back in the eye, and to set us straight. They need to be able to do this with us if they are to manage to do it with each other. (pp. 62-63)

It seems that the therapeutic relationship provides opportunity for clients to learn a better way of relating by becoming aware of their unconscious object relations that are
troubling their current family relationships. For that learning and new understanding, the therapist creates a relational context in which:

the patient is forced to move toward the analyst for an attachment. Because analyst remains at more or less steady distance, the patient is pulled forward, out of retreat. This could be thought of as manipulation, except that it seems to be necessary condition for getting the internal world out into the open…When this happens, it is a matter of reliving old events from various periods of development…in present, where appropriateness and inappropriateness of the patient’s responses can be observed not only by the analyst but, more important, by the patient, who can then see which events in current life tend to trigger old responses-responses that treat the current person (the analyst) as though he or she actually were the internal objects. (Scharff & Scharff, 1987, p. 204)

Thus, the therapist is an observer who fosters insight and understanding by interpreting unconscious material and analyzes a defensive system of the family. Object relations family therapists also believe that “transference and resistance can be considered to be interpersonal phenomena, deriving from internalized object relationships recreated in the therapeutic relationship” (Scharff & Scharff, 1987, p. 206). When making interpretations, therapists are “attending to the links between what is said and not said and to non-verbal communications” (p. 8). Even though the interpretation is considered essential in this approach, object relations therapists believe that “interpreting that fails to lead to insight, or sitting back when interpretation is needed, certainly will not help families.” (p. 8). In addition to interpretations about current situation, object relations therapists use interventions such as comments about organizing session (e.g., calming
chaos), comments about transference, and giving support and advices (Scharff & Scharff, 1987). It appears that object relations family therapists take a centered and relatively influential position, according to White’s matrix described in chapter I.

**Structural Family Therapy**

Structural family therapists facilitate the transformation of the family structure by first joining the family system as a leader, then by evaluating underlying family structure, and finally by creating “circumstances that will allow the transformation of this structure” (Minuchin, 1974, p. 111). What Minuchin meant by leadership is that the therapist is responsible for what happens in therapy and whether family members reach their growth and healing (Minuchin, 1974). Structural family therapists could be described as taking a centered and influential position in therapeutic relationship because “The therapist must assess the family and develop therapeutic goals based on that assessment. And he must intervene in ways that facilitate the transformation of the family system in the direction of those goals” (Minuchin, 1974, p. 111). Moreover, Minuchin (1974) designed several interventions or operations for restructuring that therapists may use in assisting the families that consult them. These include but are not limited to: “actualizing family transactional patterns, marking boundaries, escalating stress, assigning tasks, utilizing symptoms, manipulating mood, and supporting, educating, or guiding” (p. 140).

The relationship between the therapist and the family is of great importance in structural family therapy. Minuchin (1974) pointed out that, “Unless the therapist can join the family and establish a therapeutic system, restructuring cannot occur, and any attempt to achieve the therapeutic goals will fail” (p. 123). Minuchin further explained that, “When the therapist joins the family, he has two main tasks. He must accommodate
to the family, but he also must maintain himself in a position of leadership within the therapeutic unit.” (p. 139). Minuchin’s leadership and expert position can be evident from the following excerpt:

For instance, in a situation in which a fourteen-year-old child is having difficulties in school and his parents are in conflict about how to deal with this, I might make three interventions. Joining the husband, I would say, “A coalition between your wife and your son is making you helpless.” Joining the wife, I would say, “The inability of your husband and son to resolve conflicts is overburdening you, making you responsible for taking care of both of them.” Joining the son, I would say, “Your father and mother are arguing about your difficulties in school without giving you any chance to participate. They are keeping you younger than you are.” I then ask them to enact a change in the session. (Minuchin, 1974, p. 121)

It appears that Minuchin tries to join with each family member by providing his expert knowledge in form of multiple interpretations. Minuchin (1974) also described his stance in the relationship with his clients in the following way:

I have learned to disengage myself and to direct the family members to play out their own drama while I am observing. I am spontaneous with interventions, having learned to trust my responses to families. But I continuously observe the order and rhythm of family communications, making conscious decisions about when to talk to whom.

As a therapist, I tend to act like a distant relative. I like to tell anecdotes about my own experiences and thinking, and to include things I have read or heard that are relevant to the particular family. I try to assimilate the family’s language and to
build metaphors using the family’s language and myths. These methods telescope time, investing an encounter between strangers with the affect of an encounter between old acquaintances. They are accommodation techniques, which are vital to the process of joining. (p. 122)

In order to join with, and subsequently intervene in a family, the therapist needs to accommodate or adapt to the family (Minuchin, 1974). In other words, To join a family system, the therapist must accept the family’s organization and style and blend with them. He must experience the family’s transactional patterns and the strength of those patterns...He must accommodate to the family, and intervene in a manner that the particular family can accept. (pp. 123-125).

Minuchin (1974) believed that the therapist could change the family and “has the skills to do so. But his goals, his tactics, and his stratagems are all dependent on the process of joining” (p. 125). He proposed several accommodation techniques that may help not only with joining but also may serve as a restructuring operation. These techniques include: a) maintenance (e.g., supporting certain subsystems, accepting labeling of identified patient temporarily, confirming individuals); b) tracking (e.g., asking clarifying questions, giving approving comments, asking them to continue conversation); and c) mimesis (e.g., adopting family’s pace in communication, mimicking behavior, sharing common personal experiences with clients). Given that structural therapists position themselves as leaders with expert knowledge, who have normative ideas about what constitutes functional/dysfunctional families, and are very active in intervening through restructuring operations in order “to increase the flexibility of (these) underlying structures” (Minuchin & Nichols, 1993, p. 40), they could be described as taking a
centered and influential position in their relationship with clients, according to White’s matrix.

**Virginia Satir**

Satir’s model of family therapy is focused on teaching families congruent communication and achieving wholeness as a person (Satir, 1975). Satir (1975) believed that it is the therapist’s responsibility whether family grows or not; therefore, she considered “the therapist the leader of the treatment situation” (p. 38) with “primary responsibility of change agent” (p. 37). Problems are seen as a result of low self-esteem, which leads to dysfunctional communication (Satir, 1967). According to Satir, in times of stress, individuals tend to handle communication using five different modes of communication: 1) placating, 2) blaming, 3) super-reasonable, 4) irrelevant, and 5) congruent. The goal of therapy is to help clients get in touch with their experience and to become congruent in what they feel and communicate (Satir, 1975).

Making it possible for people again to see freely and comment openly on what they see, to be able to hear freely and comment on what they hear, and to be able to touch freely and be able to comment openly on that experience – these comprise the restorative task. (Satir, 1975, p. 82)

Satir (1975) also believed that “pain comes from the feeling of being alienated, of feeling not loved, or feeling doubtful about your lovability” (p. 79) and that “illness comes from …the person’s inability to use all his parts“ (p. 83). Satir said, “If you were to see me interview families, you would find that I put more attention on looking, hearing, and touching, than I do on the talk about the problem” (pp. 82-83). She would ask families to role-play different communication modes and then get in touch with how they felt in their
roles and how connected they felt with the rest of the family (Satir, 1975). In this sculpting technique or exercise, family members are able to achieve new awareness and interpretations by experiencing themselves and their feelings in a safe environment. In addition to sculpting, Satir (1975) used metaphors, games, and humor as techniques to intervene. Satir (1975) believed that “to help a human being change and grow, the reconstruction of that person takes place 1) in the area of communication, 2) in the area of belief about being able to grow, and 3) in the area of restoring the use of senses.” (p. 83). In her earlier writing, Satir (1967) stressed that maturity is what makes a person functional. A mature or functional person will:

a. manifest himself clearly to others.

b. be in touch with signals from his internal self, thus letting himself know openly what he thinks and feels.

c. be able to see and hear what is outside himself as differentiated from himself and as different from anything else.

d. behave toward another person as someone separate from himself and unique.

e. treat the presence of different-ness as an opportunity to learn and explore rather than as threat or a signal for conflict.

f. deal with persons and situations in their context, in terms of “how it is” rather than how he wishes it were or expects it to be.

g. accepts responsibility for what he feels, thinks, hears and sees, rather than denying it or attributing it to others.

h. have techniques for openly negotiating the giving, receiving and checking the meaning between himself and others. (Satir, 1967, p. 92)
Satir (1967) saw the role of the therapist as a “resource person” who has “a special
advantage in being able to study the patient’s family situation as an experienced observer,
while remaining outside it” and who is a “model of communication” (p. 97). “The
therapist will not only exemplify what he means by clear communication, but he will
teach his patients how to achieve it” (Satir, 1967, p. 100). Satir (1967) recommended that
“the family therapist not only intervene in family therapy sessions but that he also
structure at least the first two sessions by taking a family life chronology” (p. 112).
Based on predetermined assumptions in this model about what constitutes healthy and
unhealthy individual and what causes problems as well as what leads to being more
congruent and healthy, therapists using this approach could be characterized as taking a
centered and influential position in their relationship with people who consult them,
according to White. This model is also an example of first order cybernetics given that a
therapist is outside of family system, acting as an expert observer, who diagnoses
communicational patterns and then provides input through teaching of more congruent
communication.

Carl Whitaker

Whitaker’s symbolic-experiential therapy emphasizes emotional experiences of
family members, being personal and honest, and exposing personal pain as essential
requirement for change (Whitaker & Bumberry, 1988). Whitaker and Bumberry stated:

We organize our lives around our own limited, internal representational systems.
The richer and more diverse this world, the more freedom and creativity we have.
If we can aid in expansion of the symbolic world of the families we see, they can
live richer lives. (p. 75)
They added that symbolic-experiential therapy is focused on “helping people become more comfortable in their impulse living, to be less frightened by it, and to integrate it more fully into their concrete living” (Whitaker & Bumberry, 1988, p. 79). In other words, “Symbolic therapy is an effort to deal with the representation system underneath what’s actually being said. It involves picking up on the symbolic bits and fragments that you detect or sense” (Whitaker & Bumberry, 1988, p. 78). Whitaker used different strategies to help people become more emotionally engaged with each other and to achieve growth, which he described as: “an increased tolerance for the absurdity of life” and “achieving the state of balance between belonging and individuating” (Whitaker & Bumberry, 1988, p. 86). His strategies include, but are not limited to, sharing his association, reframing, relabeling interactions, introducing confusion so that clients’ explanation of the symptom is expanded, offering ridiculous solutions, pressing them in opposite direction, overstating the issues, blaming someone for being dishonest to provoke response, and so forth (Whitaker & Bumberry, 1988). Whitaker believed that, “True emotional growth occurs only as a result of experience” (p. 85) and that, “Insights and understanding happen as a result of experience, not as a precursor to it” (p. 86).

Carl Whitaker saw “the whole family as the patient” (Whitaker & Bumberry, 1988, p. 59) since he believed that “all of life and all of pathology is interpersonal” (p. 36). He also believed that people “seek simultaneously deeper levels of belonging and individuating” (p. 10); that, “they have within themselves the capacity to struggle and grow” (p. 20); and that, “they need to accept the fact that they remain responsible for their own living” (p. 6). At the beginning of the treatment, Whitaker explains his
expectations and also asks family members “to be personal right of the bat” (Whitaker & Bumberry, 1988, p. 12).

The relationship with clients is clearly described in this model of therapy through what Whitaker calls, the Battle for Structure and the Battle for Initiative. Whitaker believed that the therapist is the one who needs to win the Battle for Structure. The therapist needs to decide “who attends the sessions, who is asked to talk first, what the therapist accepts as a definition of the problem, etc.” (p. 56). Furthermore, Whitaker and Bumberry (1988) explained:

The Battle for structure is the period of initial political jousting with the family…As they begin to hear and absorb the conditions and limitations I am presenting, their automatic response is to begin to piece together their own “we position”…In setting these conditions, I want to engage the family in an interactive process that leads to an experiential exchange. In order for the process of therapy to be impactful rather than merely educational or social, it must consist of real experiences, not just head trips. (p. 56)

On the other hand, the Battle for Initiative means “to get them to take responsibility for what happens in therapy” (p. 65). Whitaker and Bumberry (1988) pointed out that “you need to disrupt the fantasy that you’ll make it all better…It’s often a period accented by tension and anxious silences” (p. 66) between the therapist and the family members. In contrast to Bowen, Whitaker did not try to reduce clients’ anxiety. Whitaker said that, “I don’t want to relieve their anxiety. I want their anxiety to be the power that makes things move.” (p. 11). To win the Battle for Initiative, the clients, rather than their therapist, need to decide whether they will come back for another session. Whitaker believed that,
“Additionally, they need to accept the fact that they remain responsible for their own living. Attempting to relinquish control or responsibility to me will do nothing to enhance their living.” (p. 6)

The position of the therapist in symbolic-experiential therapy is described as being “responsive to the family without being responsible for them” (p. 43). More specifically, it is a position of “symbolic parent” (45) who can be “both caring and tough” (p. 38). According to Whitaker and Bumberry (1988), “While the capacity to be nurturing is central, the capacity to be tough is equally essential” (p. 39). Whitaker also described taking an expert role in relationship with a family, as someone who is outside of the family system, impacting their functioning, as in first order cybernetics.

In beginning, my effort is to establish a metaposition in relationship to the family. I want them to understand more of what they can expect from me and what I expect from them. This is not designed as a relationship between peers. I want it understood that in my role as a therapist I’m a member of an older generation. The metaphor of a coach of baseball team is a good way of describing what the relationship will be. As the coach, I’m really not interested in playing on the team, only in helping them play more effectively. (Whitaker & Bumberry, 1988, p. 58)

A therapeutic alliance is also described as successful completion of the Battle for Structure and the Battle for Initiative (Whitaker & Bumberry, 1988).

I’m free to be responsive to them rather than responsible for them. Typically, the family is more accepting of my moves to get more personal, as well as my decisions to separate or move out. I can individuate and belong without too much distortion…Our increasing comfort with individuating and joining reflects real
growth and marks a more adaptive, healthy system. It’s during this period that the family begins to make some changes. (Whitaker & Bumberry, 1988, p. 67)

Even though Whitaker is not interested in taking responsibility for his clients, he takes an expert role as a symbolic parent who is both tough and caring and who believes that family members need courage to learn how to live with absurdity of life and to increase their emotional growth. According to White’s matrix described in chapter I, symbolic-experiential therapists could be categorized as taking a relatively centered and influential position in relationship with people who consult them.

**Emotionally Focused Couple Therapy (EFT)**

Johnson and Greenberg’s Emotionally Focused Couple therapy (EFT) places great emphasis on reorganizing emotional experiences and establishing secure bonds between partners. This model of therapy is an integration of experiential and systemic approaches and Bowlby’s attachment theory (Johnson, 2008). Johnson reports that her, basic agenda in therapy is to help people step out of negative cycles that increase their attachment insecurity all the time, bring up all these difficult emotions, and help them step into a place where they can dance together in a more accessible and responsive manner. (Young, 2008, p. 226)

In emotionally focused therapy “the purpose is to generate a corrective emotional experience and interactional experience of self in relation to other” (Johnson, 2004, p. 107). The therapist sees marital distress as a result of insecure attachments and focuses on what is blocking the emotional accessibility and responsiveness in partners (Young, 2008). After identifying negative interactional cycle and after accessing unacknowledged attachment oriented emotions, the therapist reframes the problems in terms of cycle and
of attachment needs and fears, and then helps them “create new cycles of positive bonding, where they can talk about their emotions in a whole different way and connect in a whole different way” (Young, 2008, p. 267). Johnson (2004) described the role of the therapist in the following way:

The therapist in EFT acts as a guide, a process consultant, to the reprocessing and reorganization of emotional experience in relation to the partner, and to the reorganization of interactions in such a way as to promote emotional engagement and secure bonding. (p. 106)

The creation and maintenance of a therapeutic alliance is the first task in emotionally focused therapy (Johnson, 2004). Johnson (2004) believes that a positive therapeutic alliance is necessary for a positive outcome, but it is not sufficient in itself for change. “In EFT, this alliance is characterized by the therapist’s being able to be with each partner as that partner encounters his or her emotional responses and enacts his or her position in the relationship” (Johnson, 2004, p. 58). The therapeutic alliance was also found to be a significant predictor for the successful outcome of emotionally focused couple therapy in a study by Johnson and Talitman (1997).

The position of the EFT therapist in the relationship with clients is characterized by: empathic attunement, acceptance, genuineness, continuous active monitoring of alliance, and joining the system by validating experiences of each partner and “helping the couple take a metaperspective on their interactions” (Johnson, 2004, p. 63). The EFT therapist focuses on non-verbal messages and is “willing to explain what he or she is doing in terms of intervention and how this will help the therapy process” (Johnson, 2004, p. 62). Johnson (2008) also believes that, “Timing and delivery of the
interventions are as important as the interventions themselves” (p. 117). “From the beginning, the EFT therapist validates each partner’s construction of his or her emotional experience and places this experience in the context of the negative interactional cycle” (Johnson, 2008, p. 119). “Once the alliance is established, there are two main basic therapeutic tasks in EFT: 1) the exploration and reformulation of emotional experience, and 2) the restructuring of interactions” (Johnson, 2008, p. 120). It seems that EFT therapists are taking an expert role in accessing the insecure attachments, in reframing the problems as negative interactional cycle, and in intervening to correct and reorganize emotional experiences and to create a secure bond between partners. Therefore, they could be categorized as taking a centered and influential position in the relationship with their clients, according to White’s matrix.

**Feminist Family Therapy**

In the late 1970s and in 1980s a group of female family therapists: Walter, Carter, Papp, and Silverstein explored the issues and experiences of women in patriarchal culture, examined the role of gender in family therapy models and interventions, and raised awareness on gender inequality and gender biases in mental health treatment process that tended to pathologize women (Walters, Carter, Papp, & Silverstein, 1988). Walters et al. (1988) believed that, “No context could be more pertinent to the understanding of all family systems than that of gender. There is no “neutral” context within which human systems exists” (p. 3). Therefore, a gender neutrality does not exist, according to Walters et al., and “neutrality” means leaving the prevailing patriarchal assumptions implicit, unchallenged, and in place” (p. 18).
On the other hand, a feminist framework is concerned with the cultural gender based pre-determined rules and roles that organize male-female interactions. Walters et al. (1988) defined feminism in a following way:

Feminism seeks to include the experience of women in all formulations of human experience, and to eliminate the dominance of male assumptions. Feminism does not blame individual men for the patriarchal social system that exists, but seeks to understand and change the socialization process that keeps men and women thinking and acting within a sexists, male-dominated framework. (p. 17)

Walters et al. (1988) noticed that women are disadvantaged in our society and they believed that not acknowledging it in therapy would reproduce the dominant sexist discourse, which privileges male dominance. In addition, “all interventions need to take gender into account by recognizing the different socialization processes of women and men” (Walters et al., 1988, p. 17). Walters et al said that, “We need to recognize that each gender hears a different meaning in the same clinical intervention and accordingly feels either blamed or supported by an identical therapeutic stance” (Walters et al., 1988, p. 17).

Even though Walter, Papp, Carter, and Silverstein practiced using the different models of family therapy, they examined, challenged, and stopped using systemic interventions that are used to disadvantage women. For example, they challenged the complementary roles that are based on male hierarchy; instead, they preferred egalitarian approach to power or symmetrical relationships in which both partners are participating in the instrumental and expressive tasks at home and at work. They also challenged the idea that “dependency” for women and “autonomy” for men are intrinsic or natural traits
rather than assigned to them by a patriarchal society and developed through socialization process. Thus, feminist family therapists challenged the concepts such as reciprocity, fusion and distance, complementarity, hierarchy, boundaries, triangles, and function of the symptom, which are used to describe dysfunction and assign traditional roles as the basis for healthy family functioning (Walters et al., 1988).

Feminist family therapists stress egalitarian relationships between the therapist and the clients (Hare-Mustin, 1978). However, they “can intervene in many ways to change the oppressive consequences of stereotyped roles and expectation in the family” (Hare-Mustin, 1978, p. 8) which tends to put them in an influential position. Feminist family therapists are also aware that “therapy is a political act and cannot be separated from the social issues in which the family is embedded” (Walters et al., 1988, p. 29). Feminist therapists not only raised awareness on gender inequality in family therapy, but also raised the issues of social injustice by exploring ethnicity and race; the relationship between the heterosexual community and lesbian couples (Silverstein, 2003); the male-gender socialization process and specific cultural requirements for achieving “manhood” and what it means to be a “real man” (e.g., self-reliant, invulnerable, in control) (MohdZain, 2001). Strategies used in feminist approach differ based on a theoretical orientation of the therapist; however, the feminist therapists try to address gender and power and they help clients identify oppressive social norms by deconstructing their ways of thinking (Seem, 2001). They also “use self-disclosure as a way to reduce the artificial hierarchical boundaries that exist between therapists and clients” (Seem, 2001, p. 36). Therefore, feminist family therapists could be perceived as taking a decentered and influential position. However, they could also be seen as taking a centered position if
their agendas of justice and equality are not consistent with clients’ wishes for their relationship.

**Postmodern Approaches**

Postmodern movement in family therapy occurred as a result of dissatisfaction with and reaction to a positivism and empiricism or a modern worldview, which emphasizes objectivity, discovery of the Truth, totalizing discourses, and language as reflecting or representing reality rather than creating reality. The role of the therapist is that of a social engineer who possesses technologies and “scientific” knowledge to objectively assess, diagnose, and repair individuals, relationships, and families. Thus, the modern worldview places the therapists in an expert, authoritative, and highly hierarchical position in a relationship with their clients, since it is assumed that they can objectively observe, discover facts, make predictions based on their theories, and cure people as machines from their deficiencies and disorders. Michael White called this position of the therapist “centered.”

Postmodernism rejected these ideas and opened the door for exploring multiple realities, for questioning and deconstructing dominant cultural discourses, and for placing the therapist in more of a collaborative relationship with clients by taking a non-expert and non-knowing stance in regard to how clients should be, what they mean, and how they should lead their lives. Rosenau (1992) explained postmodernism in social sciences as a cultural critique and movement in “re-conceptualization of how we experience and explain the world around us” (p. 4).

Post-modern social science focuses on alternative discourses and meaning rather than on goals, choices, behavior, attitudes, and personality…Post-modernists,
defining everything as a text, seek to “locate” meaning rather than to “discover” it. They avoid judgment, and the most sophisticated among them never “advocate” or “reject,” but speak rather of being “concerned with” a topic or “interested in” something…They offer indeterminacy rather than determinism, diversity rather than unity, difference rather than synthesis, complexity rather than simplifications. They look to the unique rather than to the general, to intertextual relations rather than causality, and to the unrepeatable rather than the re-occurring, the habitual, or the routine. (Rosenau, 1992, p. 8)

The family therapies influenced by postmodernism and social constructivism include narrative therapy, collaborative language system therapy, and solution-focused brief therapy.

**Collaborative Language Systems**

Anderson and Goolishian’s collaborative language systems model of family therapy focuses on a co-creation of new and different meanings in a dialogue between the therapist and the client(s) in which the client’s problems are dissolved through language rather than fixed by finding new solutions (Anderson & Goolishian, 1988). “In this sense, problems exist in language and problems are unique to the narrative context from which they derive their meaning” (Anderson & Goolishian, 1992, p. 28). Anderson and Goolishian’s position is based on assumptions that “human systems are language-generating systems,” that “therapy is a linguistic event that takes place in what we call a therapeutic conversation,” and that “the therapeutic system is a problem-organizing, problem dis-solving system” (Anderson & Goolishian, 1992, p. 27). “Problems are in the intersubjective minds of all who are in active communicative exchange and, as such, are
themselves always changing” (Goolishian & Winderman, 1988, p. 136). “Change is the evolution of new meaning through dialogue” (Anderson & Goolishian, 1988, p. 372). Thus, the goal of collaborative language systems therapy is not to fix systemic structures or psychic defects as in other models of psychotherapy, but rather to engage in “the continuation of the therapeutic conversation such that the co-created narrative which arises no longer includes that which was experienced as a problem or alarmed objection” (Goolishian & Winderman, 1988, p. 137). In the other words, the “problems” dis-solve as the conversation about the defined problems change. Anderson and Goolishian (1988) believe that, “We live with each other in a world of conversational narrative, and we understand ourselves and each other through changing stories and self-descriptions” (p. 380). They also believe that, “meaning and understanding in dialogue and conversation are always an interpretive activity and always in flux and change…All meaning, understanding, and interpretation is inherently negotiable and tentative” (Anderson & Goolishian, 1988, p. 381).

The role of the therapist is that of a conversational artist – an architect of the dialogical process – whose expertise is in the area of creating a space for a facilitating a dialogical conversation. The therapist is a participant-observer and a participant-facilitator of the therapeutic conversation. (Anderson & Goolishian, 1992, p. 27)

The therapist in this model is viewed not as someone who operates upon the family system, as in first order cybernetics, but as someone who is a part of the linguistic meaning system and as someone who provides context for co-development and co-creation of different narratives, meanings, and understandings. In addition,
The therapist exercises this therapeutic art through the use of conversational or therapeutic questions. The therapeutic question is the primary instrument to facilitate the development of conversational space and the dialogical process. To accomplish this the therapist exercises an expertise in asking questions from a position of ‘not-knowing’ rather than asking questions that are informed by method and that demand specific answers. (Anderson and Goolishian, 1992, pp. 27-28)

Anderson and Goolishian (1992) explained that, “Therapeutic questions always steam from a need to know more about what has just been said. Thus, the therapist is always being informed by the client’s stories and is always learning new language and new narrative.” (p. 32). “The therapist is “in there” as a learner, cooperating with, attempting to understand, and working within the client’s meaning system” (Anderson & Goolishian, 1988, p. 384). In addition, “The therapist does not control the interview by influencing the conversation toward a particular direction in the sense of content or outcome, nor is the therapist responsible for the direction of change.” (Anderson & Goolishian, 1988, p. 385). According to Anderson and Goolishian, the therapist is only responsible for opening a space for dialogical conversation and taking a stance of multipartiality, which entails “taking all sides and working within all views simultaneously” (p. 385). In addition, through collaborative dialogue in which the therapist takes non-hierarchical position, the therapist is also subject to change not only client. Anderson and Goolishian (1988) suggested that,

We, as therapists, are always taking positions. As therapists we are never void of values and always operate on the basis of these views. These prejudices, however,
are not imposed on clients. Rather, therapist and client in dialogue with one another are always acting on and reflecting their ideologies, their values, and their views. To be in dialogue is to attempt to understand others and to involve oneself in the coevolution of understanding and meaning. (p. 385)

Genuine and abundant curiosity as well as being informed by client characterizes the “not-knowing” position, general attitude, or stance of the therapist in this model.

The therapist does not ‘know’ priory, the intent of any action, but rather must rely on the explanation made by the client. By learning, by curiosity, and by taking the client’s story seriously, the therapist joins with the client in a mutual exploration of the client’s understanding and experience. (Anderson & Goolishian, 1992, pp. 29-30)

Anderson and Goolishian (1992) explained that “not-knowing” position does not mean that the therapists are free from their judgment; rather, it means that “they must listen in such a way that their pre-experience does not close them to the full meaning of the client’s descriptions of their experience” (p. 30). In addition, by taking a not-knowing stance,

the therapist does not dominate the client with expert psychological knowledge so much as he or she is led by, and learns from, the expertise of the client. The therapist’s task, therefore, is not to analyze but to attempt to understand, to understand from the changing perspective of the client’s life experience.

(Anderson & Goolishian, 1992, p. 33)

By taking a not-knowing stance, the therapist is also able to open a conversational space for co-creation of new meaning and narrative. According to White’s matrix (described in
chapter I), the position of the therapist in collaborative language systems therapy could be categorized as a decentered and non-influential.

**Solution-Focused Brief Therapy**

Solution-focused brief therapy (SFBT) is a goal-oriented, future-focused, and brief model of therapy that was developed inductively by Steve de Shazer, Insoo Kim Berg and their colleagues in the early 1980s (de Shazer, Dolan, Korman, Trepper, McCollum, & Berg, 2007). In this model, the therapist helps clients build solutions; encourages clients to do more of what is already working; helps them identify and take small steps toward change; asks questions (i.e., miracle question) to set clear, concrete, small, specific, and manageable goals; helps clients look for exceptions to the problems and previous solutions; asks scaling questions to scale the problem and the goal and to assess their progress; compliments their strengths and progress; and gives experiments and homework assignments (de Shazer et al., 2007). SFBT therapists may also ask coping questions, ask about pre-session change, and they usually take a break during the session before delivering a homework assignment. If there is a team behind the mirror, the therapist asks them during the break to make a list of compliments for all family members and to design intervention for them based on their strengths, previous solutions, and exceptions (de Shazer et al., 2007).

SFBT therapists believe that “problems are best solved by focusing on what is already working, and how a clients would like his or her life to be, rather than focusing on the past and the origin of the problems (de Shazer et al., 2007, p. 5). By focusing on exceptions and previous solutions the therapist moves the client from problem-talk to a “solution-talk mode” (de Shazer et al., 2007, p. 6).
The SFBT therapist spends most of the session listening attentively for signs of previous solutions, exceptions, and goals. When these come out, the therapist punctuates them with enthusiasm and support. The therapist then works to keep the solution-talk in the forefront. (de Shazer et al., 2007, p. 9)

Given that the goal of SFBT is to build solutions, the therapist prefers solution talk versus problem talk. In addition, the SFBT therapist is helping the client maintain desired changes. This is accomplished by learning exactly how the client behaved or responded differently during periods of improvement. As a result of identifying what worked, the client is able to repeat the success and the solution further evolves. (de Shazer et al., 2007, p. 2)

The position of the therapist can be understood not only based on what the therapists do in the relationship with the clients but also by examining the underlying assumptions of the model. According to de Shazer et al. (2007) the major tenets of SFBT include:

1) If it isn’t broken, don’t fix it. 2) If it works, do more of it. 3) If it’s not working, do something different, 4) Small steps can lead to big changes. 5) The solution is not necessarily directly related to the problem. 6) The language of solution development is different from that needed to describe the problem. 7) No problems happen all the time; there are always exceptions that can be utilized. 8) The future is both created and negotiable. (pp. 1-3)

Steve de Shazer et al. (2007) described a stance of solution-focused brief therapists as “positive, collegial, and solution-focused” (p. 4).

The overall attitude is positive, respectful, and hopeful. There is a general assumption that people have within them strong resiliencies, and can utilize these
to make changes. Further, there is a core belief that most people have the strength, wisdom, and experience to effect change. (de Shazer et al., 2007, p. 4)

Berg and Dolan (2001) explained that the therapeutic relationship in SFBT is more equalitarian and democratic than authoritarian. The therapist’s position is also defined as “leading from one step behind.” Berg and Dolan described this position in the following way:

SFBT therapists do not shy away from leading; however, rather than pushing, cajoling, or pulling their clients in certain directions, they lead from behind. From this position, the therapist gently “taps the client on the shoulder” and asks whether she noticed the beautiful sunset in the sky or that tiny wildflower swaying in the breeze. These “taps on the shoulders” are the questions that the therapist asks in order to stimulate a fresh look at the same old picture. (p. 3)

In addition, “leading from behind indicates a gentle, respectful approach that recognizes and accepts the client’s choice” (Berg & Dolan, 2001, p. 99).

Deciding when to lead and when to lag behind requires sensitivity and willingness to allow clients to make informed choices, trusting that they know what is ultimately best for them. Leading from behind begins with listening to what the client says is important, even when it seems to go against common sense and conventional wisdom. (Berg & Dolan, 2001, p. 99)

In contrast to psychodynamic schools of thought, the SFBT views resistance as a result of either a) client’s “natural protective mechanism, or realistic desire to be cautious and go slow or b) a therapist’s error, i.e., an intervention that does not fit the client’s situation” (de Shazer et al., 2007, p. 4). de Shazer (1985) believed that clients want to change, and
figured out the way to promote cooperation rather than to create resistance. In order to do that the therapist needs to approach the client in the following way:

First we connect the present to the future (ignoring the past), then we compliment the clients on what they are already doing that is useful and/or good for them, and then – once they know we are on their side- we can make a suggestion for something new that they might do which is, or at least might be, good for them. (de Shazer, 1985, p. 15)

Even though SFBT recognizes that the clients are experts on their lives and are allowed to develop their own solutions, they also take expert role in leading and making suggestions through homework assignments and judgments in form of giving clients compliments. They also make assessments by asking scaling questions and they are not particularly interested in client’s problems, instead, they prefer to lead solution-talks believing that problems are not necessarily connected to solutions. SFBT therapists also advise and encourage clients to do more of what is working. According to White’s matrix (described in chapter I), SFBT therapists could be categorized as relatively centered and influential.

**Part Two: Outcome Studies and Therapeutic Relationship or Alliance**

In the first part of the literature review, I explored the position of the therapist in many different psychotherapy approaches and categorized their positions based on White’s matrix on position of the therapist as described in chapter I. This categorization is open to discussion and is based on my extensive exploration of each model’s underlying assumptions, presuppositions, intentions, and mainly looking at what therapists using their particular models think and do in the process of therapy. In
addition, this categorization of the position of the therapist is based not only on how they describe their stance in their theory, but also on more critical examination of how they view clients, how they conceptualize clients’ problems, and how they intervene to create a difference that they believe will make a difference. Looking at the therapeutic relationship and position of the therapist in isolation without exploring the therapist’s intentions, beliefs, and practices is a very limited view that is here intentionally avoided. In this second part of this chapter, the review of research findings on therapeutic relationship and psychotherapy outcome is presented.

Exploring how therapeutic relationships are established and maintained between the therapist and their clients is important because many studies have found correlations between the stronger therapeutic alliances and clients’ progress (e.g., Arnow et al., 2013; Brown & O’Leary, 2000; Bourgeois, Sabourin, & Wright, 1990; Horvath & Symonds, 1991; Johnson & Talitman, 1997; Johnson, Wright, & Ketring, 2002; Johnson & Ketring, 2006; Kazdin, Marciano, & Whitley, 2005; Knobloch-Fedders, Pinsof, & Mann, 2007; Shelef, Diamond, Diamon, & Liddle, 2005). On the other hand, many studies found the relationship between a weaker therapeutic alliances and clients’ dropout from treatment (e.g. Robbins et al., 2008; Robbins et al., 2006; Robbins, Turner, Alexander, & Perez, 2003; Sharf, Primavera, & Diener, 2010). Furthermore, there are no studies exploring how therapeutic relationships are created in narrative therapy using a de-centered and influential position.

A study by Arnow et al. (2013) explored the relationship between the therapeutic alliance and treatment outcome in two distinct manualized psychotherapies for depression (cognitive behavioral analysis system of psychotherapy (CBASP) and brief supportive
psychotherapy (BSP)) that were administered, in addition with antidepressants, to outpatient participants who met the criteria for major depressive disorder. Arnow et al. found that early higher scores on therapeutic alliance as reported by participants were significantly associated with subsequent reduction of depression symptoms over 12 weeks treatment. They also found that therapeutic alliance was more strongly related to outcome in cognitive behavioral analysis system psychotherapy than brief supportive psychotherapy.

Brown and O’Leary (2000) examined the relationship between the therapeutic alliance and psychological and physical violence in “husband-to-wife violent couples” that attended 14 weeks group treatment, weakly for 2 hours, and received either conjoint or gender-specific cognitive-behavioral group therapy that was presented in psychoeducational format. The observers, researchers assessed the therapeutic alliances using the Working Alliance Inventory, which includes three subscales: bond between the therapist and the client, agreement on goals, and agreement on tasks. Brown and O’Leary found that strength of husbands’ therapeutic alliance was positively associated with treatment outcomes: decreased mild and severe physical and psychological aggression. They concluded that when working with couples in which men are violent toward women it seems to be important to establish a positive working relationship with the husband more than the wife.

A study by Bourgeois, Sabourin, and Wright (1990) also looked at therapeutic alliance as a predictor of positive outcome in group marital therapy with couples who reported marital distress at the beginning of 9 week treatment during which they were taught how to communicate better using active listening, learning how to express their
positive an negative feelings, how to problem solve, and how to fight constructively. Therapeutic alliance was measured after the third therapy session by therapist and clients separately. In addition, couples completed pre and post treatment Dyadic Adjustment Scale, the Potential Problem Checklist, Marital Happiness Scale, and Problem Solving Inventory. Bourgeois et al. found that marital distress at the beginning of the treatment was not significantly related to quality of therapeutic alliance measured after 3 weeks; however, therapeutic alliance was a significant predictor of successful outcome after 9 weeks. As in Brown and O’Leary (2000) study, Bourgeois et al. found that the stronger therapeutic alliance was more important precursor for positive treatment outcome in males than females. For females, therapeutic alliance accounted for 5 percent of the variance on Dyadic Adjustment Scale at the end of the treatment, while for males therapeutic alliance accounted for 7 percent of the variance in scores on Dyadic Adjustment Scale, 5 percent of the variance in the Marital Happiness Scale, and 8 percent of variance in Potential Problem Checklist scores.

Knobloch-Fedders, Pinsof, and Mann (2007) investigated the relationship between therapeutic alliance and treatment progress in couples conjoint therapy from session 1 to session 8. Treatment was not time limited and was conducted using integrative problem-centered therapy. Although therapeutic alliance was not related to improvement in individual functioning, it was found that therapeutic alliance was a strong predictor for improvement in marital distress over time accounting for 5-22% of variance. Knobloch-Fedders et al. also found that couples who completed 8 sessions had reported stronger early therapeutic alliances with their therapists (after session 1) than couples who dropped out from the treatment earlier. The first session therapeutic alliance
was also linked to completion of conjoint treatment for alcohol abuse and dependence using three different treatment modalities: Alcohol Behavioral Marital Therapy (ABMT), Alcohol Anonymous plus ABMT, and Relapse Prevention plus ABMT (Raytek, McCrady, Epstein, & Hirsch, 1999). The raters who observed therapists behavior related to therapeutic alliance in video taped sessions found that therapists who were more experienced and who delivered treatment more competently (with fewer errors) were able to develop a stronger therapeutic alliances (Raytek et al., 1999). Raytek et al. (1999) conducted also a qualitative analysis of therapists’ behavior and suggested certain characteristics how experienced therapists conducted their sessions.

They were very interactive with the couples throughout the sessions, asking open-ended questions, acknowledging and responding empathically to comments, and addressing issues that the clients initiated. The therapists also addressed both members of the couple, often checking in with each partner about his/her reaction to what the other person had said. Throughout the session, the experienced therapists addressed the topics from the manual in a flexible and personalized manner. In addressing the first session topics, the experienced therapists used discussion framework in which they focused on the reactions of each member of the couple to what was being discussed. The therapists were able to achieve a good balance between covering the necessary material and being open to the concerns of the couple. (pp. 326-327)

Therapeutic alliance was found to predict a successful outcome in Emotionally Focused Marital therapy with moderately distressed couples (Johnson & Talitman, 1997). Johnson and Talitman measured couples therapy alliance after third session in their 12-
week treatment study using EFT approach. These researchers found that strong therapeutic alliance, that was measured after third session, accounted for 22 percent of the variance in marital satisfaction at termination of treatment after 12 sessions and 29 percent of the variance in marital satisfaction as measured at 3-month follow up. Couples who experienced strong therapeutic alliances also reported higher levels of intimacy at the end of treatment. Johnson and Talitman (1997) showed that when practicing Emotionally Focused Marital Therapy therapists need to focus on building therapeutic alliances with couples, and to make sure that the task of therapy is relevant to the couple’s presenting problems as perceived by couple.

In addition to exploring therapeutic alliance in individual and couples therapy, the relationship between therapeutic alliance and treatment outcome was investigated in family therapy with different presenting problems. For example, Shelef, Diamond, Diamon, and Liddle (2005) studied adolescents who abused substances and their families using multidimensional family therapy in a 12-week long treatment. The train alliance raters observed video session segments and measured adolescent-therapist and parent-therapist alliances using Vanderbilt Therapeutic Alliance Scale. In addition, adolescents completed the Working Alliance Inventory once between sessions 3 and 5 reporting their perceptions of adolescent-therapist alliance. Shelef et al. (2005) found that adolescent alliance predicted fewer problems with substance abuse and dependency symptoms at the end of treatment. They also found that the strength of parental alliances moderated relationship between adolescent alliance and treatment outcome as well as predicted premature termination when parent-therapist alliance was low.
Another study by Johnson and Ketring (2006) examined therapeutic alliance as a moderator in therapy outcome for families dealing with child abuse and neglect. Participants in this study received a home-based ecosystemic therapy, initially twice weekly for 6 to 8 weeks, and then once weekly (on average families received 19.1 sessions). They completed Family Therapy Alliance Scale at the end of treatment, and Conflict Tactics Scale and Outcome Questionnaire at the pre- and post-treatment. Johnson and Ketring (2006) found significant relationship between pre-test reported violence and bonds subscale in therapeutic alliance, suggesting that when the violence is greater at the beginning of the treatment a therapist needs to develop a stronger bond and trusting relationships with family members in order to facilitate change. Johnson and Ketring suggested that alliance is related to symptoms of distress and violence at the end of their ecosystemic therapy. Therefore, therapeutic alliance is an important factor of change in family therapy.

Kazdin, Marciano, and Whitley (2005) studied therapeutic alliance in cognitive behavioral treatment of children (ages 3-14) referred for oppositional, aggressive, and antisocial behavior. The relationship with the therapist was measured in this study from therapist’s, child’s, and parents’ perspective using the Therapeutic Alliance Scale for Children and the Working Alliance Inventory. They also completed the Treatment Improvement Scale, the Barriers to Treatment Participation Scale, the Treatment Evaluation Inventory to measure the outcomes of accessibility of treatment, barriers to participation in treatment, and changes in child deviant behavior. Kazdin et al. found that the stronger child-therapist and parent-therapist alliances, the greater therapeutic changes on measures of child improvements at the end of family therapy (12-session treatment) as
reported by the therapist, parent, and child. The stronger therapeutic alliances were also related to more acceptable views of techniques by parents and children and fewer perceived barriers in treatment.

Johnson, Wright, and Ketring (2002) investigated therapeutic alliance in family therapy with children who experienced abuse, neglect, and/or juvenile offences. Families were in treatment for 14.3 weeks on average and were seen by co-therapy team, that included their therapist and their case manager who worked with families to resolve their issues such as child abuse and neglect, lack of family rules, family structure issues, depression, marital difficulties, financial problems, drug use, and depression. At the end of treatment, family members completed the Family Therapy Alliance Scale among other outcome measures designed for symptom distress, family coping, and interpersonal relationships. Johnson et al.’s regression analysis revealed that the therapeutic alliance accounted for 19 percent of the variance in symptom reduction for mothers, 39 percent of the variance in symptom reduction for adolescents, and 55 percent of variance in symptom reduction for fathers. Johnson et al. (2002) concluded:

The findings of this study suggest that therapists also may benefit from augmenting their skills in specific interventions with skills specific to enhancing the therapeutic alliance. To some extent enhancing one’s skills related to the therapeutic alliance is a matter of focusing less on techniques and more on the basic and time-honored therapist-client relationship. However, relationship skills really go beyond enhancing therapist-child interactions through classic notions of effective listening and demonstrating positive regard. What must be facilitated is a process whereby family members and the therapist develop into a collaborative
team in which there is a sense of agreement what needs to be done and how it is to be done. (p. 99)

Although many studies reviewed above suggest that strong therapeutic alliance predicts successful outcomes in individual, couples, and family therapy, it is unclear how alliances are created. Horvath and Symonds (1991) suggested also that the relationship between the therapist and the client is described in literature as “working,” “helping,” or “therapeutic” alliance. In addition, they explained how the concept of alliance evolved over time in research studies depending on the different theoretical orientations. Gaston (1990) also explained different definitions of alliance through different theoretical perspectives. Review of research studies on therapeutic alliance and outcome reveals that therapeutic alliances could be measured by clients, therapists, and raters at different times in treatment (early or at the end of treatment) using different scales and inventories (Horvath & Symonds, 1991). Horvath and Symonds’s meta-analysis of 24 studies found that working alliance is a moderate but reliable predictor of positive therapy outcome and that the clients’ reports are the most reliable assessment for such prediction.

Therapeutic alliances were also studied in relations to drop out in different family therapies. For example, Robbins, Turner, Alexander, and Perez (2003) found that unbalanced alliances in functional family therapy for adolescents with behavioral problems are significantly associated with dropout in therapy. Unbalanced alliances between the therapist and the family members, rather than overall level of alliance predicted dropout. Robbins et al. used trained raters to rate adolescent-therapist and parent-therapist alliances in their first video session. The results of this study suggest that family therapists need to avoid coalitions and “must remain cognizant of these potential
traps and intervene in a manner that is sensitive to the unique characteristics of individual family members as well as to the complex interactions of the family system” (Robbins et al., 2003, p. 541). Robbins et al. suggested that, “therapists in the dropout cases may have inadequately validated parental negativity about the adolescent without adequately responding to the adolescent’s needs or concerns.” (p. 541)

According to Robbins et al. (2006), weaker therapeutic alliances in the first two therapy sessions were also significantly associated with dropout from multidimensional family therapy with mothers and their adolescents who abuse drugs. Compared to families who had completed the treatment, dropout families experienced decline in both parent-therapist and adolescent therapist alliances over the first two sessions. Robbins et al. (2006) suggested that, “how the intervention is done appears to be more important than who does the intervention” (p. 114). The relationship between adolescent and parent therapeutic alliances in first sessions and retention in family therapy with drug-using Hispanic adolescents was also explored using a brief strategic family therapy (Robbins et al., 2008). As predicted, Robbins et al. found that families who completed the brief strategic family therapy had statistically significantly higher level of alliance as rated by trained raters on Vanderbilt Therapeutic Alliance Scale-Revised than families who dropped out (as judged by their therapist and attending less than eight sessions). As in Robbins et al.’s (2003) study, Robbins et al.’s (2008) study found that unbalanced alliances predicted dropouts. More specifically, mother-adolescent unbalanced alliances with therapist were significantly predictive of dropout.

Given that therapeutic relationships affect the retention and the outcome of treatment as cited above, studying qualitatively how these alliances or relationships are
created is a useful research goal. This study will particularly focus on the relationship between the therapist and the client in narrative therapy by exploring how Michael White, taking a decentered and influential position interacts with his clients. The focus is more on narrative therapist since clients tend to see psychotherapists as having a primarily responsibility for creating therapeutic alliances (e.g., Bedi, Davis, & Williams, 2005). Studies (e.g., Kivlighan, 1990; Mohr & Woodhouse, 2001) suggested that techniques or/and therapist’s interventions cannot be separated from the context of the relationship and were perceived to influence alliance by clients (as cited in Bedi, Davis, & Williams, 2005). Therefore, what therapist does and say during sessions influences the outcomes and is based on their worldview and position that they take in a relationship with their clients. There is no research (known to this researcher) that explored how a narrative therapist takes a decentered and influential position in relationships with clients.

**Part Three: Narrative Therapy**

Narrative therapy was developed by a social worker Michael White from Adelaide Australia, and David Epston from New Zealand in 1980s. According to Cheryl White, narrative therapy practice was informed and influenced initially by social movements such as anti-Vietnam War protest and feminist movement in which people questioned and challenged authorities. Later, Michael White “became determined to challenge and put forward alternatives to the taken-for-granted authorities within mental health services and psychiatry” (White, 2011, p. 159). Cheryl White explained that,

As people in many different countries became determined to alter the ways in which their societies responded to those in social and emotional distress, this
became a passion in Michael’s life. And it is this commitment that led to the development of what is now known as narrative therapy. (White, 2011, p. 159)

Michael White stressed that narrative therapy was developed as a result of his co-research with the people whom he consulted and his readings from outside the field, which includes writings of Bateson, Foucault, Bruner, Myerhoff, Vygotsky, Derrida, Deluze, and others (White, 2011). His thinking was influenced by feminist theory, literary theory, anthropology, and critical theory that helps us, according to White, “to consider the various ways that we are, or might be, reproducing dominant culture within the therapeutic discipline…and to consider how various aspects of this cultural reproduction might not be so helpful to those persons who seek our help” (White, 1995, p. 12). White believed that this critical reflection of our work and our field increases our awareness of the effects of these ways of thinking and acting with people who consult us and therefore, “it becomes possible for us to take responsibility for the real effects of our work on the lives of those persons who seek our help” (White, 1995, p. 13). White (2007) strongly believed that, “As therapists, we are responsible for the consequences of what we do, say, and think.” (p. 31).

**Narrative Therapy Worldview**

Narrative therapy, in contrast to many other models of psychotherapy, shifted from structuralism and positivism to post-structuralism and social constructionism view of understanding the world and human behavior. To clarify differences,

Positivism is an approach to the understanding of events in the world that proposes that it is possible to directly know the world – that it is possible for observers of certain phenomena to gain an objective knowledge of reality, to
identify “brute facts,” and to uncover the “truth” of the world. Positivism, in its attempts to come up with these truths, employs a reductionist method: It consistently endeavors to reduce the complexity of phenomena to basic elements, which are then considered to be the building blocks of the phenomena in question. These elements can be categorized and classified, and universal laws governing such phenomena in all places and at all times can be “discovered.” (White, 2011, pp. 149-150)

When positivism was applied to the human sciences, persons were subjected to the assessment of observers, armed with the techniques of evaluation, who were considered to be objective and thus not implicated in the construction of the realities being brought forth. Complex phenomena, as reflected in human behavior, were reduced to the building blocks of that behavior – such as certain traits, drives, needs, complexes of desire, etc. Behavior and social organization, considered to be in some way problematic, were assessed to be disorders in these basic elements, disorders that could be categorized and then classified. In this way, classification could represent the truth of the person. (White, 2011, p. 150)

It appears that the position of the therapist with a positivist and structuralist orientation is “centered” (White, 2007) or that of an expert, who can objectively assess for “abnormalities” and treat people’s “defective” personalities. This view can be seen in many first order cybernetic models in which therapists are trying to repair or fix people (as machines) by being objective experts who know what is needed for the family to be more functional. White disagreed with this view and practice. He agreed with Maturana
and others who said, “Observer in, objectivity out,” which means that a therapist is part of the system and cannot be an objective observer (White, 1986b).

Positivism thrives on the idea that “human behavior and social organization reflect, in various ways, the structure of the mind or the emotional system” (White, 2011, p. 150). Examples of these include, but are not limited to, ideas of irrational thoughts in cognitive therapy, anxiety and differentiation of self in Bowen theory, different boundaries in structural therapy, diagnostic statistic manuals, and etc. White (2011) believed that therapists informed by positivism or structuralism employ remedy methods that actually “engage people in internalizing discourses” (p. 150) which in a way may convince people that the problems in their lives are a reflection of their defective “selves” which is supported by therapists’ theoretical assumptions and cultural norms.

In addition, White (2011) believed that it is our responsibility to refuse to engage “in the politics of totalization and marginalization of person’s lives… and to refuse to enter into the ever-expanding discourses of psychopathology that so saturate the culture of therapy” (p. 64). White (2011) argued that,

To engage in these expert internalizing discourses of psychopathology is political in several senses. First, in that these discourses internalize the locus of problems that persons bring to therapy, they erase the historical forces that are constitutive of these problems, and they deny a political analysis of the context that is constitutive of the problem…This has the effect of incapacitating those persons who seek our help. The pathologizing of life subtracts from personal agency. It has the effect of privileging the expert knowledges and disqualifying the knowledges of those persons who seek our help. (p. 64)
White (2011) pointed out that the expert discourses on psychopathology lead to exclusions, discrimination, marginalization, oppression, obscuring relational politics, perpetuating inequality of opportunity, preserving hierarchy of knowledge and power, and so forth. White suggested that,

The psychologization of life that is achieved by the professional knowledges supports the assumption of therapist objectivity and preserves the myth of therapists impartiality, detachment, and neutrality. This psychologization of life is achieved through a network of universal truth claims that obscures the extent to which professional knowledges are culture-specific and the extent to which they are manufactured through specific historical and political processes. (White, 2011, pp. 65-66)

**Post-structuralism**

In his critique of structuralist discourses on human nature, White (1997) described the effects of “the will to truth, the repressive hypothesis, and the emancipation narrative” (p. 220) on therapeutic practice. These effects include:

1) The confirmation of the known or reproducing culturally venerated ways of thinking and being; in other words, arriving at thin descriptions of our lives.

2) Obscuring acts of meaning, which rules out “the possibility for us to join with persons in the exploration of alternative meanings that contradict those that are routinely reproduced in their lives” (p. 226); which “renders invisible the extent to which persons are active in the shaping of their lives as they live their lives” (p. 226); and which “rules out options for us to acknowledge our own participation in
the negotiation of meaning, in the shaping of the lives of the persons who consult us” (p. 227)

3) Constrained lives and constraining of therapeutic interactions by narrowing options for other ways of thinking and being. The “commitment to this question of ‘truth’ is significantly limiting of the possibilities in regard to our ways of being with the persons who consult us.” (p. 228)

4) The marginalization of ethics and possible negative effects of the power relation of therapy. White explained that,

When therapy is established as a context for the identification and expression of the truths of human nature, success is determined by the extent to which therapy contributes to things being as they ideally should be in the lives of persons who consult therapists- by the extent to which persons have arrived at the point at which their lives reflect the states of being that are expressions of the norms, rules and laws of nature. (p. 228)

5) Concealing the power-knowledge relation.

When this link between knowledge and power is obscured, it becomes impossible for us, as therapists, to identify the ways in which the “truths” of human nature are taken up in relations of power, and to establish therapy as a context for reviewing the real effects of these power relations. (p. 229)

6) The dissolution of history which limits focus on “deficit-centered or problem-saturated accounts of history” (p. 230). This is based on belief that,
In order that person might become free to be who they truly are, history is something to be undone, to be resolved. And in that the outcome of resolving the forces of history is the achievement of some ideal state.” (p. 229).

Poststructuralist writers and thinkers such as, Foucault, Derrida, Lacan, Deleuze, Lyotard etc. “reacted against the formalism of structuralist linguistics and against the figure of the epistemological subject implied or explicitly defended by its theorists” (Poster, 1989, p. 4).

Poststructuralists question the easy assumption that the theoretical subject can generate a discourse that represents the real, unmask domination in the real, without himself/herself introducing new forms of domination. Poststructuralists criticize the assumption of much of modern thought that theoretical discourse is a direct expression of a truth in the theorist’s mind, that this truth in some way captures historical reality, and that the question of freedom entails the appropriation of this truth by historical agents and their subsequent action to actualize it. Poststructuralists point to various ways in which language materially affects the relation of the theorist to his or her discourse and the ways in which the social field is composed of linguistic phenomena – Foucault’s discourse/practice, Baudrillard’s code, Derrida’s écriture, Lyotard’s phrases and le différend. (Poster, 1989, p. 4)

Poststructuralists believe that theory is “an epistemological attempt at conceptual clarification which spills over into a metaphysical gesture to regulate the terms of reality.
The theoretical concept places too much faith in the theorist’s ability to make
determinations, to fix identities, identities whose effect is political.” (Poster, 1989, p. 6)

The tendency in poststructuralism is therefore to regard truth as a multiplicity, to
exult in the play of diverse meanings, in the continual processes of
reinterpretation, in the contention of opposing claims. Accordingly, text replaces
mind as the locus of enunciation, and difference replaces identity as strategy of
reading. (Poster, 1989, p. 15)

While structuralists believe that people contain selves, personalities, traits,
strengths and deficiencies that can be evaluated against some objective standards given
that the therapist can be objective and discover the “truth,” post-structuralists believe in
multiple realities and see people living their lives based on their intentions, purposes,
values, goals, aspirations, commitments, dreams, etc. rather than behaving in a way that
reflects their internal structures. According to the post-structuralist worldview, people
are seen as being in a relationship with their problems rather than in possession of
problems. They are seen as social and interpretive beings, rather than structures, who are
active in construction of stories of their lives (J. Hibel, personal communication, 2011).

Narrative therapists take a post-structuralist view and de-centered position. They
focus on identity conclusions and liberating people from oppressive internalized
discourses that inhibit living their preferred identities in social context. It is a
collaborative and respectful approach or inquiry that is very influential yet not imposing
of therapists’ beliefs and values, but instead exploring and respecting a person’s
preferences in re-authoring their lives. Narrative therapists listen for, and are interested
in, people’s hopes, values, intentions, dreams, beliefs, goals, and aspirations (White,
They are interested in meaning rather than problem solving and they try “to bring forth and thicken stories that did not support or sustain problems” (Freedman & Combs, 1996, p. 16).

White (2007) believed that people’s actions are shaped by their values, purposes, hopes, dreams, intentions, aspirations and commitments rather than the essence of their identities or their true selves. His post-structuralist view can be seen in re-authoring conversation practice where he explained the difference between “internal state understandings” and “intentional state understandings” which he preferred.

Internal state understandings portray human action as a surface manifestation of specific elements or essences of a self that is to be “found” at the center of his identity. For example, in the context of internal state understandings, human expression might be interpreted as a manifestation of any number of unconscious motives, instincts, needs, desires, drives, dispositions, personality traits, personal properties (like strengths and recourses), and so on. (White, 2007, p. 101)

White (2007) believed that this way of thinking and evolution of the concept of “self” represents, in a way, “a new system of social control in which ‘normalizing judgment’ steadily displaced moral judgment’ (p. 102) and that it leads to a creation of so called “distortions,” “dysfunctions,” or “disorders” when a person is not meeting an ideal, culturally preferred standards of what it means to be “functional,” “healthy” and so forth. In addition, White (2007) stated that internal understandings tend to diminish sense of personal agency, tend to be isolating, and tend to discourage diversity.

In contrast to internal state conceptions, intentional state conceptions of identity are distinguished by the notion of “personal agency.” This notion casts people as
active mediators and negotiators of life’s meanings and predicaments, both individually and in collaboration with others…People are living their lives according to intentions that they embrace in the pursuit of what they give value to in life. (White, 2007, p. 103)

Narrative therapy is based on a premise that identity conclusions, what people believe about themselves and about their relationships, significantly influence their actions; in other words, they shape their lives. And these conclusions are also associated with dominant cultural stories that people are born and live in (White, 2007; Freedman & Combs, 1996).

**Social Construction**

In addition to post-structuralist worldview, narrative therapy was also described as having a postmodern, narrative, social constructionist, and constitutionalist view on reality, power, knowledge, objectivity, “truth,” “self,” and this worldview forms how they see people’s problems and how they position themselves to create relationships with people who consult them.

White (1993) explained that his constitutionalist perspective rejects essentialism, representationalism, and foundationalist assumptions of objectivity, and proposes that “an objective knowledge of the world is not possible, that knowledges are actually generated in particular discursive fields…And that constitutionalist perspective proposes that the descriptions do not correspond with the world, but have real effects on the shaping of life” (p. 125). This perspective puts therapists in a not-knowing, not-expert, and de-centered position when working with people who come to consult them. Narrative therapists do not try to discover the truth or look for pathologies based on some cultural
values what it means to be normal, rather they are interested and curious about people’s positions on their lives and what they value, hope for, and aspire for their lives.

Freedman and Combs (1996) described social constructionist worldview by stressing four ideas. “These ideas are: 1. Realities are socially constructed. 2. Realities are constructed through language. 3. Realities are organized and maintained through narrative. 4. There are no essential truths.” (Freedman & Combs, 1996, p. 22).

What the first idea means is that people construct their realities in relationships with each other, in social interactions over time. What they initially have decided, over generations and time, became unquestionable truth or reality. Gergen (2009) said that, “social constructionists locate the origin of meaning in relationships” (p.26), not in the mind of the individual what constructivists do. Thus, in a social constructionist view the focus is not on an individual mind, but instead, on “how people interact with one another to construct, modify, and maintain what their society holds to be true, real, and meaningful” (Freedman & Combs, 1996, p. 27). Hoffman (1992) explained that, “Social constructionists hold firmly to the idea that there are no inconvertible social truths, only stories about the world that we tell ourselves and others” (p. 19).

The second idea, that “realities are constructed through language,” means that “our language tells us how to see the world and what to see in it” (Freedman & Combs, 1996, p. 28). It does not mean that through language we can know the real world, as it is out there, but rather that the language creates the world we know. Bruner (2004) cited Slobin who said that,

One cannot verbalize experience without taking a perspective, and…the language being used often favors particular perspectives. The world does not present
‘events’ to be encoded in language. Rather, in the process of speaking or writing, experiences are filtered through language into verbalized events. (p. 7)

Also, that realities are constructed through language means that change, “whether it be change of belief, relationship, feeling, or self-concept, involves change in language” (Freedman & Combs, 1996, p. 29). Narrative therapists work with people not to change them or fix their problems, but to help them create more preferred stories that can be transformative.

The third idea of social construction worldview means that, “If realities we inhabit are brought forth in the language we use, they are then kept alive and passed along in the stories that we live and tell” (Freedman & Combs, 1996, pp. 29-30). White and Epston (1990) said that,

In striving to make sense of life, persons face the task of arranging their experiences of events in sequences across time in such a way to arrive at a coherent account of themselves and the world around them…This account can be referred to as a story or self-narrative. The success of this storying of experience provides persons with a sense of continuity and meaning in their lives, and this is relied upon the ordering of daily lives and for interpretation of further experiences. (p. 10)

Bruner (2004) argued that, “it is through narrative that we create and recreate selfhood, that self is a product of our telling and not some essence to be delved for in the recesses of subjectivity.” (p. 13). He also believed that, “Stories become transformative only in their performance” (as cited in, Freedman & Combs, 1996, p. 33).
People make sense of their lives through stories, both cultural narratives they are born into and the personal narratives they construct in relation to the cultural narratives. In any culture, certain narratives will come to be dominant over other narratives. These dominant narratives will specify the preferred and customary ways of believing and behaving within the particular culture. (Freedman & Combs, 1996, p. 32)

This means that certain dominant narratives can be oppressive for people who seek consultation because, for example, they may ascribe meaning to certain events in their lives based on comparison with cultural norms; certain dominant stories discriminate and marginalize minority groups; and every self-narrative has events that don’t get “storied” and therefore new meanings can be constructed by exploration and reflection on those events or unique outcomes in dominant story. Narrative therapists are interested in the “local knowledge” of each person in order to understand how dominant cultural stories influence them (Freedman & Combs, 1996). “Narrative therapy is about the retelling and reliving of stories” (Freedman & Combs, 1996, p. 33).

Finally, the idea that “there are no essential truths” in social construction worldview implies that there are many possibilities how an experience can be interpreted rather than one, and that there is no “essential self” because “self” according to social construction is created in interaction with others through language. Narrative therapists “think of self not as a thing inside an individual, but as a process or activity that occurs in the space between people” (Freedman & Combs, 1996, p. 34). It is seen as a performance in context rather than as an internal structure (as it is in structuralism). According to social construction view, as described by Freedman and Combs (1996):
Different selves come forth in different contexts and no one self is truer than any other. We think that people are continually constituting each other’s “selves,” and that there are many possible stories about my-self, and your-self, and other people’s selves…Instead of looking for an essential self, we work with people to bring forth various experiences of self and to distinguish which of those selves they prefer in which contexts. We then work to assist them in living out narratives that support the growth and development of these “preferred selves.” (p. 35)

Bruner (2004) suggested that,

There is no such thing as an intuitively obvious and essential self to know, one that just sits there ready to be portrayed in words. Rather, we constantly construct and reconstruct our selves to meet the needs of the situations we encountered, and we do so with the guidance of our memories of the past and our hopes and fears for the future. (p. 4)

**Narrative Metaphor**

Unlike many family therapy models that are guided by the metaphor of “systems,” narrative therapy uses the metaphor of narrative as an interpretive method. It proposes that, “human beings are interpretive beings – that we are active in the interpretation of our experiences as we live our lives” (White, 1995, p. 13). Narrative metaphor is focused on meaning; how people interpret their experiences.

It is the narrative or story that provides the primary frame for this interpretation, for the activity of meaning-making…it is through the narratives or the stories that persons have about their own lives and the lives of others that they make sense of their experience. Not only do these stories determine the meaning that persons
give to experience…but these stories also largely determine which aspects of experience persons select out for expression. (White, 1992, p. 123)

Narrative metaphor does not propose that stories are a reflection or mirror of life as it is. “Instead, the narrative metaphor proposes that persons live their lives by stories – that these stories are shaping of life, and that they have real, not imagined effects – and that these stories provide the structure of life.” (White, 1992, p. 123)

White “saw in the narrative metaphor that a story is a map that extends through time” (Freedman & Combs, 1996, p. 15). Initially, White was influenced by Bateson’s discovery that time plays a role in perception of difference and change; however, later he expanded his thinking about narrative metaphor by studying Jerome Bruner’s analysis of literary texts. Bruner proposed that stories are composed of dual landscapes: a) a landscape of action, that is composed of events that are linked in sequence through time according to specific plot and which “provides reader with a perspective on the thematic unfolding of events across time,” and, b) a landscape of consciousness, that is composed of “the reflection on the events of the landscape of action” (p. 78), meaning-making, intentions, purposes, conclusions about the identity, and so forth (as cited in White, 2007). White (2007) saw parallels between “the structure of literary text and structure of meaning-making in everyday life” and “between the literary text and structure of therapeutic practice” (p. 80). White used this dual landscape structure in his re-authoring practices and renamed the concept of “landscape of consciousness” with “landscape of identity.”

White (2007) noticed that the concepts of landscapes are relevant to the therapeutic task, which he believed to be, “redevelopment of personal stories and the
reconstruction of the identity” (p. 80). Given that every story has gaps and inconsistencies in both landscapes, White (2007) believed that therapists should focus on rich story development, to draw person’s attention to gaps in his/her “subordinate” storylines, to engage them “to fill in these gaps by stretching their minds, exercising their imagination, and recruiting their lived experience,” (p. 81) and give meaning to “many of overlooked but significant events of their lives” (p. 83). For example, he would ask them to reflect on neglected events of their lives that are not predicted by their dominant problem-saturated story, which can lead to development of preferred stories.

De-centered position of the therapist can be evident in that, compared to authors of literary text,

therapists are not the originators of the storyline that is developed in the therapeutic conversation…they are not primary author in the sense the author of a literary text is. Rather, therapists privilege the voices of the people consulting them in attribution of meaning to selected events in their lives, in their interpretation of the links between these events and the valued themes of their lives, in their deduction about what this reflects in terms of what is important to them, and in their conclusions about what this suggests about their own and each other’s identities. (White, 2007, p. 82)

White (1995) suggested that narrative metaphor,

requires that the therapist challenges his/her settled certainties. S/he can’t know, in advance, what’s “right” for people – can’t even know how the family “should” look at the end of therapy. The narrative metaphor challenges totalizing practices. It encourages the therapist to enter into a reflexive position in relation to the
constitution of therapeutic realities. And it encourages the therapist to assist those persons who see therapy to enter into a similar position in relation to their own lives and, as well, to engage in the re-authoring of their lives according to alternative and preferred stories about who they might be. (p. 66)

**Foucault**

White (1995) said that Foucault’s ideas were the most influential in his thinking. Michel Foucault, a French intellectual and “historian of systems of thought,” studied, among other things, history of mental illness and how people were categorized as “abnormal” and “normal.” Foucault showed that the definitions of mental illness, madness, criminality, and sexuality differed throughout the history of mankind and were defined by powerful minority (Fillingham, 1993). Some examples of these mental illnesses that are no longer considered mental illnesses include but are not limited to: leprosy, hysteria in women, homosexuality, and so on. Foucault (1971) said that, “We forget certain problems and create new ones.” These psychiatric labels were used to dehumanize and to torture people in history and to regulate behavior.

To Foucault language is an instrument of power… He argues that there is inseparable link between knowledge and power: the discourses of a society determine what knowledge is held to be true, right, or proper in that society, so those who control the discourse control the knowledge…To Foucault, power is knowledge and knowledge is power. (Freedman & Combs, 1996, pp. 37-38)

Thus, those in power are “able to impose their idea of the right, or the true, on the majority” (Fillingham, 1993, p. 7), which often has dehumanizing and oppressive consequences.
Foucault showed how cultural practices of objectification of persons and their bodies were used to extend and enhance the social control, to subjugate, to divide, and exclude certain people by ascription of identity with specifications for self-possession and self-containment (White, 1989). “In this objectification of identity, many of the problems that people encounter in life come to represent the “truth” of their identity” (White, 2007, p. 25). According to White (2007), “many of the problems that people consult therapists about are cultural in nature” (p. 25). People judge themselves based on dominant cultural stories and norms that they have internalized, which consequently leads to feelings of inadequacy, incompetence, deficiency, insufficiency, and so forth (White, 2002). White (2007) believed that, “dominant narratives tend to blind us to the possibilities that other narratives might offer us” (Freedman & Combs, 1996, p. 39). White (2002) also suggested that, “dramatic growth of the phenomenon of personal failure is associated with the rise of a distinctly modern version of power that establishes an effective system of social control through what can be referred as “normalizing judgment” (p. 43).

Foucault’s analysis of Jeremy Bentham’s Panopticon led to the concept of modern power (White, 1989). The Panopticon was an architectural invention of eighteen century designed for invisible surveillance of prisoners from the top of the tower, which was located in the center of a prison’s courtyard. The structure and organization of the panopticon were such that prisoners could not see whether or not the guardian was observing them from the tower, although prisoners were always visible to guardians. These factors increased a prisoner’s feelings of isolation and powerlessness and lead to behaving as if he or she was observed at all times. Therefore, a prisoner becomes his or
her own guardian in controlling his or her behavior. “The Panopticon was a model for complete and successful subjugation of persons…a particularly modern system of power that relies on normalizing judgment (White, 1989, p. 24). White (1989) explained that,

This modern system of power is one that not only renders persons and their bodies as objects, but it is also one that recruits persons into an active role in their own subjugation; into actively participating in operations that shape their lives according to the norms or specifications of the organization. (p. 25)

White (1989) further explained Foucault’s analysis of how the Panopticon model of achieving order, obedience, and social control shaped people’s behavior:

Under these conditions they would become ever-vigilant with regard to their behaviour, evaluating all actions and gestures against the norms that are specified by the particular organization. And upon identifying any anomalies or aberrations in their own conduct, they would be induced to relate to their own bodies as objects: to engage in disciplinary and corrective operations to forge their own bodies as docile. Thus, they became their own guardians. They policed their own gestures. And they became the objects of their own scrutiny. (p. 25)

Foucault argues that “now we have a society of normalization in which evaluation has replaced torture, and has infiltrated the judiciary in matters of social control; in control of bodies, or groups, and of knowledge” (White, 1989, p. 27). White was critical of reproducing dominant discourse and normalizing judgment in therapy. He believed that “many of the problems that people consult therapists about are cultural in nature” (White,
2007, p. 25) and that, “dominant narratives tend to blind us to the possibilities that other narrative might offer us” (Freedman & Combs, 1996, p. 39).

White (2011) expressed his values and beliefs about the role of the therapist by asking the following questions:

Is it our role to be unwitting accomplices of modern power, or is it our role to sponsor diversity in everyday life? Is it our role to promote single-storied conceptions of life – or to bring forth complexity in the sense of alternative stories of life? Is the therapy room context for the confirmation of the known and familiar, or is it a context for arriving at what it might be possible to know? Is it a context for domesticating the exotic, or is it a context for “exoticizing” the domestic? (p. 43)

It can be concluded that Foucault influenced White in developing counter-practices to those in traditional psychotherapies, in seeing limitations of “expert knowledges,” in being aware of the power differential in therapy, in increased accountability for our actions, in bringing forth people’s voices and their preferences, in unmasking cultural discourses, in social justice issues, in personal agency and advocacy, among other things. White (1995) was aware that, “It is very easy for us to impose “truths,” because there is a power differential in our relations with those persons who seek help” (p. 30). White was interested in “what persons determine to be preferred ways of living and interacting with themselves and each other” and to help them, “to step more into those stories that are judged, by them, to be preferred – to perform the alternative understandings or meanings that these alternative stories make possible” (White, 1995, p. 19). He was not interested
in taking a role of a social engineer who aims to fix people into becoming “normal.”
Rather, he was taking a de-centered and influential position.

Bateson

Narrative therapy was also influenced by Gregory Bateson’s ideas. White (1995) reported that Bateson’s “restraints of redundancy” introduced him “to interpretive structures and to meaning as the heartland of life as we know it” (p. 65). White (1986a) early on suggested that his thinking fits with Bateson’s “negative explanation” of the events; which means that, “events take their course because they are restrained from taking alternative courses” (p. 85). On the other hand, “positive explanation,” means that, “events take their course because there’s a reaction to an action” (White, 1986b, p. 3). White (1986b) said that,

Like Bateson, I believe that positive explanation is quite sufficient to explain what happens on a billiard table, but not really sufficient to explain what is happening in human systems…When I am thinking about problems that families, couples, or individuals might have, I think about restraints.” (pp. 3-5)

White (1986a) defined restraints as “the network of presuppositions, premises, and expectations that make up the family members’ map of the world and that establish rules for selection of information about perceived objects or events” (p. 85). These maps of the world also include values, beliefs, certain premises, etc. White (1986b) said that people are “able to respond to events out there that fit within their map in some way; and that which doesn’t fit with that map or that pattern gets lost” (p. 4). In other words, “The survival of news is dependent upon how it fits with network of presuppositions.
Information that does not have meaning in this context is “forgotten or blurred” (White, 1986a, p. 86).

According to Bateson, and White (1986b) agreed, “in the world of non-living, notions of force, impact, etc. provide a sufficient explanation for events…And in this world, quantity is critical.” (p. 9) However, in the world of living “events are much dependent on restraints and also on information about difference…So when there is some new response, it’s always a response to information about difference…The recipient sees difference and responds to that difference” (p. 9).

White (1986b) stressed that therapists would intervene differently depending on how they see the world. In positive explanation therapists take an expert stance and look for what causes the problem and how to get rid of it or reduce its quantity, which could put blame and categorize individuals, couples and families as “dysfunctional” and “mentally disordered.” White using negative explanation would think of, “What is restraining this person from finding a different direction in life?” which can put him in de-centered and non-expert position. In the world of negative explanation: therapists look for the description of the problem, not theory about the problem; therapists co-evolve with the family to come up with new ideas and descriptions or to discover something new; the therapist job is to notice what is new and how that can endure; he or she does not give interventions at the end of the session; they are much less normative and they challenge their own biases (White, 1986b).

White (1986b) believed that “symptom itself is a restraint, rather than serving some function. He also believed that the therapist could join the family system without
positively connoting the problem, but instead by externalizing the problem. White (1986a) said that,

> To assist families that have been unsuccessful in the discovery of new solution, the therapist joins with family members to form the therapeutic system, contributes to this system’s readiness via the introduction of a new ‘code book’ that allows new ideas to be selected out, establishes conditions for double description in order that new distinctions can be drawn, and interviews in ways that contribute to the endurance or survival of new ideas. Thus, the therapist assists new ideas to ripple longer than old ideas. In this therapy, the therapist participates in the creation of a context for adventure and discovery. (p. 87)

In addition to adopting negative explanation of the world and exploring the restraints, White (1986a) took from Bateson ideas about double description. White (1986a) suggested that,

> Receipt of news of difference requires that family members perceive a contrast between two or multiple descriptions. The therapist contributes to the family’s perception of such contrasts by working to develop double or multiple descriptions of certain events, standing these descriptions side by side for family members and then inviting them to draw distinctions between these descriptions. This provides news of “difference which makes a difference” (Bateson 1972, p. 453) (p. 88)

White (1986a) developed multiple ways to create the context for double description. For example, by asking relative influence questions, he is asking family members to think about the ways in which not only the problem affected their lives, but also, how they
influenced the life of the problem. Additional examples of how he was creating a context for double description include: collapsing time, raising dilemmas, predicting relapses, and etc. (White, 1986a). White demonstrated that Bateson’s notions of negative explanation, restraint, and double description influenced his initial work and how these ideas were successful in treatment for childhood fears and obsessive and compulsive behavior, as well as eating disorders (White, 1986a; White, 1986b).

**Vygotsky**

From a Russian learning theorist, Lev Vygotsky, White used and “applied the metaphor of ‘scaffolding’ to the practice of inquiry into preferred stories” (Carry, Walther, & Russell, 2009, p. 320). White (2007) assumed that people who come to therapy are acting in ways that are known and familiar for them, in their effort to solve their problems, which keeps them with the familiar conclusions about themselves and their relationships. Consequently, people may feel frustrated with their incompetence to problem-solve, and their coming to therapy is likely to be experienced as a verification of their deficiency and inadequacy. Given that White was interested in identity conclusions and alternative more preferred stories, he used “scaffolding” to traverse in conversation from what is known and familiar to what is possible for people to know and do, which he called a “zone of proximal development” (White, 2007). Scaffolding “provides opportunity for people to proceed across this zone in manageable steps” (White, 2007, p. 263). Scaffolding metaphor contributed to White’s thinking about,

How we can use therapeutic questions to provide stepping-stones for people to “learn” previously unknown things about themselves in the as yet unexplored territories of their preferred stories. Thoughtfully scaffolded questions can support
people to step from the “known and familiar” of the problem experience into the
“not yet known, but possible to know territory of preferred stories. (Carry, Walther, & Russell, 2009, p. 320)

White (2007) believed that in the process of scaffolding it is possible for people to experience:

a newfound sense of personal agency: a sense of being able to regulate one’s own life, to intervene in one’s life to affect its course according to one’s intentions, and to do this in ways that are shaped by one’s knowledge of life and skills of living. (pp. 263-264).

In scaffolding practices, White also takes a de-centered and influential stance because he privileges people’s voices, their intentions, their knowledges, and their skills to move from what is “known and familiar” to what is “possible to know and do,” which creates a sense of personal agency rather than a sense of depending on the therapist and a sense of deficiency.

Vygotsky, who studied early childhood development, emphasized that “development is founded upon learning…and that learning was an achievement not of independent effort, but of social collaboration” (as cited in, White 2007, p. 271). White believed that Vygotsky’s concept of the “zone of proximal development” can be applied to any age and contributes to our understanding of therapeutic change. Vygotsky showed that development of “concepts” of life and identity is the result of meaning development of words.

It is this conceptual development that supplies the foundation for people to regulate their lives: to influence their own actions in purposeful ways, to intervene
in their own lives to shape the course of events, and to problem-solve. According to this understanding, actions that are considered responsible and autonomous have their foundations in social collaboration. The development of this self-regulation is a reflection of what Vygotsky referred to as “self-mastery.” He employed this term in a way that is synonymous with what I have referred to as “personal agency.” (White, 2007, p. 272)

In addition to creating a map for scaffolding conversations, White (2007) believed that, “it is social collaboration in the development of meaning that is essential to the attainment of personal agency and responsible action” (p. 280). White believed that it is therapist’s responsibility to create a context for development of personal agency, to scaffold the proximal zone of development, and to avoid thinking about and labeling people as “resistant,” “incapable,” “irresponsible,” and so forth if they, for example, don’t know the answer to our question. Instead, White (2007) suggested that the therapist can “drop down a level” of his or her inquiry and reflect on his or her skills in order to recognize the limitations of his or her skills and to find new ways of expanding these limits.

**Derrida**

In addition to Brunner, White was also influenced by a literary theorist Jacques Derrida, who saw “language as a system of differences” or binaries (Gergen, 2009, p. 19). What this means is that a word meaning depends on differentiating that word from what it is not. According to Derrida,

Word meaning depends on differentiating between a presence (the word you have used) and an absence (those to which it is contrasted). To make sense in language
is to speak in terms of presences, what is designated, against a backdrop of absences…the presences are privileged; they are brought into focus by the words themselves; the absences are only there by implication…these presences would not make sense without the absences. Without the binary distinction they would mean nothing. (as cited in, Gergen 2009, p. 19)

Referring to the work of Derrida, White said that, “It’s not possible to talk about anything without drawing out what it is not. Every expression of life is in relation to something else” (Carey, Walther, & Russell, 2009, p. 319). Influenced by Derrida’s deconstructionist arguments, White developed the concept of the “absent but implicit,” and “double listening.” Applying Derrida’s ideas to his work, White proposed that,

In order to make sense of certain experiences, we need to distinguish these experiences from others that already have meaning to us and which have already been described or categorized in some way. In other words, we can only make sense of what things are by contrasting them to what they are not: we can only distinguish isolation if we already have an understanding of connection; and we can only distinguish despair if we already have some knowledge about hope.

(Carey et al., 2009, p. 321)

This suggests that therapists can listen not only for what the person describes as a problem, but also, what the problem is not, or what is the “absent but implicit” in their description. “Every expression that a person gives to their experience is in relation to other experiences that are not being named, or that are not evident but are there by implication” (Carey et al., 2009, p. 321). Therapists can listen and explore with a person,
for example, what their frustration speaks about what is important to them, what they value, what they believe in, or what they hold precious that is being violated.

Such an inquiry, about what is in the background of this person’s experience that will make sense of the distress that is being expressed in the foreground, offers an entry point to preferred or subjugated stories. From this point, we can go on to develop a rich account of their values, hopes, and commitments and so on that have been transgressed. (Carey et al., 2009, p. 321)

Therefore, listening for the “absent but implicit” can open space for a development of alternative stories and preferred identity conclusions, in which narrative therapists also take a de-centered position by privileging person’s voices, meaning, and preferences.

Narrative therapists are not listening for pathology behind what is being said. They are listening for person’s hopes, dreams, values, aspirations, commitments, intentions, and so on. They listen for what is being violated in their experiences and what they would prefer instead. They see expressed frustration, pain, sadness, and anger, as people’s taking action against what is not okay for them, rather than as a sign of their resistance and psychopathology.

According to White (2003), “Listening can never be considered a neutral activity” (p. 33). White (2003) believed that it is therapist responsibility to establish a listening context in which “expressions of pain and distress are heard and acknowledged, but not in a way that contributes further to these thin conclusions about people’s identities, or about the identity of their family or their community” (p. 33). In addition to listening for what is “absent but implicit,” White (2003) suggested that team members “attend closely to the transformation of signs and meaning” (p.33) as the conversations evolve, that are
associated with discourses of personal agency rather than discourse of deficit and incompetence.

Drawing from the work of another French philosopher, Gilles Deleuze, Michael proposed that if “difference” is the baseline of experience, then our ears can be drawn to the ever-presentness of stories that are different from the problem story. Everything that is not the problem story becomes a possible site for the emergence of new meanings that can be ascribed more useful and more “agentive” purpose. (Carey et al., 2009, p. 322)

Myerhoff

Even though early on White and Epston saw the benefit of engaging audiences in rich story development, in their contributing to endurance and extension of preferred developments in people’s lives, White’s (2007) understanding of the significance of the audiences was supported by the work of cultural anthropologist Barbara Myerhoff. Myerhoff (1982) worked with elderly Jews, the Holocaust survivors, who were isolated and invisible in their communities and who lost the sense of existence, to help them become visible and to participate in construction of their and other people’s identities through their performances, which Myerhoff calls, “definitional ceremonies.” These performances of life stories, telling and retelling, in definitional ceremonies, are understood “to be collective self-definitions specifically intended to proclaim an interpretation to an audience not otherwise available” (Myerhoff, 1982, p. 234). Sessions were designed as performances in which “people displayed the qualities they wanted seen as much as they could and became what they displayed” (Myerhoff, 1982, p. 244). Myerhoff stated that, “Performance is not merely a vehicle for being seen. Self-definition
is attained through it, and this is tantamount to being what one claims to be” (p. 235). In these “collective self-definitions,” audience played a significant role. According to Myerhoff,

> It was the audience response to the stories told and performed in these forums that was verifying of these stories. It was the audience’s acknowledgment of the identity claims expressed in these stories that was authenticating of these identity claims. It was the audience recognition of these stories that so significantly contributed to the community member’s achieving a sense of feeling at one with their claims about their lives. (as cited in, White, 2007)

Myerhoff saw that it was audience’s retelling of person’s story that played the significant role in community members “a sense of being at one with their claims about their lives” and “in renewal of one’s sense of personal authenticity” (White, 2007, p. 184). In summarizing Myerhoff work, White (2007) suggested that the actions of the audience (or community members) reflected the extent to which,

> Identity is a public and social achievement shaped by historical and cultural forces rather than by the forces of human nature, however this human nature might be conceived of the outcome of deriving a sense of authenticity through social processes that acknowledge one’s preferred claims about one’s identity and history. (p. 182)

Drawing from Myerhoff definitional ceremonies, White (2007) developed a map for definitional ceremonies that “provides a context for rich story development” (p. 165). In “definitional ceremony,” which includes telling, retelling, and retelling of retelling, the therapist is responsible for preparing the outsider witnesses and for structuring re-telling
conversation. Therapist is taking a de-center position in that he or she is not reproducing dominant discourses by instructing the outsider witnesses to give compliments, affirmations, advices, or to challenge clients or make any other judgments. Rather, outsider witnesses are asked in retelling to speak about their own experience: what they were drawn to, what images came to their mind while listening, why they were drawn to these expressions, and where this conversation may take them (White, 2007).

Myerhoff also influenced White in development of re-membering conversations. Myerhoff (1982) pointed out that, “Memory may offer the opportunity not merely to recall the past but to relive it” (p. 238). Myerhoff (1982) said that,

To signify this special type of recollection, the term re-membering may be used, calling attention to the reaggregation of members, the figures who belong to one’s life story, one’s own prior selves, as well as significant others who are part of the story. Re-membering, then, is a purposive, significant unification, quite different from the passive, continuous fragmentary flickerings of images and feelings that accompany other activities in the normal flow of consciousness. (p. 240)

White (2007) stated that, “Re-membering conversations provide an opportunity for people to engage in a revisions of the membership of their associations of life, affording an opening for the reconstruction of their identity” (p. 136). More specifically, re-membering conversations “contribute to the development of a multivoiced sense of identity,” open possibility for upgrading certain voices and some memberships and for downgrading others, “richly describe the preferred versions of identity,” “provide for a two way understanding of person’s relationship with the significant figures in their lives,” and “encourage not passive recollection of one’s past” (White, 2007, pp. 138-139).
Myerhoff stated that, “It is through re-membering that life is given a shape that extends back in the past and forward into the future” (as cited in White, 2007, p. 137). “Without re-membering we lose our histories and our selves.” (Myerhoff, 1982, p. 240)

Re-membering conversations imply and acknowledge that our identity conclusions are relational; they are shaped by important figures in our past and present and they can be re-negotiated which also can contribute to the sense of personal agency rather than to confirmation of the belief that we are stuck with our “encapsulated self.” Re-membering conversations also increase our awareness of our participation in other people’s lives, which can open space for preferred identity conclusion, for rich story development, and for sense of personal agency. Although these conversations are structured, therapist is taking a de-centered and influential position.

In conclusion, many thinkers outside of the mental health field contributed to shaping of White’s ideas and narrative practices. These practices include but not limit to: externalizing conversations, re-authoring conversations, re-membering conversations, definitional ceremonies, scaffolding conversations, and conversations that highlight unique outcomes (White, 2007). Narrative therapy is not a set of techniques to be applied to eradicate specific problems. It is “an epistemology, a philosophy, a personal commitment, a politics, an ethics, a practice, a life, and so on” (White, 1995, p. 37). Narrative therapy creates context and opportunity for re-authoring lives, re-inventing identities, discovery, adventure, and personal agency. It also privileges people’s voices, values and beliefs, which enables them to play more active role in shaping their own lives according to their preferences.
If narrative practices are taken up as “techniques” and used in a worldview that does not encourage collaboration, openness, and ongoing examination of the effects of its practices, they can have undesirable effects. It is vital that practices that have become part of the work not be used out of context of the reflective, deconstructionist, nonpathologizing worldview in which they were developed.

(Freedman & Combs, 1996, p. 275)

White (2007) emphasized that “maps” are “guiding ideas of some sort in the development of therapeutic conversations” (p. 6). They are not considered “true” and “correct” guide to narrative practice (White, 2007). White (2007) explained his position in the following way, “I do not use them to police my conversations with the people who consult me. Therapeutic conversations are not ordered, and I make no effort to determine my response to people’s expressions ahead of these expressions.” (p. 5)

**Therapeutic Relationship in Narrative Therapy**

This dissertation is focused on how Michael White creates and maintains a therapeutic alliance with clients using narrative therapy, taking a decentered and influential position. The reason for studying Michael White, rather than some other narrative therapist, is because he invented the idea of decentered but influential. Not much is written about this position and it is usually unclear to many students of narrative therapy what this position means and entails and how it is performed in the session.

In addition, the decision to study Michael White was based on a fact that he was enormously admired, by many professionals in our field, including myself, for his ability to relate differently with people who were diagnosed with mental illness. Freedman and Combs (1996) wrote that they initially fell in love with how White was able to create
relationships with his clients and they saw “how people could transform themselves and their lives in preferred ways within those relationships” (p. 264). Lynn Hoffman (2002) also admired White and described him as, “a tender therapist but a tough theorist” (p. x). Jeff Zimmerman (as cited in White, 2011) liked that Michael was “genuinely curious” about his ideas, which opened new possibilities in his work as a therapist. Cheryl White, Michael’s wife, said that when Michael worked in a state psychiatric hospital, his way of relating to people was different from usual “professional” ways. Instead of seeing and treating people as “patients,” White treated them as equals who could contribute to his life as well (as cited in White, 2011). It can be concluded that White’s unique way of relating to people inspired and influenced other professionals (including myself) to study his ideas and practice narrative therapy.

Because White was able to create profound therapeutic relationships in which people were able to transform their lives in their preferred ways, it is important to study and explore how he was able to do it. Furthermore, given the importance of positive therapeutic alliance on the outcome of therapy (as evident in second part of this literature review), and a lack of research on how narrative therapists create therapeutic alliances, this study will address that gap in the existing research literature. More specifically, the focus of this study is on how Michael White takes a decentered and influential position in his relationship with people who consulted him.

**The Effects of Taking a Decentered and Influential Position**

What is known about therapeutic interaction in narrative therapy is that White (1995) believed that it is a two-way phenomenon in which both parties (clients and therapists) are mutually influenced and changed. This is consistent with a social
constructionist worldview in which realities (and meaning) are created in relationships and through use of language. White (1995) also acknowledged the power differential in therapeutic relationships, in which therapists have more power, and therefore, are morally and ethically responsible for their actions. However, being aware of the potential negative effects of this power differential in therapeutic relationship, White strived to always create a more egalitarian relationship with his clients. One way he accomplished this was through transparency (White, 1992; White, 1995).

White (1995) challenged the idea that, for therapy to be effective it is important that persons do not know the therapist’s intentions. In contrast, White invited people to evaluate their sessions, and he asked them questions about which parts of the interview were relevant to them and which were not, what was helpful or not helpful for them, and he even encouraged them to interview him about his questions and his intentions behind them (White, 1993). Asking his clients for their feedback on their experience of therapy and giving them opportunity to decide for themselves what they preferred and what they wanted to talk about was important to Michael White in his interactions with people who consulted him (White, 1993; White, 1995; White, 2007).

White also created more egalitarian and collaborative relationships by viewing his clients in a non-pathologizing ways. This is evident in his beliefs that problems do not represent the “truth” about people’s identities, in inviting people to objectify their problems rather than themselves as defective, in his refusal to use professional language such as “patients” or “clients,” but instead, he referred to them as “people who come to consult me,” in his genuine curiosity about their problems, in taking a de-centered position on people’s lives by inviting people to evaluate their problems and create their
own preferred identities, in privileging clients’ language, skills, and knowledges, in focusing on meaning rather than on facts, in not imposing of his values, beliefs, meanings, etc., and so on (White, 2007; Freedman & Combs, 1996).

In addition to a nonpathologizing view of people, White (1993) expressed his commitment “to action against the abuses of power: against neglect, against cruelty, against injustice, and against the subjugation of the alternative knowledges” (p. 132). These were his values in addition to “solidarity,” which White (1993) explained as:

constructed by therapists who refuse to draw a sharp distinction between their lives and the lives of others, who refuse to marginalize those persons who seek help, by therapists who are constantly confronting the fact that if faced with the circumstances such that provide the context of troubles of others, they just might not be doing nearly as well themselves. (p. 132)

In this statement, it is implied that White was creating egalitarian relationships with his clients; he was interacting with them in the most humane and compassionate way; and he understood that their problems are related to their circumstances. It can be also concluded that his intention was not to put himself above his clients in terms of having a superior knowledge on how to deal with or solve clients’ problems. White (1995) did not specify how people should live their lives and he did not prescribe a direction for clients’ lives.

**Decentered and Influential Position of the Therapist**

The position of the therapist in narrative therapeutic relationship is described as a decentered and influential (White, 2007). A decentered stance is briefly described by White (2007) as a position in which “therapist is not the author of people’s positions of
the problems and predicaments of their lives” (p. 39). Instead, the therapist creates opportunities for clients to reflect on their experiences and to take their own stance in relation to their problems. Therefore, the client’s voices, knowledges, and preferences are privileged over the therapist’s expert knowledge. In a decentered position, the therapists is not privileged in attributing meaning to clients’ problems; the therapist is not imposing his or her understanding about the consequences of the problems; the therapist does not assume to know what is important to clients; and the therapist does not prescribe directions for how people should live their lives (White, 2007). In other words, the therapist is not reproducing a dominant discourse, is not oppressive, and does not act as an expert who treats defective internal structures. White (2007) described what decentered therapists do not do by saying what centered therapists do. For example,

I can see that this (problem as defined by the therapist) is having these
(consequences as drawn out by the therapist) in your life. This is a (position authored by therapist), and we will have to do something about this because (justification founded upon therapist’s normative ideas about life). (p. 40)

It seems that when the therapist takes a decentered position in relationship with his or her client, that relationship is characterized by collaboration, curiosity, not-knowing, and opening space for new identity conclusions, rich story development, and personal agency.

A decentered position of the therapist also reflects a post-modern, post-structuralist, non-normative, and social construction worldview, as well as, Foucault’s influence on White not to reproduce dominant discourses, not to marginalize people’s knowledges and voices, and to acknowledge the power differential in relationships. Therefore, it reflects striving for and creating more egalitarian relationships. A
decentered position can also be described as one in which therapists adopt a non-pathologizing view of people, in which they refuse to objectify people by prescribing them internal structures as an evidence of their “dysfunctional” or culturally inappropriate or undesirable behavior. Rather, therapists taking a decentered position are aware of and understand that identity conclusions are created relationally through language, therefore, they are not fixed inside the person. A decentered position opens space for new discoveries, new understandings of self and relationships, and new meanings that can lead to taking different directions in person’s life. A decentered stance of the therapist creates a context in which individuals can experience themselves differently in relation to their problem, in their relationships, or/and in their own sense of self. By taking a decentered stance, therapists can also contribute to creating a relationship and therapeutic conversation in which people feel liberated, more hopeful, and more empowered, with a greater sense of personal agency.

A decentered position can also be understood as a position in which the therapist tries to level the hierarchy with clients by collaborating, by asking for their feedback, and by being transparent. It also implies that voices that are silenced by dominant discourses or oppressive stories that people bring in deserve attention and exploration. By taking a decentered position, the therapist is refusing to act as a social engineer. It seems that in a decentered position of the therapist, a political aspect of narrative therapy is clearly evident. White (1995) did not deny that a “therapy is inevitably a political activity” (p. 38), and that you cannot not take a position. However, White’s political stance was to privilege people’s values, beliefs, and preferences, rather than to impose his own values or the values of our Western individualistic culture that prescribes what it means to be a
“real person,” or a “person of moral worth,” according to which people tend to evaluate their lives.

By taking a decentered position, the therapist can provide “people with opportunity to give voice to intentions of their lives and to develop a stronger familiarity with what they accord value to in life” (White, 2007, p. 220) which is evident in conversation that highlight unique outcomes. White (2007) believed that if therapists take authorship over people’s lives, they are likely to experience burden, exhaustion, and burnout as well as to leave people feeling impotent. On the other hand, taking a decentered position may protect therapists from this burden and eventually extend their career.

**Influential Position**

An influential position of the therapist is described as the therapist’s participation in selecting and bringing forward thin events that are not included in the dominant story so that more preferred stories can be developed (White, 2007). While there are many ways in which therapists can be influential, narrative therapists are influential in a sense that they open many possibilities for people to pursue what they value and hold precious. Thus, the therapist is influential by being intentional and by using questions or categories of inquiry as evident in different maps. For example, in externalizing practice, “the therapist provides people with an opportunity to define their own position in relation to their problems and to give voice to what underpins this position” (White, 2007, p. 39). The therapist is influential by assisting persons (who report negative conclusions about their identity and/or their relationship) to redefine their relationship with their problem and to re-experience their identities through four categories of inquiry: 1) negotiating a
particular experience-near definition of the problem, 2) mapping the effects of the problem, 3) evaluating the effects of the problem’s activities, and 4) justifying the evaluation (White, 2007). Through these inquiries the therapist is influential in the sense that he or she conversationally opens many possibilities for people to reflect and evaluate their lives in a different way and to pursue what they value and hold precious.

Externalizing conversation practice is only one example and one map of narrative practice among other maps (e.g., conversations that highlight unique outcomes, re-authoring conversations, re-membering conversations) through which narrative therapists can be seen as being influential. It is not simply about following the maps, which are only guidelines and not set in stone prescriptions for practicing narrative therapy, that make the therapist be influential in narrative therapy. Rather, it is more about whether the therapist helps people explore some neglected territories of their lives and provides opportunities for people to more richly describe the alternative stories of their lives.

In addition, in scaffolding conversations the therapist is influential by assisting a person to progressively traverse from what is known and familiar toward what might be possible for him or her to know and do about his or her identity and life (White, 2007). Drawing from Vygotsky’s work, White (2007) emphasized that the learning (or change) is achieved through taking manageable steps and is the outcome of social collaboration that occurs through language. Therefore, the therapist plays a significant role in influencing each conversation through the language he or she uses; for example, the therapist’s questions, that are small enough for a person to answer and reflect on, may assist the person to move to a new unexplored and neglected territories that may lead to development of preferred identity conclusions. The therapist’s talk may lead to either
learning something new about one’s life, identity, beliefs, values, hopes, intentions, skills, relationships, and problem (that often makes a difference in person’s life) or it may lead to what the person already knows (familiar conversation) that usually makes no difference in what the person concludes about his or her identity, his or her relationships, and his or her problem. As White (2005) stated:

The therapist is influential not in the sense of imposing an agenda or in the sense of delivering interventions, but in the sense of building a scaffold, through questions and reflections, that makes it possible for people to: a) more richly describe the alternative stories of their lives, b) step into and to explore some of the neglected territories of their lives, and to c) become more significantly acquainted with the knowledges and skills of their lives that are relevant to addressing the concerns, predicaments and problems that are at hand. (p. 9)

Therefore, the influential position of the therapist can be explained as the therapist’s skill to be very intentional in his or her inquiry that focuses on assisting individuals to create alternative stories and more preferred identity conclusions without imposing his or her values and beliefs about how they should live their lives and without providing his or her expert insight and interventions.

Narrative therapists use their influential position to explore people’s hopes, dreams, goals, aspirations, values, beliefs, skills, and knowledges; rather than to explore, diagnose, and cure their deficiencies (White, 2007), which is the practice in other more normative models and which leads to creating a different kind of relationships between the therapist and the client. These therapeutic relationships can be described and experienced as more egalitarian, respectful, and empowering, instead of more oppressive,
hierarchical, and limiting that could create negative consequences for both the therapist and the client. These consequences include but are not limited to the therapist’s burn out and frustration when the client is not compliant with his or her interventions that make sense according to his or her theory; the possible lack of collaboration due to clients’ so-called “resistance” as perceived by therapist; the client’s dependency on the therapist’s expert knowledge about how to solve their problems; the client’s feelings of incompetence, deficiency, or not being understood when he or she is diagnosed or told what to do that does not fit with his or her values and beliefs, to name just a few.

On the other hand, the relationship in which the therapist is influential but de-centered tends to create a sense of personal agency, competency, and hope. For instance, individuals suffering from anorexia and bulimia reported experiencing sense of relief, freedom, control, and hope as a result of experiencing and being in externalizing conversations (Maisel et al., 2004) in which the therapist takes a de-centered and influential position.

An influential position of the therapist can be evident in therapist’s participation in co-creation of new meanings, new stories, and new identity conclusions that are according to clients’ preferences and values. Although the therapist is not taking a primary role in authorship of alternative stories, he or she participates in the process and is responsible for the outcome (White, 2007). Narrative therapists are aware of their influential position in relationship with their clients and they examine and question the effects of their practices (Freedman & Combs, 1996; White, 1995).

Influenced greatly by Foucault, White (2002) was aware that a therapist (person in power with expert knowledge) can replicate the dominant discourses and can further
recruit people into disciplining themselves and others based on socially constructed norms, as well as, that therapists could through their authority operate as agents of social control. White refused to be influential in such manner. Instead, White used influential position to provide people “with an opportunity to refuse normative criteria in the judgment and the justification of their activities...[and to]...focus on the consequences of one’s activities in the shaping of one’s life and relationships” (White, 2002, p. 68). Thus, White did not relinquish people from taking responsibility for their actions neither did he blame them for not acting in particular ways that are culturally constructed to be normal; rather, he was able to open space for people to deconstruct problems and to create a different relationships with their problems in which they felt less oppressed by them, were able to hear more their voices and be more empowered to take different actions and responsibility according to their values and preferences. Hence, White was influential in very different way than other therapists who had ideas and norms for clients what it takes to be a normal or functional person or/and family - replicating dominant discourses that are oppressive and lead to self-surveillance, negative judgments, and self-blame given that the people are objectified rather than their problems.

More than any other theorist of his time, White was concerned about the effects of therapeutic practice on people’s lives. By quoting Foucault, “We know what we think; we think we know what we do; but do we know what we do does?” David Epston suggested that White looked at not only intentions but also the effects of therapeutic practice (as cited in White, 2011, p. xxviii). White (2007) believed that therapists are responsible for the consequences of what they think, say, and do in therapy. Given the inherited power differential between the therapist and the client, in which therapists have
more power, White (1995) stressed that it is easy for therapists to impose the “truths” and; therefore, steps should be taken to prevent such imposition.

An influential position, like decentered, reflects White’s worldview, his theoretical ideas, and his acknowledgment of power differential in a relationship, and in a way it holds therapists accountable for the effects of what they do and say in their conversations with people who consult them. White (1995) asserted that, “to enter the belief that therapy can be totally egalitarian, would make it possible for therapists to ignore the special moral and ethical responsibilities associated with their position” (p. 70), which was certainly not his intention. White (2005) also believed that taking a decentered and influential position could be potentially invigorating of therapist.

This study intends to answer the following research question: How, if at all, can Michael White be seen to take a decentered and influential position in narrative therapy? The methodology of this study will be explained in the next chapter.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

This study used qualitative inquiry, a single instrumental case study design, and conversation analysis as a method of studying the relationship between the therapist and the client. This study aimed to address the following research question: How, if at all, can Michael White be seen to take a decentered and influential position in narrative therapy? This study intended to look for the ways in which White can be seen to take an influential and decentered position in his narrative consultation with the family based on his description of decentered and influential stance. Thus, this study looked at the examples of how White takes a decentered and influential stance in relation to his clients.

Qualitative Inquiry

Qualitative inquiry, rather than quantitative, was used because this study focuses on exploration of text in context (on qualities) rather than on quantities that require mathematical processes for understanding and interpretation (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Qualitative inquiry can be used to explore phenomena about which little is known or/and to gain new understanding by obtaining details about the phenomenon (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). In this study, I used qualitative inquiry to explore, describe, and provide detailed understanding of the decentered and influential position of the therapist. Creswell (2007) suggested that qualitative research can be used when “a problem or issue needs to be explored” (p. 39), when “we need a complex, detailed understanding of the issue” (p. 40), and when “quantitative measures and the statistical analyses simply do not fit the problem” (p. 40). We know little about a decentered and influential position of the therapist in narrative therapy and if and how White uses this stance in relationships with his clients. This study did not aim to quantify White’s talk or manipulate any variables,
but rather to focus on how, and if at all, he uses a de-centered and influential stance. In addition, a qualitative inquiry fits with this study research question because it is focused on the processes in observed talk interaction between the therapist and the client rather than on their internal or psychological states that are usually measured and tested in quantitative studies (Hays & Singh, 2012). In contrast to quantitative research methods, qualitative research is more sensitive to context; it “seeks to understand phenomena in context-specific settings” (Golafshani, 2003, p. 600). Hays and Singh (2012) defined qualitative research as “the study of a phenomenon or research topic in context” (Hays & Singh, 2012, p. 4).

Rather than studying a decentered and influential position from a structuralist and positivist worldview that might be used in quantitative studies (Creswell, 2007), a post-structuralist and social-constructionist paradigm was used in analyzing the conversation between the therapist and the client in order to explore if and how Michael White takes a decentered and influential position in relationship with his clients. Finally, a qualitative inquiry was chosen because it can provide thick and detailed descriptions and therefore a deeper understanding of the phenomena being studied (Hays & Singh, 2012) – a decentered and influential position of the therapist - which is the goal of this study.

**Case Study Design**

A single case study design and conversation analysis were previously used in studies that explored the interactional patterns between the therapist and the client. For example, Gale (1991) studied one-session consultation with solution-oriented therapist, Bill O’Hanlon, to discover the interactional patterns between the therapist and his clients and how the therapist elicits particular responses from clients such as solution-focused
Wickman and Campbell (2003) used a single case study design and conversation analysis to investigate the conversational style of Carl Rogers when he was being “Rogerian” which contributed to a clearer definition of his main concepts: empathy, unconditional positive regard, and genuineness. Thus, using a single case design is a common practice in conversation analysis (Gale, 1996) that requires a microanalysis of talk.

While there are different types of case study designs (Stake, 1995), a single case instrumental design was used in this study, because the intention was to gain the insight and understanding of a decentered and influential position of the therapist in relationship with clients. Instrumental case study designs are used when there is “a need for general understanding, and feel that we may get insight into the question by studying a particular case” (Stake, 1995, p. 3).

In this study, I used a single study instrumental case design because one session was studied intensely in order to provide a great detail about a therapist who takes a decentered and influential position, given that there is lack of research on this topic. Also, the intention of this study was to understand the concept rather than to generalize it through measurement and testing hypothesis, which is more consistent with quantitative research methods. As Stake (1995) stated: “The real business of case study is particularization, not generalization. We take a particular case and come to know it well, not primarily as to how it is different from others but what it is, what it does” (p. 8). Once the concept of a decentered and influential position of the therapist is understood and more richly described with examples, future studies can compared it with other available cases and quantitative methods can be used to test future research hypothesis.
Since not much was written and understood about this idea, a single instrumental case study design seemed to be the appropriate first step.

**Conversation Analysis**

Conversation analysis originated from ethnomethodology in 1960s (Gale, 1996). Ethnomethodology, a style of social research, investigates “the ways in which collectivity members create and maintain a sense of order and intelligibility in social life” (ten Have, 2007, p. 139). Harold Garfinkel, a sociologist, who developed ethnomethodology, was interested in studying how people analyze, make sense, and perform social activities using ethno methods of reasoning (Gale, 1996). As reviewed by Gale, Garfinkel believed that people’s actions are social accomplishment and he saw language as a “reality-constituting practice,” rather than representation of reality, which is similar to the social constructionist view of reality.

While most qualitative researchers are interested in knowing “the world as participants see it, ethnomethodologists prefer to study how, by the use of which procedures and methods, any particular ‘world’ is produced and perceived” (ten Have, 2007, p. 139). Instead of conducting interviews, ethnomethodologists tend to study and analyze naturally occurring talk, which often includes audio and video recordings (ten Have, 2007). Given that the focus is on how participants use language in interaction, as Gale (1996) stated, “analyzing interviews as they occur in various settings (e.g., a clinical encounter) is a useful ethnomethodological activity for understanding how the participants construct a social institution (e.g., therapy)” (p. 109).

What ethnomethodology and conversation analysis have in common is their preference for studying naturally occurring talk rather than conducting experiments, they
both focus on “how participants themselves produce and interpret each other’s actions,” and “the researcher treats all the interactional empirical data as unique and different and thus worthy of serious analytic attention” (Pomerantz & Atkinson, 1984, as cited in Gale, 1991, p. 29).

Conversation analysis (CA) was founded by Harvey Sacks and his colleagues, Jefferson and Schegloff, who developed methods for studying naturally occurring talk (Gale, 1996). Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) defined conversation analysis as “the study of recorded, naturally occurring talk-in-interaction” (p. 12) that focuses on how participants in their conversation orient each other, organize, and interpret their talk. In other words, how their talk is organized “from the perspective of how participants display for one another their understanding of ‘what is going on’” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p. 13). Thus, by analyzing the therapist and the client talk, it could be observed how they interpret and understand their utterances. However, in this study the main focus was on examining the therapist’s talk and how and, if at all, he took a decentered and influential position in his interaction with clients. This study did not look at the relational effects of White’s decentered and influential position, but rather examples of that position and ways in which he used it, if at all.

Use of recordings in conversation analysis provides the researcher opportunity to make precise and detailed observations of interactional patterns that could be lost in experimental methodologies (Heritage, 1984). In addition, “It permits other researchers to have direct access to the data about which claims are being made, thus making analysis subject to detailed public scrutiny and helping to minimize the influence of personal preconceptions or analytical biases” (Heritage, 1984, p. 238).
Gale (1996) suggested that CA as a method has many advantages for practitioners because it can bridge research and practice in many ways. These include: studying how therapists achieve success, studying if they do what they say they do, demonstrating how social identities are created in interaction and through language, using it as a method for self-supervision, and so forth (Gale, 1996). According to Gale (1996), “CA can examine how clinicians actually perform a particular therapeutic model” (p. 120). Heritage (1984) stated that conversational analysis has no fixed intrinsic agenda in terms of which objectives could be studied. “Rather, conversation analysis represents a general approach to the analysis of social action which can be applied to an extremely varied array of topics and problems” (Heritage, 1984, p. 291). The advantage of conversation analysis is that it is “nondisruptive to the conversations that it explores” (Gale, 1991, p. 23). Even though the investigator is the instrument of the inquiry, he or she does not influence the development of recorded conversation unless he or she has conducted the interview or/and has been present.

“CA has developed through empirical studies that have focused on specific, observable phenomena. So, in the first place, CA is not a theoretical, but very concretely empirical enterprise” (Perakyla, 2007, p. 154). Sacks initially studied phone calls in suicide prevention facility and the problem of getting the callers name (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). Sacks’s original idea was that, contrary to the belief that conversations are random, “there is ‘order at all points’ in talk-interaction” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p. 19). According to Hutchby and Wooffitt, “For CA, the notion of order at all points means that nothing in talk-in-interaction should be dismissed as trivial or uninteresting
before we have subjected it to analysis” (p. 20). Thus, the researcher approaches data with an open mind and without prior knowledge which details are important.

While in quantitative research hypotheses are first made and then tested in a controlled and systematic investigation, in conversation analysis “observations are used as the basis for theorizing” (Gale, 1991, p. 28). For example, Gale and Newfield (1992) studied how the therapist, O’Hanlon, used language to achieve his therapeutic agenda in marital therapy session. These researchers developed and described nine categories of O’Hanlon’s procedures (e.g., pursuing a response over many turns, using humor to change topic, clarifying unclear references, overlapping talk in order to get a turn, reformulation of meaning, offering a candidate answer) for pursuing a solution oriented talk. Wickman and Campbell (2003) used conversation analysis to examine Carl Rogers’s conversational style; how he enacts his main ideas of empathy, genuineness, and unconditional positive regard. According to their analysis, Rogers uses met-statements to promote genuineness, he externalizes internal dialogue to communicate empathy, and he withholds giving advice to demonstrate unconditional positive regard (Wickman & Campbell, 2003). Hence, conversation analysis is an inductive rather than deductive methodology that is “rigorously empirical…[and]… avoids premature theory construction” (Levinson, as cited in Gale, 1991, p. 28) that can be used to investigate the position of the therapist in narrative therapy. Even though, some effects of taking a decentered and influential position were described, more can be learned about how, if at all, White uses a decentered and influential position in narrative therapy. This study looked at the ways in which White can be seen to take this position based on what he said.
Assumptions

According to Heritage (1984), three fundamental assumptions of conversation analysis are: “(1) interaction is structurally organized; (2) contributions to interaction are contextually oriented; and (3) these two properties inhere in the details of interaction so that no order of detail can be dismissed, a priori, as disorderly, accidental or irrelevant” (Heritage, 1984, p. 241). Gale (1996) expanded these points by saying that, conversations are meticulously co-orchestrated phenomena. An individual’s action is not independent of the actions of others but is patterned in relationship to other’s actions. Meanings are expressed and understood precisely because there are patterned structures to interactions. Second, simultaneously as speakers shape their utterances specifically for intended recipient(s), their utterances also contribute to the continuation or closing of that context. Thus, every action both shapes the context and is constrained by the context. Third, CA examines paralinguistic (and sometimes the nonverbal) features of talk as well as the structural sequencing of the various turn takings. Therefore, all interactional features of the context are relevant to the analyst. (p. 109)

It seems that main assumption of conversation analysis, as explained by Gale, is that understanding is achieved in circular fashion and that individual actions cannot be understood in isolation. The focus is not on internal structures of individuals involved in interaction, but instead on how their actions accomplish particular meanings (Gale, 1996). Thus, “The analysis is sensitive to pattern and form, rather than focusing on substance” (Gale, 1991, p. 32). Given that conversation analysis investigates social interaction, it was possible to obtain new insights and understanding of relational
dynamics between the therapist and the client through application of this methodology (Perakyla, Antaki, Vehvilainen, & Leudar, 2008). By studying moment-by-moment talk between the therapist and the client, it was possible to describe in great detail how the therapist and the client interact and how the therapist takes a decentered and influential position.

Conversational analysts use exemplars from transcript to support their observations, such as categories of patterns (Gale, 1991). According to Gale (1996), the conversation analysis method is similar to the Taylor and Bogdan’s analytical induction and Glaser and Strauss’s constant comparative method. Some of the micro patterns studied in previous research are turn-taking switches, adjacency pairs, accounts, preliminaries (Gale, 1996), overlapping talk, repair (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008), and so forth. Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) suggested that researchers often use different techniques in conversation analysis and that specific techniques may work well for one researcher but not for another. They suggested approaching data with “conversation analytic mentality” which is described as “sitting down with a transcript, and the associated tape, and trying to describe, turn by turn, what is going on in the talk.” The conversation analytic mentality is also described by “approaching data in terms of ‘What are the participants doing here?’, ‘How they are accomplishing that?’, and ‘How do they display the orderliness of the talk for each other?’” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p. 133). These questions guided the researcher in approaching data to answer her research question.

I used qualitative inquiry, a single instrumental case study design, and conversation analysis because they methodologically fit with my research question. The
purpose of this study was to explore and describe if and how White interacts with his clients taking a decentered and influential position, an idea invented by White that was not previously studied and richly described. Qualitative case study was used because the focus of this study is to richly describe and understand a decentered and influential position, and conversation analysis was used to accomplish that goal. Conversation analysis is a qualitative research method used to analyze “segments of therapeutic encounters” (Gale, 1996, p. 111) or entire session of a single case and is “concerned with process (the “how” question)” (p. 111). It is a microanalysis of naturally occurring talk that can be used to understand and describe how participants (the therapist and the client) construct their relationship through language (Gale, 1996). The focus of this study was on process and how and if at all White takes a decentered and influential position in relationship with clients. Examples of how this stance can be used will be provided in Chapter 4. Hence, the proposed methodology seemed appropriate for accomplishing the goal of this study.

Procedure

Selecting Data

In conversation analysis, instead of transcripts, video or audio recordings of naturally occurring interactions are considered ‘the data’ (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). A single session by Michael White was chosen for several reasons. First, Michel White is one of the inventors of narrative therapy and his ideas are dominant in this approach. He was highly respected by his colleagues in mental health field for his innovative ideas and his ability to create positive relationships with his clients. White invented the idea of decentered and influential. Secondly, the single session case that was used is seen as
representative of Michael White’s work and his decentered and influential position.

Third, the single session case that was used is a commercially available video recorded session, which allowed the researcher to examine the context of therapy and influential but decentered stance in great detail. I followed these inclusion criteria in selecting a case for analysis.

Several strategies were used to identify video sessions of Michael White. I searched family therapy databases for Nova Southeastern University patrons via official library website; more specifically, I searched Counseling and Therapy in Video: Volume I, II, and III database section and Nova Catalog for any DVDs located in Alvin Sherman Library at NSU. I identified three video session interviews by Michael White called, “Re-authoring Lives in the Face of Lost Dreams,” “The Best of Friends,” and “Re-authoring Relationships through Stories of Caring.” All three video sessions are commercially available at the www.masterswork.com website. I have contacted a representative at the Master’s Production and was assured that I can use the White’s video sessions for my research project (J. Andrews, personal communication, February 9th, 2016). I chose to use White’s session called, “Re-authoring Lives in the Face of Lost Dreams,” because it is a full session, does not have many interruptions and comments as in other sessions, and it fits the inclusion criteria of this study. Before transcribing the video session and analyzing the data, this study was submitted for an Institutional Review Board (IRB) review at Nova Southeastern University and was officially approved.

Transcribing

Given that transcribing is a discovery process as well as constructive activity, it is important in conversation analysis that the researcher herself or himself transcribes the
video session (Gale, 1991; 1996). Therefore, I transcribed White’s video session using my headphones in my home office. The video session was transcribed into a Word document that was saved into my password-protected computer to which only I have access. I repeatedly listened to and watched video session in order to refine the transcript. The session was first transcribed verbatim and then the notation system (see Appendix B) that fits conversation analysis conventions was used for transcribing and conversation analysis of the session. Furthermore, I collaboratively listened to the video session with my dissertation chair in order to further improve the transcript.

**Data Analysis Steps**

In this study, the conversation between White and his clients was transcribed in as much details as possible in order to gain insight and describe how White uses a decentered and influential position in relationship with his clients. I transcribed the video session using transcription conventions as described in Appendix B. Using inclusion criteria (see Appendix A), which I have created based on review of White’s literature, I examined the research question: How, if at all, can Michael White be seen to take a decentered and influential position in narrative therapy? These inclusion criteria in Appendix A are only some, but not all, of the kind of things that I was looking as I analyzed the qualities of White’s talk. I was open to discover examples of decentered and influential position that I did not find in White’s writings but which I observed in the video session (see Chapter 4 for more details) in addition to describing ways in which he can be seen to take this stance based on what he said. Also, I was alert to distinctions between an influential position, a decentered position and a combination of both. The
exclusion criteria were times when White did not take a decentered and influential position. These few examples were noted but were not further analyzed.

The findings of this study contributed to richer description of ways in which a decentered and influential position can be used in narrative therapy, since the phenomenon of investigation (decentered and influential stance) is better understood and more richly described. Those descriptions can also be a useful tool for future studies in which researchers are interested in studying a relationship between the decentered and influential position of the therapist and other factors as well for educational and training purposes in supervision and self-supervision.

After initial transcribing, it appeared that White can be seen to use decentered and influential stance based on inclusion criteria. I proceeded by identifying and analyzing instances in conversation so that I can describe in more details ways in which Michael White takes a decentered and influential position in narrative therapy. I immersed myself in a continuous recursion process of listening and watching video session, transcribing and refining the transcript, “developing categories of patterns, and comparing these categories with subsequent segments of talk” (Gale, 1996, p. 112). Coding of transcript to categorize data was done using track changes in review section and tools on Microsoft office Word document.

I used, as suggested by Gale and Newfield (1992), the constant comparative method which involves “simultaneously coding and analyzing the data in order to develop concepts,” and analytic induction that involves:

a) developing a hypothesis (or category); b) studying the fit of the phenomenon with the hypothesis; c) reformulating the hypothesis if it does not provide a good
description; d) looking for negative cases to disapprove the hypothesis; and e) when negative cases are found, reformulating the hypothesis or redefining the phenomenon. (p. 157)

Thus, upon initial analyzing, various categories were considered and studied for fit with my hypotheses (Appendix A). I constantly compared descriptions (categories) with the text. The exemplars in text helped decide whether or not Michael can be seen to demonstrate an influential and decentered stance with the clients. Emerging themes and supra-themes were modified, if needed, based on relevant examples (or negative examples) in text. Finally, I present my findings of if and how White takes a decentered and influential position, through the use of exemplars from the transcript to support my observations (see chapter IV). Direct quotes from the transcript will help reader decide about the validity of my observation, analysis, and claim about descriptive specification of a phenomenon- decentered and influential position of the therapist.

**Quality Control**

In order to establish quality control, Gale (1996) stressed several ways that credibility, applicability, and dependability can be maximized in conversation-analytic research, which I used. According to Gale, credibility is achieved by “soaking” oneself in the data; that involves repeated listening, watching, and refining transcript, then by sharing transcript with co-researchers and discussing observed patterns and emerging themes, by using deviant examples to refine category development, by supporting particular patterns and themes with showing evidence of repeated examples, and by writing a journal. Dependability and applicability of the study is maximized by providing the entire transcript to readers for their review and conclusions, as well as, by describing
procedures used by the researcher in conducting the study (Gale, 1996). These recommended strategies were employed to ensure the trustworthiness of this research study.

In addition, I approached data analysis with an open mind and curiosity, rather than confirmatory and restrictive attitude, in order to investigate the ways in which White takes a decentered and influential position in narrative therapy. Even though this is a “discovery oriented research,” it does not mean that categories are there to be found. Rather, the categories constructed were my descriptions of what I saw as meaningful. In addition, discovery oriented research means that the researcher started the study open-minded, without priory ideas what to expect to “find” in analysis (Gale, 1991). Even though I had some ideas about a decentered and influential position of the therapist based on reading in narrative therapy literature and my inclusion criteria (as described in Appendix A), I did not have a priory knowledge about the details of this stance; in other words, if White accomplishes this stance, and if so, how he does it. Each description and theme developed is a subject to reader for his or her own understanding, analysis, and interpretation of meaning given that each reader will use his or her own world view to make sense of what is presented as finding. In addition, to reduce my biases, I met with my dissertation chair, who practices narrative therapy, and my committee members, who are not narrative therapists, to discuss my observations and to obtain their feedback. Sharing my observations with my committee members, who are not narrative therapists, and asking for their feedback maximized trustworthiness of findings.
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS

Upon completing the data analysis processes I organized the data according to themes, supra-themes, and sub-themes to describe richly and illustrate how Michel White takes a decentered and influential position in narrative therapy. I discovered that White can be seen to take a decentered and influential stance while practicing narrative therapy based on how he described it in the literature and my inclusion criteria (see Appendix A). However, during the process of conversation analysis additional themes emerged from the data that were not mentioned throughout the literature on decentered and influential position in narrative therapy. I describe those in Part Three: Surprises of this chapter. These themes are additional ways of practicing decentered and influential stance.

During the data analysis process, sub-themes emerged from data for many themes, and that information can contribute to understand better the performance of decentered and influential stance. Supra-themes are created to represent and summarize main themes – how I saw White being decentered and influential.

In first part of this chapter, tables for decentered and influential stance are used to illustrate findings. The tables include supra-themes, themes, and sub-themes in order to describe richly White’s decentered and influential position in narrative therapy session.

In Part Two, the examples from the transcript (short segments) are included for each theme to support my observation that White can be seen to practice a decentered and influential position and to more richly describe how he does it with use of direct quotes.

In Part Three: Surprises, the tables and examples are presented for themes that emerged from data analysis that were not included in my literature review and inclusion
criteria. The findings of this study are my interpretation and are presented to readers for their evaluation and interpretation. Therefore, they should not be seen as facts or static.

### Part One: Tables

Table 1

*Michael White’s Decentered Position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLABORATIVE</strong></td>
<td>Therapist privileges client’s voice.</td>
<td>Therapist privileges client’s preferences about the content of conversation, setting, and reflecting team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist seems to collaborate with clients by privileging client’s voice, interpretations, meanings, skills and knowledges, and preferences, by paying close attention to client’s language, and by listening to and asking what is important to client.</td>
<td>Therapist privileges client’s interpretations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist privileges client’s meanings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Therapist privileges client’s skills and knowledges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist privileges client’s preferences.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Therapist privileges client’s preferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist pays close attention to client’s language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist seems to listen to what is important to client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist asks what is important to client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 continues

Michael White’s Decentered Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EGALITARIAN</td>
<td>Therapist seems to be transparent.</td>
<td>Therapist seems to be transparent about: a) the setting, b) the process of therapy, c) his experience of session, and d) his intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therapist asks for client’s feedback.</td>
<td>Therapist asks clients for their feedback about: a) the content of conversation, b) the setting, c) client’s experience in the session, and d) the process of conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therapist invites clients to evaluate session.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therapist asks client to evaluate problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Michael White’s Decentered Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-HIERARCHICAL/ NONEXPERT</strong></td>
<td>Therapist refrains from attributing meaning to client’s problems.</td>
<td>Therapist avoids providing his own insight by asking questions and privileging client’s voice, and by using editorial that includes client’s languages, preferences and meanings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist refrains from taking a hierarchical position. Therapist tries to level hierarchy by respecting clients’ meanings and understandings about their problems, by taking a decentered stance about what is the best for them and how they should live their lives, and by not providing his expert knowledge and judgment in terms of compliments, solutions, insight, and normalizing. Ultimately, clients are seen as experts on their lives, not therapists. White believed that there is a hierarchical difference between therapist and client but that there are many ways how therapist can try to level that hierarchy.</td>
<td>Therapist avoids imposing his understanding about the consequences of the problems. Therapist does not act as a primary author in how clients should live their lives. Therapist avoids prescribing directions for client. Therapist holds back knowing in advance what is best for the client. Therapist avoids providing solutions for client. Therapist avoids providing compliments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist refrains from attributing meaning to client’s problems. Therapist avoids imposing his understanding about the consequences of the problems. Therapist does not act as a primary author in how clients should live their lives. Therapist avoids prescribing directions for client. Therapist holds back knowing in advance what is best for the client. Therapist avoids providing solutions for client. Therapist avoids providing compliments.</td>
<td>Therapist avoids providing his own insight.</td>
<td>Therapist avoids confronting clients about their beliefs. Therapist refrains from providing normalizing judgment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 continues

*Michael White’s Decentered Position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NON-PATHOLOGIZING /POST-STRUCTURALIST VIEW</td>
<td>Therapist avoids providing diagnosis for client’s problems and avoids objectifying the client.</td>
<td>Therapist refuses seeing client in totalizing ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist refuses to objectify and categorize people and to see them in totalizing ways because he is not seeing them as having internal structures that need to be fixed into becoming less pathological or normal. This position is informed by post-structuralist world-view Therapist refuses to reproduce dominant discourse and avoids simplistic behavioral goals. Therapist sees clients as acting according to their intentions, values, beliefs, plans, hopes, aspirations, goals, and dreams.</td>
<td>Therapist refrains from seeing clients as having internal structures.</td>
<td>Therapist avoids categorizing people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist avoids asking questions that verify client deficiency or inadequacy.</td>
<td>Therapist avoids seeing problems in totalizing ways.</td>
<td>Therapist rejects trying to fix people into becoming normal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist avoids simplistic behavioral goals.</td>
<td>Therapist sees clients as acting according to their intentions, values, beliefs, hopes, dreams, aspirations, and/or goals.</td>
<td>Therapist avoids making statements and giving advice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURIOSITY</th>
<th>Therapist mostly asks questions, and mostly avoids making statements and giving advice.</th>
<th>Therapist mostly asks questions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therapist mostly avoids making statements and giving advice.</td>
<td>Therapist mostly avoids making statements and giving advice.</td>
<td>Therapist mostly avoids making statements and giving advice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Michael White’s Influential Position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO-RESEARCHER AND CO-CREATOR OF CONTEXT FOR RICH STORY DEVELOPMENT/ NARRATIVE METAPHOR</strong>&lt;br&gt;Therapist is influential by providing opportunities for clients to deconstruct their dominant story, to more richly describe alternative stories, and to step into and explore some neglected territories of their lives.</td>
<td>Therapist provides opportunities for clients to more richly describe the alternative stories of their lives. Therapist provides opportunities for clients to step into and to explore some of the neglected territories of their lives. Therapist provides opportunities for clients to deconstruct their dominant story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO-CREATOR OF CONTEXT FOR PREFERRED IDENTITY CONCLUSION / POST-STRUCTURALISM</strong>&lt;br&gt;Therapist is influential by creating a context in which clients have opportunities for re-experiencing their identity and creating a more preferred identity conclusion. This is based on a post-structuralist view of identity. Therapist is influential by objectifying client’s problems and asking questions about client’s hopes, dreams, intentions, aspirations, and preferences. Therapist is also influential by assisting clients to move from what is known and familiar to what might be possible for client to know about his/her life and identity. By providing opportunities for client to revise the relationship with the problem, clients may experience their preferred identity.</td>
<td>Therapist provides opportunities for clients to redefine their relationship with the problem and/or to re-experience their identity. Therapist provides opportunities for clients to create a more preferred identity conclusion. Therapist assists clients to move from what is known and familiar to what might be possible for him or her to know about his or her life and identity by asking questions. Therapist asks questions that seem to lead to learning something new or neglected about clients’ hopes, dreams, intentions, aspirations, and preferences. Therapist objectifies client’s problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 continues

*Michael White’s Influential Position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO-CREATOR OF CONTEXT FOR REFLECTION, DISCOVERY, LEARNING AND PERSONAL AGENCY</strong></td>
<td>Therapist provides opportunities for clients to become more significantly acquainted with the knowledges and skills of their lives that are relevant to addressing the concerns, predicaments and problems that are at hand. Therapist avoids asking questions that seem to lead to known knowledge. Therapist refrains from imposing his or her agenda and delivers interventions. Therapist asks questions to open possibilities for clients to pursue what they value and hold precious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist is influential by providing opportunities for clients to become more significantly acquainted with the knowledges and skills of their lives that are relevant to addressing the concerns, predicaments and problems that are at hand, and by asking questions that open possibilities for clients to pursue what they value and hold precious. Therapist also creates context for reflection, discovery, learning, and personal agency by refraining from imposing his agenda and delivering interventions and by avoiding to ask questions that seem to lead to known knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part Two: Examples from Transcript

In this section I presented examples from the transcript that correspond to each theme for White’s decentered and influential position. That way, readers can quickly move from reading tables and finding supporting evidence in this section. In addition to presenting exemplars for each theme they are annotated with my own interpretations. Readers can also refer to Appendix B in order to understand the notations in the transcript.

The narrative consultation case that I used for this study is entitled “Re-authoring Lives in the Face of Lost Dreams” lasts 105 minutes, including reflecting team. In this session, Michael White (MW) consults with Diane (D), her two young children Mathew (M) and Andrew (A), and her mother Dorothy (Do). Diane is a 38-year-old White Caucasian graduate student of psychology who has been divorced about a year. She worked in area of public health before her children were born. Diane’s older son Andrew, who is seven years old, was born with severe disabilities and has a seizure disorder. Diane had many hopes that Andrew would be better. Diane’s younger son Mathew is five years old and attends special ED preschool. Diane reported that she was struggling with remaking her life as a single mother with children with disabilities and her crises around meaning. Her mother, Dorothy, who was initially observing the session behind the one-way mirror, also joined the session. The main themes from the session incorporate her changed relationship with hope and reinventing her preferred identity conclusion that involves a sense of self-esteem, refusing to be so disciplined, getting in touch with her creativity and intellectual capabilities, being herself more, being more open with other people, and not being perfect.
Decentered Position

Collaborative

White seems to collaborate with clients by privileging client’s voice, meanings, interpretations, skills and knowledges, and preferences, by listening to and asking for what is important to client, and by paying close attention to client’s language. It appears that White collaborates with clients when he is taking a decentered position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLLABORATIVE</td>
<td>Therapist privileges client’s voice.</td>
<td>Therapist privileges client’s preferences about the content of conversation, setting, and reflecting team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist seems to collaborate with clients by privileging client’s voice, interpretations, meanings, skills and knowledges, and preferences, by paying close attention to client’s language, and by listening to and asking what is important to client.</td>
<td>Therapist privileges client’s interpretations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist privileges client’s meanings.</td>
<td>Therapist privileges client’s skills and knowledges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist privileges client’s preferences.</td>
<td>Therapist pays close attention to client’s language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist seems to listen to what is important to client.</td>
<td>Therapist asks what is important to client.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Therapist privileges client’s voice.** In this example, White privileges the client’s voice by asking her about her way of thinking about hope rather than assuming or suggesting that hope is a positive thing in her life.
Example 1

1251  D:  That’s really (1.6) I didn’t think of it in terms of my hoping for myself.
1252  
1253  MW:  Right, was it important to think about like that? Is that a helpful way of thinking about it or? =
1254  
1255  D:  = um (3.0) yeah yeah. >I mean cause I invested so much< time in (.4) hoping that the children will be okay hoping that my marriage would work out hoping that you know everything =
1256  
1257  D:  = um (3.0) yeah yeah. >I mean cause I invested so much< time in (.4) hoping that the children will be okay hoping that my marriage would work out hoping that you know everything =
1258  
1259  MW:  = yeah =
1260  
1261  D:  = and having to let go of those hopes is really (.6) important so (.4) I guess it is kind of shifting my relationship to hope =
1262  
1263  D:  = and having to let go of those hopes is really (.6) important so (.4) I guess it is kind of shifting my relationship to hope =
1264  
1265  MW:  = yeah yeah yeah =

Note: White is decentered by asking her, “Is that a helpful way of thinking about it or?” (lines 1254-1255), which in turn helped the client learn something new and realize how her relationship with hope impacted her life and shifted.

**Therapist privileges client’s interpretations.** White is privileging the client’s interpretations by using editorial in this example. An editorial is the question posed by the therapist that includes the client’s previous comments or interpretations and ends with check-in type of question such as, for example, “is that right?”
Example 1

MW: = okay so there are two major changes in your relationship with hope. um (.6) One of it, is that it doesn’t extend your (inaudible) so much (1.0) and the other one is that you’re allocating some of it to yourself, is that right?

D: Yeah.

Note: White is privileging the client’s interpretations by using editorial, which includes the client’s previous interpretations about how her relationship with hope changed and checking-in question “is that right?” A more centered therapist usually would summarize what he or she heard by expressing his or her expert opinion, which is based on therapist’s etiology of problems and worldview. I noticed that White did not do that, and that instead, he respected the client’s interpretations.

Therapist privileges client’s meanings. White is privileging client’s meanings by being curious and asking open-ended question about the meaning of the client’s crises in this example.

Example 1

MW: Okay you mentioned a little bit about (.6) how you had this a bit of a crisis around meaning, was that? =

D: = uh-huh =

MW: = is that correct? Can you tell me a little
Note: White is taking a decentered position by asking the client, “Can you tell me a little about what that crisis is about?” (lines 596-597). Note that this open-ended question is not one of the first things that therapist said in this session; instead, it is based on what White heard from the client in their conversation while he was trying to get to know them. White is curious to learn from the client about “that crisis” and therefore, he privileges client’s meanings. I noticed that White did not make statements consisting of his expert knowledge and meanings.

**Therapist privileges clients’ skills and knowledges.** White privileges the client’s skills and knowledges by asking how question. The how question can be seen as a short version of how were you able to do that question.

*Example 1*

1516 MW:  = how?
1517 D: = and **just be myself more** I mean I feel like
1518 I’m (.6) I can I’m expressing who **I am** so
1519 much more than kind of being (.5) tied so
1520 much with this other person and wondering
1521 whether what I am doing is satisfactory to
1522 him and =

Note: In this example, White did not come up with his conclusion by offering statement or assumed that he knew about client’s skills and knowledge, but instead, he asked the “how” question which shows his curiosity and that he privileges the client’s knowledge
and skills. As a result, the client expressed her skills that she is able to be and express more who she is without wondering if that’s satisfactory to her husband.

**Therapist privileges clients’ preferences.** In this session, White privileges the client’s preferences about: a) the content of conversations, b) the setting, and c) the reflecting team.

*Example 1 – about content of conversation*

459 MW: I would be interested to know what would

460 you be interested in talking about today,

461 because I (.5) you know I don’t have much

462 information about =

463 D: = uh-huh =

*Example 2 – about setting*

473 MW: [can I also say you know I would be

474 interested in what conditions would be the

475 best for you? Whether you would like

476 children to be present or you would prefer

477 that [

*Example 3- about reflecting team*

2541 MW: = um *any* normally I would ask few more

2542 questions about that but (inaudible) and um

2543 I think that we should (find this out) fairly

2544 soon >any other do you have any other

2545 thoughts about reflections?< ((asking
Note: White privileges client’s preferences by asking, “what would you be interested in talking about today” (line 460), “what conditions would be best for you?” (lines 474-475), and “do you have any other thoughts about reflections?” (lines 2544-2545). A more centered therapist might suggest who needs to be present for the session for therapy to work or for the family system to be fixed, he or she might provide a direction for content based on a given diagnosis and look for particular answers such as if the client is taking medications as prescribed by doctor, how often she is depressed, and so on. I noticed that White did not suggest that and instead he respected the client’s preferences by asking her these questions above.

**Therapist pays close attention to client’s language.** White repeats back that he heard a client using the client’s language. He is not reframing the client’s words. In this segment, they talked about the client’s fear of not being perfect.

*Example 1*

1741 D: [that I am not perfect or
1742 something ((laughs)) =
1743 MW: = okay [a fear of being not perfect

Note: White is decentered by paying close attention to the client’s words, and by saying, “okay a fear of being not perfect,” he respects the client’s interpretations of her experience. He inserted the word “fear” because they were previously talking about her fears and the client mentioned it first in the line 1629 in the transcript. On the other hand, a centered therapist might challenge the client’s statements or beliefs by asking the client for the evidence that made her believe that she is not being perfect or would try to
reframe her experience of fear by using different words or constructs (e.g.,
multigenerational transmission process, differentiation of self, complex of inferiority,
being stuck in negative self-talk, lack of self-acceptance) so that the client changes her
view of the problem. Since the client is at the center of the interaction not the therapist,
the client’s language is privileged – given that words have meaning and shape realities.

Therapist seems to listen to what is important to client. In this example, White
communicates that he is interested in listening to and talking about what is important to
the client.

Example 1

984 MW:  [no no I am not looking for any
985 particular answer I am interested in what
986 you are interested in talking about and =

Note: White communicates that the client is privileged in deciding on the content of
conversation and ensures the client that there are no right or wrong answers. He is
decentered and collaborates by listening what is important to the client.

Therapist asks what is important for client. In the first example, White is asking about
the client’s future plans and her program, which seemed important to the client. In the
second example, White is asking the client if the support team is important to her.

Example 1

164 MW:  = yeah wow is that after how long? How
165 long is the program been? =
166 D:  Two years =
167 MW:  = Two years *yeah*=
D: yeah.

MW: And where do you go from there when you graduate?

Example 2

D: = we both know that we need each other for that (.4) so we really try to work hard >and

I guess I do feel like I have < a team

anyway I mean between (. ) the therapists and

Andrew’s teachers and my parents and

(.5) um his doctors >I mean< it really is (.9)

it’s a community ((smiles))

MW: yeah yeah and that’s been important?

D: It’s been essential [yeah

Note: In the first example, White shows that he is interested in what is important to the client by asking about her goals or plans, “And where do you go from there when you graduate?” (lines 169-170). In the second example, by asking, “and that’s been important?” (line 741), White is asking about the importance of her support team that she had for her son Andrew. He did not make an immediate assumption that teamwork was important rather he asked the client. A more centered therapist usually would suggest that more support is needed and typically would provide referrals for additional support groups, may examine the quality of her support, or focus on Andrew’s diagnoses and symptoms of her depression and so forth. White can be seen as collaborative by listening and checking-in with the client about her preferences and interests.
Egalitarian

White seems to create egalitarian interaction with clients by being transparent, by asking for client’s feedback, by asking clients to evaluate session, and by asking clients to evaluate problems. It appears that White can be categorized as egalitarian when taking a decentered position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EGALITARIAN</td>
<td>Therapist seems to be transparent.</td>
<td>Therapist seems to be transparent about: a) the setting, b) the process of therapy, c) his experience of session, and d) his intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist seems to create egalitarian relationship with clients by being transparent, and by asking for client’s feedback. Therapist seems to create egalitarian relationship by inviting clients to evaluate session and provide their feedback. By asking clients to reflect and evaluate their problems, therapist creates egalitarian interaction.</td>
<td>Therapist asks for client’s feedback.</td>
<td>Therapist asks clients for their feedback about: a) the content of conversation, b) the setting, c) client’s experience in the session, and d) the process of conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist invites clients to evaluate session.</td>
<td>Therapist asks client to evaluate problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therapist seems to be transparent. White can be seen as being transparent about: a) the setting, b) the process of therapy, c) his experience in session, and d) his intentions.

Example 1 – about setting

66 MW: = What do you think about all these cameras and things? (2.3)

Example 2 – about the process of therapy

263 MW: = to get into this sort of work *yeah* (. ) So:

264 um and you are already familiar with a
reflecting the team process [and (inaudible)]

D: [I’ve done it

some =

Example 3 – *about his experience in session*

MW: = I arrived yesterday, my world is still
going around in circles you know =
D: = you are in a completely different time =
MW: = if I ask the same question *twice* you know
that =
D: = ((laughs)) It’s okay =
MW: = ((laughs)) =
D: = I’ll answer the same question twice.

Example 4 – *about his intentions*

MW: [yeah. So:: (2.0) I made couple of notes
here and if that’s okay and come back to
them
D: = sure =

Note: By being transparent, White seems to create a more egalitarian interaction. In contrast to a more centered therapist who may believe that clients should not be informed of therapist’s intentions for healing to occur, White believed in importance of therapist’s transparency that contributes to creating a more equalitarian interaction in which clients are not pathologized or seen as below therapist in any way.
Therapist asks for client’s feedback. During the session, White can be seen to often ask clients for their feedback about: a) the content of conversation, b) the setting, c) the client’s experience in the session, and d) the process of conversation.

Example 1 – about the content of conversation
1232 MW:  ((laughs)) okay yeah (.) so um are we
1233 talking what’s interesting to you to talk
1234 about or? =
1235 D: = uh-huh yeah it is =

Example 2 – about the setting
66 MW: = What do you think about all these
67 cameras and things? (2.3)

Example 3 – about her experience in the session
438 MW: So what’s like it for you to be out here in
439 front of the group behind the one-way
440 screen? =

Example 4 – about the process of conversation
768 MW: [yeah. So:: (2.0) I made couple of notes
769 here and if that’s okay and come back to
770 them
771 D: = sure =

Note: By asking clients for feedback about the content of conversation, about the setting, about the client’s experience in the session, and about the process of conversation, White seems to create egalitarian relationship with clients.
**Therapist invites clients to evaluate session.** In this example, White asked the client to evaluate what she heard in the session from her mother.

*Example 1*

2608 MW: = was that acknowledgment from your

2609 mom? Was that a positive thing for you? =

2610 D: = yeah yeah it is. **Actually to tell you the**

2611 truth it opens up possibilities for further

2612 discussions for more conversation with my

2613 mom about that.

Note: In this example, White did not ask usual evaluative question, “Was this session useful to you?” or something similar. Instead toward the end of the session, he asked the client to evaluate what her mother specifically said during the session to see if that was useful for her identity conclusion or/and their relationship. A centered therapist may provide his or her expert evaluation of the session. I noticed that White did not do that, but instead, he asked the question, which makes him decentered.

**Therapist asks clients to evaluate problems.** Instead of making interpretations and evaluations for the client, White is asking the client to evaluate.

*Example 1*

998 D: (.3) How do you mean? I’m trying to

999 imagine how my relationship with it

1000 changed. (4.0) I think my hope (1.0) my

1001 relationship with hope in relation to

1002 Andrew has changed =
1003 MW: = *yeah* yeah can you tell me about that?

Note: White is taking a decentered position by asking the client to evaluate her relationship with hope. By being curious about the client’s relationship with the problem and yet refusing to provide his expert evaluation of it, he is expressing a not-knowing/non-expert position as well as his post-structural worldview, which is part of being decentered. This stance also helps the client to become more curious and aware of her relationship with a “problem.” A centered therapist usually would provide his or her evaluation in terms of individual or family diagnosis and typically focus on prescribing a direction for symptom reduction or family system perturbation or/and restructuring, transference and countertransference, and so on depending on their theoretical orientation.

*Example 2*

1656 MW: So this fears would have you do what?

1657 What sorts of things would these fears have you doing that can’t get you to do now you

1659 know? =

*Example 3*

1746 MW: (2.3) So this fear that someone might find out that you are not being perfect =

1747 D: [yeah =

1748 [would be isolating

1750 D: [I think to be honest >I mean< it has a lot
to do with my family and not wanting my
mom and dad to know certain things about [me that are personal =

Note: In examples 2 and 3, White asks the client to evaluate “this fear” and its consequences in her life. In contrast to centered therapists who might provide their understanding of the client’s fear and how it makes her depressed and unhappy or how it is a product of her irrational thoughts, a decentered therapist privileges the client’s understanding of the consequences of the problems on their lives and provides opportunities for clients to see themselves in relationship with the problem rather than in possession of it. As a result, clients may feel liberated and empowered to change the relationship to the problem.

**Non-Hierarchical/Not-Expert**

White seems to be a non-hierarchical or a not-expert in the interaction with the clients. He appears non-hierarchical by not attributing meaning to client’s problems, by not imposing his understanding about the consequences of the problems, by not-knowing in advance what is the best for clients and how they should live their lives, and by not providing his expert knowledge and judgment in terms of compliments, solutions, insight, and normalizing. He also appears a non-hierarchical by not prescribing directions for clients and avoids confronting clients about their beliefs. It appears that White is non-hierarchical when performing a decentered position.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-HIERARCHICAL/NOT-EXPERT</strong></td>
<td>Therapist refrains from attributing meaning to client’s problems.</td>
<td>Therapist avoids providing his own insight by asking questions and privileging client’s voice, and by using editorial that includes client’s languages, preferences and meanings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist refrains from taking a hierarchical position. Therapist tries to level hierarchy by respecting clients’ meanings and understandings about their problems, by taking a decentered stance about what is the best for them and how they should live their lives, and by not providing his expert knowledge and judgment in terms of compliments, solutions, insight, and normalizing. Ultimately, clients are seen as experts on their lives, not therapists. White believed that there is a hierarchical difference between therapist and client but that there are many ways how therapist can try to level that hierarchy.</td>
<td>Therapist avoids imposing his understanding about the consequences of the problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist refrains from providing compliments.</td>
<td>Therapist avoids prescribing directions for client.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist avoids providing solutions for client.</td>
<td>Therapist holds back knowing in advance what is best for the client.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist avoids providing his own insight.</td>
<td>Therapist avoids providing normalizing judgment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist avoids confronting clients about their beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Therapist refrains from attributing meaning to client’s problems.** White does not assign meaning to the client’s problems. Instead, he uses questions to find out from the client.
Example 1

1637  MW:  = This is fear of? =
1638  D:  [(ugh ohh)
1639  MW:  = of upsetting someone or?
1640  D:  = yeah >no you know< I had a lot of years of being really disciplined about food and [eating =
1642  D:  = yeah >no you know< I had a lot of years of being really disciplined about food and
1643  MW:  [(ohh okay)
1644  D:  = and um and I think a lot of that was just fear of (.) expressing myself of who I was =
1645  MW:  [(right
1647  D:  as a woman and >you know< whatever other capabilities (.4) all the other capabilities that I have =
1649  MW:  = right =

Note: In this example, White was curious about the nature of her fear, and although he made a guess “of upsetting someone” he respected her attribution of meaning, that it is a “fear of expressing myself.” Centered therapists typically would provide their insight why she has this fear based on their theory; for example, her negative thoughts (cognitive therapy), unfinished business from a childhood (psychoanalysis), sense of inferiority (Adlerian), low differentiation of self (Bowen) and/or her suffering from an eating disorder, etc. White took a decentered position by being curious and privileging client’s local knowledge rather than his expertise.
Therapist avoids imposing his understanding about the consequences of the problems. In this example, White asks questions about client’s understanding about the consequences of her problems.

*Example 1*

1656 MW: So this fears would have you do what?
1657 What sorts of things would these fears have you doing that can’t get you to do now you
1659 know? =

Note: White takes a decentered position by asking questions about the consequences of the problem (fear) rather than imposing his own understanding of the consequences of her fear. It is also evident that White externalizes fear and asks indirectly about her skills and knowledges in overcoming the fear.

Therapist does not act as a primary author in how clients should live their lives. In the first example, White accomplishes this by asking questions, while in the second example he avoids providing suggestions how the client should live her life.

*Example 1*

1430 MW: = *yeah okay*. So how does that fit with
1431 um (.8) this changing relationship with
1432 hope? Are they connected this refusal to be
1433 so [disciplined and changing your
1434 relationship to hope?
1435 D: [ohhh you know it’s something that is
1436 happening now =
MW: [yeah]

D: = it’s hard to say what

MW: [yeah]

D: = I’m kind of wondering how it’s gonna

MW: (3.8) >you know what it is though< it’s

D: kind of like hope that (1.2) well in allowing

D: myself to to um have a different

D: relationship with a **discipline** =

*Note: In this example, White inspires curiosity in the client rather than provides his expert knowledge about the connection between her relationship with hope and her refusal to be so self-disciplined. It appears that, as a result, the client discovered something new about herself; she became aware how her changed relationship with hope influences her relationship with discipline. White is learning from the client by being curious about her own experience and does not assume that he knows what is the best for client.*

**Example 2**

D: = >cause I guess it< made me feel like I had

D: some control over my life =

MW: = right I get it. *yeah*=

Note: In this example, the client was talking about her discipline about what she ate and the consequence of it: “I had some control over my life.” White did not suggest treatment for eating disorders or offered diagnostic label for her problem. Instead, he just said, “right I get it. yeah.” White did not suggest how she should live her life. He did not
ask her, how long she is having an eating disorder or/and about how she can have more control over her life without controlling her eating, as usually would the therapist operating from the centered position.

**Therapist avoids prescribing directions for client.** White seems non-hierarchical by not prescribing directions for the client. He avoids giving directions by asking questions.

*Example 1*

540  D: = I mean school’s been really absorbing so
541  
542  MW: = and that’s been helpful?
543  D: Ye:s.

Note: In this example, White is taking a decentered position by asking whether getting absorbed in school has been helpful for the client. He is not assuming that he knows that it is helpful, and he is not providing directions for the client. A centered therapist might think that the client is in denial by getting absorbed in work and not facing her “real” problems such as depression, or he might suggest that she should get absorbed even more in work without asking if that’s been helpful for her. White is decentered by privileging client’s inside knowledge and meanings and respecting her preference how she should live her life. Consequently, he can be seen as creating a non-hierarchical relationship with the client.

**Therapist holds back knowing in advance what is best for the client.** White is curious rather than knows in advance what is best for the client. In this example, he asks how question, instead of providing his expert knowledge, which makes him non-hierarchical.
Example 1

1620 MW: [>yeah yeah<]  
1621 How come that it is surprised to you? that=

Note: In this example, White asked if she was surprised that she is refusing to be so disciplined and then “how come” that it was a surprise to her. He holds back knowing what is the best for the client. A centered therapist might get excited and congratulate her on being able to refuse to be so disciplined or might suggest that discipline is a good thing for her. That way, the conversation would be closed, and the client’s voice and preferences would be shut down. A decentered therapist is curious and does not know in advance what is the best for the client.

Therapist avoids providing solutions for client. In this example, White avoids providing solutions by saying “yeah” and “right” while the client talked about her struggle and figuring out where to go from where she was.

Example 1

528 D: = and just struggling with all the things
529 about being a single parent and trying to
530 remake my life with difficulties of having
531 any children just particularly difficulties
532 that I (. ) have with my boys =
533 MW: = yeah =
534 D: = and I’m (. ) just trying to (1.8) um figure
535 out where to go from here.
536 MW: *right* =
Note: In this example, White is decentered by not providing solutions how she should remake her life, live as a single parent, and address difficulties with her children. Therapists may have different ideas about what can be helpful for the client, and as a result, they may provide solutions. During the session, there were many opportunities for White to provide solutions for the client, but I noticed that he did not do it. A more centered therapist typically would provide his or her insight, suggestions, and solutions.

**Therapist avoids providing compliments.** In this example, White avoids providing a compliment by asking the how type of question.

*Example 1*

1110  D:  = yes I am trying to do [that
1111  MW:                       [yeah (.)
1112          *okay all right.* How did you achieve that?

Note: The client expressed that her social life is getting better, and that she is trying to allocate more hope to herself. White did not take a centered position by saying that was a great thing; instead, he asked the question to create an opportunity for the client to more richly describe her alternative story. Even though White mostly avoids compliments, I found that there were few times when White was more centered by complimenting Mathew’s good behavior.

**Therapist avoids confronting clients about their beliefs.** White respects the client’s beliefs and does not try to challenge the client in both examples below.

*Example 1*

762  D:  = and uhh (1.5) it does it gives me you
763  know it gives me that sense of purpose =
The client talked about how getting absorbed in schoolwork gives her a sense of purpose. White did not confront that belief. He agreed with her by saying, “yeah right.” By respecting the client’s interpretations and meaning a therapist is decentered. A more centered therapist might challenge her and see her getting absorbed in work as an escape from real problems.

Example 2

D: ..........................................................

(.3) I think school gave me a sense of (2.2)
estee m that I was starting >that was being <
eroded in my marriage ((nodding)) =

MW: = ((nodding)) hmm okay =

Note: White did not challenge the belief that her marriage eroded her self-esteem. He wasn’t interested in asking about the history of her low self-esteem or trying to help her gain more self-esteem. Instead, he respects her interpretations and her expert knowledge on her experience.

Therapist avoids providing his own insight. White avoids providing his insight by: a) by asking questions and privileging client’s voice, and b) by using editorial that includes client’s language, preferences, and meanings.
**Example 1 – by asking questions and privileging client’s voice**

834  MW:  = *yeah* so what sorts of things would you

835  be (valuating in) yourself (.5) for when you

836  are able to reflect on this? =

**Example 2 - by using editorial that includes client’s language, preferences, and meanings**

1302  MW:  You mentioned that (.7) um medication

1303  helped a bit to get you out of spot=

1304  D:  [uh-huh

1305  MW:  =that you were in (.4) but you haven’t

1306  experienced going back there again =

1307  D:  = yeah =

1308  MW:  = and we talked about how you changed

1309  your relationship to hope and =

1310  D:  ((nodding))

**Therapist refrains from providing normalizing judgment.** In this example, White avoids providing his expert evaluation and normalizing the client’s situation or problems.

**Example 1**

614  D:  = and I was feeling just really overwhelmed

615  with (1.4) Andrew and how I was gonna

616  continue to take care of him cause

617  physically is getting hard =

618  MW:  = yeah =
D: = and Mathew’s got lots of >lots of lots of < energy =
MW: = yeah yeah =
D: = yeah and his own uniqueness ((laughs))
(1.3) and um (1.5) I just felt like (.5) how was I gonna be able to get through the day no less the years and wondering too how and also struggling with how’s gonna remake my own life >you know< I would love to have (1.2) a relationship again someday and I am overwhelmed with would anyone want to come in to the situation >you know< it’s (2.2) ah so I was feeling kind of depressed around that =
MW: = yeah yeah *okay* so *wow* so can I just check now with Andrew how’s Andrew now? His pain is that =

Note: In this example, White did not provide normalizing judgment by evaluating her situation or by diagnosing her children with ADHD and physical disability nor did he say that what she was experiencing is normal. Thus, he refrains from providing normalizing judgment. White is not asking questions that would thicken the client’s problem-saturated story. Instead, he was curious about Andrew and said, “yeah okay” few times to indicate that he heard her.
Non-Pathologizing/Post-Structuralist View

It appears that White’s decentered position includes a non-pathologizing and a post-structuralist view. White refuses to objectify and categorize clients, he avoids providing diagnosis for the client’s problems, he refuses to see them in totalizing ways and as having internal structures that need to be fixed. White has a non-pathologizing and post-structuralist view because he rejects trying to fix clients into becoming normal; instead, he sees them acting according to their intentions, hopes, dreams, beliefs, aspirations, values, and goals. White is also decentered by not seeing problems in totalizing ways and by avoiding simplistic behavioral goals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NON-PATHOLOGIZING /POST-STRUCTURALIST VIEW</td>
<td>Therapist avoids providing diagnosis for client’s problems and avoids objectifying the client.</td>
<td>Therapist refuses seeing client in totalizing ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist refuses to objectify and categorize people and to see them in totalizing ways because he is not seeing them as having internal structures that need to be fixed into becoming less pathological or normal. This position is informed by post-structuralist world-view. Therapist refuses to reproduce dominant discourse and avoids simplistic behavioral goals. Therapist sees clients as acting according to their intentions, values, beliefs, plans, hopes, aspirations, goals, and dreams.</td>
<td>Therapist refrains from seeing clients as having internal structures.</td>
<td>Therapist avoids categorizing people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist avoids providing diagnosis for client’s problems and avoids objectifying the client.</td>
<td>Therapist rejects trying to fix people into becoming normal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist avoids asking questions that verify client deficiency or inadequacy.</td>
<td>Therapist avoids seeing problems in totalizing ways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist avoids simplistic behavioral goals.</td>
<td>Therapist sees clients as acting according to their intentions, values, beliefs, hopes, dreams, aspirations, and/or goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Therapist avoids providing diagnosis for client’s problems and avoids objectifying the client.** In this example, White asks the client about her relationship with hope, rather than objectifying her with hopelessness or diagnosing her with depression.

*Example 1*

1064 MW: = but I was thinking about your relationship with hope yeah]

1065 with hope yeah]
D: = yeah thinking about how it has changed

yeah]

MW: = and just wondering whether or not

coming out of this um (1.6) down time that

you had whether you come out with a
different sort of a relationship to hope um =

Note: White is decentered by not-pathologizing the client and by seeing her in relationship with hope, which creates a sense of personal agency and empowerment that she can do something about it. That is based on his post-structuralist view. A centered therapist may diagnose her with depression and try to help her become more hopeful.

**Therapist refuses seeing client in totalizing ways.** In both examples, White does not see the client in possession of the problem and as having a defective personality that needs to be healed. He refuses to see her in totalizing way by asking about her relationship with the problem.

*Example 1*

MW: So this fears would have you do what?

What sorts of things would these fears have you doing *that can’t* get you to do now *you know?*

*Example 2*

MW: = Could you ever imagine yourself (reveling) in imperfection? =
Note: In the first example, White does not see the client as fearful and asks the questions about how the fears influence her or not influence her anymore. In the second example, White does not see her as imperfect, but rather asks her about “(reveling) in imperfection,” which also indicates his non-pathologizing and post-structuralist view.

**Therapist refrains from seeing clients as having internal structures.** In this example, White is curious about mother’s relationship with perfection.

*Example 1*

2629 MW: ……….. And I also wondered whether
2630 um (1.4) um its been an issue for you as
2631 well Dorothy >you know< in your life to
2632 challenge (.6) this notion of perfection?

Note: White saw the client in a relationship with the problem (perfection) rather than in possession of it. From his question, it is evident that he does not perceive clients as having internal structures. This is consistent with his non-pathologizing view of people who come for consultation and his post-structuralist worldview.

**Therapist avoids categorizing people.** In this example, White informs the client about his intentions and that the client will not be categorized in any way because the focus is on the process.

*Example 1*

285 MW: = and focus on the process rather than on
286 you personally so: (1.2) group will be making
287 comments and asking questions about the
288 interview itself.
Note: White is decentered by not only refusing to see the client as having internal structures that need to be “fixed” but also by informing her that she will not be categorized.

**Therapist rejects trying to fix people into becoming normal.** In this example, White is not asking questions to fix client’s problem with eating and control. He was just listening and did not try to change the client into becoming “normal”.

*Example 1*

1660 D: = um (1.7) *well* particularly around food
1661 just not wanting to be real disciplined about
1662 what I ate and not wanting to (2.0) um *>you*
1663 know< eating only what I was decided I
1664 was going to eat that day and that kind of
1665 thing =
1666 MW: = right okay =
1667 D: = be really controlled about it =
1668 MW: = *yeah* =
1669 D: = *>cause I guess it< made me feel like I had
1670 some control over my life =
1671 MW: = right I get it. *yeah*=  

Note: White neither diagnosed the client with an eating disorder, nor he tried to fix it. He is decentered by not imposing his beliefs and values how people should be and what constitutes a normal behavior.
Therapist avoids asking questions that verify client deficiency or inadequacy. In this example, White was curious about Andrew and their intentions and plans for him. White did not ask questions about Andrew’s physical and mental disabilities and his seizure disorder; about the intensity and frequency of his symptoms as usually would a centered therapist focused on diagnosing and treating diseases. He also asked about Mathew’s plan for future.

*Example 1*

365 MW: so um (.) yeah and so (.) What happens with
366 Andrew? I know that (.) is Mathew be
367 going off to a place school or something?
368 [What happens to him?]
369 D: [He is in the preschool =

Note: White is decentered by avoiding questions that would verify the client’s inadequacy or/and deficiency. Instead, he asks about their intentions, plans, goals, etc. White was curious to get to know them outside of “what’s the problem with your children” way of thinking.

Therapist avoids seeing problems in totalizing ways. White does not see problems as all good or all bad.

*Example 1*

996 MW: Sure >yeah< sure I wasn’t thinking that it
997 wasn’t helpful force in your life

*Example 2*

1061 MW: ye:ah I think hope is really important I
Note: In these two examples, White is decentered because he avoids seeing her hope as having all good or all bad effects on her life. As a result of exploring her relationship with hope, the client became aware of when the hope is helpful and when it is not useful in her life and how it changed over time (see example 3).

**Example 3**

1239 D: [yeah well it’s (1.3) interesting

1240 in talking >I mean< (.9) talking about hope

1241 cause it’s kind of like a theme =

1242 MW: = yeah =

1243 D: = of my life =

1244 MW: = yeah =

1245 D: = and recognizing when hope is good and

1246 when when it can take me beyond the place

1247 MW: = yeah =

1248 D: = and that it’s not just about >that it can

1249 be< for myself too.

**Therapist avoids simplistic behavioral goals.** White seems curious about the client’s preferences and her story rather than setting measurable behavioral goals.

**Example 1**

459 MW: I would be interested to know what would

460 you be interested in talking about today,
because I (.5) you know I don’t have much information about = 

D: = uh-huh =

Note: White had spent approximately fifteen minutes getting to know clients before he asked this question. He did not ask in the beginning of the session the standard questions such as, “How can I help you today?” or “What is your goal for today’s session?” or something similar. Throughout the entire session, White did not appear as a therapist who is interested in changing client’s behavior.

Example 2

D: = and just struggling with all the things about being a single parent and trying to remake my life with difficulties of having any children just particularly difficulties that I (. ) have with my boys =

MW: = yeah =

D: = and I’m (. ) just trying to (1.8) um figure out where to go from here.

MW: *right* =

Note: After the client reported her struggles about being a single parent and trying to remake her life, White avoided simplistic behavioral goals to fix her problems. He did not ask questions such as: What can you do to remake your life? Was there a time you felt good as a single parent? Or to suggest her to do more of what was working. White
didn’t set or asked for a behavioral specific and measurable goal, instead he was curious about her experience of being a single mother and her preferred story.

Therapist sees clients as acting according to their intentions, values, beliefs, hopes, dreams, aspirations, and/or goals. In both examples, White is curious and asks questions about the client’s goals, aspirations, and values.

*Example 1*

158 MW: = I just met her briefly (1.3) and a and a
159 you are in the program [here?]
160 D: [uh-huh] yeah
161 graduating in couple of months =
162 MW: = Are you really? =
163 D: = yeah =
164 MW: = yeah wow is that after how long? How
165 long is the program been? =
166 D: Two years =
167 MW: = Two years *yeah*= 
168 D: yeah.
169 MW: And where do you go from there when you
170 graduate?
171 D: Well then I have to do my internship hours
172 I have to (1.1) accrue three thousand hours
173 [before I can =
174 MW: [thr::ee thousand!]
D: = yes (laughs) =
MW: = before [before you?
D: [before I can take a licensing exam
MW: = really?
D: yeah ((nodding and smiling))
MW: (inaudible) How long will that take? =

Example 2
D: = but um (2.9) I don’t know I just feel more
open to and I really enjoy (1.5) having the
people around me and my family we are
very close family =
MW: = *uh-huh* =
D: = and um that’s really important to me =
MW: = right so that’s >that’s< more valuable to
you that sense now than it was? =

Note: White is decentered by not-pathologizing the client and by being curious about her
goals and ambitions. In the first example, he was curious about her education and goals
for future, and in the second example, he asks about her values – her sense of being open
and having close family. I noticed that White seemed like he was getting to know the
clients throughout the session, rather than trying to “fix” them. Based on the questions he
asked, it also appears that he sees clients as acting according to their hopes, dreams,
values, intentions, goals, beliefs, and aspirations.
Curiosity

White’s curiosity, while performing a decentered stance, is evident in all themes mentioned above. He mostly asked questions and he avoided making statements and giving advice. It appears that curiosity is a way of performing and being in a decentered position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURIOSITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist mostly asks questions, and mostly avoids making statements and giving advice</td>
<td>Therapist mostly asks questions. Therapist mostly avoids making statements and giving advice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therapist mostly asks questions.

If a reader takes a look at examples in all other themes, he/she will notice that White mostly asks questions when he is performing a decentered stance. So it is evident that he is decentered by mostly asking questions. However, he is not only performing other themes by asking questions, asking questions is a way of being decentered. On the other hand, asking any question does not make a therapist automatically decentered. Therapists can ask mostly questions that reveal their centered position, for example, if they ask clients questions that verify their deficiency or inadequacy.

Therapist mostly avoids making statements and giving advice.

It is evident throughout the entire transcript or in all other themes that White is decentered by avoiding statements and giving advice. Instead, White performs decentered stance with curiosity.
Influential Position

Co-Researcher and Co-Creator of Context for Rich Story Development/ Narrative Metaphor

White can be seen as influential by providing opportunities for clients to deconstruct their dominant story, to more richly describe their alternative stories, and to step into and explore some neglected territories of their lives. While performing these themes or ways of being influential, White acts as a co-researcher and co-creator of context for rich story development. These influential themes are influenced by narrative metaphor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO-RESEARCHER AND CO-CREATOR OF CONTEXT FOR RICH STORY DEVELOPMENT/ NARRATIVE METAPHOR</td>
<td>Therapist provides opportunities for clients to more richly describe the alternative stories of their lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist is influential by providing opportunities for clients to deconstruct their dominant story, to more richly describe alternative stories, and to step into and explore some neglected territories of their lives.</td>
<td>Therapist provides opportunities for clients to step into and to explore some of the neglected territories of their lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist provides opportunities for clients to deconstruct their dominant story.</td>
<td>Therapist provides opportunities for clients to deconstruct their dominant story.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therapist provides opportunities for clients to more richly describe the alternative stories of their lives. In these examples, White uses questions or editorial to provide opportunities for the client to more richly describe her alternative story that includes her possible changes (example 1), and being more open (example 2). White is curious about anything outside the client’s problem-saturated story.
Example 1

963 MW: ................................ (1.3) You know
964 you mention that (.9) you did have this low
965 time but (.3) you actually came out of that
966 (.4) being absorbed in your work helped a
967 lot. >I was wondering if there were< some
968 other things as well that changed for you?

Note: White used editorial and then asked the unique outcome question, “I was
wondering if there were some other things as well that changed for you?” which provides
the opportunity for the client to reflect on and be curious about what else changed for her.
It is a question that opens space for creating an alternative more preferred story.

Example 2

1705 MW: (.9) so: (1.0) okay is this something that
1706 you could have done like this six months
1707 ago? or twelve months ago? (. ) talk so
1708 openly about =

Note: When White heard about the unique outcome that she is “being more open about
things,” he did not compliment her, but instead, he asked her more questions to
participate in the co-creation of her alternative story by acquiring about her perception of
the difference in her identity conclusion, “is this something that you could have done like
six months ago?” By doing that he is respectful of her knowledge and skills and
stimulates her to think about what made that possible. The client perceives herself as
more open and White is being influential by thickening that story.
**Therapist provides opportunities for clients to step into and to explore some of the neglected territories of their lives.** In the first example, White asks the client if she is surprised that she is refusing to be so disciplined which can lead to exploring new or neglected aspects of her life. In the second example, White first used the closed-question “did you know” and then more specific follow-up question to ask her mother about her role in helping her daughter refuse to be so disciplined, change relationship with hope, and challenge the expectations.

*Example 1*

1613 MW: ………………………………………
1614 …….< are you surprised that to (1.0) um
1615 (.5) you know acknowledged the fact that
1616 you are refusing to be (.9) um (.9) so
1617 disciplined or? is that surprise to you? or
1618 isn’t? =

Note: White is influential by asking the question, “are you surprised…?” in order to get more details and learn from and with the client about how it was possible for her to refuse to be so disciplined. In other words, what made that possible, which leads to a new knowledge and unknown territory what client might know about her identity.

*Example 2*

2052 MW: Did you >did you< were you aware that
2053 you played some role in in (that)? =
2054 Do: = I certainly know that I play a role in my
2055 children’s lives =
MW: = yeah =

Do: = you know to know to what extent I think

MW: a parent really doesn’t always know to what extent (.2) and I hope that Diane knows that

I’m always there even if it’s telephone call=

MW: = I guess I was meaning specifically did

you know that you played some role in

helping Diane to (.9) enter into this refusal

of disciplining herself so much and to (.)

challenge the [expectations =

MW: = I guess I was meaning specifically did

you know that you played some role in

helping Diane to (.9) enter into this refusal

of disciplining herself so much and to (.)

challenge the [expectations =

Do: [no, not really

MW: = change her the relationship with hope?

Do: [not really =

Note: White clarifies by being more specific and in this example, he is trying to be influential by asking about the mom’s contribution to the client’s refusal to be so disciplined, to her challenging the expectations, and to her changed relationship with hope in order to co-create an alternative story about their relationship and to thicken Diane’s preferred identity conclusion. By asking these questions he invites mother to explore some neglected territories of their relationship.

**Therapist provides opportunities for clients to deconstruct their dominant story.** In this example, White asked the mother about her daughter’s imperfection to provide opportunities for clients’ to deconstruct the dominant story – her struggle with trying to be perfect.
Example 1

MW: Are there any time in Diane’s life with you you ever experienced her um (.9) (raveling) in imperfection? Can you ever recall a time when Diane was imperfect? =

Note: Since the client reported that she had feared being perceived as not being perfect, and that she has been experimenting with not being so disciplined, White asks in this example about the possible unique outcome. He asks mother if she remembers a time when her daughter was imperfect. White was not influential by saying that mother should support her to accept her imperfection. Rather he asked the question to open the conversation for co-creating the alternative identity conclusion.

Co-Creator of Context for Preferred Identity Conclusion/ Post-Structuralism

White can be seen as a co-creator of context for preferred identity conclusion when he performs the influential stance. White is influential by providing opportunities for the client to redefine her relationship with the problem and to re-experience and create a more preferred identity conclusion. This is based on a post-structuralist view of identity. White is influential by objectifying client’s problems and asking questions about the client’s hopes, dreams, intentions, aspirations, and preferences. He is also influential by assisting clients to move from what is known and familiar to what might be possible for client to know about his/her life and identity.
Therapist provides opportunities for clients to redefine their relationship with the problem and/or to re-experience their identity. In this example, White provides this opportunity by asking about the client’s different relationship with hope.

*Example 1*

1068 MW: = and just wondering whether or not
1069 coming out of this um (1.6) down time that
1070 you had whether you come out with a
1071 different sort of a relationship to hope um =
1072 D: = yeah =
1073 MW: = and what you sort of *relationship*?

Note: During the conversation, White made it possible for her to evaluate when the hope is good and when it is not so good for her. In these questions, “whether you come out
with a different sort of relationship…and what sort of relationship” White provides opportunities for the client to think about herself as separate from the problem and to redefine her relationship with the problem.

**Therapist provides opportunities for clients to create a more preferred identity conclusion.** White appears to do that by asking question in example 1 and by using editorial in example 2.

*Example 1*

847 D: = and my intellectual capabilities that they
848 are still intact despite of having giving birth
849 to two children ((laughs)) which I
850 sometimes doubt it that it was there
851 ((smiles))
852 MW: So put you back in touch with that?

Note: In this example, White is influential by asking a follow-up question that helps the client get in touch with her more preferred identity conclusion that she has intellectual capabilities.

*Example 2*

1525 MW: = right okay so um (1.0) that helps me
1526 understand so it made a lot easier for you to
1527 be who you are (.8) and: just being with
1528 people and (.8) um =
1529 D: = uh-huh =
1530 MW: = not >not< um sort of having to fit with
Therapist assists clients to move from what is known and familiar to what might be possible for him or her to know about his or her life and identity by asking questions. In the first example, White uses the how question and in the second example, he uses clarifying question to move the client from what is known and familiar to what might be possible for her to know about her life and identity.

*Example 1*

1110 D: = yes I am trying to do [that

1111 MW: [yeah (.)

1112 *okay all right.* How did you achieve that?

*Examples 2*

1377 MW: [*okay right okay good* um (2.0) in terms

1378 of the self-esteem that you mentioned that

1379 you’re being reclaiming and sense of

1380 accomplishment getting more in touch with

1381 your own (self) would you say self-

1382 discipline is that what you meant when you

1383 said discipline or?

1384 D: umm (2.6)
MW: you said discipline and creativity =

Note: In these examples, White created an opportunity for the client to move from what is known and familiar to what might be possible for the client to know in terms of how she can achieve new things and about her creativity and self-discipline. By asking these small questions White participates with the client in traversing from what is known and familiar to what might be possible to know about her life and identity.

**Therapist asks questions that seem to lead to learning something new or neglected about clients’ hopes, dreams, intentions, aspirations, and preferences.** In the first example, White asks about the client’s ambition and whether it was a shift for her, which leads to learning something new about her hopes and preferences. In the second example, White summarizes what he heard which led to learning that sense of a goal and accomplishing things is important to the client.

**Example 1**

222 MW: = *yeah yeah* has that been your ambition

223 for some time? or is that a recent (.4) recent

224 shift for you? =

Note: In this example, White is curious about the client’s dreams and aspirations. He sees people acting according to their intentions and values rather than according to their internal structures. White asks the question, “is that a recent shift for you?” that seems to lead to learning something new or neglected about client’s aspirations.

**Example 2**

906 MW: = right, so it’s a matter of >sort of<

907 reclaiming some things that you wouldn’t =
908    D:  = uh-huh =
909    MW:  = lost not lost but would be buried =
910    D:  = uh-huh =
911    MW:  = around your experiences.
912    D:  And I think too a sense of a goal and
913                                working toward accomplishing it =

Note: In this example, White used editorial to be influential in assisting the client to learn something neglected, that “a sense of a goal and working toward accomplishing it” is very important to her, and that school gave her that experience.

**Therapist objectifies client’s problems.** White objectifies the client’s problem by asking questions in which problems may have influence on a client, as “fear” in this example, which puts the client in a relationship with the problem.

**Example 1**

1656    MW:  So this fears would have you do what?
1657                                What sorts of things would these fears have
1658                                you doing that can’t get you to do now you
1659                                know? =

Note: White is influential by objectifying the fear and by asking, “What sorts of things would these fears have you doing that can’t get you to do now you know?” This question not only separate the person from the problem, but contributes to personal agency that the client can do something about “this fear”. Furthermore, by objectifying problems, the client can become aware of what the problem requires from her, whether she is okay with that or not, etc. White’s influential position includes the post-structuralist worldview.
Co-Creator of Context for Reflection, Discovery, Learning, and Personal Agency

White, as a co-creator of context for reflection, discovery, learning, and personal agency, is influential by providing opportunities for clients to become more significantly acquainted with the knowledges and skills of their lives that are relevant to addressing the concerns, predicaments and problems that are at hand, and by asking questions that open possibilities for clients to pursue what they value and hold precious. He also creates context for reflection, discovery, learning, and personal agency by refraining from imposing his agenda and delivering interventions and by avoiding to ask questions that seem to lead to known knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO-CREATOR OF CONTEXT FOR REFLECTION, DISCOVERY, LEARNING AND PERSONAL AGENCY</td>
<td>Therapist provides opportunities for clients to become more significantly acquainted with the knowledges and skills of their lives that are relevant to addressing the concerns, predicaments and problems that are at hand. Therapist avoids asking questions that seem to lead to known knowledge. Therapist refrains from imposing his or her agenda and delivers interventions. Therapist asks questions to open possibilities for clients to pursue what they value and hold precious.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therapist provides opportunities for clients to become more significantly acquainted with the knowledges and skills of their lives that are relevant to addressing the concerns, predicaments and problems that are at hand. In the first example, White asks the how question, how is something helpful to the client, like being absorbed in the school, which she previously reported. In the second example, White asks how she is able to achieve something in particular situation, which can also lead to learning about her skills in addressing her problems.

**Example 1**

544  MW:  How’s that being helpful?

545  [absorbing

**Example 2**

1413  MW:  ((writing notes while she was talking))

1414  Okay, how are you achieving that in a

1415  situation that’s? =

1416  D:  = well I think I can talk about it in a relation

1417  to school I mean I always I allow myself to

1418  say well I can take extension on a paper I

1419  never done that before ((smiles))

Note: In both examples, White asked how questions. How is the client able to do certain things? Such exploration usually reveals information about the client’s skills and knowledges that could help her with addressing her problems. These “how” questions also stimulate personal agency and learning something new about one’s skills that could contribute to co-construction of a more preferred identity conclusion.
Therapist avoids asking questions that seem to lead to known knowledge. In this example, White’s open-ended question led to a pause and a deeper reflection by the client.

*Example 1*

834 MW: = *yeah* so what sorts of things would you
835 be (valuating in) yourself (.5) for when you
836 are able to reflect on this? =
837 D: umm I think (.7) um (1.3) one thing is the
838 discipline that I had to [sit down and do this
839 MW: [right yeah *yeah*
840 D: = to (take) out the time for myself to do
841 that =

Note: White’s question “what sort of things would you be (valuating in) yourself for when you are able to reflect on this?” made the client think and pause for few seconds. It required a deeper reflection about her identity and what she values.

Therapist refrains from imposing his or her agenda and delivers interventions.

White is not influential by expecting particular answers or by delivering interventions in a form of making suggestions. He is influential by being decentered as well.

*Example 1*

984 MW: [no no I am not looking for any
985 particular answer I am interested in what
986 you are interested in talking about and =
Note: This theme is part of being decentered too. White asks for the clients’ preferences and how they prefer to lead their lives according to their beliefs, values, hopes, intentions, etc. White is influential not by imposing his views but rather by asking questions, by seeing clients as separated from problems, and by co-authoring alternative stories and more preferred identity conclusions.

**Therapist asks questions to open possibilities for clients to pursue what they value and hold precious.** In the first example, White asks questions, while in the second example, he provided hypothetical scenario to open possibilities for the client to pursue what she values.

*Example 1*

786 MW: So: (1.4) um (1.3) the getting absorbed in a

787 work gave that sense of purpose that was

788 really important to you, what (.) how would

789 you name the purpose? I mean what what =

790 D: = umm (2.2) how I name it? (4.2)

791 MW: ((White puts his notes on the ground))

………………………………………………………………………………

799 D: = you know what’s most (inaudible) me is

800 the sense of self-esteem and keeping it in

801 tack and feeling like I really accomplish

802 something. It’s really important >it’s

803 always been< important to me =

804 MW: = yeah *yeah* =
D: = and with kids >you know< when sometimes at the end of the day is like what did I accomplish? >you know< =

Note: In this example, White is influential by opening possibilities for client to pursue what she holds precious and what is important to her - and that is, to feel accomplished. Even though White did not get an answer how she would name the purpose, she revealed that a sense of self-esteem has been always important to her.

*Example 2*

MW: = yeah? I was just wondering (.4) um I am not going to ask you to imagine how you might do that at this point (.4) but if you were to (reveling) in imperfection and experienced um applause from your mom in relation to that >or not applause< but just really appreciation for that (.) would that make a difference to you?

Note: In this example, White is influential by thickening her efforts to refuse to be perfect. He provided a hypothetical scenario and asked if getting an appreciation from her mother for “reveling in imperfection” would make a difference for her. White also externalized the imperfection, which puts the client in relationship with it rather than in possession of it, which would be the case if he had said when you were being imperfect. It shows his post-structuralist worldview.
Part Three: Surprises

So far I explored and described many ways how White can be seen to take a decentered and influential position based on the literature review of what he said about this stance and my inclusion criteria (see Appendix A). Given that the data analysis was approached with open mind and discovery attitude, I found additional ways how White can be seen to perform decentered and influential stance. These new themes (or ways of doing decentered and influential stance) are listed in Table 3 and Table 4 below, and they are further explained and supported by the exemplars from the transcript that follows the presented tables. In addition, the new decentered and influential themes with exemplars are annotated with my interpretations.
Table 3

*Michael White’s Decentered Position New Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EGALITARIAN</strong></td>
<td>Therapist asks client to reflect and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist seems to create</td>
<td>evaluate unique outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egalitarian relationship with</td>
<td>Therapist asks client to evaluate new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clients by asking them to</td>
<td>development or unique outcome around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reflect and evaluate unique</td>
<td>identity conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outcomes, by asking them to</td>
<td>Therapist asks client to reflect and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate new development or</td>
<td>evaluate reflecting team conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unique outcome around identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conclusion, and by asking them to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate reflecting team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **NON-HIERARCHICAL/ NOT-EXPERT**  | Therapist avoids imposing his understanding about the consequences of the unique outcomes. |
| Therapist avoid imposing his      | Therapist avoids imposing his understanding about the consequences of the unique outcomes. |
| understanding about the consequences not only problems but also unique outcomes. | Therapist avoids imposing his understanding about the consequences of the unique outcomes. |
| Therapist is taking a non-expert position and therefore creates non-hierarchical interaction with clients. | Therapist avoids imposing his understanding about the consequences of the unique outcomes. |
Table 4

*Michael White’s Influential Position New Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO-RESEARCHER AND CO-CREATOR OF CONTEXT FOR RICH STORY DEVELOPMENT/ NARRATIVE METHAPHOR</strong>&lt;br&gt;Therapist is influential by co-creating a context for rich story development by asking about and highlighting unique outcomes, by highlighting the effects of unique outcomes and by writing down any reported changes or unique outcomes.</td>
<td>Therapist (asks questions) or highlights events outside of problem-saturated story or unique outcomes.&lt;br&gt;Therapist highlights the effects of unique outcomes reported by client on their lives.&lt;br&gt;Therapist writes down unique outcomes or any reported changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELATIONAL VIEW OF IDENTITY/SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION</strong>&lt;br&gt;Therapist is influential by providing opportunities for clients to reflect on and evaluate the contributions of other people in development of their preferred identities and by asking family members if they have noticed any preferred changes, which may contribute to thickening of client’s preferred identity conclusion and is based on relational view of identity and social construction. This is based on a perspective that identities are social achievement created in relationships and through language.</td>
<td>Therapist provides opportunities for client to reflect and experience preferred identity conclusion by asking if other people in client’s life know or have noticed about their changes.&lt;br&gt;Therapist provides opportunities for clients to reflect on and evaluate the contributions of other people in their lives on development of their preferred identity conclusion.&lt;br&gt;Therapist asks question to family member which contributes to creating or/and thickening client’s preferred identity conclusion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
White’s Decentered Position New Themes

Egalitarian

According to my conversation analysis, White seems egalitarian in the interaction with the clients by asking them to reflect and evaluate unique outcomes, by asking them to evaluate new development or unique outcome around identity conclusion, and by asking them to evaluate reflecting team conversation. These themes emerged from data and were not included in the initial themes for the decentered position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EGALITARIAN</td>
<td>Therapist asks client to reflect and evaluate unique outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist seems to create egalitarian relationship with clients by asking them to reflect and evaluate unique outcomes, by asking them to evaluate new development or unique outcome around identity conclusion, and by asking them to evaluate reflecting team conversation.</td>
<td>Therapist asks client to evaluate new development or unique outcome around identity conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist asks client to reflect and evaluate reflecting team conversation.</td>
<td>Therapist asks client to reflect and evaluate reflecting team conversation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therapist asks client to reflect and evaluate unique outcomes. In this example, White asks the client to evaluate her different relationship with hope, if it’s a positive development for her.

Example 1

1176 MW: [would you say more recently?]
1177 Would you say it’s a positive development?
1178 That hope doesn’t extend your (inaudible) your
1179 limits so much? =
1180 D: [I think so because I think it’s real
Note: White is decentered not only when he asks clients to evaluate their problems but also when he asks them to evaluate unique outcomes. By privileging the client’s voice in this way, White can be seen in the egalitarian relationship with the client. A centered therapist usually would not ask these kinds of questions because he or she would assume that these were positive developments.

**Therapist asks client to evaluate new development or unique outcome around identity conclusion.** In this example, White asks the client to evaluate her new development around identity conclusion – being more open to people.

*Example 1*

1716 MW: = Do you see the increase in openness as a

1717 positive thing or negative thing? =

1718 D: = I think it’s a positive thing =

Note: White is decentered by asking this evaluative question for unique outcome around her identity conclusion, “the increase in openness” which she reported. White did not suggest that being more open is a good thing for her. A more centered therapist would usually state his or her expert opinion about what is good or bad thing for the client. It is possible that clients feel more understood, and that they discover what is important for them if they have been asked these evaluative questions that bring forth their voices instead of a therapist’s expert knowledge.

**Therapist asks client to reflect and evaluate reflecting team conversation.** In this example, White asks the clients to evaluate the reflecting team conversation by asking for their comments.
Example 1

2496 MW: just wonder what do you um any comments

2497 about those thoughts or reflections I know it

2498 was little distracting for you cause you were

2499 pretty [busy

Note: In contrast to more centered therapists who usually provide compliments from the team behind the one-way mirror or any other judgments based on their worldview and theoretical orientations, White asked clients to reflect on what resonated for them from the reflecting team conversation. In that way, he takes a decentered position. A more centered therapist might pick what resonated for him or her from a reflecting team conversation and would ask clients to reflect on those observations. I noticed that White did not do it.

Non-hierarchical/Not-expert

My conversation analysis shows that White not only avoids imposing his understanding about the consequences of the problems, but also avoids imposing his understanding about the consequences of the unique outcomes. Thus, he can be described as non-hierarchical or not-expert while performing a decentered position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NON-HIERARCHICAL/</td>
<td>Therapist avoids imposing his understanding about the consequences of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT-EXPERT</td>
<td>the unique outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist avoid imposing his</td>
<td>Therapist is taking a non-expert position and therefore creates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding about the</td>
<td>non-hierarchical interaction with clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequences not only problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but also unique outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist is taking a non-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expert position and therefore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creates non-hierarchical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interaction with clients.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therapist avoids imposing his understanding about the consequences of the unique outcomes. White creates a non-hierarchical interaction by not knowing what are the consequences of unique outcomes. Instead, he asks the how evaluative questions.

Example 1

1721 MW: [yeah
1722 How does that affect you? you know to be
1723 more open in this way? How does it?= 
1724 D: = um I think (3.3) it makes me more um
1725 (1.8) I don’t know (.) it’s it allows me
1726 closer connections to people I think. =

Note: In this example, White is decentered by asking the question, “How does it affect you?” to be more open in this way (which is the unique outcome). A centered therapist would typically impose his understanding by, for example, giving her compliments for being more open. A centered therapist might also interpret her new openness as a reduction of her depressive symptoms that are caused by biochemical imbalance or due to a more positive and rational thinking. I noticed that White did not do it.

White’s Influential Position New Themes

Co-Researcher and Co-Creator of Context for Rich Story Development/ Narrative Metaphor

As a co-researcher and co-creator of rich story development, White can be seen as influential by asking about and highlighting unique outcomes, by highlighting the effects of unique outcomes, and by writing down any reported changes or unique outcomes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO-RESEACHER AND CO-CREATOR OF CONTEXT FOR RICH STORY DEVELOPMENT/ NARRATIVE METHAPHOR</strong></td>
<td>Therapist asks questions or highlights events outside of problem-saturated story or unique outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist is influential by co-creating a context for rich story development by asking about and highlighting unique outcomes, by highlighting the effects of unique outcomes and by writing down any reported changes or unique outcomes.</td>
<td>Therapist highlights the effects of unique outcomes reported by client on their lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therapist writes down unique outcomes or any reported changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Therapist asks questions or highlights events outside of problem-saturated story or unique outcomes.** In this example, White asks about her relationship with her husband and their teamwork in relation to children.

*Example 1*

712 D: = and we feel the same way about Andrew

713 and his care (.) we try to have a cooperative

714 spirit about =

715 MW: = right =

716 D: = about the kids and what they need

717 MW: okay so =

718 D: = so: =

719 MW: = and that teamwork survived survived the separation? The teamwork

720

721 [in relation to children? =
D: [uh pretty good pretty good yeah I mean I do most of the like 95 percent of the research and I tell him what I found out and but (.6) he certainly (.7) was very involved with Andrew in the hospital when he was there for the surgery =

MW: = yeah=

D: = we really that’s been our primarily goal is to keep that spirit in (tack)

MW: = *keep that going* =

D: = absolutely essential =

Note: In this example, White is influential by highlighting unique the outcome “and that teamwork survived separation?” Even though separation was difficult for the client, she said that they both had cooperative spirit and feel the same way about the children, and White highlighted that.

**Therapist highlights the effects of unique outcomes reported by client on their lives.**

In this example, the client was talking about how she was affected by her new increased openness and White paused and highlighted it by saying back what he heard.

*Example 1*

D: = um I think (3.3) it makes me more um

(1.8) I don’t know (.). it’s it allows me closer connections to people I think. =

MW: = *right* (.). okay. So changes your quality
of your [relationships =

D: [uh-huh

MW: = with others =

D: = uh-huh =

Note: In this example, White highlights the effects of unique outcome by saying “right okay. So changes your quality of your relationships” and the client agrees with “uh-huh.”

**Therapist writes down unique outcomes or any reported changes.** During the session, White is taking notes of unique outcomes or/and the effects of unique outcomes. He is not taking notes of client’s problems, diagnoses, or his professional assessment of them; instead, he writes down the exact words and checks-in with the client. By writing down these specific things he is being influential.

**Example 1**

D: = ye:ah just kind of being (1.0) letting

things just happen a lit more and not

worrying so much about the consequences.

MW: ((writing notes while she was talking))

Note: In this example, White writes down while the client was reporting the unique outcomes, “letting things just happen a lit more and not worrying so much about the consequences” which is a new development for her.

**Relational View of Identity/Social Construction**

White can be seen as influential by providing opportunities for clients to reflect on and evaluate the contributions of other people in development of their preferred identities and by asking family members if they have noticed any preferred changes,
which may contribute to thickening of client’s preferred identity conclusion and is based on relational view of identity and social construction. This is based on a perspective that identities are social achievement created in relationships and through language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supra-Themes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONAL VIEW OF IDENTITY/ SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>Therapist provides opportunities for client to reflect and experience preferred identity conclusion by asking if other people in client’s life know or have noticed about their changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist is influential by providing opportunities for clients to reflect on and evaluate the contributions of other people in development of their preferred identities and by asking family members if they have noticed any preferred changes, which may contribute to thickening of client’s preferred identity conclusion and is based on relational view of identity and social construction. This is based on a perspective that identities are social achievement created in relationships and through language.</td>
<td>Therapist provides opportunities for clients to reflect on and evaluate the contributions of other people in their lives on development of their preferred identity conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist asks question to family member which contributes to creating or/and thickening client’s preferred identity conclusion.</td>
<td>Therapist asks question to family member which contributes to creating or/and thickening client’s preferred identity conclusion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Therapist provides opportunities for client to reflect and experience preferred identity conclusion by asking if other people in client’s life know or have noticed about their changes.** In this example, White asks the client about her mother’s comments about the changes she was making recently.

*Example 1*

1490 MW: = can you tell me about those comments? =

1491 D: = um (1.5) well that I am >you know< I’ve

1492 been much more relaxed about um (1.1)

1493 entertaining in my house like having family
for dinner and having people over. It’s much easier for me than it used to be. =

Note: In this example, White provided opportunity for the client to reflect on her mother’s comments about her recent positive developments. That way, the client was able to experience and think about her preferred identity conclusion even more. White is thickening thin descriptions and contributes to rich story development about her preferred identity, which puts him in influential position.

**Therapist provides opportunities for clients to reflect on and evaluate the contributions of other people in their lives on development of their preferred identity conclusion.** In this example, White asks the client to reflect on contributions of her mother on construction of her preferred identity conclusion that includes her refusal to be so disciplined.

*Example 1*

2029  MW:  = So what is your mom said or done that’s contributed to you (.5) this refusal to be so disciplined and some of the other things that we were talking about?

Note: It is evident that White does not see individuals creating and performing their identities in isolation. Instead, he is asking many questions that bring forth and thicken a client’s preferred identity, including the contributions of other people to their lives, which make him influential. His relational view of identity is also based on social construction worldview.
Therapist asks question to family member which contributes to creating or/and thickening client’s preferred identity conclusion. This means that White does not see people in isolation; rather he has a relational view of their identity conclusions.

*Example 1*

2180  MW:  = before we turn around (. ) just to get some
2181    (.3) we’ve been talking about things
2182    generally and some other questions that I
2183    would ask but I’m not going to because of
2184    the time situation I am interested in
2185    interviewing you about um (.9) a little bit
2186    more um (.3) because um Diane (. ) is a little
2187    surprised that she is actually achieved what
2188    she has in terms of refusing to be so
2189    disciplined um reforming revising her
2190    relationship with hope challenging the
2191    expectations so that they don’t stretch her
2192    (1.0) put her in a (limb) like they did and
2193    number of other developments. But I was
2194    gonna ask you whether you were surprised
2195    that she achieved this (. ) and if you are
2196    surprised I would be interested in talking
2197    with you about that and if not I would be
2198    interested in you telling some story about
your daughter that would give us a bit of an idea of what sort of foundations that she was standing on in order to make it a business to change the shape her life in a way that she has (.4) in recent times but (.7) I don’t know if you have any immediate response to that?

Note: In this example, White is influential by being transparent about his intentions to interview mother about her daughter’s achievements in terms of her refusing to be so disciplined, revising her relationship with hope, and challenging the expectations. He used editorial that included the client’s language and interpretations. Then, White asked mother if she was surprised about her daughter’s accomplishments, and if she could share a recent story about her daughter “that would give us a bit of an idea of what sort of foundations that she was standing on in order to make it.” White engages mother in co-construction of her daughter’s preferred identity by asking these questions and thus can be seen as having a relational view of identity based on social construction.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore and better understand the performance of the decentered and influential position of the therapist in narrative therapy by studying Michael White’s talk. This investigation addressed the research question: How, if at all, can White be seen to take a decentered and influential position in narrative therapy? In this chapter, I reflect upon the completed research by discussing my findings and some implications of the study. Additionally, I discuss future directions for research and some limitations of this study.

Discussion on Findings

White’s Decentered Position

In this video, my conversation analysis (CA) showed Michael White performing a decentered and influential stance in many different ways that are richly described in chapter 4. The decentered position is described as one in which White can be seen as a collaborative, egalitarian, non-hierarchical/non-expert, a non-pathologizing/poststructuralist, and curious. I learned from this session that performing the decentered position means creating interactions in which the therapist is a collaborator by privileging the client’s voice, interpretations, meanings, skills, knowledge, and preferences, by paying close attention to client’s language, and by asking and listening to what is important to clients.

In contrast to more centered therapists, who typically aim to identify and challenge clients’ beliefs and irrational thoughts, for example cognitive and cognitive behavioral therapists (Beck et al., 1979; Ellis, 2005), or who try to transform the family system structure by using different interventions, such as marking boundaries, for
example structural therapists (Minuchin, 1974), this investigation showed Michael White performing a decentered position, which privileges the clients’ beliefs, values, interpretations and preferences. For example, in this session White did not encourage the client to be more hopeful; rather, he was curious about her relationship with hope and her preference about it. By doing that, White privileges the client’s voice, her meanings and interpretations, and her preferences. Thus, White does not collaborate with clients to set the stage for delivering interventions in order to convince them to change. Instead, by being decentered with clients, he collaborates with them throughout the entire session and respects their voices.

In this video, my CA showed that being decentered also means that the therapist is in an egalitarian interaction with clients by being transparent about the setting, about the process of therapy, about his experience of therapy and his intentions, by asking clients to evaluate the session and give their feedback, and by asking them to evaluate their problems, unique outcomes, and new developments around their identity conclusions. White (1995) believed that therapists have a moral and ethical responsibility when it comes to power differential between the therapist and the client. He said that “it is an error to believe that therapy can ever be totally egalitarian…and that we should do what we can to make it very difficult for that power differential to have a toxic or negative effect” (White, 1995, p. 70). This suggests that narrative therapists should strive toward creating egalitarian relationships with clients and they should monitor their more powerful position. One way to do that is by being decentered. In this video, my CA showed that White was decentered in many different ways, for example, by being transparent, by asking evaluative questions, or by asking for
feedback, which puts him in an egalitarian interaction with his clients. Thus, being
decentered makes him egalitarian as well.

In this study, I found that White’s decentered position also means being in a non-
层级的互动与客户或成为非专家。在本视频中，White
accomplished that by respecting clients’ meanings and understandings about their
problems, by not knowing what is best for them and how they should live their lives, by
not providing his expert knowledge and judgment in terms of compliments, solutions,
insights, and normalizing. A more centered therapist, on the other hand, might provide
compliments as in solution-focused therapy (de Shazer, 1985), or provide insights about
clients’ unfinished business from their childhood as in psychodynamic therapy (Freud,
1917), or give clients directives about how they should behave in order to solve their
problems, as in Haley’s strategic therapy (Haley, 1976), which puts the therapist in the
expert position.

White refused to take such a position because he recognized the limits of “expert”
knowledges that may lead to internalizing problems and objectification of identity
(White, 2007). Many of the problems that people struggle with, White (2007) believed,
are cultural in nature. This means that people are measuring and evaluating their lives,
relationships, and identities based on the dominant cultural ideals and stories that include
what it means to be a “real” person, or to be successful, or to have a good relationship,
and so forth. They evaluate themselves based on whether they are matching that
culturally created or “normal” standard. If the person is not matching these standards, his
or her negative self-evaluations are likely to produce feelings of inadequacy and
deficiency and perceptions of oneself as being dysfunctional and disordered.
It was evident in this session that White refused to act as an expert or a social engineer by taking a decentered position. According to my CA, White can be seen as decentered and non-hierarchical by not trying to “fix” people into becoming normal, and by not imposing his understanding about the consequences of the unique outcomes. I found that being decentered means that the client’s voice and knowledge are privileged because they are seen as experts on their lives.

In this video, my CA showed that White’s decentered stance means having a non-pathologizing and post-structural view, in which therapist tends not to objectify and categorize people, and to see them in totalizing ways, because he is not seeing them as having internal structures that need to be “fixed” into becoming less pathological or normal. White performed the decentered position when he avoided reproducing dominant discourse, and he saw his clients as acting according to their intentions, beliefs, values, goals, aspirations, and dreams. During the session, he asked the clients many questions about their hopes and aspirations. White did not diagnose the clients with depression, eating disorder, ADHD, and so forth. The non-pathologizing view of people in a decentered stance allows White to create a context for collaboration and non-hierarchical relationship. In this session, my CA analysis showed that White performs the decentered position with lots of curiosity given that he mostly asked questions, and he avoided making statements and giving the advice.

**White’s Influential Position**

According to my CA, while performing the influential position White can be seen as a co-researcher and co-creator of context for rich story development and preferred identity conclusion and as a creator of context for reflection, discovery, learning, and
personal agency. It is also evident that influential stance is shaped by the relational view of identity, social construction, narrative metaphor, and post-structuralism.

In this session as a co-researcher and co-creator of context for rich story development, White is influential by providing opportunities for clients to deconstruct their dominant story, to more richly describe alternative stories, and to step into and explore some neglected territories of their lives. During the session, White was curious about how the client refused to live under the expectations that she must be perfect and how she refused to be so self-disciplined and became more open with other people. My CA showed that White assisted clients in rich story development by asking about and highlighting the unique outcomes and by writing down any reported changes and unique outcomes. Thus, I believe that learning how to listen for the unique outcomes is the essential first step for the influential stance in narrative therapy. Once the therapist hears the unique outcome, the alternative and more preferred stories can be co-created if the therapist is curious and asks questions about it. White performed influential stance by asking many questions about the client’s unique outcomes during this session. He highlighted them and wrote them down for his future questions and editorials. It is important to note that White did not perform the influential stance by intervening to fix the “dysfunctional” family system; instead, he was influential by being curious about clients’ hopes, dreams, and aspirations and by thickening alternative story which was evident throughout this session.

My CA of this video showed that White’s influential stance also served in creating a context for co-construction of the preferred identity conclusions. I found that White is influential by creating a context in which clients have opportunities for re-
experiencing their identity and creating a more preferred identity conclusion. During this session, White provided many opportunities for the client to separate herself from the problem and to experience her preferred identity conclusion (e.g., as being more open, as having a sense of accomplishment, as being less perfect, etc.).

Being influential in this way is based on White’s post-structuralist perspective that suggests seeing people in relationship with ideas rather than in possession of internal psychological structures or “selves.” In this video, my CA showed that White is influential by objectifying the client’s problems (e.g., “this fear,” “perfection,” etc.) and by asking the clients about their hopes, dreams, aspirations, intentions, and preferences. By taking the influential stance, White created opportunities for the client to revise her relationship with the problem (e.g., hope, perfection, discipline) and as a result to experience her preferred identity. I also learned that in influential stance, White assisted clients to move from what is known and familiar to what might be possible for the client to know about his or her life and identity.

This investigation showed that as a creator of context for reflection, discovery, learning and personal agency, White can be seen as being influential in this video by providing opportunities for clients to become more acquainted with knowledges and skills of their lives that are relevant in addressing their concerns, by asking questions that open possibilities for them to pursue what they value and hold precious, by not imposing his agenda and delivering interventions, and by not asking questions that lead to known knowledge. White was not influential by providing his expert knowledge; rather, he was curious about the client’s values, and preferences and that co-investigation or co-research led to new discoveries, realizations, and personal agency.
My CA of this session also suggests that White has a relational view of clients’ identity conclusions (which is based on social constructionism) while taking the influential stance. White was influential by providing opportunities for the clients to reflect on and to evaluate the contributions of other people in the co-construction of their preferred identities, and by asking family members if they have noticed any preferred changes, which may, in turn, lead to thickening the client’s preferred identity conclusion. From his performance of the influential position, it can be concluded that White sees people’s identities as a social achievement, created in relationships and through language.

In conclusion, my CA showed that White takes the decentered and influential position in this session, and I described many ways that he performs it. This study not only provides validation for the presence of the influential and decentered therapist positions in White’s narrative therapy practice, but also expands the knowledge of ways in which he accomplishes this.

**White’s Decentered and Influential Position**

Even though, for the purposes of this study, the decentered and influential positions are separated, in order to gain more understanding of these concepts and to richly describe ways in which White takes a decentered stance and influential stance, they can also be seen as connected. Using Flemons’s (1991) completing distinctions ideas, the relationship between the decentered and influential positions can be described as separated but also connected, and therefore represented in the following way:

THE POSITION OF THE THERAPIST / (Decentered / Influential)

Throughout this session, White can be seen and described as being decentered and influential at the same time. For example, when he asked the client to evaluate her
unique outcomes, which positions him as decentered and egalitarian, White also provided
the opportunity for the client to richly describe her alternative story, which situates him
as influential and a co-creator of context for rich story development. Thus, he can be
seen as simultaneously decentered and influential.

White can also be seen as being influential in a decentered way. For example, White
was influential by providing opportunities for the client to create a more preferred
identity conclusion by using editorials, in which he also privileged the client’s voice and
preferences about who she wants to be. In this way he is both decentered and
collaborative. Therefore, it is possible to describe White as being influential in a
decentered way. In conclusion, White can be seen as taking the decentered position, the
influential position, and both decentered and influential position because they are often
combined.

**Humor and Empathy**

During my conversation analysis, I also noticed some additional aspects of
White’s discourse that were not the focus of this study. I discovered that White shows
that he cares and shows empathy. For example, White asked the client about her son,
“Can he look forward to being free from surgery from this point on?” In this question, he
demonstrated that he cares and is curious about the client’s pain-free future given that the
mother described how painful it was for her son to go through surgery.

I also observed that White uses humor throughout the session. For instance, he
said at the beginning of the session that he was still recovering from his trip and that, “if I
ask the same question twice you know that=” which made the client laugh and respond,
“it’s okay…I’ll answer the same question twice.” He also used humor in an awkward
situation such as when he accidentally spilled his water, he said, “I am blaming it on jet leg.”

I noticed that throughout the session, the client and the therapist often laughed together which could be interpreted as a sign of a positive relationship and as White being emotionally in sync with the client. In addition, I observed that when White was interrupted, he let the client talk. Even though these findings were not the focus and the goal of my study, they can serve as useful information about some additional aspects of White’s discourse that can be studied in more details in future studies.

Findings and Previous Studies

In contrast to Gale’s (1991) study which focused on patterns and discovering procedures of how the therapist elicits solution-oriented talk from the client, this study used CA to focus on describing ways in which White can be seen to take a decentered and influential stance, without examining the effects of this stance on the client’s talk. Thus, compared to more traditional studies using conversation analysis, this study did not focus on how the therapist and the client switch turns, or on their overlap in the talk, or some paralinguistic features of talk.

Conversation analysis was used in this study to richly describe White’s performance of decentered and influential position and focus was on his talk. In contrast to Kogan and Gale’s (1997) study that describes White’s agenda as “decentering,” and focuses on how “decentering agenda” is accomplished with a couple at the conference setting, this study utilized White’s (2005) model of position of the therapist in narrative therapy to explore how White takes a decentered and influential stance. It is important to note that Kogan and Gale’s definition of “decentering” is not the same as what White
described in his literature on decentered and influential position of the therapist, which was used for the purposes of this study.

**Implications**

The findings of this study can be used as a template for practicing and training narrative therapists how to perform the decentered and influential stance. Narrative therapists can use these findings to improve their clinical practice and to create decentered but influential relationships with their clients. Given the limited amount of literature about this stance, narrative therapists can use the findings of this study to better understand the concept of the decentered and influential and to learn how Michael White used it in many different ways in his consultation with this family. The findings of this study can also be used as a tool in narrative therapy supervision and self-supervision to increase therapists’ awareness of their stance, and whether they are performing the decentered and influential position, which may lead to improving their relational clinical skills and creating and maintaining the positive relationships with the clients.

The findings of this study also suggest consistency between White’s writings and his performance. I was able to observe him performing decentered and influential stance most of the time throughout the session even though there are few instances where he could be categorized as more centered (e.g., when he complimented the child for good behavior during the session). In addition, while some new themes emerged from my data analysis, some themes from my inclusion criteria, which were based on literature review, were not found. Thus, it can be concluded that White does not perform all these themes in every session while being decentered and influential.
Most of the time throughout the session White used questions and avoided making statements that include his insights and suggestions while being decentered and influential. It could be valuable information for some students to learn that even Master therapists such as Michael White are not perfect in their performances. Thus, learning how to be decentered and influential takes time and practice.

By focusing on the performance of the therapist, this study provides a better understanding of how different concepts or ideas are applied in therapy. I believe that successful performance of any model of therapy requires not only theoretical knowledge of its concepts but also applied understanding how it is done. Many students report that they have theoretical knowledge about narrative practices, but they have difficulty applying them. The findings of this study could help them in that regard, as it helped me to better understand the decentered and influential position and how to apply it in my clinical practice.

Also, instructors who teach narrative therapy courses can use these findings for their presentations and explanation of White’s decentered and influential stance in narrative therapy.

**Limitations and Future Studies**

Limitations of the present study must be noted and considered in future research. First, only a single-session case was analyzed using conversation analysis. Replication of this study that includes other cases would improve validity of my findings and contribute to more generalization of my findings. Although narrative therapy does not claim to treat different races, gender, ethic groups or problems differently, it would be interesting to compare findings from this study with other case studies that include more diverse
population, not only families but also couples and individuals, cases that include more sessions not only one, and different presenting problems. Thus, it is recommended to replicate this study using more diverse cases.

Second, this study is limited by the use of a researcher as an instrument of inquiry. Given that the researcher is the instrument of the study in conversation analysis, my claims are my interpretation and are subject to readers’ analysis. I provided for readers the examples from the transcript to evaluate each theme and to make their conclusions. The consumers of this research also have the opportunity to make their own interpretations based on the entire transcript listed in appendix C. It is likely that each reader of this study “brings her or his own world view/epistemology that will organize how she or he makes sense of what is written” (Gale, 1991, p. xi). Furthermore, to address this limitation I met with my dissertation chair, Dr. Hibel, who challenged my interpretations and helped me become more reflexive in the process of study. I approached this study with open mind and discovery oriented attitude. I do not claim that my findings are facts and static. I recommend that future studies include research team to conduct data analysis where subjectivity is addressed by coming to the consensus on the interpretations of the findings (Hays & Singh, 2012). Prospective studies can investigate additional ways how narrative therapists can be seen as decentered and influential in narrative therapy.

Third, this study did not focus on patterns and sequences of talk between the therapist and the client. Instead, the focus was mainly on Michael White’s talk in order to richly describe and better understand his decentered and influential position. Consequently, this study did not provide information about how taking a decentered and
influential stance affects the relationship between the therapist and the client or/and how it affects the outcome of therapy. However, given that this study provides rich information about the decentered and influential stance this study can be seen as a steppingstone for future studies that focus on answering such research questions using different research methods. For example, quantitative studies can be used to explore the impact of decentered and influential stance on the therapist’s well-being, burnout, satisfaction, and compassion fatigue. Quantitative studies can be used to investigate the correlation between the decentered and influential stance and client’s perception of therapeutic alliance and the outcome of therapy. If future studies discover positive effects of this stance, marriage and family therapists could use these findings to improve their chances of providing treatment that includes the highest likelihood of success and the greatest benefits for both clients and therapists.

It is important to recognize that this study did not investigate the effects of decentered and influential stance on the client-therapist relationship. However, it is reasonable to expect and assume that the stance of the therapist affects the interaction if we believe in interconnectedness and that our thoughts and actions are connected.

Previous research has indicated that a relationship between the therapist and the client is an important factor in a successful outcome of therapy (see review in Chapter 2). Among many factors that could influence and shape the relationship between the therapist and the client, the position of the therapist in that relationship is rarely studied. This study was the first step in that direction by exploring and explaining how, if at all, White can be seen to take a decentered and influential stance in narrative therapy.
Based on my observation, I believe that White’s decentered and influential stance contributed to creating positive relationships with his clients. Also, given that a narrative therapist’s stance is described as decentered and influential (White, 2007), we could say that narrative therapists tend to co-create with clients decentered and influential therapeutic relationships.

I also believe that the decentered and influential stance should not be practiced as a technique, but rather it should be seen and adopted as a way of being with clients in narrative therapy, because it is based on a specific worldview which includes post-structuralism, narrative metaphor, social construction, relational view of identity, Foucault’s modern power and so on (see review in chapter 2). I believe that unless the therapist adopts this worldview, it would be difficult or impossible for him or her to perform this stance.

**Personal Reflection on Conversation Analysis**

Conducting a conversation analysis was a long process that required a great attention to details. I recommend to future researchers using conversation analysis to first watch and listen to very short segments (few seconds long) of a session while transcribing, and then to repeat, watching longer segments to check for accuracy of their transcribing and analysis. While practicing conversation analysis, it is possible that researchers are developing their attention to detail skill, which is a useful tool not only for the research purposes, but also it can improve their communication and listening skills in therapy session by learning to pay close attention to details. Conversation analysis was a useful method for this study because it provided findings of White’s decentered and influential position that are rich in details.
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Inclusion Criteria
Inclusion Criteria

**Part A: Decentered Position**

1. Therapist privileges client’s voice.
2. Therapist privileges client’s interpretations.
3. Therapist privileges client’s meanings.
4. Therapist privileges clients’ skills and knowledges.
5. Therapist privileges clients’ preferences.
6. Therapist asks clients to evaluate problems.
7. Therapist pays close attention to client’s language.
8. Therapist sees clients as acting according to their intentions, values, beliefs, hopes, dreams, aspirations, and/or goals.
10. Therapist seems to listen to what is important to client.
11. Therapist asks what is important for client.
12. Therapist seems to collaborate with clients.
13. Therapist mostly asks questions.
14. Therapist seems to be transparent.
15. Therapist invites clients to evaluate session.
16. Therapist asks for client’s feedback.
17. Therapist seems to create egalitarian relationship with clients.
18. Therapist avoids simplistic behavioral goals.
19. Therapist refrains from attributing meaning to client’s problems.
20. Therapist avoids imposing his understanding about the consequences of the problems.

21. Therapist does not act as a primary author in how clients should live their lives.

22. Therapist avoids prescribing directions for client.

23. Therapist holds back knowing in advance what is best for the client.

24. Therapist avoids providing diagnosis for client’s problems and avoids objectifying the client.

25. Therapist avoids providing solutions for client.

26. Therapist refrains from providing normalizing judgment.

27. Therapist avoids providing compliments.

28. Therapist avoids confronting clients about their beliefs.

29. Therapist refrains from seeking to discover the truth.

30. Therapist avoids providing his own insight.

31. Therapist refuses seeing client in totalizing ways.

32. Therapist avoids seeing problems in totalizing ways.

33. Therapist refrains from seeing clients as having internal structures.

34. Therapist rejects trying to fix people into becoming normal.

35. Therapist avoids categorizing people.

36. Therapist avoids asking questions that verify client deficiency or inadequacy.

37. Therapist mostly avoids making statements and giving advice.

38. Therapist refrains from taking a hierarchical position.
PART B: Influential Position

1. Therapist provides opportunities for clients to more richly describe the alternative stories of their lives.

2. Therapist provides opportunities for clients to step into and to explore some of the neglected territories of their lives.

3. Therapist provides opportunities for clients to become more significantly acquainted with the knowledges and skills of their lives that are relevant to addressing the concerns, predicaments and problems that are at hand.

4. Therapist asks questions to open possibilities for clients to pursue what they value and hold precious.

5. Therapist provides for client an opportunity to refuse a normative criteria in the judgment of their activities and to focus on the consequences of one’s activities in the shaping of one’s life and relationship.

6. Therapist provides opportunities for clients to redefine their relationship with the problem and/or to re-experience their identity.

7. Therapist provides opportunities for clients to create a more preferred identity conclusion.

8. Therapist assists clients to move from what is known and familiar to what might be possible for him or her to know about his or her life and identity by asking questions.

9. Therapist asks questions that seem to lead to learning something new or neglected about clients’ hopes, dreams, intentions, aspirations, and preferences.
10. Therapist provides opportunities for clients to reflect and evaluate their lives in a non-expert way.

11. Therapist provides opportunities for clients to deconstruct their dominant story.

12. Therapist objectifies client’s problems.

13. Therapist avoids asking questions that seem to lead to known knowledge.

14. Therapist refrains from imposing his or her agenda and delivers interventions.
Appendix B

Transcript Notation
Transcript Notation

(.) A pause which is noticeable but too short to measure.

(.5) A pause timed in tenths of a second.

= There is no discernable pause between the end of a speaker’s utterance and the start of the next utterance.

: One or more colons indicate an extension of the preceding vowel sound.

Under Underlining indicates words that were uttered with added emphasis.

CAPITAL Words in capitals are uttered louder than the surrounding talk.

(.hhh) Exhale of breath.

(hhh) Inhale of breath.

( ) Material in parentheses are inaudible or there is doubt of accuracy.

[ Overlap of talk.

(( )) Material in parentheses indicate clarificatory information, e.g.,

((laughter)).

? Indicates a rising inflection.

! Indicates an animated tone.

. Indicates a stopping fall in tone.

* * Talk between * * is quieter than surrounding talk.

> < Talk between > < is said quicker than surrounding talk.

(Gale, 1991, p. 105)
Appendix C

Transcript of White Session
MW: How are you Mathew?

M: I am fine, I just (became) like this =

MW: [((laughs))

M: = I can listen real hard!

MW: Can you? ((laughs))

M: (2.6) You Michael White? =

MW: = That’s right, that’s who I am yeah(.)

M: That’s right. Hi Michael White ((shaking hands)) =

MW: = Hi, it’s good to meet you.

M: This is Andrew! ((pointing at his brother))

MW: Who is this?

M: Andrew

MW: Hello Andrew. ((shaking hands with Andrew)) Please to meet you Andrew (.9)

So how old is *(your* = ((asking Mathew))

M: [he can listen hard! =

D: = Okay Mathew honey (wanna) sit down on the chair now =

M: = Okay

MW: How old is your brother Andrew?
M: He is five.
MW: He is five, is he?
D: You are five =
MW: = you’re five
M: okay
D: = Andrew is seven.
MW: Seven.
D: Shhh relax sweetie shhh *okay* ((talking to Andrew)) ((Andrew is coughing))
MW: And you are Diane?
D: I am Diane.
MW: Oh Diane ((shaking hands))
D: Nice to meet you.
MW: Yeah please to meet you =
M: = Look I got sna::ck! Okay.
MW: What do you got there? What’s that?
M: A (inaudible) and Jorge!
MW: Sorry?
M: yeah (1.5) *yeah* ((nodding)) =
MW: = What’s this >what’s this< yellow thing?
D: [What’s in there?
M: (inaudible)

D: Mathew, can you listen? =

M: Yeah!

D: = He asked you what’s in the box? =

MW: = what’s in the box? =

D: = no, no this box? ((showing at Mathew’s yellow box))

M: ahhh a snack! =

MW: = a snack you can’t (inaudible) =

D: = yeah ((laughs))

M: I have a grape juice, a purple grape juice =

D: = aha there is a purple grape juice in there =

MW: = yeah good =

D: = ((laughs)) =

MW: = It’s always good to meet you and you are five years old? =

M: = yeah five years old Michael White.

MW: ((laughs))

D: ((laughs))

M: Just listen =

MW: = What do you think about all these cameras and things? (2.3)

M: just listen Michael White =
MW: Have you seen this on television? Do you want to have a look?

M: Yeah yeah

MW: Do you want to come with me and have a look?

M: Yeah =

MW: And see your mom and brother on television? =

M: Yeah! =

MW: Come and have a look (1.0) See what it looks like =

M: See what it looks like ((went to see camera)) =

MW: Yeah just have a look =

M: Yeah it’s like a bee =

MW: Like a bee?

D: ((laughs))

M: Could be look!

D: *this is gonna be the Mathew comedy hour I think* ((laughs))

MW: See! You are on the television over there

M: Wow =
MW: = Who is that? (2.2)
D: Do you want us to move? =
MW: = Who’s that? Your mom and your brother, ha? =
M: = uugrrrr ((Mathew’s producing sounds)) =
MW: = okay ((laughs)) like a gorilla(.)come on back ((laughs))
M: >wait wait< I (went) back (.9) don’t move=
MW: [Who were you pretending to be then like a gorilla? =
M: = yeah =
MW: = you were? =
M: = yeah! ((returning to his seat))
MW: ((heh)) Do you like gorillas? Yes? =
MW: [ We are just getting a back of you right now, so: if [you ((cameraman talking to White)) =
MW: [oh, is my back is my back alright?
D: ((laughing))
M: my back! (Mathew’s showing at his back and everyone’s laughing))

MW: yeah well =

D: = You have nice back I mean I don’t have to worry about my hair then ((laughs))

M: okay (Mathew plays in front of camera))

C: okay

MW: So you prefer to have something else not my back? = [

M: [(can listen close my ear just listen, listen Jorge, okay) =

((Mathew closing his ears with his hands))

MW: = So I can sit around here a little bit how would that be? (3.7) ((White moves to another chair)) (.hhh)

M: (we) listen to the movie =

D: = oh you like this movie? umm

MW: How am I now? (asking camera team))

C: You’re fine, you are fine.

D: (laughs) and you are happy (looking at Andrew)

MW: (1.8) So: uh um =
= Okay Jorge=
Andrew is seven years old?
uh-huh =
= yeah okay (2.1) and you have the two children? =
= uh-huh =
= *yeah* so =
= yeah that’s it =
= certainly Mathew is (live) one isn’t he?
That he is ((laughs))
((Mathew producing different sounds))
I couldn’t work out if he was trying to be a gorilla or =
= I think he is the beast =
= a beast =
= a (inaudible) beast =
= the beast [*okay*=
[((laughs))
= so I understand that your mom is here as well =
= uh-huh =
= I just met her briefly (1.3) and a and a you are in the program [here?
D: [uh-huh] yeah

graduating in couple of months =

MW: = Are you really? =

D: = yeah =

MW: = yeah wow is that after how long? How long is the program been? =

D: Two years =

MW: = Two years *yeah*=

D: yeah.

MW: And where do you go from there when you graduate?

D: Well then I have to do my internship hours

I have to (1.1) accrue three thousand hours [before I can =

MW: [thr::ee thousand!]

D: = yes (laughs) =

MW: = before [before you? [before I can take a licensing exam

MW: = really?

D: yeah ((nodding and smiling))

MW: (inaudible) How long will that take? =

D: = A thousand years [((laughs)) =

MW: [((laughs))}
That’s three hours a year ((laughs))

couple of years yeah ((laughs))

three thousand hours?

ye:ah =

and how do you arrange that? cause I am not familiar with the system here?

Um: (1.2) well you have to find somewhere where you can a supervised internship >right now< I am doing my training-ship here at this at the center =

= yeah =

= and I would like to stay on: as an intern so that you just increase your number of hours so you can (.7) you know =

right so you can >stay< possibly stay here as an intern and [see families here =

[hopefully ye:ah yeah

= three thousand [to stay =

[ye:ah doesn’t that sound incredible? I got two hundred now

((laughs)) so it’s digging my way to

[(inaudible) ((laughs))=

[(oh you only have two thousand to go)
206 D: = yeah =
207 MW: = and and (.) after that you (.) you can sit
208 for licensing and =
209 D: = take a written exam and oral exam =
210 MW: = yeah and then you are free to? (.)
211 D: = hang up you license [hang up your (   )]
212 MW: [yeah right okay]
213 and then go [to
214 D: [right and then right hopefully
215 and then find a new profession ((laughs))
216 MW: (laughs) oh well you are well on the way =
217 D: = yeah it’s a (step) =
218 MW: = and your mom’s been working in this
219 area for: quite some time?
220 D: Uh-huh yeah she’s been a therapist for few
221 years now =
222 MW: = *yeah yeah* has that been your ambition
223 for some time? or is that a recent (.4) recent
224 shift for you? =
225 D: = umm (.6) well it’s my interest in
226 psychology is kind of been there for a long
227 time []
228 MW: [yeah
D: in my previous life before my kids were born
((smiles))

MW: ((laughs))

D: I worked in area of public health =

MW: = yeah =

D: = and health education =

MW: = yeah =

D: = and I (.8) did that for about eight years

MW: = yeah =

D: and >I always thought< that I was really

interested in psychology. So um then I was

home with the boys =

MW: = yeah =

D: = for few years and then I just think my

experiences with them made me really

interested >we got involved in support

groups< and um some peer counseling with

families and parents who’ve been through

the same kinds of things =

MW: = yeah =

D: = with children I had and (.4) I got really

interested in that and got really fascinated

with how people coped =

MW: = yeah =
D: with these things . so I decided to >you

know< that I wanted to go >I knew I was
going to go < to work some time this was a
career that was very interesting to me and
also it would allow me the flexibility I
could have in taking care of their needs =

MW: = right *yeah* =

D: = so I signed up in here =

MW: pretty pretty good place to be coming from

I think =

D: = uh-huh =

MW: = to get into this sort of work *yeah* (. ) So:
um and and you are already familiar with a
reflecting the team process [and (inaudible)]

D: [I’ve done it

some =

MW: = You’ve done it some. So we don’t need to
talk a whole lot about what’s

[gonna happen today

D: [I think I know what’s gonna happen =

MW: (yeah just briefly) we’ll talk a bit and then

we will switch places with some of the

people from behind the screen we are gonna
be back with them and um (2.2) we will be
the audience to their thoughts for bit and
then (. ) we will switch back again and I will
just talk with you about your experience
about their comments =
D: = okay =
MW: = yeah and what we traditionally do at the
end is we would just get together and talk
about the interview =
D: = ((nodding)) Okay sounds good =
MW: = and focus on the process rather than on
you personally so: (1.2) group will be
making comments and asking questions
about the interview itself.
D: Okay.
MW: You might like to (.7) make some
comments or ask some questions as well.
D: Sure.
A: (ahmmm)
D: Ohhh (inaudible) ((talking to Andrew))
M: (inaudible)
D: (we can’t be there) ((saying to Mathew))
MW: So what’s Mathew um when do you go to school here? Next year? Or this year?
M: Yeah next year =
MW: = next year is it? Okay =
M: = This is (mommy’s) school you just have it (inaudible) ((pointing at the camera and posing for camera))
MW: ((laughs)) =
D: = you like seeing yourself over there don’t you? ((asking Mathew)) =
MW: = Where can you see yourself? Oh in the mirror of course =
M: (inaudible)
MW: You can see what?
D: ((laughs)) What can you see?
M: (4.1) ((Mathew is quiet; putting his hand on eye))
MW: [hehe
D: [hehe =
MW: = So do you and your mom get together in terms of this work a bit and talk about the work or? =
D: = the work itself? =
MW: = yeah ((nodding)) =
D: = some some yeah *yeah*. We talk a lot about (. ) this family a lot ((laughs)) =
MW: = about this family your family =
D: yeah yeah we do we do talk about some things related to work =
MW: = yeah =
D: = and it’s been nice to have that as (.5) you know someone close to me who can also understand what I am (. ) going through =
MW: = yeah yeah =
D: = professionally (. )
M: (Okay Jorge just listen) ((Mathew talking))
MW: yeah okay. And Andrew is seven seven years old?
D: Seven and a half =
MW: = seven and a half and =
M: (inaudible)
MW: pardon? ((asking Mathew)) I am what?
M: You are Michael White!
MW: I am Michael White yeah =
D: = Mathew we know that =
M: = you are from other country =
MW: = I am from where?
M: You’re from Australia.
MW: Yes Australia yeah =
D: ((laughs))
MW: = Do you know where Australia is?
M: What?
MW: Do you know where Australia is?
M: What?
MW: It’s a long way away.
M: You are you are (inaudible) =
D: = He had to ride on the airplane for a long long time =
MW: = yeah in fact I am still recovering from it =
D: = are you? =
MW: = I arrived yesterday, my world is still going around in circles you know =
D: = you are in a completely different time =
MW: = if I ask the same question twice you know that =
D: = ((laughs)) It’s okay =
MW: = ((laughs)) =
D: = I’ll answer the same question twice.
so um (. ) yeah and so (. ) What happens with Andrew? I know that (. ) is Mathew be going off to a place school or something?

[What happens to him?]

He is in the preschool =

= he is in preschool for couple of years now

= yeah yeah =

= and um he is in special ED preschool four mornings a week =

= yeah =

= so he is pretty busy =

= yeah yeah and Andrew? =

= and Andrew goes to school too he goes to public school =

= yeah =

= he goes from 8:30 to 2:30 every day =

= yeah =

= and they work on his sitting and on his standing =

= yeah =

= that’s what he is working on.

Really?
And hopefully some steps >he just had< hip surgery last summer so =

= he had some seatback but (.) we’ve been working for few years on his getting head control =

= yeah = = and his ability to bear weight on his legs=

= yeah = = he works hard >but you know what< he likes to rest a lot ((laughs))

*yeah* that makes sense when you are working hard [yeah you need to rest

[jyeah he’s been working five days a week too =

= yeah =

((Andrew is moving his head))

Uh! Andrew rel::ax ((talking to Andrew))

(you got get Jorge you get)

I guess if he >is having< Andrew is having therapy five days a week that’s pretty big

program =
D: it's very rigorous. Yes yes he has worked really hard.

MW: So how is he doing with his sitting? is he?

D: You know he used to sit in a special chair=

MW: = yeah =

D: = where they straps his arms so he can work on lifting his head =

MW: = yeah =

D: = and um (.4) it’s getting stronger

MW: yeah?

D: It’s getting stronger =

MW: = yeah =

D: = yeah (1.2) Mathew helps him lift his head sometimes so ((smiles))

MW: Does he?

D: He pushes his head up ((smiles)) =

MW: = *yeah* that’s good so so Mathew supported for Andrew’s times?

D: Yeah, well it makes him angry when Mathew doesn’t pick up his head he sort of ( ) on him >mommy he is not picking his head up< so that’s how he gets his sibling rivalry =
MW: = yeah =

D: = but Andrew’s working hard =

MW: = yeah okay. >Alright< so (2.1)

D: don’t touch that sweetie (talking to Mathew)

MW: So what’s like it for you to be out here in front of the group behind the one-way screen? =

D: = It’s funny ((laughs)) [a bit odd

MW: [It’s a funny experience yeah

D: I am glad I can’t see them ((laughs)) =

MW: ((laughs)) yeah =

D: = It’s kind of strange. It’s good for me to know because I’ve been on the other side

((laughs))

MW: You would know most of the folks here or quite a few folks here?

D: I didn’t see a lot coming in but I think some of them =

MW: = yeah =

D: = uh uh! ((Andrew’s coughing)) Some of them are very familiar cause I took the
course this summer with Jennifer and David

so =

MW: = yeah =

D: = some of them are in the class.

MW: I would be interested to know what would you be interested in talking about today,

because I (.5) you know I don’t have much information about =

D: = uh-huh =

MW: = this meeting and ah (.) which is usually my preference really =

D: = yeah =

MW: = you know just to (.) to start with people interested in starting at and =

D: = well (.) this kind of all came about…

honey let’s put this away and can you sit still on the chair and let’s turn this chair

[arround (talks to Mathew)]

MW: [can I also say you know I would be interested in what conditions would be the best for you? Whether you would like children to be present or you would prefer that [}
D: [umm yeah I kind of prepared for that =
MW: = yeah =
D: = so my mom’s gonna be grandma today =
MW: = Okay =
D: (Um did if I feel it’s) when some things
when I talk about kids =
MW: = okay =
D: I probably would feel more comfortable
having =
MW: = okay =
D: = sweetie why don’t you sit on chair okay?
((talks to Mathew))
M: *yeah*
D: Sit down all the way here you go can you
hold this on your lap? And sit real quiet?
M: I can do it!
D: Good boy.
MW: So you can make decision about that?
D: Yeah I feel comfortable doing it =
MW: = yeah =
Well actually it all started with having to do with my professional paper which is a requirement for my graduation. =

Yeah =

from the school. And I am working with Jenifer on that (.) and (. as I said I’ve just always been (4.1) wondering how people >I mean know, I don’t really know< but I wonder how people cope with not just kind of difficulties with kids but all kinds of tragic of life but particularly children with disabilities and (. I am kind of a (. trying to find out how people make meaning of their lives =

hmmm=

when something catastrophic happens =

yeah =

and in talking to Jenifer (. especially it was like at the beginning of the school year in September I was really struggling with a lot of the same questions myself and it was becoming real difficult for me. Um um I’ve
been separated for a year from my
husband=
MW:  = so for one year? =
D:  = for over a year we are going to be
divorced =
MW:  = right right =
D:  = and just struggling with all the things
about being a single parent and trying to
remake my life with difficulties of having
any children just particularly difficulties
that I (.) have with my boys =
MW:  = yeah =
D:  = and I’m (.) just trying to (1.8) um figure
out where to go from here.
MW:  *right* =
D:  = I am feeling a lot better now than I was at
that time =
MW:  = yeah =
D:  = I mean school’s been really absorbing so
I get real absorbed in that =
MW:  = and that’s been helpful?
D:  Ye:s.
MW:  How’s that being helpful?
[absorbing

It’s kind of being kind of a (container) for me it’s giving me a lot of structure to know you know even though I would prefer to do something else on the weekend than write a paper it’s I know I have to do so I just do it and it’s been really better for me in that way =

yeah = so I am really anxious about school being over = yeah =

because I no longer (would) have that kind of a structure and I have to figure out where to go from there with me with the kids how we manage = right right. I understand that you (would) end up being primarily responsible for the children, is that right?

They live with me. = They live with you? = yeah they live with me. They visit their dad every other weekend. =
MW: = right every other weekend =
D: = uh-huh every other weekend and one night during the week they stay over night from after dinner till (.6) before breakfast they spend the night and he brings them back in the morning, and I have help at home =
MW: = right right =
D: = so that really helps me =
MW: = right right (.) but the major responsibility for parenting would be on your shoulders =
D: = right =
MW: = is that correct? =
D: = the decisions about and those decisions really (. ) a lot of times are mine anyway =
MW: = yeah =
D: = just about schooling and doctors and surgeries and therapies =
MW: = yeah =
D: = and all those things =
MW: = yeah =
D: = that happen yeah =
MW: = yeah =
D: just primarily it’s mine.

MW: Okay you mentioned a little bit about how you had this a bit of a crisis around meaning, was that?

D: uh-huh

MW: is that correct? Can you tell me a little about what that crisis is about?

D: Umm I guess it’s something that kind of comes and goes and I think that a lot of it had to do with Andrew’s surgery he had surgery this summer

MW: yeah

D: and it was really horrible he had both of his hips were dislocated they had to be bones had to be broken and reset and he was in body cast for six weeks and um I just felt totally overwhelmed he was in a lot of pain and it went on when he was out of cast the difficulties his discomfort went on for probably about five months and I mean it’s been couple of months that he is been comfortable again

MW: yeah
= and I was feeling just really overwhelmed with (1.4) Andrew and how I was gonna continue to take care of him cause physically is getting hard =

= yeah =

= and Mathew’s got lots of >lots of lots of < energy =

= yeah yeah =

= yeah and his own uniqueness ((laughs))

(1.3) and um (1.5) I just felt like (.5) how was I gonna be able to get through the day no less the years and wondering too how and also struggling with how’s gonna remake my own life >you know< I would love to have (1.2) a relationship again someday and I am overwhelmed with would anyone want to come in to the situation >you know< it’s (2.2) ah so I was feeling kind of depressed around that =

= yeah yeah *okay* so *wow* so can I just check now with Andrew how’s Andrew now? His pain is that =
D: = well he still has some discomfort like
when I dress him in the morning if I move
his hips (.8) together too fast >or even just
in the morning< cause he is pretty stiff =

MW: = right =

D: = he cries a little bit >but it doesn’t go on
for a long time< and he’ll have periods of
time when he cries when he is probably too
tired from the exercises >Mathew can you
sit down please < on the chair thank you
your microphone’s gone ((laughs)) =

M: = my microphone =

D: = yeah just still for a little while sweetheart
you can look at your book, okay?

M: (inaudible)

D: Okay ((to Mathew)). Excuse me and um
>what was I saying?< he is (. ) you know
Andrew there is always something going on
I mean he has seizure disorder and
sometimes lately his seizures are a little
more intense um (.8) he cries at night and
(. ) sometimes I wonder weather it >I don’t
know where it’s from< it seems to me that
it is because he doesn’t know it is the only way of expressing himself =

MW: = yeah =

D: = he doesn’t want to be in bed =

MW: = yeah =

D: = it’s really hard for me (he just) >cry cry cry< at night sometimes for an hour or so =

MW: = yeah =

D: (1.5) the hardest thing is not knowing what’s troubling him and some thing is bothering him because he can’t tell me =

MW: = yeah =

D: = overall his health has been fairly good (inaudible) um (.9) and a (.5) now that the nightmare of the surgery is behind me I can say I am glad we did it but it was just horrible =

MW: = *yeah* =

D: = but he seems to be more comfortable now *so* =

MW: = and and (1.3) can he look forward to being free free from surgery from this point on? or is that? =
D: = not [necessarily
MW: [not necessarily?
D: = no cause there is likelihood that his hips
could become dislocated again =
MW: = right =
D: = I mean we really we really put a lot of
effort, time, and money into idea of getting
him having excellent follow up physical
therapy we found excellent therapist =
MW: = yeah =
D: = who is working with him five days a
week =
MW: = yeah =
D: = in hopes that he will gain the muscle
strength to start to do some standing
because really that would be his best
chances of [
MW: [of getting his
D: = of keeping his hips in place but (.9) there
is always that possibility he is only seven =
MW: = yeah =
D: = and lots of kids have it done again *you
know later in their life*
MW: When you said we who (.9) did you work with a team?

D: I guess I am still talking about my husband (laughs) I mean you know because he is involved in making decisions in helping to pay for this things so is important =

MW: = yeah =

D: = and we feel the same way about Andrew and his care (. ) we try to have a cooperative spirit about =

MW: = right =

D: = about the kids and what they need

MW: okay so =

D: = so: =

MW: = and that teamwork survived survived the separation? The teamwork [in relation to children? =

D: [uh pretty good pretty good yeah I mean I do most of the like 95 percent of the research and I tell him what I found out and but (.6) he certainly (.7) was very involved with Andrew in the hospital when he was there for the surgery =
728  MW:  = yeah=
729  D:  = we really that’s been our primarily goal is
to keep that spirit in (tack)
731  MW:  = *keep that going* =
732  D:  = absolutely essential =
734  D:  = we both know that we need each other for
that (.4) so we really try to work hard >and
I guess I do feel like I have < a team
anyway I mean between (.) the therapists
and Andrew’s teachers and my parents and
(.5) um his doctors >I mean< it really is (.9)
it’s a community ((smiles))
741  MW:  yeah yeah and that’s been important?
742  D:  It’s been essential [yeah
743  MW:  [yeah yeah is that you
mentioned this crises that you went through
that was around Christmas was it? Or?
746  D:  Well it was before that actually it was
probably summer through maybe (.9)
748  October or something =
MW: = yeah right (.) and you mentioned

something about getting absorbed in work
in a sense =

D: = getting what?= 

MW: = getting absorbed in the work =

D: = in schoolwork? =

MW: = yeah did that help in some way?

[Or not?]

D: [It did yeah at the beginning it was hard I 

was having a hard time getting back into it=

MW: = yeah =

D: = because of just (I was feeling) so poorly=

MW: = yeah= 

D: = and uhh (1.5) it does it gives me you 

know it gives me that sense of purpose =

MW: = yeah right =

D: = that I that’s really important =

MW: = important?= 

D: [yeah 

MW: [yeah. So:: (2.0) I made couple of notes 

here and if that’s okay and come back to 

them 

D: = sure =
772  MW:  =um (4.0)
773  D:  (inaudible) ((Diana talking to Mathew))
774  what’s in it? (asking Mathew)
775  MW:  Wow! There are some treats yeah
776  D:  ((laughs))
777  M:  They are not treats they are snacks.
778  D:  They are snacks ((laughs))
779  MW:  Snacks okay I am sorry treats mean
780  [something else
781  D:  [treats are sweet ((laughs))
782  MW:  ((laughs))
783  D:  >Snacks are crackers< =
784  MW:  = right okay so the snacks =
785  D:  = yeah.
786  MW:  So: (1.4) um (1.3) the getting absorbed in a
787  work gave that sense of purpose that was
788  really important to you, what (. ) how would
789  you name the purpose? I mean what what =
790  D:  = umm (2.2) how I name it? (4.2)
791  MW:  ((White puts his notes on the ground))
792  D:  Well oh your water just spilled. ((laughs))
793  M:  oh wow (. ) must be jet leg ((smiles)) =
794  D:  = must be [true
MW: [I am blaming it on jet leg =

D: ((laughs))

MW: = few days after you been (.) traveling here

((stands up and takes off his jacket)) =

D: = you know what’s most (inaudible) me is

the sense of self-esteem and keeping it in

tack and feeling like I really accomplish

something. It’s really important >it’s

always been< important to me =

MW: = yeah *yeah* =

D: = and with kids >you know< when

sometimes at the end of the day is like what

did I accomplish? >you know< =

MW: = yeah =

D: = and I (.5) um (1.4) and particularly since

it’s been so stressful the last year since my

husband >actually it was stressful before<

he moved out too =

MW: = *yeah* =

D: but (. ) (I’ll tell you) I can have a bad day

but when I get a paper back in the mail with

an A on it then I would feel like everything

was fine! [((laughs)) =
MW: [((laughs))]

D: = so I guess it is really important to have that external kind of validation =

MW: = yeah =

D: = that I have (.4) you know =

MW: = *right*

D: = that I can sit down at my computer and (.5) turn out paper that’s =

MW: = right =

D: = creative *I mean* it’s the creativity I think that’s really important =

MW: = right so you can reflect a bit on [that

D: [oh yeah

MW: = and gain that sense of self-esteem =

D: = ye:s yes =

MW: = *yeah* so what sorts of things would you be (valuating in) yourself (.5) for when you are able to reflect on this? =

D: umm I think (.7) um (1.3) one thing is the discipline that I had to [sit down and do this

MW: [right yeah *yeah*

D: = to (take) out the time for myself to do
that =
MW:  = right =
D:  = and umm=
MW:  = so it’s **discipline** *yeah* =
D:  = A-ha () and um creativity
MW:  (.2) yeah =
D:  = and my intellectual capabilities that they
are still intact despite of having **giving birth**
to two children ((laughs)) which I
sometimes doubt it that it was there
((smiles))
MW:  So put you back in touch with that?
D:  Yeah ((smiles)) =
MW:  = yeah *okay* (nodding) =
M:  [Mommy! (inaudible) My snack!]
MW:  so it’s very rewarding for you personally =
D:  = very rewarding and and excuse me
(talking to Mathew) You want to unpack?
M:  *yeah*
D:  Okay. All you have to do is take this out
and open them up >put your hand in there<
**see** there is crackers and cheese and apple
and purple grape juice.
M: Okay! =

D: Okay, you are all set. Um (1.9) what question I am sorry?

MW: um I was thinking about the crackers and the cheese and the grape juice =

D: = oh would you like some? =

MW: = no it’s ok = ((smiles))

D: ((laughs))

M: Eat the crackers!

MW: I would want a cracker >can I have a cracker<?

M: (inaudible)

D: Give a cracker to Michael.

M: Ok. (2.0) watch this

MW: Thanks!

M: here you go. (giving cracker to Michael White)

MW: Are these good crackers?

M: yeah they are crackers >thank you<

MW: [mmm

M: [you’re welcome!=

MW: = mmm it tastes like treats to me =
D: = ((smiles)) ye::ah (.8) depends on your [perspective ((laughs))]

MW: [((laughs))]

M: I can’t move this box =

D: = You can’t move it? (helps Mathew move the box in his chair) Here you go.

MW: So just generally um =

M: = can’t move, I can’t! =

D: ((helps Mathew move the box to his lap)) (.3) I think school gave me a sense of (2.2) esteem that I was starting >that was being < eroded in my marriage ((nodding)) =

MW: = ((nodding)) hmm okay =

D: = just *you know* feeling pretty terrible about the whole situation about myself and not getting any strokes any longer and (.4)

it was kind of really nice external source =

MW: = right =

D: = kind of validated my (1.2) what I felt was there and just had to tap into it again =

MW: = right, so it’s a matter of >sort of< reclaiming some things that you wouldn’t =

D: = uh-huh =
MW: = lost not lost but would be buried =

D: = uh-huh =

MW: = around your experiences.

D: And I think too a sense of a goal and working toward accomplishing it =

MW: = *right*=

D: = um with Andrew I had so many um (1.1) so many years of (.9) hope you know and I would put my heart and soul into trying to do some thing about it =

MW: = hmm =

D: = find a new therapy or >you know< whatever it was and then haven’t ultimately make that much of a difference =

MW: = hum =

D: = it was very disheartening and very frustrating =

MW: = *uh-huh* =

D: = so it was an opportunity to do something that [had =

MW: [yeah

D: = a goal that I could accomplish =

MW: [yeah
D: *so*.

MW: So: that process >you know< (1.0) of actually what believing something could be done that was (.5) going to make a world of difference (.6) and then pursuing that with therapist but finding out that it didn’t work quite how you wanted it and hoped it would be it’s pretty demoralizing experience =

D: = yeah. =

MW: [yeah

D: = you know (4.3) it’s terrible but you see I always (1.3) I always have that hope even if I just fall down and I just picked myself up=

MW: = yeah =

D: = and I picked myself and I sometimes I withdraw for awhile from Andrew and everything with him I just have to take some time out =

MW: = *uh-huh* ((nodding)) =

D: = and I then (.) I kind of get rejuvenated again but it’s always dangerous I know to have that hope because you fall harder.
MW: Yeah yeah =
D: = I do that a lot =
MW: = I guess hope is important but I guess um

(1.3) um (.2) the issue is about the extent to which it um dominates in terms of what you are doing and how you are generally approaching things. Is something been a shift with that? Like you got a different sort of relationship with hope? (1.3) You know you mention that (.9) you did have this low time but (.3) you actually came out of that (.4) being absorbed in your work helped a lot. >I was wondering if there were< some other things as well that changed for you?

D: (3.7) um (1.9) How I came out of that period of time?
MW: Yeah ((nodding))
D: Well medications helped too.
MW: Did it? =
D: = yeah anti-depression medication =
MW: = yeah? =
D: = yeah that helped a lot (1.1) and =
MW: I was [thinking =
D: [I think]

MW: = sorry =

D: = no go head =

MW: = [well I was thinking

D: >that’s not the answer you were looking for< I am sure drugs (laughs)

MW: [no no I am not looking for any particular answer I am interested in what you are interested in talking about and =

D: = right what else changed in that time =

MW: = I am just wondering whether your relationship to hope changed as well?

D: um: (1.5) my relationship to hope?

MW: Yeah.

D: (5.5) I don’t kn:ow. I mean it’s like I hang on to hope because it’s what gives me (1.4) the motivation to get up and go on every day.

MW: Sure >yeah< sure I wasn’t thinking that it wasn’t helpful force in your life

D: (.3) How do you mean? I’m trying to imagine how my relationship with it changed. (4.0) I think my hope (1.0) my
relationship with hope in relation to
Andrew has changed =
MW:  = *yeah* yeah can you tell me about that?
D:  um (1.4) for the most part I mean my hopes
for him since he was born changed
dramatically =
MW:  = yeah =
D:  = when I was when I um (1.5) when he was
born I hoped that he would overcome
everything that he had =
MW:  = yeah =
D:  = he was devastatingly ill as a new born =
MW:  = yeah =
D:  as a premature baby (.6) and nobody
thought that he would live to the next day
and I so I had hope that this little boy was
so strong that he can keep overcoming all
these (.7) horrible obstacles =
MW:  = yeah.
D:  and physically he did! I mean he survived
*that was really miraculous* um (.7) and I
had different hopes all the time then I
hoped >you know< that he will be able to
say “mommy” some day then I hoped that he will be able to sit up my hopes were kept being lowered =

MW:  = right =
D:  = um (.8) and I got kind of (.5) my relationship with hope became quite rejuvenated about three years ago when I heard about the program (.9) not far from here in a small town about hundred miles from here that was teaching kids like Andrew how to sit stand and walk =

MW:  = yeah =
D:  = and I was really afraid of hope I was (.7) real cautious about it

MW:  [yeah
D:  = because it was so painful

MW:  [yeah
D:  = but I threw myself into it and we move up there for a time and got Andrew in a program (. ) and (. ) got the program going down here >so in that sense< it helped a lot of other people but Andrew didn’t make much progress in it =
MW: = *right* =

D: = so once again my (.5) hopes became more that he would be pain free =

MW: = yeah =

D: = and that’s why we did the surgery >I mean put him in pain< but hope to with the ultimate goal of having um (2.2) I think my hope for Andrew is that he’s a (1.3) that he is content and at peace.

MW: yeah *yeah*

D: (1.3) and that’s a hope I have to hang onto=

MW: = yeah =

D: = because that’s that’s (.4) the meaning in his life.

MW: ye:ah I think hope is really important I wasn’t (.) wanting to cast it out or nothing =

D: [no I know =

MW: = but I was thinking about your relationship with hope yeah]

D: = yeah thinking about how it has changed yeah]

MW: = and just wondering whether or not coming out of this um (1.6) down time that
you had whether you come out with a

different sort of a relationship to hope um =

D: = yeah =

MW: = and what you sort of *relationship*?

D: Well I feel (.8) hopeful once again =

MW: = yeah =

D: = very hopeful for myself =

MW: = *yeah*=

D: = um (1.0) for um (2.4) for Mathew and I

[you know

MW: [yeah

D: (2.5) I think it’s always in question about

Andrew =

MW: = yeah =

D: = but (2.3) I have a lot hope about this little
guy he makes my heart sing ((smiles))=

MW: = ((laughs))=

D: = and keeps me up at night =

MW: = Does he? =

D: = He likes to sleep with his mom so (.7) um

M: ((spreading his arms in approval))

A: ((coughing))
D: yeah relax sweetie ((saying to Andrew))

and you know I am starting to get hope about my own life =

MW: yeah yeah [okay. *so*

D: [my social life’s gotten somewhat better =

MW: = *yeah* =

D: = but you know =

MW: = that’s sort of thing I was [thinking of

D: [yeah it’s just (1.4) yeah >I mean I really< I am more in touch with =

MW: = yeah =

D: = hope again =

MW: = so you’ve been allocating some of the two (self) in a way =

D: = yeah =

MW: = more so right? =

D: = yes I am trying to do [that

MW: [yeah (.)

*okay all right.* How did you achieve that?

D: (1.0) Which part? =

MW: = [to allocate some of that hope to yourself?
D: [to allocate some of it to myself?]

MW: = yeah

D: Oh I think it was a question of survival

MW: = Was it? =

D: = *yeah* that I knew that there were certain things that I had to do for myself or I wasn’t gonna survive for these boys

MW: = wow =

D: = um one of the things that has been helpful to me is (3.4) it’s hard I act as it is already done but accepting my limits ((laughs)) =

MW: = yeah yeah =

D: = I always wanted to be able to do so much and knowing that when I (set out) to do so much is when I >I think that’s <when I fell so hard (.2) you know because (.5) when I go through crises is because (1.1) it’s hard for me to accept that that I may not always be >that I will not< be able to care for Andrew in my home my whole life

MW: = right [okay

D: [that I am not going to be able to lift [him soon =
MW: [yeah yeah

D: = not only just physically but emotionally =

MW: = hmm =

D: = that I cannot do this by myself =

MW: = hmm =

D: = that I’m keep getting more help and also
to allow myself to have some time away =

MW: = right. So this hope (.4) was extending
your posture limits in some way but =

D: = yes =

MW: = now [you are able to =

D: [yes absolutely, that’s absolutely
right. It was extending me beyond my
limits =

MW: = yeah right.

A: ((Andrew’s coughing))

D: Oh my goodness that’s a nasty cough

*that’s a nasty cough yeah you’re ok*

(talking to Andrew) umm (1.1) yeah it was.

It was like um (3.1) it was like >you know<

the hope had supernatural powers =

MW: = yeah yeah yeah =
= and um (1.3) it was taking me beyond place where I can really be =

(1.2) >that’s hard to accept< cause I want to be able to do everything =

= ((laughs)) =

= excellent. ((laughs))

But that’s something that’s happened over the last um months in a sense =

= it’s a process =

= yeah =

= I have to say

[yeah right]

= it’s ongoing process =

[yeah]

= but definitely more recently

[would you say more recently?]

Would you say it’s a positive development?

That hope doesn’t extend your (inaudible)

your limits so much? =

[I think so because I think it’s real]

= yeah =

= it’s real for me, it’s real life =
MW: = okay so there are two major changes in your relationship with hope. um (.6) One of it, is that it doesn’t extend your (inaudible) so much (1.0) and the other one is that you’re allocating some of it to yourself, is that right?

D: Yeah.

MW: Okay. ((writing notes))

M: ((chocking on food sounds))

MW: (3.3) um (2.0) How are those snacks going?

M: going yeah going good =

MW: [pretty good?

D: [wanna try some apple? ((asking

M: Mathew))

M: (.2) Want some apple? You have some apple! Okay? ((pointing at White))

MW: ((laughs))

D: ((laughs)) he will feed you whether you want it or not. ((laughs))

M: Here you go! ((giving apple to White))

MW: Thank you very much ((coming closer to get the apple)) thank you that’s =

M: = thank you =
MW: = okay, can I eat it in a minute? Do I have
to eat it straight away [or can I =
M: [yeah yeah
D: He can wait?
MW: [I can wait?=
M: No EAT it! =
MW: = I have to eat it now?
D: [he can’t talk and eat]
MW: It’s hard to talk while I am eating. I’ll just
put it here for a minute I’ll eat it before you
finish off today ok?
M: (eat::: it::::::)
D: Mathew
MW: Do you like apple?
M: (.eat it it’s good!
D: Mathew =
MW: = Is an apple a treat or snack?
M: (it’s nice) it’s a snack
D: ((laughs))
MW: ((laughs)) It’s a snack, okay.
M: It’s a snack!
Mathew honey you want us (inaudible) just a little bit later okay he is talking to mommy, okay? =

D: = okay =

M: = okay =

D: = All right, thank you.

MW: (((laughs)) okay yeah(.) so um are we talking what’s interesting to you to talk about or? =

D: = uh-huh yeah it is =

MW: um what’s interesting about talking about this because we start a bit of the conversation [and I don’t know]

D: [yeah well it’s (1.3) interesting in talking >I mean< (.9) talking about hope cause it’s kind of like a theme =

MW: = yeah =

D: = of my life =

MW: = yeah =

D: = and recognizing when hope is good and when it can take me beyond the place

MW: = yeah =

D: = and that it’s not just about >that it can be< for myself too.
Yeah.

That’s really (1.6) I didn’t think of it in terms of my hoping for myself.

Right, was it important to think about like that? Is that a helpful way of thinking about it or?

= um (3.0) yeah yeah. >I mean cause I invested so much< time in (.4) hoping that the children will be okay hoping that my marriage would work out hoping that you know everything =

= yeah =

= and having to let go of those hopes is really (.6) important so (.4) I guess it is kind of shifting my relationship to hope =

= yeah yeah yeah =

= *and you know*(1.7) having the same amount of hope but just re-allocating it =

= I think it’s a really big achievement for people to shift their relationship to hope (.)

particularly um they’ve been in a sort of situation that you’ve been and in relation with children and marriage and (.2) I guess
I understand from talking to women that it’s a particularly big achievement for women because um they get so recruited in hoping for everybody else and =

D:  = ye::ah =

MW:  = and (.2) not that it’s a negative (trait) I guess it is a really positive one but =

D:  = I am glad I have it, [I don’t think it’s negative]

MW:  [yeah yeah] but I guess um (.5) the fact that you are (not) excluded from this now is really interesting development =

D:  ((nodding))

MW:  = ye::ah. So: um (. ) and (. ) we started off (. ) you talked a little bit about how you got interested in how people cope with things =

D:  = uh-huh=

MW:  = and umm I am getting to find out a little bit about >you know< how you coped I mean what’s working for you? =

D:  = *yeah* =

MW:  = and um (1.0) so: I guess that’s probably why I’ve been asking the questions that I’ve
been asking. You mentioned some other things about (.2) can I say is the teamwork changed a bit also in the last?

D: = the whole team or the team between their dad and I?

MW: (cut at 46:30)

MW: You mentioned that (.7) um medication helped a bit to get you out of spot=

D: [uh-huh

MW: = that you were in (.4) but you haven’t experienced going back there again =

D: = yeah =

MW: = and we talked about how you changed your relationship to hope and =

D: ((nodding))

M: [Michael?]

MW: Yeah?

M: You want these? =

MW: = No [I’ll have one later on okay?]

D: [I think that’s enough sweetheart, it’s too much you won’t be able to eat lunch =

((talking to Mathew))

MW: = He is very generous =
D: = very generous =

MW: = yeah *yeah* very generous =

D: if it's ice-cream (inaudible) ((laughs))

MW: ((laughs))

D: *ok shhhh* you be a very good boy now

((saying to Mathew))

MW: yeah and (1.3) and um (2.0) um (.) just

wondering if there’s some change in terms

of a teamwork itself? if it can also account

you know for (.5) the steps that you are

taking to get back (.3) back your life in

some way so =

D: = yeah umm (1.6)

MW: Is there more teamwork than it was? Or is

the teamwork the same? Or is it changed? =

D: = I don’t know if it is changed um =

MW: = I don’t mean just with Steve I mean

generally you know with all the folks =

D: = um yeah I am trying to think how that

works? (3.7) I feel like I’m kind of more

you know back into the team =

MW: = back in to the team? =

D: = ye::ah back on the team =
D: = um (3.1) you know (.3) I’ve been kind of captain of this teams =

MW: = yeah =

D: = for a long time =

MW: = yeah =

D: = and I am still captain of the team um (1.9) I keep trying every once in awhile to share that (1.2) position with their dad but um (1.0) he isn’t really take the ball but >you know what I am trying to do is< to maybe allocate with more of some of the things that I can’t do =

MW: =hmm =

D: = and or even for their care or taking to appointments or whatever (.4) being less (.7) hopefully trying to let go of some of that so that I can (.5) have some of that more for myself =

MW: = hmm hmm =

D: = by maybe being better leader by delegating other people a little better.

((smiles))
 MW: I guess it’s a bit hard if other people don’t take the ball you know?

 D: = yeah=

 MW: = That makes it pretty difficult, doesn’t it to get out of that captain position?

 D: [yeah but you know actually he would take the ball but (. ) it’s like I am still the chief executive =

 MW: [right okay ((nodding))

 D: [I still make the final decisions (. ) but he does financially support it so that’s his job which he does well.

 MW: [*okay right okay good* um (2.0) in terms of the self-esteem that you mentioned that you’re being reclaiming and sense of accomplishment getting more in touch with your own (self) would you say self-discipline is that what you meant when you said discipline or?

 D: umm (2.6)

 MW: you said discipline and creativity =

 D: = yeah I meant self yeah I know I also have lots of discipline self-discipline I think um
A: ((Andrew coughing))

D: ugh okay um (1.7) did that hurt a little bit?

(asking Andrew) hm yeah um (5.7)

I think it was a discipline it’s kind of a challenge to myself to um (1.8) to in a midst to what seemed to me and others as chaos to be able to (carve) out the time for myself >but I have to say something about< the discipline I think it’s kind of two edge cause for me I’ve always been pretty disciplined so some of what I am trying to experiment with is (. ) not being so disciplined.

MW: Right okay that’s what I’ve guessed

[actually (inaudible)]

D: [yeah I mean I just kind of letting go of it a little bit =

MW: [yeah yeah

D: = is much more freeing than ((nodding)) =

MW: = right so you (won’t) be so disciplined? =

D: = right! yeah that is that’s true =

MW: = like a refusal in a sense =
D: ye:ah just kind of being (1.0) letting
things just happen a lit more and not
worrying so much about the consequences.

MW: ((writing notes while she was talking))
Okay, how are you achieving that in a
situation that’s? =

D: well I think I can talk about it in a relation
to school I mean I always I allow myself to
say well I can take extension on a paper I
never done that before ((smiles))

MW: ((laughs))

D: (.9) I haven’t had to yet but I just allow
myself to think that I can do that =

MW: =that that’s okay

D: [that’s okay =

MW: = yeah

D: = and that a lot of things are okay that
doesn’t something doesn’t have to be
perfect it’s just (.6) getting through it in
(tack) that’s important =

MW: = *yeah okay*. So how does that fit with
um (.8) this changing relationship with

hope? Are they connected this refusal to be
so [disciplined and changing your relationship to hope?

D: [ohhh you know it’s something that is happening now =

MW: [yeah

D: = it’s hard to say what

MW: [yeah

D: = I’m kind of wondering how it’s gonna (3.8) >you know what it is through< it’s kind of like hope that (1.2) well in allowing myself to to um have a different relationship with a discipline =

MW: = yeah =

D: = um it maybe (1.3) um (2.0) there is hope in that (.2) my life can be different that it has been =

MW: = right (1.9) okay so (that’s) the connection between the two in that sense =

D: = yeah =

MW: = yeah =

D: = it’s kind of opening another possibility and way to be =
MW: = okay (.7) your mom is sitting behind one-way screen here and um (1.0) I guess she knows already that you’ve been reclaiming self-esteem and sense of accomplishment and getting more in touch with intellectual capabilities and so on, right?

D: She intuitively knows a lot of things about me that I don’t have to say to her =

MW: = How would she know these things intuitively? Are you close? =

D: = Yes. =

MW: = You are.

D: We talk on the phone a lot and she’s very involved with my children =

MW: = yeah =

D: = and my life =

MW: = *right.* So so how many in your family you are one of how many? =

D: = I have two sisters.

MW: And where are you in the line up? =

D: = middle =

MW: = you are number two (. okay (. *okay*

((writing notes)) (1.7) so um: your mom is
hearing this now you (recon) some things that she will know intuitively but there were some pretty important developments in your life =

D: = aha =

MW: = in last few months or so?

D: Yeah I don’t know if *she* (.3) yeah I think she’s noticed some changes because she made some comments =

MW: = yeah? =

D: = about some things that I was doing that I hadn’t done before =

MW: = can you tell me about those comments? =

D: = um (1.5) well that I am >you know< I’ve been much more relaxed about um (1.1) entertaining in my house like having family for dinner and having people over. It’s much easier for me than it used to be. =

MW: = yeah yeah =

D: = umm (1.9) >and and< she’s commented on that (.3) we didn’t go into any discussion about it (.6) but I did (bring out) that it’s more fun than it’s used to be *you know* I
don’t feel as (.9) hassled* um I didn’t feel so comfortable (1.4) *yeah* when I was married it was ((laughs)) I spent so much emotional energy being angry that (.7) now I am freed of that and =

MW:  = right =

D: = there was emotional injury and other things that are more creative.

MW: Okay so (.5) so what is that reflect you think? The fact that you you said reflects (partly) that you are now separated that made it easier for you to be relaxed and =

D: [I think

MW: = less hassled and easier without [this =

D: [yeah =

MW: = how?

D: = and just be myself more I mean I feel like I’m (.6) I can I’m expressing who I am so much more than kind of being (.5) tied so much with this other person and wondering whether what I am doing is satisfactory to him and =

MW: = oh I see *yeah* =
D: so there is kind of a freedom in that =
MW: right okay so um (1.0) that helps me understand so it made a lot easier for you to be who you are (.8) and: just being with people and (.8) um =
D: uh-huh =
MW: not >not< um sort of having to fit with certain expectations about who you should be [or something like that, is that it? D: [yeah] and just >just< the mechanics of the home life =
MW: yeah =
D: needing help with the children and =
MW: yeah =
D: maybe some times getting it some times not or you know whatever [it was =
MW: [yeah =
D: it’s easier for me to just do it myself and not be annoyed because somebody else is not helping me [out kind of thing =
MW: [yeah =
D: but um (2.9) I don’t know I just feel more open to and I really enjoy (1.5) having the
people around me and my family we are very close family =
MW: = *uh-huh* =
D: = and um that’s really important to me =
MW: = right so that’s >that’s< more valuable to you that sense now than it was? =
D: = no my family has [always been important to me =
MW: [always been
D: = but I feel like I can enjoy them more >in my own home< =
MW: [yeah
D: = that’s the difference opening up my home to [them.
MW: [yeah so (you’re free)
D: [that feels really good you know =
MW: [okay.
D: = really been conscious of trying to have >you know< establishing new rituals for me and children around holidays and =
MW: = yeah? yeah? =
D: = doing different things that we didn’t do =
MW: = What sort of rituals? =
D: = Well we decorate the house for all the holidays =
MW: = yeah? =
D: = and make cookies for >you know< like we did Valentine’s cookies in shapes of hearts and we wrote everyone’s name on them on Valentine’s day and we um (.9)
D: What else did we do? What did we make the other day for Purim? ((looking at Mathew)) We had a Jewish holiday the other day we made hamentashen.
MW: [yeah yeah
D: = as each holiday kind of like being aware of the seasons and okay like (.7) Hanukah time is over we decorate for New Years and we make >you know< a big (thing) of =
MW: [yeah yeah
D: = so we just have new family rituals that are just ours.
MW: = yeah =
D: = so that’s really nice =
MW: [that’s great that’s great
D: ye::ah. =
MW: = and um (.5) and the children enjoy the rituals too I guess?
D: You know we involve Andrew in as many family things as we can =
M: [(inaudible)
D: and he likes having a lot of people around him so I know he enjoys that. And Mathew is >you know< he is learning with all these new things I want him to look forward to (.5) the holidays and when he remembers about the last time we celebrate it =
MW: [*yeah*
D: = so (. ) yeah I think he is enjoying it.
MW: (1.4) So it’s quite a different atmosphere generally in home *in your home life.*
D: [yeah
MW: Can I get back to this discipline >you know< are you surprised that to (1.0) um (.5) you know acknowledged the fact that
you are refusing to be (). so
disciplined or? is that surprise to you? or
isn’t? =
((nodding)) it is a surprise to me.
How come that it is surprised to you? that=
= um (5.5) *why is that surprise? These are
interesting question why?*
= um (1.0) I don’t know cause I guess I’m
so used to being one way um
(ugh ohh)
MW: of upsetting someone or?

D: yeah >no you know< I had a lot of years of being really disciplined about food and [eating =

MW: [(oh oh okay)

D: and um and I think a lot of that was just fear of (.) expressing myself of who I was =

MW: [right

D: as a woman and >you know< whatever other capabilities (.4) all the other capabilities that I have =

MW: = right =

D: = and just kind of letting (.2) some of that go um [it’s scary =

MW: [right yeah >yeah<

D: = and yet it feels like (.5) I’m kind of being more like a participant in life (than before)=

MW: So this fears would have you do what?

D: What sorts of things would these fears have you doing that can’t get you to do now you know? =

D: = um (1.7) well particularly around food just not wanting to be real disciplined about
what I ate and not wanting to (2.0) um >you
know< eating only what I was decided I
was going to eat that day and that kind of
thing =
MW: = right okay =
D: = be really controlled about it =
MW: = *yeah* =
D: = >cause I guess it< made me feel like I had
some control over my life =
MW: = right I get it. *yeah*=*
D: [*yeah
MW: = *okay* all right. >One of the things< that
I (.5) I’m gonna ask you couple of more
questions then (us) just we’ll hear from the
team if that’s? =
D: = okay fine ((nodding)) =
MW: = Are we talking about what you want to
talk about or [(inaudible)]?
D: [yeah actually I am aware of
saying lots of things that I can’t believe that
I am saying cause there are people on the
other end there [((laughs)) =
MW: [((laughs))]
D: = that I know so: ((laughing)) =
MW: = What sorts of things are you saying that you can’t believe you’re saying? =
D: = um (.4) well I think talking about (.9) the discipline about that and um about (1.2) the depression that I had and the medication =
MW: [yeah yeah
M: (inaudible)
D: = and that kind of stuff it’s very personal =
MW: = yeah =
D: = and =
MW: = Is it okay is it okay with you or? =
D: = It is now ((laughs)) yeah it’s okay.
MW: [*yeah right*
D: = yeah I think cause part of (.) my growth is being more open >I mean I don’t believe I have to tell everybody everything about my life< but being more open about things =
MW: = yeah =
D: = not keeping so many things to myself
MW: (.9) so: (1.0) okay is this something that you could have done like this six months
ago? or twelve months ago? (. ) talk so
openly about =
D: [I don’t know, I don’t know, maybe not
MW: [*not sure*
D: = about my children most probably but not
about myself.
MW: You know: um (.8) so you would be more
closed to people about yourself personally?
D: = uh-huh=
MW: = Do you see the increase in openness as a
positive thing or negative thing? =
D: = I think it’s a positive thing =
MW: [it’s positive
D: = yeah
MW: [yeah
How does that affect you? you know to be
more open in this way? How does it? =
D: = um I think (3.3) it makes me more um
(1.8) I don’t know (. ) it’s it allows me
closer connections to people I think. =
MW: = *right* (. ) okay. So changes your quality
of your [relationships =
D: [uh-huh
MW: = with others =
D: = uh-huh =
MW: = *yeah* was there a certain fear that you’ve managed to (.5) break free off like in relation to that? like what does this suggest that um
D: (.3) a certain fear? =
MW: = that there was a certain fear playing some part [ yeah (makes me find out) =
MW: = [in relation (with others) that I am not perfect or something ((laughs)) =
MW: = okay [a fear of being not perfect
D: [I mean big surprise! ((Diane and Michael White laugh))
MW: (2.3) So this fear that someone might find out that you are not being perfect =
D: [yeah =
MW: = [would be isolating
D: = [I think to be honest >I mean< it has a lot to do with my family and not wanting my
mom and dad to know certain things about
[me that are personal =
MW: [yeah yeah
D: = because it would be extra burden for them
to worry about it and also just to keep my
own boundary about (.7) who I am and
keep that =
MW: = yeah (.6) yeah. Are you concerned that
boundary is being broken today? or is? =
D: = a little bit =
MW: = is that a concern of yours? =
D: = a little bit =
MW: = It is, what are you concern about? =
D: = um =
MW: = cause this is a unique situation to have
your mom [behind the screen
D: [yes it is.] It caused me some
anxiety we talked about a little bit =
MW: [*yeah yeah*]
D: = um (3.6) well I think you know in regards
to specially when I talked about the
medications [is something I’ve never =
MW: [yeah
D: = told her =
MW: = right =
D: you know and and because I want it
because it was real important that it just be
my own personal thing =
MW: = yeah =
D: = and I don’t >you know I don’t want to
discuss it< =
MW: = right okay =
D: = it’s like it’s my own (.8) personal world =
MW: = yeah (1.2) so: um. How can we attend to
this concern like here today like your concern could have certain effect on your relationship with your mom or (play)
direction with you? =
D: = um (. ) well I don’t know that I am concerned to have direct specific relationship effect on my relationship um (.3) it’s just um (. ) it’s just the process of exposing [myself =
MW: [yeah yeah
D: = it’s kind of uncomfortable =
MW: yeah ((nodding)) okay is there any way that I could attend to that (. ) that we could attend to this discomfort? =

D: maybe we can bring her in too =

MW: maybe she will come in. =

D: yeah =

MW: okay I wonder if she’ll come in =

D: okay =

MW: *yeah* (.6) your mom’s name is?

D: Dorothy. =

MW: Dorothy. That’s right. *yeah* (2.5) I wonder if Dorothy could come in? =

((White’s looking at the mirror while asking)) ((door opens and Dorothy comes in))

MW: Hi Dorothy. Would you like to come in and join us?

Do: Sure. =

M: Dorothy there is a great movie! =

Do: There is a great movie?

D: ((Diane and Michael are laughing)) Mathew is making a great movie ((laughs)) =

MW: [((laughs))]

MW: [((laughs))]
This movie (starring) Mathew. We are calling it Mathew meets Michael.

(we are so (inaudible) it’s called)

((Mathew’s reading his book))

((5.0) waiting for the recording team to give Dorothy a microphone))

I am really glad that (. ) you suggested that Dorothy come in =

D: = uh-huh =

= yeah (. ) and I guess you:ur interested in Dorothy’s response to this or? =

= I am ye:ah just maybe

= *yeah* I would be interested in your response as well. =

= response to her taking medication? =

= well [what ((asking Diane))

[just this whole thing =

= I think as far as that I’ve noticed that she is feeling so much more upbeat and hopeful and we spoken about it and I am glad if that’s what doing it we have been glad to see changes =

MW: = yeah =
Do: = with her =

MW: = yeah yeah =

Do: = especially these past few weeks=

MW: [*yeah*

Do: = and it’s (.7) it’s been >feeling really
good< and (. ) if it’s part of her perspective
and her hope and with the medications

that’s great =

M: ((Mathew is moving around and talking
(inaudible) while Dorothy is talking))

Do: = that’s great. I wouldn’t have asked her it’s
that we you know speak about it and we
just want everything so good for her. (3.4)

She is very special.

MW: (1.5) I can understand that.

D: Shhhh be quite ((telling Mathew))

MW: What are you thinking about right now? =

Do: = I’m just thinking that I want everything
good (.7) and wonderful for her (.9) and
whatever process she goes through
therefore to be good (1.8) is alright. =

MW: = yeah =

M: (do you try movies?)
Come sit over here. ((telling Mathew))

MW: (1.2) So you really (inaudible) things =

Do: = absolutely absolutely ((nodding))

MW: Is there some problem *with this thing*?

((asking cameraman))

C: *no okay sorry*

Do: put it down ((saying to Mathew who sits in

her lap)) so that I can see Michael’s face =

MW: = so that’s what you are thinking about =

Do: = yeah *yeah* I know she’s been in a lot of

pain and I always want to fix it *but you*

can’t fix all the pain =

MW: = yeah.

Do: (1.8) and um (.6) I think some of the things

yeah that she said is not a surprise *to me*

and I’m certainly aware that there are times

(.5) I just don’t say it I don’t want to

impinge upon her own privacy and her own

boundaries because I do respect (.5) I have

a great deal of respect of her as a person. =

MW: = hmm =

Do: (2.4) and you know I hope that >you

know< whatever she needs we are there for
her certainly (1.1) and I certainly know that she feels open to that.

MW: (1.3) Do you want to say anything to your mom about the concerns you had about? =

D: = um (.9) ye:ah well it’s hard for me >you know< it’s like I think (1.0) what I wanted to =

A: [((Andrew is coughing))]

D: [ughhh] ((looking at Andrew))]

= look I am really aware in my relationship to you that I kind of like (.3) let you all the way in and sometimes put up wa:lls =

Do: = uh-huh =

D: = that’s not okay now and I know that it must be really hard [for you::

Do: [sometimes it gets a little confusing.

D: I know but it’s like sometimes um I guess it’s just whatever sometimes I just need that privacy and I think (.3) one of the reasons I was concerned about (.3) the medication is that I didn’t want >like I didn’t want< to talk about it (.8) um >you know< like with
the kids sometimes we talk about it and

stuff and =

Do: [uh-huh uh-huh

D: = you do some research and I really needed that to be [really private

D: = you blossomed

D: = so: that was my concern [about =

D: = [you blossomed

D: = not telling you. =

D: = I can understand that. =

D: = not that I didn’t think that you suspect it

((laughs)) because ((laughs))

Do: = I really didn’t suspect it I just thought that you just looked [so good lately you

D: = blossomed

D: = [you blossomed

D: = [because of the dates I had (laughs)

Do: I thought that was it! but to be able to do that and go out and you just looked more

upbeat you know we spoken about that you just have more (“jeune devire”) you know

it’s just been so good you know to see that.

*You know* these past few weeks and if
that’s what helped that’s great. You know I
(..) send people for medication and I find
that I see you know differences and I am
certainly a believer in it >you know to an
extent< and =
MW: = it might be part of the story but it’s only
part of the story =
D: = you know for me it’s a significant part of
the story =
MW: = right =
D: = not the effects of it but just my
willingness to say I can’t do this alone and
to reach out for [whatever =
MW: [right okay
D: = I needed
MW: [so that was a pretty yeah
D: [yeah
MW: Was that sort of getting away from this (.9)
disciplining of yourself as well *in a way or
like*? =
D: = yeah like I can do this myself
MW: [yeah
D: = or that um
MW: [so the act of (self) was significant=

D: = yeah and realizing that hope had limits =

MW: = yeah okay =

D: = *yeah* ((nodding)) =

Do: = I think some of it is (2.2) and I guess it
certainly (steams) back a lot from me
thinking that Diane can always do anything
that she ever wanted to do and I think it’s
too much of a burden to put upon anybody
(6) >you know as a parent< because (. .) she
was always just so present and there and
interested and bright and certainly always
took leadership roles you know even as a
very young child and saying to someone oh
you can do whatever you want and (.4)
that’s you know I realized that now that’s
too much to say to anybody because then
you have to keep living up to it and doing
that (.6) and that can be a hardship.

D: It’s hard to say perfect thing when your
parents are always right ((laughs)) =

Do: = That’s true. =
MW: = Has you mom um (.9) done anything to contribute to you actually breaking free of these expectations as well? I think mom is (inaudible) but is she also =

D: = yeah I think so because there was always a sense of having to (.3) live up to some expectations that my mother has of me and so in her (. ) um it’s been a lot of (.4) times when I and I was very open and sharing how difficult at time that was for me this past summer and (.2) her support of me and her ability to >you know< her saying (2.4) acknowledging the limits was really important like a real relief [like oh I don’t have to be! =

MW: [so your mom’s acknowledgment of the fact =

D: = yeah I don’t have to be you know sometimes it is a pressure well (. ) Why don’t you do that? Why don’t you do that? Is like HA maybe I have to do that, but just the recognition that there are some limits
and that she acknowledged them was (.4) pretty significant.

MW: So this (hope feels) like there is always lots of gaps that I am always interested in when I am talking with people and this (hope) fills the gap a little bit for me =

Do: = uh-huh =

MW: = and I am starting to find out about what your contribution has been to your daughter you know daughter’s refusal to be so disciplining of herself, is that correct in a way? =

D: = uh-huh yeah =

MW: = your mom has played a role in it (.6) and how did she? =

D: = Not that I think she played a role in making me so disciplined ((laughs)) but =

MW: = yeah yes both =

Do: = ((noding)) certainly retrospectively one can look back and (give her a) smart =

MW: = yeah yeah we can always be wise (in down sight) =

Do: [absolutely absolutely
MW: = I don’t think we don’t think give any of
us is that being wise in (forth sight).

D: Yeah we don’t know exactly what to say in
front *to do that that would be nice* =

MW: = So what is your mom said or done that’s
contributed to you (.5) this refusal to be so
disciplined and some of the other things
that we were talking about?

[inaudible (expectations)]

D: [Said or done?] God I don’t think that I can
think of specific things

MW: [what worked?]

D: you know well (1.5) >you know< I think
just an acceptance which is been so
important to me (1.0) you know the
difficulty that I’ve been going through
particularly around my separation =

MW: = yeah =

D: = and concerns about the children (.8) just
going on the phone with my mother she
does listens to me the only person in the
world I don’t have to pay you know she
does listen to me ((laughs)) =
Do:  

((smiles))

D:  = and that’s so valuable to me (. ) I don’t

mean it cynically as it sounds. ((laughs))

Do:  = (nodding and smiles))

MW:  Did you >did you< were you aware that

you played some role in (that)? =

Do:  = I certainly know that I play a role in my

children’s lives =

MW:  = yeah =

Do:  = you know to know to what extent I think

a parent really doesn’t always know to what

extent (.2) and I hope that Diane knows that

I’m always there even if it’s telephone call=

MW:  = I guess I was meaning specifically did

you know that you played some role in

helping Diane to (.9) enter into this refusal

of disciplining herself so much and to (.)

challenge the [expectations =

Do: [no, not really

MW:  = change her the relationship with hope?

Do:  [not really =

MW:  = Is it important for you to know? =

Do:  = It is important to know that. =
MW: = It is =
Do: = and it is also >you know< important to
know she got referred to you before and in
like doing her own rituals and having things
in her own home when in the past >you
know< I have done it *you know* I am
mom and everybody comes to mom’s house
and I do everything and I try to do the best I
can (.4) and the fact that she is wanting to
do it and so well =
MW: = yeah =
Do: and it’s been (.3) so warm and caring =
MW: = *yeah* =
Do: = and um it’s so good for me to see you
know to see her doing that and I know that I
backed off if she says come to my house
and we are doing something. We are having
this holiday party and um (.9) I don’t have
to say I’ll do it =
MW: = right okay =
Do: = when in the past I would say oh don’t
bother I’ll do it now =
but what’s important to me is interesting how it started because it used to be I was so overwhelmed with having the whole family in my house and with Andrew and Mathew and trying to have everything done (.) but the family said let’s do it in a way that’s easiest for you Diane =

= and the easiest thing for me turned out to have it in my own home. I don’t have to bring Andrew and they said we’ll bring the food (.) Was it thanksgiving? We’ll bring the food and I said fine ((laughs)) I’ll set the table (.) but I mean just that (2.0) just that (.) concern of making it easiest for me and allowing me to make it easy on myself because I always try to do things that I thought was supposed to be done =

[for everybody else

= for everybody else that was like worst for me =

= *yeah yeah* =
D: = so it’s that permission giving >I mean<
even at age almost thirty-nine ((laughs))

MW: ((laughs)) you are already thirty-nine? =

D: = ((laughs)) thanks!

Do: [(laughs)]

D: = not quite >I am only thirty-eight<

*in two weeks I’ll be thirty-nine* =

MW: = only thirty-eight ((smiles)) =

D: = ((laughs))

Do: [(laughs)] (.)

M: ((Mathew is playing loudly))

Do: want some (air) Mathew? =

MW: = we are going [to switch around in just a

sec =

D: [oh-oh honey, Mathew are you

ready to get up now?]

Do: (I can take him outside) pardon?

MW: = he’s been really good =

Do: = [he has been this is a long time

he has been this is a long time for him

MW: = they both are being great actually =

D: = yes Andrew you too
Do: [I actually came along to help take care of children =

MW: = yeah =

Do: = not into the room cause I did respect Diane’s privacy and felt that was important.

MW: was um (.9) is this something um (.6)

Mathew was a bit primed up for this meeting or?

D: (.7) Was he what? =

MW: = I am just impressed with how Mathew’s being in [this meeting

D: [he’s been excellent terrific he’s been very good

MW: = I said was he primed up for the meeting?

Do: [Diane talked to him this morning

D: [We talked about it yesterday that he is not going to school today he is going to meet Michael White from Australia he was really

trilled with that =

MW: = yeah really? =

D: = He called you Michael Jackson a few times but =

MW: = Michael Jackson yeah that’s okay =
Do: He called Ronald Regan Ronald McDonalds =

MW: (laughs) that’s okay too.

D: [come on sweetheart

MW: So he’s been really great =

D: = he’s been very welled behaved I am very proud of you sweetie =

MW: = Do you know why your mom is proud of you? =

M: = eh? =

MW: = Do you know why she is proud of you?

M: ((Mathew’s making funny faces and sounds for camera))

MW: ((laughs)) (inaudible) because you are so cute? ((laughs))

D: ((kissing and hugging Mathew)) smart boy can I wipe your nose?

MW: Can I just say quickly =

Do: = yes =

MW: = before we turn around (.) just to get some (.3) we’ve been talking about things generally and some other questions that I would ask but I’m not going to because of
the time situation I am interested in
interviewing you about um (.9) a little bit
more um (.3) because um Diane (. ) is a little
surprised that she is actually achieved what
she has in terms of refusing to be so
disciplined um reforming revising her
relationship with hope challenging the
expectations so that they don’t stretch her
(1.0) put her in a (limb) like they did and
number of other developments. But I was
gonna ask you whether you were surprised
that she achieved this (. ) and if you are
surprised I would be interested in talking
with you about that and if not I would be
interested in you telling some story about
your daughter that would give us a bit of an
idea of what sort of foundations that she
was standing on in order to make it a
business to change the shape her life in a
way that she has (.4) in recent times but (.7)
I don’t know if you have any immediate
response to that?
Do: (2.3) the surprise about discipline because I did not realized that’s what she was working on =

MW: = yeah =

Do: = that was a surprise =

MW: = yeah =

Do: = that was not what I thought =

MW: [yeah yeah

Do: = what she was working on. =

MW: = right.

D: = because I have it’s true I have seen her as a disciplined person she has always worked really hard and persevered and having everything you know come out just right and I think >you know< the difficulties that she has had and I think it’s her own and I am sure a lot of it is external >you know from us< but her own intrinsic way of wanting to be perfect and thinking that that’s what she had to do because that was what’s expected of her that she would do that (.3) and um (.2) I am sure >you know< that at many levels >you know< I gave her
(.6) that (2.1) that that (1.7) that projection that’s how she should be: (. ) and I >and I< meant it in a positive way positive for her and her own self-growth and I guess it has certain >you know< had certain destructive qualities to it you know I can look back and say that and um (. ) and but as far as the discipline it’s interesting you know it’s really interesting and surprising to me that that’s what has helped her right now in moving ahead and forging ahead you know with her own growth =

MW: = Are there any time in Diane’s life with you you ever experienced her um (.9)
MW: = raveling) in imperfection? Can you ever recall a time when Diane was imperfect? =
D: = (laughs))
MW: = when she seemed (in revenant in that)
MW: = can you?* =
Do: = well she would get herself in a corner a lot =
MW: = would she? =
Do: = and couldn’t get herself out I mean that’s we always said that she works so hard to do something or get herself entangled in the corner was there and needed to walk out >you know< two steps from it and couldn’t see it. So you know that’s certainly is (*sign of imperfection*) =

MW: = Could you ever imagine yourself (reveling) in imperfection? =

D: = I can image it =

MW: [you can imagine it

D: = yeah sounds like a really fun thing to do ((laughs)) =

MW: = yeah? I was just wondering (.4) um I am not going to ask you to imagine how you might do that at this point (.4) but if you were to (reveling) in imperfection and experienced um applause from your mom in relation to that >or not applause< but just really appreciation for that (. ) would that make a difference to you?

D: um (1.5) hmm =
applause was not the right word because
that’s bit like =
yeah like a performance =
yeah like being perfect I didn’t mean
perfect I mean perfection you know um but.
yeah like a performance =
yeah like being perfect I didn’t mean
perfect I mean perfection you know um but.
(1.0) I don’t know I would have to think
about that. I mean I know giving myself I
just know in small ways how recently I’ve
kind of said (. ) oh this is not perfect and
that’s oka:y and that’s great you know =
[yeah
I can think of small things =
that’s on a way isn’t it? =
yeah =
yeah *okay* (.8) Anyway I won’t ask you
to answer that question right now because
we are running we have pretty tight time
schedule =
okay =
so we are going to hear from the
reflection team now =
yeah.
I’ll tell you that um (.8) it’s I suppose I should see being surprised that the world prevents *you know* these kinds of what seems like coincidences when you experience what I had. um um I became interested in this field as a result of having a child (.5) who was profoundly retarded at age four and a half and so (1.4) Diane’s (1.2) curiosity about how other people cope with was one of my motivations too. I started working with school kids after my daughter got (.9) my second daughter and um (1.8) started to see how much families were needing attention. The kids needed every minute every second they were getting but I can see how much families were needed and instead of working directly with the children who were handicapped and had different I moved into working with families also so I am really quite moved at that other someone else has taken a path like this in this work. =
M1: = and that’s had a strong influence on your professional life too?

W1: Well it’s (.hhh) what how I got to be here um (1.6) I have been (2.2) I never thought about that question before. What is >you know< I don’t work most of the time with families who have children who are *you know have* these kinds of issues I moved more into working with couples and people who are afraid um =

M2: = this just coming from um >you know< a position some personal knowledge around you know Diane’s situation I don’t know if there was anything about her that struck you in particular or just you know sort of just coming from you also (your) position um (.5) is there anything?

W1: (1.2)Yes now that you asked me um (.6) um her humor um her easiness with both boys um struck me that something I’ve seen and haven’t thought of it just until you asked me that question about um how was it that that I could do you know work with a child
and have children and one who was profoundly handicapped and it was people would say ugh isn’t that hard? And I go (.9) well yes no yes it’s just as hard as you think it is no it’s not because it’s just what I do I just get up and do it >you know< so I was really touched by the easiness and humor = I was really impressed with (1.2) what’s she is juggling and how well she is doing it. I was reflecting of my own experiences in graduate school which in itself was so physically and emotionally stressful for me. It was one of hardest time for me really = Is that about what she said how people coped? = yeah and I mean on the top of that she’s dealing with two kids and kids that are particularly challenged and I (.7) was really impressed in light of my own experience with just challenged of graduate school itself. I’ll just go next and I’ve listened to a lot of women who I worked with explain to me
some of their experience and *you know*

I’ve heard >over and over< women talking about how they sort of being systematically recruited into sort of lifestyle of (.5) being for others and sort of restricted disciplines and sort of life of (itself make life). I was very impressed by Diane (1.3) and her (.hhh) some of the things that she described that (.8) she’s a >you know< she’s in some instances in recent times she refused to some of discipline invitations. She >she< seems to experiment a little bit in terms of delegating responsibility around issues with the kids with some limited success I understand. (1.7) And this idea that she seems to making use of it seems useful to her to sort of bringing herself in the world more um I find it it was very interesting to me um and I guess one question that I had about it was (1.7) >you know< how might sort of the shift that she seems to be (1.1) um you know undertaking in her life (.) how might this shift invite others to sort of
notice her in new ways (.) and to be for her
as she seems to be embarking on a road of
>you know< balancing her life between being for others and being for herself.
((nodding))

W1:  I am interested in that notion of her of what you were saying about how might that encourage other people to be (1.0) for her (4.1) um I wondered if the Thanksgiving thing was an example of that (.8) where instead of her doing it herself (1.2) everyone said well let’s make it easy on you and she oh the easiest would be to have it in my house so we’ll bring the food and so and so, I wonder is that the thing you were thinking of? =

M2:  = yeah, I think so. I think so and as you were saying that I’ll just tag one of the idea onto because this is strictly based on my experience you know listening to to women talk to me (.5) but one of the things that they describe that makes such a sort of admirable you know big undertaking is that
>you know< often when they sort of (1.0)
separate from you know um these
disciplines that restrained them or often
when they sort of undertake this um
endeavor of being for themselves (.9) guilt
has a way and as Michael point out
expectations have a way of trying to sort of
throw her back you know into a self-neglect
position. And I wonder >I don’t know if
this applies to her or not< but if it does the
question I have would be: I wonder if she
has any experience of (.5) sort of you know
maneuvering around what guilt might have
in mind or =
M1: = yeah I had a thought in relation to what
you said David in terms of (.9) being
familiar with ah trying to do things all by
herself and really being new in a sense to
relying on others and reaching out to others
(.7) um and she has quite a community that
she seems to have reached out to in terms of
the physical therapist the doctors and the
support group and her husband and her
mother and I am sure other people are involved as well. And I was wondering if this community that she’s helped built in a sense had a voice what would it say about her participation with her children, what would it say about her taking timeout for herself, what would be community voice be about that? =

M2: = Do you have any fantasies about that?

M1: I don’t have a particular image I was just curious more of what that would be.

((knocking on door or window))

W2: I’ll talk briefly, I was curious about that too because when you talked about thanksgiving and um: >the other people coming in and bringing the food and that sort of thing< but I am curious to know if Diane would asked them how comfortable they were about having that type of the relationship with her which seems like a shift. I am curious what they would say? So I was following what you said. The other comment I want to make is (being I am)
I’ve worked with a lot of people who had children with disabilities which may be extremely challenging to them (.6) and I think there is a real invitation a >very very< strong invitation of being for others in that situation and one thing that really stood out for me about Diane and thinking back of other people I’ve worked with is when she was talking about hope and how she changed her relationship with hope. And just personally knowing being with others what a difficult (task) that is to do to shift that you are going to change what was that you intended initially and it takes a lot of strength and lot of courage to do that and I guess I witnessed that in other people so I wanted to let her know that I am trying to appreciate how difficult that is and also I’ve seen other people go through that but what really stood out of that is that she felt comfortable as she made each of those shifts, she seems now feeling more
comfortable about making each of those shifts which is I think that contributed to that difference in relationship with hope =

M3: = yeah that really speaks to her future as well =

W2: = It does yeah I wonder about future =

M3: = through her past through recognizing the sparkling uniqueness of the struggle of the struggling past through this and what this point toward her future =

W2: = uh-huh yeah =

M3: = yeah that’s *a nice way to put it*

W1: It’s probably good time to go there is so much more to say =

M1: = yeah. ((Everyone is standing up to leave the room; the end of reflecting team))

MW: ((White with family again))

just wonder what do you um any comments about those thoughts or reflections I know it was little distracting for you cause you were pretty [busy

D: [um well I >I was listening really <

trying to remember what I was thinking
about when I was in there um (.8) I was
kind of smiling to myself cause one of the
gentlemen said something about the
experience of guilt ha ((laughs)) I wrote a
book on this ((laughs)) =

MW: [((laughs))]

D: = yeah >I mean< because letting go of
some of the stuff and becoming (1.0) is
such a process just it’s beginning of
becoming >you know< for myself is so hard because I think about (.3) some of the
questions were who would be least
surprised and who would be (.2) about you
know what would community’s voice
would be (.2) I always have this community
voice in my head like (.4) you know of
course I do fabulous job with kids and I
know everybody thinks that’s great but
what they would think about me doing for
myself that feels >like I am not really
supposed to do that< so it’s kind of trying
to let go of that =

MW: = yeah *yeah* =
D: = that’s really hard to do.

MW: (1.2) [so that =

D: [maybe I would be so prefect with kids

but maybe I won’t be so amazing with

children

MW: ((nodding)) ye:ah

M: ((screaming))

D: Honey wanna sit at mommy’s lap? ((asking Mathew)) ha? We are almost done sweetie=

MW: [So was that?

D: = I know this is hard for you ((saying to Mathew))

MW: why (inaudible) would be really good yeah?

and (.5) I can understand why your mom is

proud of you *yeah* same with Andrew =

D: = Andrew is good boy too =

MW: = um *any* normally I would ask few more

questions about that but (inaudible) and um

I think that we should (find this out) fairly

soon >any other do you have any other

thoughts about reflections?<( (asking

Dorothy))
(1.6) I was thinking what I heard some of it
I didn’t hear very well what they were
saying about >you know< also about >you
know< the community and expectations of
Diane =

= yeah =
= and um (1.4) and how she would >you
know< perceive other >other< how other
person would perceive her? And and you
know in knowing her I know that she she
always works to live up to those
expectations of her because everyone says
everything you do is so well () everything
is in order and how do you do it? I am
always so amazed by it. I think the more
people say that the more pressure it puts
upon her =

[yeah yeah
= and that’s a hard one because she
internalizes all that pressure because most
people don’t expect that she would have to
do all the things that she does.

[right
And that’s certainly is how she internalizes that everyone has that expectation. I think people are surprised and would not be surprised um. If she falls down on anything or says I can’t do it I need help.

((whispering to children))

= because people would certainly say she has a handful but look how great it is =

*yeah* so that’s something

= inadvertantly people would actually increased expectations that Diane might not have thought so* just the remarks of that

= yeah and then surprised that she continues to do that and if she says I can’t I don’t feel that yeah it’s about time that she said that because she just moves along so well that most people would see her and say I don’t think she has care in the world =

= yeah =
Do: = you know which is just incredible.

MW: We can just stop in just a minute. Normally I would be wanting to ask more questions about your experience of reflecting team =

D: = uh-huh =

MW: = but I have just (another) question that I would like to ask and then we will stop okay? =

D: = yeah =

MW: = um I just (.5) I was talking to your mom briefly about (.9) her contribution to (1.2) challenging discipline and >whatever< and your mom talked about her contribution to enforcing yours =

D: [yeah ((smiles))]

MW: = was that acknowledgment from your mom? Was that a positive thing for you? =

D: = yeah yeah it is. Actually to tell you the truth it opens up possibilities for further discussions for more conversation with my mom about that.

MW: For her to acknowledge the part she played

D: [yeah
and you subjecting yourself to these expectations or to be perfect =

[yes]

or whatever =

Yes.

I figured that was pretty important =

= it is =

that acknowledgment (.7) *yeah* so: um I

figured that was a special contribution that I experienced from your mom today that sort of we didn’t get back to at the beginning of

the session that I would like to explore a little bit more cause I figured that’s pretty important. And I also wondered whether

um (1.4) um its been an issue for you as well Dorothy >you know< in your life to challenge (.6) this notion of perfection?

*Um* =

= In my own personal life? =

= yeah? =

= yeah yeah =

= It’s been issue for you as well. =
Do: =yeah. I was always trying to do more and not thinking that I could do it and trying to do it better and surprising myself if I >do do< something and (I am) able to take full credit if someone says you did that really well =

MW: = okay. And if you had a little bit of break through in it as well?

Do: Yeah yeah I think =

MW: = When did you have a break through in that?

Do: (3.1) I would say in recent years =

MW: [in recent years?]

Do: = really in recent years. So it wasn’t certainly during Diane’s growing up days =

MW: = right =

Do: = and certainly >you know< it impacted on her for sure ((nodding)) =

MW: = okay so (. ) so you had break through in recent [years um =

Do: [uh-huh

MW: so approximately how old were you when you had that break trough? =
Do: = I am pretty old now ((laughs))

what [should I say? =

D: = just a little bit over thirty-nine

Do: = she is older than I am so (1.1) I would say

in my late fifties =

MW: = so you did it in your late fifties =

Do: = uh-huh =

MW: = and you did it in your late thirties *okay =

Do: = she’s ahead of me =

MW: so I wonder when the next challenge might
go from there?

Do: ((laughs))

D: ((laughs))

MW: = in early teens. =

Do: = early teens would be good. ((laughs)) =

MW: = yeah. I was interested in that as well.

Because that’s something I would also like
to explore. We won’t explore that right now

because we are really (head up) against the
time limits but a (.7) I’d like to explore

what got you recruited into those

expectations? and (.5) how was it that in

your late fifties you also refused and (.9)
I’m also wondering about that sort of link
>you know< so =

D: = I wonder if there is simultaneous letting
go of that =

Do: = uh-huh =

D: = on both our parts =

MW: = yeah =

D: = because I always had a feeling that um
(.8) that my mother was very excellent in
what she did >she never really knew it < =

MW: = yeah =

D: = and so it was she would look at me and
think that >you know< I can do some things
that she couldn’t do =

MW: = yeah =

D: = and maybe recognizing that she is good
enough and prefect enough >is maybe kind
of < comes at the same time as mine does
maybe is something that happens
simultaneously. Listen guys ((saying to
children)) =
MW: = So we are going to stop now. (inaudible)

simultaneously protesting at particular point in time =

D: = Excuse me? =

MW: = like simultaneous protest at the same point in time. It’s really interesting to explore further >but we are going to stop now<. We gonna skip the forth part because we just don’t have time to do that. (.9) And I just would like to say I really enjoyed meeting with you =

D: = Thank you. I enjoyed as well. =

MW: = and I am really pleased that you come in as well

Do: [Thank you thank you ((shakes hands with Michael)) and thank you Diane for letting me in because =

D: = ((shakes hands with Michael)) it’s always difficult ((said to Dorothy)) =

MW: = and all the best with rest of your program

D: [thank you
MW: = for the three thousand hours of the supervision ((smiles with Dorothy))

D: Do you have an opening in Australia for intern? ((laughs))

MW: [((laughs)) We have a lot of requests for that sort of thing =

D: [I bet you do

MW: = yeah but shall be fun.

M: Thank you Michael White ((shakes hands))

MW: Thank you very much it's been really good meeting you.

M: Thank you Michael thank you fat boy!

MW: Fat boy? Was he talking about you?

((looking at the camera)) ((laughs))

D: = don’t be silly =

M: (inaudible)

D: I thought we are going to make it though the whole morning without saying that.

MW: Well we nearly made it.

M: ((laughing))

MW: Mathew(.) I’ve enjoyed meeting with you it’s been really good =

M: = I enjoyed ((making faces and sounds))
and Andrew I’ve enjoyed meeting with you

too Andrew I’ve enjoyed meeting with you

Thank you Michael. Thank you fat boy!

((laughs))

Mathew! (Don’t be silly)

Well I would to =

[Mr. White!]

= I would identify with that a little bit more

last year but I lost a little bit of weight since

then ((smiles)) =

((laughs)) Have you seen this dinosaurs

show? =

= No I haven’t. =

= but that’s what (inaudible)

[he picks those things on the shows.

((laughs)) (Shaming) television isn’t it?

ye:ah so take this off ((taking of his microphone)).

Thank you.

Thank you Michael!
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